

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_tbhs\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tbhs_01.php)

# Transactions

of the

## Baptist Historical Society.

---

“A True and Short Declaration, both of the Gathering and Joining Together of Certain Persons [with John More, Dr. Theodore Naudin, and Dr. Peter Chamberlen]: and also of the lamentable breach and division which fell amongst them.”

THE above words not included in brackets, as is well known, originally formed the title to Robert Browne's fourth published work, which was printed about 1583, and which gives the early history of the church organized by him. I now would apply this expressive title to the very similar history of an early Anabaptist congregation in London, which was apparently gathered <sup>1</sup>(organized is too formal an expression) about August 20, 1652, and led a precarious existence until May 23, 1654, or somewhat later.

Up to the present time it has been known that there was such an Anabaptist church, and that its membership included in 1654 such persons as Dr. Peter Chamberlen, John Light, John Spittlehouse, John Davis, Richard Ellis, Richard Smith, and Robert

1. The church appears not to have been fully organized until about the middle of January, 1653-4, or perhaps somewhat later.

Feak.<sup>2</sup> It has been known, too, that this congregation practised the immersion of believers or adults,<sup>3</sup> feet washing, and laying on of hands,<sup>4</sup> and it has been supposed that it held its services for worship on Saturdays. Until now the inner history of the church has remained a blank.

It fortunately happens that the original Records of this congregation are in existence to-day,<sup>5</sup> preserved in a thin folio of about 130 closely-written pages. The earliest date in the volume is on the title-page at the back, where the accounts were kept. Here we read "London: A Booke for the Accounts<sup>6</sup> and other Businesses Of the Chirch: Aug the 20.<sup>th</sup> 1652." The next earliest date is that of August 22 in the same year, found on page 3, where, written in the later hand of Dr. Peter Chamberlen, have been added various notes<sup>7</sup> relating to the subject of church discipline, etc., under the heading, "Acts of the Church. Delivery to Satan", which forms a rather uninviting introduction to the book. The accounts of the church also date from August 22. No attempt seems to have been made to enter records of church proceedings in the volume until June 5, 1653, from which time they appear with some irregularity until May 23, 1654, when they abruptly end. Thus about one hundred and thirty pages of records have been packed into the space of less than one year. This fact in itself would make this old minute book a notable work, but it is rendered still more worthy of attention by the presence in it of other factors, which tend greatly to enhance its value.

In the first place, the records are for the most part composed of separate original documents, which are written in a variety of hands, and in several instances contain interesting autographs. In this respect the volume is quite unique among works of its kind that I have had the opportunity to examine. The earliest writing in the book—the title—is in John More's hand. He also kept the earliest accounts of the church, namely, from August 22,

2. Dr. J. W. Thirle's "A Sabbatarian Pioneer—Dr. Peter Chamberlen", in the "Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society" for May, 1910, p. 23, etc.

3. The mode of baptism employed by the congregation is not directly mentioned or described in the records, but is implied in the case relating to the sprinkling of the child of Rebecca Hounsell who married the Jew, "Eleazar." Chamberlen says to her (p. 51): "You knew that Sprinkling of Infants is no Ordinance of Christ,"

4. This congregation of English Anabaptists apparently began to practice laying on of hands about 1653-4, but Henry Danvers, in "A Treatise of Laying on of Hands, London, 1674, p. 58, suggests that others did so earlier.

5. Rawl. MS. D. 828, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

6. Throughout this article practically all abbreviations have been extended.

7. Written, I think, about Jan. 1, 1653-4.

1652, until November 21, 1653, as well as the earliest minutes, and in the volume besides are six rather extended letters written by him to the congregation. Before December 25, 1653, accordingly, I infer that More was the “Overseer”,<sup>8</sup> if we may so call him, of the church. By far the greatest part of the volume of records, however, was written by Dr. Peter Chamberlen, but I think that he cannot have been very prominent in the affairs of the church, if indeed a member, before about November 21, 1653, when his name first appears in the accounts. On December 25, 1653, Chamberlen seems to have taken the account and minute book in charge, and from that date onwards it was evidently in his keeping. Besides the handwriting of More and Chamberlen, there are at least three letters of Dr. Theodore Naudin (one of them extended) containing fine autographs by him, a letter by Rebecca More with her signature, a short note by Henry Jessey with his autograph, etc.

In the second place, these records present to us a remarkably human view of the internal affairs of this early Anabaptist Church. Robert Browne’s story of the trials of his congregation, published seventy years before these pages were written, is indeed a “short declaration” “of the lamentable breach and division which fell amongst” them, as compared with the minute and particular narrative of the woes of Dr. Chamberlen’s church, which are here so undisguisedly depicted. There is, indeed, no better evidence of the unexpected difficulties into which the early separatists were plunged, than is given in this old book with unexampled fulness and vividness.

In the third place, these records plainly show that “the Church that walked with Dr. Peter Chamberlen” up to the spring of 1654 was not a Seventh-Day Anabaptist congregation,<sup>9</sup> as has hitherto been supposed.

---

8. Henry Jessey in 1652 addresses a letter to John More as if he was an authority in the congregation at that period, and Peter Chamberlen in the Records (p. 131) speaks of “how farr unfit he [More] was for an Overseer.”

9. For calling my attention to this very important point I am indebted to Dr. Whitley. Chamberlen in almost every instance indicates the days of the week on which the church held its meetings by the astronomical signs, as was his custom, pointed out by Dr. Thirtle, *Transactions*, vol. II. p. 7. So far as I remember, not a single meeting here recorded was held on a Saturday. It is my present belief that Dr. Chamberlen did not become a Sabbatarian until about 1656. About the beginning of the year 1657 (New Style) Johh Spittlehouse published a work relating to the Seventh-Day Sabbath. This is the earliest English Anabaptist tract bearing on the controversy that I remember to have seen. It is entitled “A Manifestation of sundry gross absurdities,” and was written against a sermon preached by John Simpson on December 14, 1656. Shortly after Spittlehouse also wrote another pamphlet against the same sermon, entitled “A Return to some Expressions”. Thomas Tillam’s book entitled “The Seventh-Day Sabbath”, which was published in 1657, is another of the earliest works of the kind. On Jan. 6, 1658-9 we find Dr. Chamberlen and Thomas Tillam holding a Dispute on that subject with Jeremiah Ives. In 1659 Ives brought out his

In the fourth place, we have in these records such fresh material for character sketches of the worthies of that congregation as to-day is very seldom found. In this connection the following well-known view<sup>10</sup> of Chamberlen and his church, written by Thomas Tillam about 1653-4, may be presented for comparison with what is to follow:—

And having found many congregations in the practise of the ordinances I wanted, I was by a blessed hand guided to my most heavenly brother, Doctor Peter Chamberlen, one of the most humble, mortified souls (for a man of parts) that ever yet I met with. In whose sweet society I enjoyed the blessing of my God, by the laying on of hands. And after a lovefeast, having washed one another's feet, we did joyfully break bread, concluding with a hymn. In all which the singular majesty of Christ shined forth, to the mighty conviction of some choice spectators.

Here Thomas Tillam undoubtedly presents an ideal picture of the congregation and its Elder, and it is well for the sake of perfect fairness that it has been preserved. But that Tillam's view is rather that of a favourably disposed casual visitor, than of one intimately acquainted with the affairs of the church, is made perfectly evident, when we take a peep, as it were, behind the scenes into the "inner life" of the church. For this purpose we may now turn to some of the more striking minutes and documents contained in the Records:—

[From margin, p. 5: "1652 December the 15.<sup>th</sup>"]  
Eliazer Barishaie Baptized at ovidford I.[ohn]  
M.[ore].<sup>1</sup>

[From Margin: "16.<sup>th</sup>"]  
Sister Hownsell and Bro: Eliazer married giving  
writings runing as foll.[ows:].<sup>2</sup>

---

"Saturday no Sabbath," and in his Epistle mentions Mr. Spittlehouse's "*Book called, Error blasted*". I infer, therefore, that Sabbatarianism became a matter of special interest to English Anabaptists only about 1656 or 1657, when Dr. Chamberlen with others, probably including members of this earlier congregation, may have "gathered" a new church on a Sabbatarian basis.

10. In a letter to the Anabaptist Church at Hexham (Hanserd Knollys Society's edition of the "Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys, and Hexham," London, 1854, p. 323).

1 That is, More baptized "Barishaie," who was a Jew. Dr. Whitley believes that Old Ford was at that time the scene of many baptisms.

2 The account of this marriage ceremony tallies very well with that of another such ceremony which took place several years earlier among the English Anabaptists, as reported by Thomas.

I—doe receive unto my selfe in the presens of God, and men, to bee my Lawful wife during the terme of my dayes in this present Life to haive and to hovld unseperable and un alterablle till deth to the testefijng and Iustefijng of which I haive sent [*sic*] heare unto my hand in the presens of god as above said and wee [i.e., us] whose names are under written

December the 16.<sup>th</sup> 1652.

I Eliazer Barisaie Befor god at the time abovesaid receive unto my selfe as my Lawfull wife Rebecka Hownsell Widdow to In.<sup>o</sup> Hownsell to haive and to hould unseperable and un alterabli till death. apou what grovnds or pretenses what soever contrary to the Law of god or of this nation of England wherin we live, to haive and to hovld as above said in Lawfull wedlock wittnesse my hand the day and yeare above saide  
elizier bar issaie

December the 16.<sup>th</sup> 1652.

I Rebecka Hownsell as aforesaid doe Receive apou the saime grownds in the presens of God. Eliazer Barisaie as my lawfull husband to haive and to hould till death wittnesse my hand the day and yeare aboue said

Rebeckah hounsell

---

Edwards (“The third Part of Gangæna,” London, 1646, p. 113) :—“She [a woman who had been a member of Blunt, Emmes, and Wrighter’s Church in London] married a husband, a Box-maker, one of [Thomas] Lam’s company, who got from her all he could, and set up a Boxmakers-shop on purpose (as she conceives) to get what she had to furnish a shop with, and after a time went away from her into the Army, and though he came out of the Army a long while agoe, yet he keeps from her, and will not live with her, nor allow her any maintenance ; and she having followed him to his church and meetings, the Church maintaines him in it (as she reports to me) saying she is an unbeliever and of the world, what have they to do with her, with other words to that effect ; and when she goes to any place, where she hears he is, or thinks she may find him, they abuse her, are ready to offer her violence, and some of these Sectaries will deny he is married to her, and bid her prove it. Now she tells me that in those Anabaptists Churches, (of which she sometimes was[]) they are not married by Ministers, nor by any other man speaking words to each party which they assent to, but before some of their way they professe to take each other to live together, and one of their company writes down in a paper, with some hands subscribed to it, of two such going together on such a day ; which writing this woman had in her keeping, but her husband coming in one night late after she was a bed, got it out of the place where she had laid it ; and now she is troubled how she shall prove him to be her husband.”

[From margin] wittnesse to both of these indenters or ingaigments by way of matremony: In<sup>o</sup>: More[,]<sup>3</sup> T. Naudin.<sup>4</sup> Iohn Spittlehowse<sup>5</sup> test: Iohn Light Rich Eeles [Ellis]<sup>6</sup>

An. Domini 1653

[From margin: "Maij the .10.<sup>th</sup>"] Sister Abigall Marshall gaue to the Chirch a siluer Bowle

Iun the 5th.

Resolved by the Chirch to send for Brother Elles [Ellis] Sister Elles. Sister Anderson, Sister Coveny Sister Iones. Bro. Prise Sister Parker to the end they may giue an account of ther absense from the publik meetings of the Chirch, and that Bro. Light, and Br.<sup>o</sup> More doe summons them accordingly against the next first day.

3 John More appears to have lived in Lothbury in 1653 ("A Discourse Between Cap. Kiffin and Dr. Chamberlen," 1654, p.1.). He was a servant of Mr. William Webb, who lived "at the end of *Bartholomew Lane*, by the old *Exchange*," and was baptized (immersed) on Feb. 1, 16552-3 by some unnamed person(? John Spittlehouse or Dr. Peter Chamberlen) (See "The Disputes between Mr. Cranford, and Dr. Chamberlen," 1652, p. iii.). If the date of More's baptism as here given is correct, he was not himself immersed when he baptized the Jew "Barishae" on the preceding Dec. 15th as above.

Dr. Whitley has called my attention to the fact that Mr. or Col. William Webb had another uncommon servant in the person of John Toldervy, who published at London in 1656 the following pamphlet: '*The Foot out of the Snare*, OR, A Restoration of the inhabitants of *Zion* into their Place, . . . BEING A Brief Declaration of his entrance into that *Sect*, Called (by the Name of) Quakers . . . With the manner of his Separation from Them. . . .

John More published in 1653-4 "A Lost Ordinance Restored: Or, Eight Questions in reference to . . . *Laying on of hands*, . . ." Dr. Whitley points out that More also brought out two other tracts during this period, namely, "A Generall Exhortation to the World; by a late Convert from the World. Wherein the present National Churches are admonished to a timely repentance . . .", London, 1652, and "A Trumpet sounded: or, the great mystery of the two little horns unfolded . . .", 1654.

4 Theodore Naudin was evidently of French extraction, and like Peter Chamberlen a Doctor of Medicine. During the years 1651 and 1652 he carried on a written controversy with the Rev. Jean Mestrezat, of which the correspondence was published by Naudin in 1654 under the title, "Conference Touchant le Pedobaptisme Tenüe a Paris entre le Sieur Jean Mestrezat, Pasteur de l'Eglise reformée de Charenton lés Paris, & Theodore Naudin, Docteur en Medicine . . .," London.

5 John Spittlehouse is rather better known than either John More or Dr. Naudin, on account of the larger number of works published by him.

6 Richard Eellis, or Ellis, I think may be the same Richard Ellis whose name appears in the list of Richard Blunt's Anabaptist Society in 1641-2.

They went

I.M. I[.]L.

[From margin: “ Iun. 19.<sup>th</sup> ”] That Bro. More & Bro Light dooe againe goe to Sister Anderson Sist[.] Coveny Bro: Price Sister Parker & . . [?] Ann. and & [sic]

Bro. Elles reasons for not Coming first that sum of the Chirch waire set against him by misinformation.

2ly. that hee had maid a promise hee would not com till things waire regulaited

I[.] those set against him waire Sister Ann. & Bro Smith. by my Sister Rawlings and Bro & Sister Spittlehowse

Bro. Smiths Anser. That by reason of som expretions hee had from the afore said hee was occationed to speak against bro Elles

B. Spittlehowse & [?] Anser and confess That Bro Smith dyning heare and Bro more beeing sent for to bro. Elleses they sayd it was ther usiall custom

B. Smith A.[nser] that Bro Elles should say that Bro More used to com in about 3. or 4 a'clock in afternone to his howse uery hungry to eat with mee saijng that hee could not, with quietnesse at home

[From margin: “ Ch.(urch?) ”] Why Bro. Elles heare apou had not gon to them and alone tould them ther falt

[From margin: “ An(ser) ”] Because the businesse was publik

[From margin: “ as to the second ”] Bro Noddan [?] & B. Smith. An.[ser] Wee tould him wee ware regulaited Ch:[urch] not a warantable excuse

Iun. 19 [1653]

The Conclution of the Chirch apou Bro Elles & [?] Businesse first that Bro. Elles aught to bee humbled in him selfe with sister Elles for absenting themselu[es]

2ly for not going to Bro. Spittlehowse & and [sic] aquantin them of his discontent



3ly That Bro Spittlehowse & [?] bee Humbled for giuing ofens to Bro Elles

4ly that Sister Rawlings bee humbled for not haiuing respect unto the Chirch

5ly That Sister Elles bee humbled for the saime

Iun. 26.<sup>th</sup> [1653]

Cos.[en] Spittlehowse.<sup>7</sup>

Sister Iones.

Sister Ann.

Sister Elles.

Sister Coveny.<sup>8</sup>

[Here on page 15 John More ceased to keep the church records.]

[From margin: "1653 Decemb:☉. 25." i.e., Sunday<sup>9</sup>].

The Church after breaking of Bread Watched & Prayed. There being onely Br[.] Naudin, More, Light, Smith, Chamberlen Sister More, Iones, Sara, Rawlinson Sister Monck went away as not yet reconciled to sister Read

[From margin: "D. 26." i.e., Monday.]

P. Chamberlen Summoned early by L:[ord] Major & in Custody all day for threatening the Generals Life about .8. Weeks before. 3. Witnesses not Agreeing & He denyeing, was dismissed.

[From margin: "Ro: 4.7."'] Blessed are they whose Iniquities are for given, & whose Sins are Covered. This was from the Lord

Businesses Depending.

A Catalogue of the Names of the Church.

7 John More, who wrote this record, was apparently related to John Spittlehouse, for in his "second Epistell" on p. 89 he again speaks of "Cosen Spittlehowse".

8 It is to be noticed that Dr. Chamberlen has not yet been mentioned in these records.

9 At this point Dr. Chamberlen began to keep the Records, and about this time I fancy he added "Acts of the Church. Delivery to Satan" on p. 3 which More had apparently left practically blank. The astronomical signs, which appear now for the first time, were familiar to Dr. Chamberlen as a philomath: Transactions, vol. II. page 112.

A Catalogue of the Separation. with a Letter  
to them by Messenger  
The differences Examined, & the Parties not  
reconcilable warned & (if they hear not  
the Church) Dismissed as [?] Unbeleev-  
ing, till humbled [?]  
And each to be signified to them in writing

Acts of the Church

[From margin: “Beginning. 165 $\frac{3}{4}$ . ☉ Ian: 1.” i.e.,  
Sunday]

Theodore Naudin<sup>10</sup>

John Light

John More

Rich Eeles [Ellis]

Rich: Smith

Eleazar Bar Ishay Excommunicated

Peter Chamberlen

John Davis

John Spittlehouse.

William Eyre

William Walker

William Deakin

John Worfack

Elizabeth More

Sara Iones

Elizabeth Monck

Temperance Andersor

Iorie Read

Francis Smith

Rebecca Hounsell

Anne Eeles [Ellis]

Ireland

Anne Rawlinson.

Anne Harriman.

Sara Burton.

[John] Hounsell mort.

Elizabeth Walker

Ioan Haddock

Dorothy Deakins

Ireland

Abigail Diodaty. Lincoln

10 Here, it will be noticed, Naudin's name heads the list, while Chamberlen's comes seventh, and Spittlehouse's ninth. The writing, I believe, is Chamberlen's, so that no special significance can be assigned to the order.

“A True and Short Declaration”

Sara Peirse	}	Yorkshire
Dorothy Peirse		
[sic] Sara Peirse		
	Susanne Coveny	
	Mary Rowce.	Devon:
	[Sister] Primat.	
	Mary Spittlehouse	mort.

the Separated Assembly<sup>11</sup>

Thomas Roswell	Mary Roswell
Robert Cook	Rose Price
Math: Smith.	Helen Cook
John Hales	Margaret Lee
Peter Roswell	Ioan Hull mortua.
William Hopkins	Anne Pigot
Simon Berry.	Elizabeth Chandler
Leonard Wayn	Iorie Parnel
Harvey	Anne Bishop
Wilcocks <sup>12</sup>	Anne Francklin Smith
	Elizabeth Smith mortua
	Anne Boddington.
	Anne Parry. Evanuit
	Ioan Wright
	Mary Tayler
	Anne Pond.

Alice Dandy. walketh with Bro: [Samuel]  
 Loveday  
 Ioan Read. Excommunicated by the  
 Separated Assembly & walketh [with  
 Bro: Edward?] Barbe[r?]

11 We are not definitely told what was the cause of this separation from the parent congregation, but from a remark later made by Chamberlen I judge that Thomas Roswell held some “Heresie.” Roswell appears to have been the leader of this second company, for in one place in the accounts “Mr. Roswell’s Church” is mentioned.

12 This was probably Francis Wilcocks, who on, or about, Jan. 14, 1659, was one of those to sign a broadside entitled, “A Declaration of some of those People in or near London, called Anabaptists.” I. have come to this conclusion after considering some suggestions offered by Dr. Whitley.

Arise Evans <sup>13</sup> wholly forsaken the Faith.  
 Isaac Freeborn Embraced this present World.  
 Eleazar Bar Ishay put the Gospel to an open  
 shame.<sup>14</sup>

George Price hath forsaken the Faith:

[From margin: “Ian. ☉ 8. 1654” i.e., Sunday 8  
 January 165 $\frac{3}{4}$ ]

The busines of Difference between Sister Monck  
 & Sister Read was taken into consideration.

Sister Monck accuseth Sister Read of Lyeing.  
 sayeing that Sister Monck said that the Church was  
 a Company of Pitchpatches & Brother Naudine the  
 worst of all. Witnes Sister Rawlins & Sister  
 Anne[.] They witnes also that Sister Read called her  
 Goship, & . . . & Almes woeman or such like.

Ordered that Brother More & Brother Chamberlen  
 goe to Sister Read to know whether Sister Monck did  
 say those words & what witnes thereof. And what  
 else Sister Read hath to say against Sister Monck  
 Sister Read saith that her Mayd being by that Sister  
 Monck came in Rayling & spake the words abovesaid.  
 but Brother Light coming in shee forboar? Our Sister  
 Read did aske Sister Monck forgivenes for what she

---

13 Arise Evans gives the following account of his experience with Dr. Chamberlen's congregation, in which, it will be noticed, his view agrees much better than Thomas Tillam's with that presented in the Records. Evans apparently never intended to be considered a member of the church:—

“And after the King was put to death [in 1648-9], seeing no remedy for it, I remained silent a long time, in which time God called me aside to look into the closets of the *Anabaptists*, as *Ezeck* : 8. 9. and by reason of some acquaintance I had with Doctor *Chamberlen*, he brought me into their secret Chambers, where I saw no small abomination commirted [committed], and now being taken among them as a friend, and pitying them, I often shewed them the necessity of Infants baptisme, and lawfulness of it, and that there was but one true succession of Ministry, and Ministers, which they had not, and at the last they were so offended at me, that they forbad me to come among them, and I having experience enough now of their wayes, was soon perswaded, being weary to see their corruption, division, malice, and enmity toward one another, and as I departed from them, I gave them these lines to consider, as followeth . . . ” (“An Echo to the Voice from Heaven” 1652, pp. 90-[91]-92.) Evans wrote and published at least fifteen or sixteen works.

14 He was baptized because Rebecca Hounsell would not otherwise marry him. He evidently had his child baptized in the State Church, etc. A good deal of space in the records is devoted to this family.

had spoken, & then our Sister Monck did the like & desire mutually, God to forgive each other. & shaking hands did kiss in witness of Reconciliation.

The business of Brother Eleazar & Sister Coveny was also taken into Consideration. And Ordered thereupon That Brother Eeles [Ellis] & Brother Smith goe to Sister Coveny to receive all her complaints in writing & to know the Cause of her absence from us

[From margin: "Ia: 8." (165 $\frac{3}{4}$ .)]

Memorandums concerning Sister Monck

When she came first amongst us Shee was in Credit & Lived in some good fashion. Keeping many servants & Mayds at work [.]

The occasion of her decay was by a Nephew left upon her by her own Brother, & not satisfieing as was promised for his keeping. Her brother also being some charge to her. Together with some wrong done (as she saith) both by m<sup>r</sup> Bolton's servants & by her Mayds. The occasion of her discontents was by her endeavour to be freed of the Child, whereupon her Mother set her self against her, & shee & her Brother stirred up Brother & Sister Cook against her, who did her much evil to m<sup>r</sup> Bolton & Others.

Shee accuseth also Sister Pigot of the Report that Shee was in an Ale-hous drunck, where (she saith) she never [was] in her life but at the doore [.]

Shee is desired to bee mindfull of (Ia: I [?] . 26)

If the other Company [evidently "the Separated Assembly"] rejoin Care must be had to enquire the bottom of those reports. & see amendement.

Brother Chamberlen admonished thrice by Brother Naudin. 1. Privatly. 2 with Br: More. 3. Openly. The accusations were these.

Brother Naudin opposing Br: Ch: [amberlens] exposition said that the white hors. (Rev. [?] 6 [?] . 2) was Adams [?] time of Innocency which brother Ch: proved

not [From margin: “at Br Mores.”]; bec:[aus] all was future (Rev. 1. 3. 19. | 4. 1. & 22. 6. 10) Br. Naud: also accused Br: Ch: for holding forth the Popish Tenet in sayeing [From margin: “about H. G.(host?) being Angel”]<sup>15</sup> which when Br. Ch: would have answered br: Naudin permitted not, so Br. Ch: went out of the Room. At night goeing home bro: N: admonished Br Ch. the .1. time. The 2d. occasion [From margin: “at Br: Ch.(amberlen’s)”] was Upon layeing on of Hands that it is not a signe of the frutes of the Spirit Or effects of Prayer. For that were popish ex opere Operato. And we must not expect the frute of our prayer but leav it with G[od.] Br Ch. affirmed that this was Contrary to sound doctrin, to Teach any Doubting in Prayer (1 Tim: 2. 8. Mat. 21. 21 [?]. 11. 23. Io: 1. 6. 7. 8.) At an other time Upon the 7. Revel[.] Bro. Naudin would have no Signification [?] of Men by Angels but pure Angels of G.[od] & all those things were yet to come but Br. Ch: replied that the Revelation was of all that should happen from Christ to the end of the world. And it were not likely that so great a distance of time should have nothing mentioned by the H. G.[host] For under the Law God was carefull to foretel what should be before Babylon in Babylon after Babylon &c. Beside we may know the Hystories to answer these Propesies.

And when we came to the .9. Ch.[apter] Br: Naud: opposed Br: More & would have the Starr to signifie the devil onely & not Man. But Br. Ch. replied that the devel was long since falne, & Starres in the .1. Ch.[apter] & Angels are taken for men:

So Br: Naud: took Br. More with him & admonished Br Ch[amberlen] the .2d. time.

The .3d. time was upon the earnest solliciting of the Church for an Elder. Br Ch. being nominated

---

15 Between “sayeing” and “which” an extended blank has been left in the original text.

Br Naud. found him not fit bec:[aus] Proud bec.[aus] Angrie (1 Tim. 3. 6 Tit. 1. 7)

Br: More also accused Br Chamberlen of Anger because brother Spittlehous said so. about. . .

Br: Mor said Br Chamberlen would not leave of it.

Br Chamberlen told him he offered him once to let it bee heard by his Brother Primat. which Brother More denyed & told Brother Chamberlen it was a *Lye* [From margin: "but this was not remembered by the Church"] . . . that Brother Chamberlen said. Brother Chamberlen refered [?] all to the Church who vindicated him [.] Brother Naudin & Br. More said they would com no more [.]

NB. That night we fasted & brake Bread, And the Spirit led me to read the .11. Cor from verse 18. about Heresie as formerlie when Br Roswel fell off from Supper at night.

Br: More admitted not the open Book (Rev: 10. 2.) to be the reviving of the Gospel, but .7. thunders after we are perfect [.]

[From margin, page 22: "Fast Ian: (8, 165 $\frac{3}{4}$ )"]  
The same Night Br Naudin was nominated by Br. More Elder with Br. Ch[amberlen] & upon that Condition Br Ch. might be chosen bec[aus] Br Naudins patience might countervale Br. Ch[amberlens] Choler. And Br. Naudins Diligence in Gouverning supplie Br. Ch[amberlens] Remisnes. But Br. Eeles [Ellis] & Sister Monck excepted against Br Naudin bec[aus] not apt to Teach But fals Doctrin. & also impatient. And it was upon this they resolved to com no more alledging we were without Order.

Br: More also at washing of feet charged Br. Ch[amberlen] of Ieloucie [?] for admonishing to mind the work they were about [.]

.....

[The text of the following letter was written by John More, but the marginal notes and the closing section

were written by Dr. Chamberlen. These are here placed in the text, indented.]

The severall requestes of mee In.<sup>o</sup> More, which I humblie desier of the Chirch; which I haive laityly for their disorders withdrawne my selfe from according to the call of god 2 thessalonians 3. 6. 14. 15. apone [?] the amendment of which, according to the word of god in my following requestes (wherin they are cheeffly contained) I shall haive fellowship with them, In the meanwhile contenting my selfe with the feloship of god, and of his deere sun Christ Iesus my Lord, I shall Love them and pray for them.

[Note on the word “disorders” by Dr. Chamberlen] which were none but what he & D.N. made by fals Doctrines & would not be contradicted. For as for Sister Monck, Read, Coveney. Eleazar &c. the Ch:[urch] was in dealing with them & therefore Orderly.

My Requestes follow.

1. First That ther bee no crying up of man, by the esteeming of his iudgment (becavse his) more then of an others. I. corents. [I. Cor.] 3. 4 but that the scripture and the scripture only with cleere inferences from thense, bee the prooffe of all doctriens or opinions in whomesoever, acts: 17. 11. In.<sup>o</sup> 5. 39. & [Chamberlen’s note.] that is for not receiving their fals doctriens.
2. Secondly That ther bee a full and perfect freedom, for every one’s orderly speakin of his thoughtes in Love, at what time soever they are given to him to speake, without any abridgment under the pretense of contradiction, if as I before sayd hee speakes in Love and orderly I cor. 14. 31. 32. 33. I thessalonians 5. 21. I. In.<sup>o</sup> [John] 4. 1. &
3. Thirdly That all that walke disorderly and not according to the word of god, in any perticuler what-soever without a suffittient manifestation of a reall and



satisfactory humiliation, shall bee withdrawne from  
2 thessalonians 3. 6. math. 18. 15. 16. 17. &

[Chamberlen's note.] This cheiffly aymed  
at P.C. but could prove nothing.

4. Forthly That all ofended, which complaine of the  
ofender behind his back shall bee accovmpted of the  
aforesaid

[Chamberlen's note.] about the Lye.

5. Fiftly That all heerers of sutch complaintes that  
shall keep them privat shall bee accompted as aforesaid

[Chamberlen's note.] Br: Eeles.

6. Sixtly That to the better performanse heare of[,]  
Elders bee chosen, and ordained in the Chirch, act.  
14. 2. tytus 1. 5. iames. 5. 14: & [sic]

[Chamberlen's note.] D. N.[audin] & I.  
M.[ore]

[From margin: “ January the 15<sup>th</sup> ” 1653-54]

He was demaunded whom he could accuse,  
& he could accuse none but all in  
Generall, Being convinced that all could  
not be guilty of the 1. & 2. Article. He  
insisted onely on Disorder[?] Being putt  
to nominat what disorder, He could urge  
nothing of Consequence but want of  
Elders & made all disorder to bee in  
that onely.

[From margin: “ Ian. 15.” (165 $\frac{3}{4}$ )] Fast

None hath *Fellowship* with God & Iesus Christ  
who hath none with his Saints. (1 Io: 1. 3. 6. 7.)

(1) Yoū cannot say you have withdrawn since you  
never were yet absent from any Church meeting or  
Action.

2 The *disorders* which are mentioned (2 Thess. 3.  
6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12.) are Idlenes. Not Working. but  
Busibodies. That all the Church are so, is a great  
untruth, & false aspersion. If any in particular, Have

you done your duty in an orderly telling them? (Mat: 18. 15. 16. 17.

.....

Proposalls

If the Church think they shal walk more Orderly without Brother Chamberlen. Then he will withdraw, till they shall desire his returne

The like hath been Offered by Sister Monck.

Br. More. I can be withdrawn though I meet. For I am Withdrawen when I no longer acknowledge myself One of them.

Br. Chamberlen Then you acknowledge your self no more of us

Br M: No. I stand apart

Br. M: All the members are disorderly Ergo the Church

Br. Ch: What Disorders.

Br. M: They that loine not with me in the wayes of God are disorderly.

[Blank space] Br: Naudin was in this busines also.

[From margin: “Fast. 165 $\frac{3}{4}$  Ian: ☉. 22.” i.e. Sunday.]

(1 Cor 14. 34.)

Brother Naudin by the desire (as he saith) that sister Anne Harriman declared that she was not free to come to the Meeting becaus that Bro: Naudin said He would not walk with such as gave libertie to woemen to speak in the Church. For she could not walk where she had not libertie to speak. And therefore rather then Brother Naudin should withdraw, she would withdraw. And this was but One of her Reasons for her Absence

Upon this There arise these .3. Questions.

Whether Woemen may speak in the Church?

What Woemen may speak?

What they may speak?

.....

[This discussion<sup>16</sup> concerning the right of women to speak in church meetings covers pages 28-32 in the Records, and the conclusion reached on page 32 is that] "a Woeman (Mayd, Wife, or Widdow) being a Prophetess 1[.] Cor: 11. may speake, Prophesie, Pray, with a Vayl. Others may not."

[From margin: "165 $\frac{3}{4}$  Ian: ☉. 29." i.e., Sunday.]

This day the Church had notice that [the Jew] Eleazar Bar-Ishai (who calleth himself Eleazar Paul who for the love of a woeman (as we now discover) hath made outward profession of the Faith of Christ by being Baptized, becaus his wife did else refus to be Married to him) is falne from the Faith & hath long dissembled with the Church by goeing to other Assemblies under the Notion of selling of Books, & hath now carried away his Child to be Sprinckled by the Presbyterians or Others without giving either Notice, or causing any Dispute about the Busines. And therefore . . . Wee do in the name of Iesus Christ pronounce the said Eleazar Bar-Ishai alias Paul to be delivered unto Satan. And do account him as a Heathen & an Infidel for neglecting to Hear the Voice of the Church.

.....

[From margin on p. 43: "165 $\frac{3}{4}$ . Ianuar: ☉. 31." i.e., Tuesday.]

Whereas there hath been observed a kind of Laodicean spirit creeping in amongst us for want of a more vigilant Eye upon ourselves & each others walking. It is this day resolved that for the more Orderly &

<sup>16</sup> At one place in the report of this discussion Chamberlen has written the following significant words :-

"Br. More & Br. Naudin. Another Excepted not a Contradiction. Here the dispute was broken off because of Strangers."

In other words casual visitors like Thomas Tillam were favoured with seeing the better side of the congregation.

Comfortable walking, wee do particularly mind these Precepts of the Holy Ghost as followeth [ :— ]

1.[.] 1. Cor: 3. 4. Not to be One of Paul & an other of Apollos. &c

2. Acts 17. 11 To search the Scripture & not men about things propounded. (10: 5. 39)

3. 1 Cor: 14. 31. 32. 33. That all may have libertie to Prophesie. according to Order. without hinderance  
Ro: 1. 19. 2 Cor: 12. 20

4. 2 Thess: 3. 11  
1 Tim. 8. 13.

That Talebearers, Whisperers & Backbiters bee especially looked unto becaus, that Take away the Talebearer & Contention ceaseth (Pro. 26. 20 [ ]).

5. Mat: 18: 15. 16. 17. That to prevent such disorders this Rule be constantly observed. 1.<sup>st</sup> to speak of the Offence in privat. 2.<sup>ly</sup> with .2. or 3. Witnesses & .3.<sup>ly</sup> the Church.

6. That Elders be thought on. according to the Rule .1. Tim. 3. Tit: 1.

7. That the Church submit themselves (for Order sake) unto the Elders. Heb: 13: 7. 17. 1 Pet. 5. 5. & 1 Cor. 16. 15. 16. & 1 Cor. 14. 32. 33.

8. For further Explanation of the Rule in Mat. 18. That there be no Recrimination, but that first the Rule spoken of be observed if the party complaining be guilty of the same or any other fault.<sup>17</sup>

.....<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> The above "Precepts" are written in Chamberlen's hand, and he evidently wished to have the members subscribe to them. In the fulfilment of this desire, however, he must have been disappointed, for although there is an ample blank space left on p. 44, there are no subscriptions.

<sup>18</sup> At this point a note may be added relating to a meeting held on 7 Feb., 1653-4. To this meeting Dr. Chamberlen made some hasty references on a half leaf now numbered p. 33a, and not bound in its proper chronological order. Among the subjects discussed at this time were "1. Whether we have a call from God to visit the L[ord] Pr[otector]? 2. If yea. Upon what account? or, to what end?" Several members whose names are given took part in the discussion, and seem generally to have agreed, that it might be their duty to tell him of his faults, but only "in respect of the especial call of God, and the end." At least, this appears to have been Dr. Chamberlen's conclusion.

[From margin: "165 $\frac{3}{4}$  Febr:  $\text{O}^{\circ}$ . 21", i.e., Tuesday.]  
the [Love] Feast<sup>19</sup>

A Meeting desired by Sister Primat to be of rejoicing towards which was given .20.<sup>s</sup> whereof spent 16.<sup>s</sup> It was in relation of her safe deliverie. After Supper I.[ohn] Light (supposing he ought to speak something) began a solemn discours, quite from any subject spoken of before. And abruptly said that there was a great fault amongst us in that One Man used to take up a whole houres discours. & gave no Libertie to any other to speak: Hereupon Peter Chamberlen opposed him once or twice, to which he answered. . . with some impertinencies. Whereupon P. C.[hamberlen] seeing he received not instruction but spake again. . . said he spake impertinently & foolishly. (for first he spake about a Subject not at all mentioned before & then he went to an other subeject nothing appertaining to what he was speaking of then) But Dr[.] Naudin pretending to quiet the matter said that it was a fault he had often complained of, & that Dr Chamb: was too blame in it.

[Marginal note by Dr. Chamberlen: "that P.C. had not given Libertie to the Saints. And was in fault for Reproving an Elder."]

Io: Moore immediately said he was of Dr. Naudins opinion, & that indeed P. Ch[amberlen] was much too blame.

[From margin: "I dare not deny what Bro: N. hath said."]

The Church afterwards takeng P. Ch.[']s] part a long time. At last Io: More said he found not fault about P. C. hindering others but calling I:[ohn] Light Fool. So did Dr. Naudin.

But first P. Ch. had professed he would no more

<sup>19</sup> This may have been the Love Feast to which Thomas Tillam refers in his letter previously cited, but as has already been pointed out, the members of Chamberlen's congregation did not discuss their woes in the presence of strangers,

offend those .3. in speaking long in their Company. Note. They never accused I: Light for speaking an Untruth. They never accused I.L.[ight] for accusing an Elder. but Iustified his accusation, though an Untruth. And that it was an Untruth first their own evading it to the cavill of the word (foolishly) & quitting their first accusation. Secondly I.L. turning it to his meaning of a Table talk. (wheras no man at Table talks an hour, Nor could Dr Naudin & Io[.] More have then applied it to former accusations) And thirdly that it was wholly impertinent to any thing spoken at Supper. And Fourthly that upon P. Ch. receiving it in that sense, it was in that sens wholly discoursed of. Lastly P. Ch. in his single discours charged I.L.[ight] that he could mean none but either P[.]C[.] or I. M.[ore] which could not be denied, & especially P.C. becaus that none of late have spoken an hower but P.C.

The summ is there apparent Hartburnings. . . And it is apparent that God hath sent a Dividing Spirit, since what is Truth to one, is Untruth to an other. And what's pleasing to one is Unpleasing to an other. It is a very notable untruth, & manifest to all hearers For P.C. did never hinder any from Speaking: but hath (indeed) opposed fals Doctrin, & persuaded once Mat: Smith to forbear publick Speaking: becaus he was not gifted thereto.

P. C:[hamberlen] is in a hard condition, that he neither knoweth how to Speak, nor how to be silent. For it is expected he should speak, & is thereto appointed by God, & Men.

And if he did not, None els would. Besides he alwayes asketh whether any other are free to speak, both before & after. Nor did ever any shew any signe of a desire to speak, whom P.C. forbad. Io: M: & Dr N:[audin] insisted upon it, that P.C. called I. L:[ight] Fool. All the Ch:[urch] witnessed that they

wrested the words of P.C. for he said onely he spake foolishly, which he offered to prove. for they that speake untruely speake foolishly. Beside he offered the place (Mt: 16. 23.) where Peter is called Satan, when he acted the part of a Tempter: For not understanding the things of G.[od]

for the Close of all I: M:[ore] said We are no Ch:[urch] of Christ. P. C.[hamberlen] answered. True. Not with them in it. For the Spirit of Christ is a Spirit of Truth, & Peace & Love.

[From margin: "♁. 21. feb:" i.e., Tuesday, 21 February, 165 $\frac{3}{4}$ .]

This day a Letter was produced by Thom: Roswell from Dorothy Deakins, wherein she accuseth her husband for having Iane Hadock in his Hous with him at Eniscorthy<sup>20</sup> & not owning the said Dor:[othy] to be his Wife: nor so much as a servant.

Her letter was dated from Wexford.<sup>21</sup>

Att the same time a Letter from W:<sup>m</sup> Deakins complaining of the Injuries & Troubles his wife had put him to. By other Letters it did appear that William Deakins & Iane Had:[ock] were cast out of the Church at Wexford.

[From margin: "165 $\frac{3}{4}$  Febr: ☉. 26," i.e., Sunday.]

This day Dr Naudin came & desired to speak with P. C:[hamebrlen] who, when they were in privat began to lay .2. things to his charge 1. of calling I. L.[ight] Foolish. 2. of rebuking an Elder openly I:L. being P.C.[s] Elder. & that P.C. should humble himself & repent.

When he had fully ended. P.C. began as followeth.

First that he was ready to justifie what he said, & that he had not sinned (as Dr N: layed to his charge) but had done but his duty. Secondly that I.L. was not an Elder in Office. For the first Whereas the Meeting was appointed for Rejoicing & Mirth. And

20 In Ireland.

21 In Ireland.

that the discourse had been of other Subjects as Laughter, . . . &c: wrested from Lu. 6. 25. . (wherein P.C. nevertheless spake but little) I:L: began abruptly to find fault with our Meetings. That Men had not Libertie to speak. P.C. asked who debarred the Libertie of any from speaking. I.L:[ight] said that he had often [or] sometimes a mind to speak & was not suffered, becaus of long discourses by the Hower. Which was contrary to. . . For we should onely read the Scripture, & speak in short, & presently give way to others. For we should all prophesie one by one, & let the first hold his peace. P.C. asked when any was hindered that desired to speak & asked him whether he did not often call upon men to speak, & that either he must speak or no body would.

I:L: said he did not mean P.C. Whem then said P.C.

All in generall said I. L:[ight.] Then P.C. said you must either mean me or brother Moore for none els use to speak by the hower. & principally me of late for none else have spoken in publick of late. Then I.L: said that our Meetings the 3d dayes We were too long in our discourses. P.C: said there was none spake there by the Hower. I.L: fel to som other accusations which might seem to reflect upon P.C. & seemed also to bee in passion. so P.C. said he spake impertinently & foolishly. Whereupon Dr Naudin began his discours. This is the substance (as neer as could be remembred) of the beginning [?] of falling out.<sup>22</sup>

.....

[From margin: “165<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> ○ March. 12.” i.e., Sunday.]

This day P. C.[hamberlen] (being sent for over night by Sister Anna, & told how full of sorrow. D.N. [Dr. Naudin] was & desirous of reconciliation) began

<sup>22</sup> This sentence would certainly seem to indicate that the congregation was eventually dissolved (about 1654).



his discours That God was a Spirit & must be worshipped in Spirit & Truth & he had experimentally found that G.[od] had chastised him for Offenses in the Spirit, & therefor thought that for Chastisement G.[od] had set him as a mark to be shot at: but he was desirous to humble himself. And to the end there might be a reconciliation according to Mat. 5. 23. 24. he desired to acknowledge he spake foolishly in boasting the last day though occasioned thereto as Paul. 2 Co: 11 [?] And as to the manner of rebuking brother Light, He desired to be humbled for it in what any might think it proudly, or undevoutly spoken. But as to the words themselves he desired they might be . . . & thereupon discoursed concerning the words. And said that he forbore to speak many times because som Spirits could not bear him.

In this discours Dr. N:[audin] found fault with .2. Passages

1. that P. C.[hamberlen] said he was a Mark. Wherein he noted .2. things first Pride that he should set himself out for a Mark [;] Secondly of Iudging others & censuring others that they aym at him.

The other Passage was that he said som Spirits could not bear [him] wherein he showed also the sam Spirit of Pride & Iudging. Or Words to such like purpose. And then he delivered in the Paper Marked\*\* to be answered. Which is inserted before [i.e., pp. 63—66 of the Records].

The business is referd unto the Church in the Afternoon. And the whole Church that remaineth being there D. N:[audin] acknowledging them to be a Church. They took the busines into examination And found that I. L.[ight] had Acused P. C.[hamberlen] of an Untruth & that he did it also unseasonably So that it [was] impertinently & foolishly spoken. And therefore they thought it fitt that I.L. should be humbled for the same. Which they did beleev he

would for that in Gal. 3. 1 They find the word (Foolish) used to Saints. And forasmuch as D[.] N.[audin] & I. M.[ore] did abett and back I:L. in his fault. That therefore D.N. & I. M[.] should humble themselves to P.C.

And forasmuch as I.L. & I.M. had taken offence at P[.] C[.] in that busines: that therefore P.C. should be sorry for having greived them. as Paul (I. Cor: 8. 13). Which thing P.C. had done & was ready to do. But D.N.[audin] would not obey the Ch:[urch] but said they spake falsely. Partially. And were a Party And were sworn to do whatsoever P.C. would have them. He also pretended to see the [Account] Book that he might answer P.C.[’s] writing. And . . . he writ out what he would, he would give no Answer: but was going away, till the Brethren prevailed with him to stay. till P.C. came up at which time the former Censure of the Ch:[urch] was read. But Dr N[audin] would not hear the Ch:[urch] but said he would send in writing to Inform them better.

.....

D.N.[Dr. Naudin]did also take exception that P. C.[hamberlen] called them Naudin, More, and Light not brethren. Which was upon the Account of Withdrawing, & not hearing the Ch:[urch].

Dr N. denied the withdrawing, with an Oath, which P.C. confuted by I.M.[’s] own handwriting to which Dr N. had not onely given Consent: but affirmed openly that Paper was altogether his mind, & would have subscribed it, & was very angry before all the Ch:[urch] that he was hindred from Subscribing it.

So that rash Perjury of speaking an Untruth so apparent before the Lord, Ought to be repented of And I.M. for denieing the Ch:[urch] of Christ (if it prove to be his (Sayeing[?])).

.....

Theodore Naudin, an vnworthy Seruant of  
 God, to his<sup>23</sup> Beloued Brethren in the  
 Lord Iesu, Grace, Mercy & Peace from  
 God the Father & our Lord Iesus.

Deare & Beloued Brethren I perceaued at our  
 meeting of the twelueth of this moneth [Mar. 12, 165 $\frac{3}{4}$ ]  
 that you were grieued & offended of my carriage to-  
 wards you: &, as I can remember, I confesse I gaue  
 some occasion of it. for which I am hartily sorry &  
 beg your pardon. But lett me tell you that if you  
 knew the dept &, if I am not mistaken, the justice of  
 my sorrow, I doubt not but you would wonder that I  
 did not break in greater passion. For, truth is, that  
 neuer the like did afflict my poore heart. And for the  
 justice of it, it doth clearly appeare vnto me.

.....

2. Secondly from the greatnesse of the last. For  
 not one member onely vid: [elicit] Br. More, but another  
 besides, vid: his wife, is fallen off [from the church]  
 by this disorder. Yea two other, vid: Br. Light &  
 Sister Primat are like to fall off if not already fallen.  
 Whence I gather if my sorrow should abounde for the  
 cutting off one Member, it cannot be but exceeding  
 great for the cutting off of many. O dear Brethren  
 our small body cannot be but much defiled, weakned  
 & disenabled by the amputation of so many members.

3. Thirdly, From the worthinesse of those we have  
 left. For, although they be all very farr from per-  
 fection, vnto which euey godly soule aimeth att, yet  
 I cannot but glorifie God for the humilitie in some,  
 patience, temperance, meeknesse, charity, kindnesse,  
 extraordinary ability in the dispensation of the word  
 in others: & in all for the zeale for the truth, to the  
 very hazard of their liberties, fortunes, or other just  
 comfort.

I should but giue them their due & do no

---

23 Undated, but evidently written between April 2, and April 7, 1654.

more then the 'Apostles haue done many times for their like, both men & women, young & old, if I should name them & make a priuate description & commendation of them: & also nothing but what the present occasion requireth, since I finde you very little sensible of your damages. But I'll choose rather to forbear it, lest you should not be able to bare it & should giue, you haue done already, before & behind me, other constructions to it then justly &, if you knew my heart, it should deserue.

O Deare Brethren what shall we expect, if the very Pillars & walls of it are plucked down.....

.....

For first in respect of me, had my Br. Chamberlen but acknowledged his fault & repented for it, I should haue been quickly satisfied. But instead of that, what hath he done, but excuse it to the vtmost of his power, both in the same day that he committed it as his withdrawing from some of vs did abundantly testifie. And also in the next following Lords day, both in priuat to me & afterwards in your presence, with such a violence of passion that his [?] discourse was nothing but scorne & bitternes against me, in saying I had been a burden vnto him since I had been in felowship with him [i.e., as an Elder?], that he would prooue that I had no qualitie of an Elder, that he had a power to correct me. & many such other expressions worthy euer to be forgotten, & very little consonant with an humble spirit. And againe in the last Lords day of my meeting with you what was these words, that God for his offenses had set him as a mark to be shutt [shot] att, but an acknowledgment that our reproofes were shotts, that is injuries & persecutions cast att him?...

[P. 88, date April 9, 1654.] A perfect reconciliation in love between Brother Smith & Brother Eeles [Ellis] & between Brother Eeles & Sister Sara Burton.

[Portions of a Letter written by Dr. Peter Chamberlen to Dr. Naudin about April 12, 1654.]<sup>24</sup>

.....

If therefore your exhortation to the Brethren to oppose to the Utmost of their strength those that are proud bee rightly applied, it will certainly fall upon you in this thing. where so much Pride, Contention & Stubbornness of Spirit, to the breaking of all in peeces hath appeared. And that I may use your own argument, it was an exorbitant Pride for you to Injure me your Brother your Elder your Father in the Gospel, & that in the presence of the Anointed of G.[od.] And be not mistaken where there is no fear no respect, there is neither Humiliation nor Love. I shal leav this with . . . more from your own Papers both of your Pride & Anger, calling your Accusations but a delivery of thoughts . . . with so much assumed Authority.

2.<sup>25</sup> in pleading that Authority as if you were an Elder, wheras you were but a probationer at the most & that not with Consent of all, but upon your good behaviour

3. that you make your Eldership a protection for your Anger, wheras Anger & Petulancy is particularly excepted against an Elder. (Tit. 1. 5[?])

2. in pleading for your Argument by such fals aspertions & high Accusations. I. that I took upon my self to be a Teacher & an Elder. Surely that is not taken that is given. If I took it, I pray tel me from whom? But it was given from G:[od] I. by Revelation of his Truths & 2. by necessitating[?] into the discoverie of those Truths which els none did,<sup>26</sup> or[?] then would doe, or so much as suffer to be published, nor hardly yet.

24 The whole letter in its unfinished condition covers pp. 95-111 and was not sent to Dr. Naudin, as is stated in Chamberlen's writing. The letter is undated but must have been written not long after April 12, 1654, as may be inferred from its position in the Records.

25 This *first* point 2, and point 3 are crossed out in the text but their contents are practically repeated on p. 109 of the Records.

26 This passage would suggest that Dr. Chamberlens' was the first to advocate the use of certain practices among the English Anabaptists (such possibly as laying on of hands, and the washing of feet).

2. by man For you who have submitted to my Teachings, have by obedience to that word spoken & practised by me yelded the place, though in form & after the manner of men you would thrust me out of it, & I would yeld unto it, if my account of your Souls did not press me to that little acceptance I have of it. Secondly my frequent Boastings as if I were farr wiser & [more] learned then all of you. . . . Nor were I fitt to be your teacher, if I told you nothing but what you knew already. Yet I beleeve not that any will join with you[?] in this Accusation to say that I have said so of my self.

.....

For to speak the greif of my Soul & others is not scorn nor bitternes. unless bitternes of Greif for your being so a Burthen to me & to all the Ch.[urch] (as many of them have sadly complained) & if I said you are not Qualified for an Elder, it will easily appear by what hath been spoken. & by the qualifications of Elders. (Tim. 3. 2. &c.) How are you blameles, who are blamed[?] by all? & blameworthy by your Contention Turbulency. Anger. being in Law with your own Father. At distance with your wife (as by her Letters appear) at Continual difference with your mayd (as by her too frequent Complaints).....

[From margin p. 119: “1654. ☉. April. 30.” i.e., Sunday.] Dr Naudin, & Mr More falne away  
Mr Light

Mr Spittlehouse upon (Mt: I. 22 compared with Is: 7. 14 & 8. 4) affirmed that the Apostles[?] did not understand the . . . & that it was fulfilled in Is. 8. 4. therefore not here to be repeated (viz Mat. I. 22). But was better resolved before departure.

.....

[Part of a Letter of Elizabeth More to the Church, dated “Aprell<sup>th</sup>30 [sic] 1654.”]

Frindes the Reasons of my absence is no small greefe unto me[.] I loue you all so well and most earnestly desier your Well fare in the lord and should I but se you amend your Wayes and the euell of your dueing Ier 7. 3. and turne unto the lord to searue him with all your hartes dutro [Deut.] 30. 10. I should with much Reyosing [*sic*] com to you againe wich parted from you with much grefe of sperit[.]

The first Reson of my absence is because when I met with you time after time with and [an] Intenshon to saake god) . . . I found confushon falling out and Ralling amongst you[.] When I haued stayed all night big with child to wach and pray expsecting the comfortabell presence of god amongst you wich he hath promised to his Matt. 18. 20 I haue not found him amongst you but confushon and disorder as is not of him . . .

Secondly thare be sum a mong you that I can not discouer anny thing at all of god in them because they haue kept most wicked and Lasiusious [*sic*] company.....

[From margin: "1654. Maij. ♀. 12", i.e., Friday.]

This day Rich: Smith was visited by Peter Chamberlen. & being asked whether he went with Sister Monck. that he came not again. He answered he knew not what he should do there.

P.C: Surely there was somewhat to do. R.S. said. what?

P[.]C: answered to worship G :[od.]

R:S: He would meet no more[.]

P.C. asked why

R.S. bec:[aus] of Sister Monck.

P.C[.] said bec:[aus] you are angrie with her will [you] be also angrie with God?

R.S: said She did caus divisions & we should mark such.

P.C. said we should do it according to Rule. And

though we did not Break Bread with her yet we might worship God in her Company[.]

R.S: said. He questioned that.

P.C. we did it in the presence of Strangers.

R.S. However he would not meet with her

P.C: will you also 'Accuse me bec:[aus] of her

R.S. yes you maintain her in her evil

P.C: You did never accuse me before[.] But shew wherein. & prove it either by Witnes or 'Argument

R.S. Tis easy to be seen

P.C. have I not reprov'd her both in public & privat?

R.S. One may see that you maintain her in her evil.

P.C. I desire you would beware of Temtation[?], For the breach of the bonds of Love is the breach of the bonds of Christ.

R.S. I shall come no more to the meeting

P.C. I beseech you consider what you doe, & search the Scripture by what rule you walk. & write down the reason of your actings, & you will see what you doe[.] Let us at least be Men, if not Christians.

[From margin: “1654 ○ May. 14”, i.e., Sunday]

This day Brother Smith came to the Meeting (notwithstanding his former refusall) & so all things were reconciled in love. Onely Sister Monck is yet a burthen to his Spirit, which must be endeavoured to be reconciled.

[On May 18 accordingly Peter Chamberlen wrote a letter to “Eliza Monch” and on page 131 at the close of the text of the letter he has written the significant words, “○. 21. 5: [i.e., Sunday, May 21] sister Monck humbled & reconciled”]

[From margin: “♂. 23. May. 1654.” i.e., Tuesday]

Sister Smith admonished of miscalling her husband (Dog &c) & humbled, & reconciled. Mr More formerly being told of it, advised Bro: Smith to bear it. Sheweth



how farr unfit he was for an Overseer. Br. Smith might bear with offences to him: but not to G:[od].

[Here the records conclude abruptly, leaving two blank pages at the end.]<sup>27</sup>

### CHAMPLIN BURRAGE.

---

<sup>27</sup> This abrupt ending, like a passage noticed earlier, suggests that the congregation ceased to exist not long after May 23, 1654, though this inference may be quite incorrect. A passage written by Arise Evans may perhaps be interpreted to confirm the inference:—

"God sends them [the Anabaptists] an evil spirit, 1 *Sam.* 16. 14. that puffeth and vexeth them, and sets them one against another; so that there is no peace among them: and though they do mighty things for a time, prevailing, yet at last they come to nothing, . . .". ("The voice of King Charles . . .", 1655 of which the Epistle is dated, "March 23, 1654") p. 51.

### Kentucky Baptist Historical Society.

Professor McGlothlin of Louisville has given this Society a good start by editing three papers, covering in all 100 octavo pages. One is a sketch by Dr. Harvey of William Hickman, a Virginian attracted by Whitefield's preaching, who was converted in 1773, was one of the pioneers into Kentucky, and there organized more than twenty Baptist churches. He was involved in the constitutional agitation which resulted in the entire separation of Church and State, and the establishment of religious equality; he was one of the earliest to crusade for emancipation of the slaves. His life may help us to understand the work of our pioneers on the frontiers of Canada and Australia. The other long contribution, by Dr. James, tells the story of a Theological Institute which existed from 1845 till 1891, and then merged in the Kentucky Baptist Education Society. We congratulate our sister society on a good inaugural issue.

### Original Records, 1665-1672.

The full text of the returns made to the bishops in 1665 and 1669, and the full text of all the Indulgence Papers 1672-1673, of which we spoke in volume I, page 162, are at length published by Professor Lyon Turner, at 50s. We earnestly commend these to all students of the period, and hope next issue to appreciate them from the Baptist standpoint.

## Seeking a Change.

PASTORATES in the seventeenth century were often lifelong, as with Spilsbury, Knowles, Kiffin, Bunyan, Caffin. But occasionally men were willing to consider a call elsewhere. The Church to which the man belonged considered that it had a right to be consulted, and a right to refuse a dissolution; the case of Hardcastle at Jessey's church is well-known. The letters following are rather exceptional in that they show a man anxious to leave his Church, and show his offer to go elsewhere being sent round among sister churches. The whole negotiation indeed led to nothing, but the situation is remarkable.

Richard Adams had a career that was singular in a few respects. When John Tombes was at Bewdley chapel before 1650, he trained young Adams for the ministry, and Adams obtained the living of Humberstone in Leicestershire. Being ejected thence in 1662, he retired to Mount Sorrel, and seems to have maintained himself by teaching. To this the justices did not object, but when he kept conventicles in his house, he was fined a shilling a day. In 1669 he was reported, in 1672 he took out a licence for Congregational worship. From Tombes he was not likely to be imbued with any very sturdy Baptist principles, but in Leicestershire there were many General Baptists. So when, in 1688, John Clayton died, the Shad Thames church in Southwark arranged with Adams to become pastor. There had been trouble in this church during 1687 as to the laying on of hands, which had necessitated an appeal to the Assembly. But with the arrival of Adams, the church quitted its old friends, and in 1689 sent him and two delegates to the Particular Baptist Assembly. The aberration was but momentary; it promptly returned, while Adams in October 1690 was ordained assistant to Kiffin at Devonshire Square.

When Kiffin died in 1701, Adams remained sole pastor, and undertook a general re-organisation, when it was agreed that singing might be allowed after the morning and afternoon services, provided business and the Lord's Supper were not interfered with.

Mark Key had by this time joined the church, and created a peculiar situation; he had been a member and minister at White's Alley General Baptist church, but had left, had been at Reading, and after a period of trouble as to Calvinism, had evidently swung over in his opinions. He was first appointed to exercise his gift here, then invited to move his lecture from Rope-makers' Alley and assist Adams for part of the day. Wapping invited him. This church asked him to stay, and then resolved to accept his transfer from White's Alley if he were in full standing there still. Warwick next invited him, and the church refused to let him go. Petticoat Lane invited him, and he refused. All these invitations were between February 1702-3 and January 1704-5, yet not till December 1706 was Key ordained as assistant to Adams.

Meantime Adams had had his own troubles. Richard Adams junior had been expelled in July 1702 for joining Mr. Payn's congregation; there had been friction in May 1704 about the revival of the London Association, when he actually did not sign the minutes; money ran short on July; men were leaving the church; and one visitor from Hooknorton insisted on preaching, though the church refused to call him to the ministry. Twice in 1705 was Sister Adams censured by the church, he naturally not signing the minutes; and a third time in 1707. In 1706 the trouble about the Association surged up again, and two meetings in April and May were repudiated by a larger meeting, when Adams and Key rallied 19 members. So low had the great church fallen.

It was under these circumstances that Key was ordained, and Adams felt he could honourably look round for a change. Now in 1704 the Particular Baptist of Portsmouth Common had obtained a meeting-house, by the enterprise of Edward Parsons, shipwright. He bought from Joshua Whitehorne, a tallow chandler, and from Henry Seager, gentleman, two pieces of land on West Dock Field, and out of stone from Netley Abbey, built a meeting-house, 32 feet square. One of the leaders among these Baptists was a glazier, named Thomas Whitewood, and through him Adams opened negotiations in June, 1709, to see if the church was ready for a minister. The letter went in the first instance to John Howe, a London man who had gone down to Portsea, and who, fifteen years later, himself preached here. Portsmouth was not desiring a pastor yet, and the letter was sent on to William Knight, of Broughton. No one was wanted here, and it went on further to John Bunny, a butcher of Whitchurch.

This church sent an invitation to Adams, at Pittfield Street in Agnes la Claire, near Hogsden, and on 25 August, 1709, Adams

sent his reply, direct to Whitchurch. For reasons indicated in this reply the affair came to nothing. He stayed on, but in 1712 was pensioned off on £12, to preach once in two months; and he died so unostentatiously that the date is uncertain, whether 1716 or 1719.

The letters are reproduced from the transcript made by Miss Marion Cox of Whitchurch; the originals being now in the Regent's Park library, in the custody of our President.

Beloved Brother How,

yo<sup>rs</sup> of the 18<sup>th</sup> June Instant I have recd & give you kind thanks for yo<sup>r</sup> care in my business. as to the Isle of wight I am quite of from them. If they thinke M<sup>r</sup> Sealey a fitter man for them than my selfe, they may freely take him for me. I have a desire to live in the countrey, and have good reason for it, and if you know a people that I may be suitable for, If they will send for me & beare my charges I will goe to them & stay one or 2 Lords dayes w<sup>th</sup> them, and when wee come to have some understanding of each other wee shall better know how suitable I may be for them, & how agreeable they may be to me in judgm<sup>t</sup> & temper I am under noe necessitty of Imposing my selfe on any people, but I can truly say my earnest desire and prayer to God is that he would place me (If I should remove) where I may be serviceable to the Interest of Christ the few [a hole] I have yet to live. If I serve a people it is highly reasonable they should allow me something according to their ability, but I shall easily convince them I am not covetious. I should be very willing that they should be at liberty to choose another when they please, and I shall be willing to be at liberty to leave them if I see cause. I know that the most grave serious Brethren & sisters of the congregation will be loath to leave me, but they know in their consciences, that I have good reason to part with them. Mr. Cox I understand hath beene in Towne, Mr. Keyes told me, he was to meete him at a place appoynted. I have some reason to thinke that

my proposall made in my letter to you is returned to London.

I desire you to speake to Brother whitewood & tell him I desire him when he has any money to send it me. He may returne it by Mr Gawler. Let Brother whitewood place the charge of my letters to you, to my accot. If comissioners should come downe to portsmouth according to act of pliament, I desire that either Brother whitehorne or Brother whitewood will let me know if they see occasion. My Christian Respects to you & all friends I am

yo<sup>r</sup> Brother & fellow Labourer  
in the Lords worke  
Rich: Adams

London June 27<sup>th</sup> 1709

If I should be sent for I should be willing to pay some part of the charges my selfe.

[To the Baptists at Whitchurch]

Deare Brethren

I have recd yo<sup>r</sup> first and 2<sup>d</sup> letters. About the time I recd yo<sup>r</sup> first It pleased the great disposer of all things to remove my deare & loving wife from me by death, w<sup>ch</sup> hath made a great altera<sup>o</sup>n in the scene of my affaires, she was a good companion both in a temporall & spitull accot. I would have gone w<sup>th</sup> her into any part of England where I might have had a prospect of serving Christ & his Interest she had a great desire to live in the country where she might enjoy the benefit of a good ayre, but now she is gone where there will be noe complaynt for the want of these outward comforts. I have met with some abusive carriage from some few in our congrega<sup>o</sup>n some of these few are brought to see their mistakes I am willing to goe out of the Noise of London, but I now forsee it will be difficult to come of regularly from the congrega<sup>o</sup>n, I have onely, as yet, opened my mind to one

of the chiefe of our brethren (a deacon) who told me he would never consent to my removing I gave him some good reason why I desired to remove & desired him to consider what I have said & discourse with our other two Deacons concerning this matter when I have consulted w<sup>th</sup> some of our chiefe Brethren I shall be capable of giving you a satisfactory answer. The Lord direct you and me in this great affaire. My Christian love to you all. I am

yo<sup>r</sup> Brother in the faith &  
fellowship of the gospell  
Rich Adams

I would be willing to take a Journey to see you, but that will signifie little unless I can pceive that the Church will be content to pt w<sup>th</sup> me

**The Ejected of 1662 in Cumberland and Westmoreland.**

Mr. Nightingale has in the press two volumes running to 1400 pages, to be published by the Manchester University at 28s. This is the fruit of some years of research.

## The Fifth Monarchy Movement.

THE term "Fifth Monarchy" serves as a summary designation for an extraordinary religious and political movement, based on intense belief in the imminence of the "Fifth Monarchy," or universal rule of God's people on earth, as gathered from revelations contained in the apocalyptic book of Daniel (esp. chapters ii., vii., xi.). This movement is one of the numerous movements or parties that existed during the Commonwealth period in England, and owed its rise to the unique conditions of the time—a fervid religious spirit brooding upon the great political crisis, and seeking the key to it in the prophetic Scriptures, more especially the books of Daniel and Revelation. Under such conditions arose a very general expectation of some extraordinary dispensation shortly to appear. We have to recognise at the outset that the anticipation of the Fifth Monarchy—of an earthly reign of Christ and the saints—was very widely distributed at this time. Thomas Goodwin, in a sermon of the Fifth Monarchy, 1654, affirms that "all sorts, almost out of all quarters of the world, though they run several ways, yet they fall all into this notion. Those that are for the restoration of the churches to their first purity, they conclude for this reigning for 1,000 years. . . . Others that are for the coming of Christ in spirit (as the language of some is) they say this also That towards the end of the world, Jesus Christ will break forth to his people with a great deal of glory and splendour, so as never before. The very Jesuits themselves have been so much convinced that such things are to be in the later days, that some of them have written a book of the Fifth Monarchy; only, indeed, they do apply and appropriate it unto themselves." Modern students of the period confirm this testimony. "The idea of the near approach of a 'Fifth Monarchy' was *most widely spread*." . . . "there was not a denomination in which the idea did not exist" (Barclay, "Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth," 182, n 486. n) Hardly less comprehensive is the statement of Gooch ("History of English

Democratic Ideas in the 17th Century," 1898). "At the basis of the creed of every religious body of the time, except the Presbyterians, lay the Millenarian idea" (p. 127).

There is, then, a sense in which the great majority of (religious) Englishmen at that time might be called Fifth Monarchists. The name, however, is actually, and better, reserved for a minority with whom this belief was not merely a pious opinion or aspiration, but became their central and all dominating idea, and a primary principle of action—who were disposed to pursue, by such means as lay in their power, constitutional, or sometimes even unconstitutional, the aim of bringing nearer the realisation of that hope. A Fifth Monarchy party, in this narrower sense, first showed conspicuously in the army, where they are traceable (say) after the battle of Naseby (June, 1645). This victory, it will be remembered, had been won by the army that had sprung from the New Model (February 19),<sup>1</sup> and the Self Denying Ordinance (April), and which consisted largely of Independents and Anabaptists. For these sects, with their strong recoil from the established ecclesiastical order, and their belief in a direct guidance by the Spirit of the individual's understanding of the Word, there was in Fifth Monarchism something congenial, and it was specially among them that the movement found its recruits. These multiplied rapidly among the rank and file of the army, and included also some prominent officers (Rainsborough, Rich). Foremost among the latter was Colonel Harrison, one of the bravest and most capable of the Parliamentary commanders, who enjoyed the special confidence of Cromwell.

The military Fifth Monarchists soon became a party that counted in public affairs. In the struggle that presently ensued between the (Independent) army and the (Presbyterian) Parliament, their voice began to be heard. In the Army Declaration, 1647 (*e.g.*), the officers say that several of their number are in favour of placing authority in the hands of some "approved at least for moral righteousness," and specially actuated "by the principles of morals and religion" (Simpkinson, Thomas Harrison, p. 62). But their influence was shortly to be exerted with tragical effect, in a national affair of the first importance. The king was now under Parliamentary custody. What was to be done with

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Goodwin, preaching before the House, Feb. 25, on the "great interest of States and Kingdoms," declared that Christ would show himself King of nations as well as of saints, by ruining nations (containing his saints) which should not comply with his interest; and claimed the rapid changes of the last few years as signs of the near approach of Christ's Kingdom.



him? The retention of any earthly king, whatever limits might be set to his powers, was an obstacle to the realisation of the personal rule of Christ. Charles must die. It was accordingly the Fifth Monarchy officers who led in insisting on the execution of the king. The murder of Rainsborough by Royalists (October, 1648), only made them more resolute to have the king's life. Soon the extreme difficulties of the situation brought round to their view Cromwell and other leaders, who had been reluctant, and Charles was beheaded January, 1649. Harrison had been sent to escort him to London before his trial, and was popularly credited with being chiefly responsible for his death. From about the time of this event may be dated the appearance among the Fifth Monarchists of "a party which in comparison may be described as revolutionary" (Gooch)—a party (*i.e.*) which, not content with passively awaiting the introduction by providential interpositions of the reign of the saints, or at any rate with only such active measures towards its introduction as did not exceed lawful agitation, was disposed, whenever a promising opportunity should offer, to attempt to hew out with the sword a road for the saints to the government. Views of this kind find expression before long in Cary's "Little Horn's Doom and Down-fall" (April, 1651), in which it was affirmed "that nobles and mighty men were about to become subject to the saints, that it was lawful to combat Christ's enemies with the material sword, and that the saints should then possess riches, and reign with Him on earth" (Gooch).

Apart from the movement in the army, Fifth Monarchy principles were by this time laying hold of civilians in various parts of the country. Norfolk was a county in which they soon found numerous adherents. We have evidence of this in a petition (February, 1649), prepared for presentation to the Council of Officers "by many Christian people dispersed abroad throughout the county of Norfolk and city of Norwich." "It asked for the establishment of the reign of Christ and His saints. As only the godly were fit to govern, the Church should be the sole depository of civil authority. Independents and Presbyterians were to combine to choose delegates, who were in turn to elect "general assemblies or Church Parliaments, as Christ's officers and the Church's representatives, and to determine all things by the Word, as that law which God will exalt alone and make honourable" (Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, 132-3). In Wales, again, Fifth Monarchy views soon began to be ardently propagated. In January, 1650, an Act was passed for the teaching and preaching of the Gospel in Wales. The commission to execute it was given to Harrison, and among his assistants was Vavasour

Powell, who became (as we shall see) one of the most vigorous ministerial champions of Fifth Monarchy. The commission proceeded by replacing clergy, that seemed to them inefficient, with Independent ministers, preachers "of the spirit." But soon Cromwell had to march north to engage the Scotch, and Harrison was recalled to take (as major-general) the chief command in England. Powell, for his part, raised troops, and assisted him in the work of keeping order at home. At Musselburgh (August, 1650), the English army put forth a declaration to the people of Scotland, which we notice here for its plain tincture of Fifth Monarchy sentiments, language which was in later days thrown up against the army by steadfast Fifth Monarchists in proof that it was renegade from its "primitive Virgin spirit." "We did many of us rejoice at the Covenant [the solemn League and Covenant of 1654], because we found in it strains towards these ends ["the destruction of anti-Christ and the deliverance of the Lord's Churches"] . . . although some being more enlightened, did apprehend it to be so mixt with worldly interest, that they justly feared the INTEREST OF JESUS CHRIST would be but only pretended to, and the interest of this world and of anti-Christ himself carried on in a vizard, as we have since had abundant experience of," etc. The authors declare themselves "persuaded in our consciences that he [the king] and his monarchy was one of the ten horns of the Beast spoken of Revelation vii. 12-15," and confident that "the Lord will own" his execution. . . "When he brings forth these his enemies that will not suffer Jesus Christ to be king in the midst of His saints, and breaks them in pieces like a potter's vessel, let not Scotland nor any other nation say What dost thou?" The Scotch were crippled at Dunbar (September, 1650), and finally disposed of at Worcester (September, 1651).

There was henceforth in the three kingdoms no power that could resist the victorious army. The Presbyterian remnant of the Long Parliament could not hope for much more respite. The army was bent on getting rid of it. In April, 1653, it was dissolved by Cromwell, driven thereto (as he hinted) by parties led by Generals Lambert and Harrison respectively. The rule of the people had now gone the same way as the old monarchy. To the Fifth Monarchy men the opportunity seemed to have arrived for bringing in a government of the godly. In a letter to the officers serving under Fleetwood, in Ireland, at the time of the dissolution of the Parliament, 1653, Harrison, and some other army magnates, say, "The Lord hath once again pulled down the mighty from their seats, and we trust it is that Himself may reign. . . It will be your duty, and ours, to pray without

ceasing that those whom God shall call to the government may be men full of the Holy Ghost and Power." But how was such a government to be secured? Fifth Monarchy men were opposed on principle to parliaments elected by the people. The right government was one called of Christ, the King, and responsible only to Him. Harrison's wish was that the new Council of State (chosen by Cromwell and other leading officers) should choose a Parliament, with the help of nominations sent in by the "gathered" or voluntary churches throughout the land. John Spittlehouse, who described himself as a "late member of the army," advocated a Committee chosen by the officers (Army Vindicated, April 24th), or preferably a government nominated by Cromwell, who, like Moses, was divinely appointed to rule the Lord's people (A Warning-piece discharged, May 19th). Yet another pamphleteer ("The army no usurpers") roundly asserted it to be "of not less than divine institution that men fearing God should have the government." Specially full and interesting is the programme embodied in the numerous manifestoes of John Rogers, Independent minister, who, however, could boast of having on occasion borne arms in the Parliamentary cause. He was by this time one of the most eminent preachers of the Fifth Monarchists. He now (April 25th) "humbly offered to his excellency Lord-General Cromwell, a few proposals relating to civil government. 1. That your Excellency do choose the men that must govern this commonwealth. 2. Either a Synhedrin, Parliament, Council of seventy, or else one of a [each] county. But if the present junction of affairs requires a quicker despatch, that in the interim twelve worthies may be chosen as present governors—like to Israel's twelve judges. 3. They must be men fearing God, lovers of truth and justice, hating bribes and covetousness, which corrupt justice, not respecters of persons, wise (though not politic), and understanding in the times and seasons [Scripture references for each quality]. They must govern as the servants of Jesus Christ, but not as Lords over Christ." Rogers urges the Protector to "consult with the saints, and send to all discerning and spirited men for their proposals." At the end of May Rogers gave Cromwell one or two additional hints in the dedicatory epistle to his "Ohel or Bethshemesh. . . . an idea of Church Discipline," etc., a work which contended for the Congregational form of Church government as against the (established) Presbyterian form—it even claimed that the former is one of the great promises of these latter days, in which Christ alone shall reign, and an earthly paradise be restored! Rogers here adds, "Seeing running waters are always sweetest, that there might be a yearly election (or so) of officers in greatest

trust or power, lest they should in time assume an absoluteness to themselves, and become oppressors." He also beseeches Cromwell (1) not to usurp (as his predecessors had done) Christ's power in matters of religion (2) to countenance all he can to Congregational churches, "as the gates and palaces of Zion. But 3. lest we lost the substance for the shadow, there be, my Lord, a hidden number of saints (so called in Ps. 83<sup>d</sup>) that you must be a shield to, too, in your capacity. They are as yet scarce known in the world, as they will be ere long."

With these proposals (save as regards the *numbers*) substantially coincided the plans that were actually adopted. Nominations were called for, and were sent in by congregations of most of the English counties; and a Parliament representative of all the counties, and of Scotland and Ireland, was chosen by the Council of State, which Parliament, after co-opting five of the chief military magnates, numbered in all 144. It was to retire in November, 1654, having first appointed successors for twelve months. That Cromwell himself largely shared at this time the hopes of the Fifth Monarchists, appears from the speech he made when delivering over to this Parliament the supreme authority. (July 4th). I confess I never looked to have seen such a day; I did not . . . indeed, we have not allowed ourselves the choice of one person in whom we had not this good hope, that there was in him faith in Jesus Christ; and love to all his People and Saints. . . . Never was a supreme authority . . . under such a notion, in such a way of owning of God and being owned by him: And therefore I may also say, never such a people so formed, for such a purpose, thus called before . . . Who can tell how soon God may fit the people for such a thing [themselves electing a Parliament]? . . . and give me leave to say: if I know anything in the world, what is there likelier to win the people to the Interest of Jesus Christ, to the love of godliness (and therefore what stronger duty lies on you, being thus called) than an humble and godly conversation? . . . And why should we be afraid to say or think, That this may be the door to usher in the Things that God has promised: which have been prophesied of. . . . And we have thought, some of us, That is it our duties to *endeavour* this way; not merely to *look* at that prophecy in Daniel, 'And the kingdom shall not be delivered to another people.'" etc.

The hopes of Fifth Monarchists naturally rose high. Never, indeed, had they a fairer prospect of achieving their political programme. What they were hoping from this Parliament we can now perhaps gather best from another publication of John Rogers, written probably in the autumn of 1653, "Sagrir, or

Doomsday drawing nigh, with Thunder and Lightning to Lawyers," etc., 1654. Again he begins with an address to Cromwell—"now you have won us, you must wall us with the good and wholesome laws and liberties of the people, as we were before the Norman invasion, or rather as Israel of old, Deut 61." Then follows an address to readers of various "faculties." The "Parliament man" is to make a clean sweep of the existing laws, and substitute "the laws of God given by Moses for republic laws, as well as the laws of God given by Christ, which must in for Church laws," thus "throwing down the standing of lawyers and priests." *Ministers*, in their turn, are warned that "their maintenance, which is now by tithes, must tumble (ere long) to purpose . . . not but that there is to be a maintenance for the Gospel Ministry, which is moral, and the equity of the Law, but this must be in Gospel manner" ("in as voluntary a way as may be, so that the people ought to be free in the manner of payment," Bethshemesh). *Lawyers* also are admonished, and much of the book is devoted to an exposure of the tyrannies, inequities, delays, and costliness of the existing laws, and the corrupt and grasping administration of them by the lawyers. Ch. V. is "of the Fifth Monarchy, when? and how? and why?" etc. All agree as to the near and swift approach of the Fifth Monarchy, though differing as to the precise time. The prophecy of the little Horn (Daniel vii.) has been variously interpreted of the Pope, the Turk, Julius Cæsar, anti-Christ, and Antiochus Epiphanes. "With much assurance and clear light," however, Rogers identifies it with William the Conqueror, and the subsequent line of English kings. Its predicted judgment took place in the case of Charles I. "After this horn (thus judged) . . . the Day of Judgement will reach France, Spain, Denmark, Poland, etc., with all the rest of the 10 horns. . . . Then enters the Fifth Monarchy. . . . Within this seven years, by 1660, the work will get as far as Rome, and by 1666 this Monarchy must be visible in all the earth." (The author cites in support of his views various prognostications of former times, one of which at least may be admitted here, if only to illustrate the naive arbitrariness with which Fifth Monarchists interpreted prophecies to their own purpose). "Cataldus Finius, minister of Trent. . . . when Rome (says he) begins to hear the loud bellowing of the fat cow (I know not who that is, unless the English nation, as seems by what follows) woe! woe then be to thee, O Flanders full of blood! and Zeeland and Holland full of treacheries (as if this were the way of the war to Rome)."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> England was at war with the Dutch. Fifth Monarchists desired to impose

Respecting the laws and officers of the new order, Rogers says, "Christ hath (of right) the supreme authority of the nations. . . . Although he doth delegate a judicial power to his servants, Isai. 1<sup>27</sup> 1 Kgs 6<sup>12</sup>, and subordinate officers, Isai 60<sup>17</sup> Dan 7<sup>27</sup> Rev 19<sup>14</sup>, which must all be saints too; yet he keeps the legislative power to himself, and will not part with it (nor can he) to princes or parliaments." The business of Parliament is "to model and conform the civil affairs for Christ's coming. 1. Constitute none but honest, faithful men, such as follow the Lamb, into places of trust, or offices of this nation. 2. See that . . . those laws which are contrary to sound reason or religion, whether in things civil or ecclesiastic . . . be abolished for ever. 3. Improve your utmost for Jesus Christ, and his monarchy at home and abroad. . . . The law of God, which is now slighted as imperfect, while men set up their own notions and forms, in the stead, and prefer Gratian's or a Justinian's law, and so make themselves as heathens without the law of God amongst them, this law lies in Deut. 6<sup>1</sup>. These are the commandments (i.e. the 10 in 2 tables given to Moses on Mt. Sinai Exod 20) the statutes (i.e., the several cases depending on, and arising out of each command . . . ) and the judgments (i.e. the sentence upon the breach of every law, how and what punishment must be). Now this law . . . must be set up," etc.

In the Parliament (the "Little," "Barbon," or "Nominated" Parliament) there was, under the lead of Harrison, a strong minority, which sympathised with such views. Through their efforts, more or less progress was made towards abolition of ecclesiastical patronage and tithes, and of the Court of Chancery, and towards a comprehensive simplification of the existing code of laws. They were further disposed to challenge the vote for the pay of the army. Thus they alienated and alarmed various classes of the community. Their opponents in the House also raised the cry that property in general was being attacked, and obtained a snap vote for returning authority into the hands of Cromwell (December 12th).

Great were the surprise, disappointment, and indignation of the Fifth Monarchists; and these feelings they expressed in unmeasured terms, which drew to their fellowship many of the more violent and desperate spirits in the nation. On December 18, at Blackfriars, then the chief meeting-place of Fifth Monarchists in London, a preacher (Powell or Feake) adjured any

---

upon them a "peace upon the account of Christ, to engage together against Anti Christ, Rome, prelates, enemies of all nations." (Bethshemesh, dedication).

friend of Cromwell present to tell him that he was "the dissemblingest perjured villain in the world, and that soon he should be served worse than that great tyrant, the last Lord Protector [Somerset]." Preaching was resumed next day. Christopher Feake, a Baptist Fifth Monarchist preacher,<sup>3</sup> handled the description of the little horn in Daniel vii. in such a way as to insinuate its identification with Cromwell, while declaring that he would name nobody. Powell followed him, enlarging on the subject from Daniel xi. with less reserve. "The King of the North" he interpreted to be the late king, and applied the description of the "vile person" who should succeed him (*v.* 21) to the existing régime. After someone, who attempted to express some opposition, had been howled down, Mr. Cockaine discoursed for the rest of the time on Hosea v. 1-2, affirming that the unholy alliance of king and idolatrous priests had its parallel in England at that moment, *i.e.*, in the Protector and the established ministry. Rogers, for his part, published, on December 21st, his "humble cautionary proposals" to the Protector, bidding him take heed of being guided or governed with "the old State principles of carnal policy," and so on. On the other hand, in January, 1654, "the most respected of the London Baptists wrote to disclaim all participation in the views of the Fifth Monarchists" (Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate II.*, 305). In a letter to Baptists in Ireland, Kiffin criticises the Blackfriars preachings, for (1) implying that magistrates are "only accountable to Christ for their actions, and not to men; and would not this have been the same with the late king" . . . (2) asserting that the policy of war or peace with other nations should be determined by "a spirit stirred up, as they say, by God to throw down potentates and powers, rather than the prudential rules of justice and righteousness in the doing to all men as they would man should do to them."

A kindred sobriety of mind was shown by Cromwell himself. At the opening of the Parliament of 1654, while cordially recognising "that Jesus Christ will have a time to set up His reign in our hearts," he said, "but for men, on this principle, to betitle themselves, that they are the only men to rule kingdoms, govern nations, and give laws to people, and determine of property and liberty and everything else; when such a pretension as this is, truly they had need to give clear manifestations of God's presence with them, before wise men will receive or submit to their conclusions." Cromwell now firmly repressed the turbulence of the Fifth Monarchists. Many officers and men were dismissed from

---

<sup>3</sup> Feake "occupies a middle position between the quiet dreamers and the armed fanatics—his violence was exclusively of the tongue." (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*)

the army. Harrison, having neglected an order to keep at home, was presently imprisoned for a while. The prominent preachers were called before the Council, and Feake and Simpson were sent to Windsor Castle (January 28, 1654). Rogers' house was searched, and his papers seized. This drew from him a solemn remonstrance to Cromwell, Mene, Tekel, Perez, etc. A few months later, he held a day of humiliation at St. Thomas Apostle's, where he had a lectureship, and in his sermon accused the apostate Protector of having broken all the ten commandments, called him a "great thief," and complained of his spies and tale bearers. Shortly after the Council ordered his apprehension, and he was imprisoned (Lambeth, July, 1654; Windsor, March, 1655; Carisbrooke Castle, December, 1655). Of the very harsh treatment to which he was subjected in Lambeth, "that old butcher's shop and shamble of the saints," and other strong places, he wrote in prison a very detailed account ("Jegar Sahadutha, or a heart appeal").

In February, 1655, owing to an appeal by friends for the release of himself and Feake, he was brought before the Protector to discuss whether it was for Christ's sake that he suffered—supporters of both parties being also present. Cromwell told him that there was, as never before, complete liberty of conscience, called God to witness that none suffered in England for the testimony of Jesus, said that Rogers suffered for "railing, lying, and as a raiser of sedition," that parties intolerant of others' views must be kept out of the government; and when Rogers besought him to "consider how near it is to the end of the Beast's dominion, the forty-two months"; cut him short with "Talk not of that, for I must tell you plainly they are things I understand not." Rogers, for his part, defied all law and rule that trespassed on his Spirit-prompted faith. ("Faithful narrative," etc., by Fifth Monarchy men present, 1655). General Harrison, Colonel Rich, and two other Fifth Monarchy leaders, Messrs. Carew and Courtney, afterwards waited on Cromwell with a request for release of the prisoners. A few days later they were themselves brought before Cromwell, in presence of ministers, representing both sides (Simpson was one). They declined in any way to acknowledge this 'anti-Christian and Babylonish' government, and having refused an undertaking to keep to their own counties, were committed for contempt and various treasonous practices" (Thurloe to Monk).

Rogers' prison-book bewails the present apostasy, "not only among mercenary professors, but the little remnant." He would not know what to make of its coldness, cowardliness, and carelessness, "were it not to fulfil the word of God" (Rev. ii. 9), and



that the enemy "may be surprised as in the days of Noah and Lot," etc. He is stimulated to write by many requests from perplexed saints "for resolves in the work of the day about the witnesses, the time, the street [Rev. xi.] . . . the order and effects of their rising; also about the vials . . . the first and second Beasts . . . and who is the man that makes up the last character of the Beast, viz. 666." True, he has had his own misgivings, from "the intricacy, depth, and incomprehensiveness of those deep prophecies which I have to ferry over or pass through," as well as from "the bellowing threats and atrocity of the Beast now up in England." But he has been confirmed by the reported visions of a woman subject to hypnotic trance, and by dreams of his own—"for though I am as far from . . . having dependence upon dreams or visions as any man alive, yet I must not omit the night-teaching of the Spirit, nor such dreams and visions which bring forth blessed effects upon the spirit of men, or are notifications of the truth and mind of God." He also comforts himself that fools "are the Lord's instruments, yea, such asses and idiots as we are (by grace) the King of saints shall ride upon into his throne." Accordingly he gives a vigorous exhortation to the "remnant" to be ready, and especially to the imprisoned leaders. "Come, come, sirs, prepare your companies, for King Jesus his Mount Sion muster day is at hand. . . . We wait only for the word from on High to fall on, and faith and prayer to do the execution according to Rev. 18<sup>6</sup>,—and then by the grace of God the proudest of them shall know we are engaged . . . to stand or fall with the Lord Jesus . . . so as neither to give nor take quarter, but according to his orders. . . . Is it not high time for the witnesses to be rising. . . . Yea, the man among the myrtle-trees (Zech. 1<sup>8</sup>) on his red horse is already mounted, if I mistake not, and ready to march, with his sword to execute, and fire to plead with all nations; for his bow<sup>4</sup> he used upon his white horse (Rev. 6<sup>3</sup>) hitherto, but the next is his sword on his red horse, and the slain of the Lord shall be many (Isai. 66<sup>16</sup>)."<sup>4</sup> Finally, Rogers calls on "this bastard of Ashdod" to release the prisoners; or "else I say unto thee by the authority of the Lord committed to me that thou shalt die like a BEAST. . . . And I summon you all that have a hand or heart in this persecution to appear before my Christ, his elect angels and saints . . . after the 1335 days, when we shall judge you that now judge us." . . .

Partly owing to the violent spirit here illustrated, Fifth Mon-

---

<sup>4</sup> Interpreted as the *Word* of God, Goodwin, Sermon of the Fifth Monarchy, 1654.

archism had, indeed, largely declined in credit and in numbers. By the spring of 1656, the Welsh Fifth Monarchists were settling down into peaceful Baptists, like their leader Powell, who had lately received baptism, and whose "Word for God" (1655) expressed the political views of Fifth Monarchy in a milder form. In Norfolk, also, the Fifth Monarchy congregations were losing many to the Baptists or Quakers. Even in London the cause had lost ground. Here the chief meeting-places were now at Allhallows (milder), and Swan Alley, Coleman Street (more violent). In the winter of 1655-6 were started five meetings of twenty-five members each, of whom one only was to know of, and be the channel of communication with, the other meetings. Emisaries from these meetings went forth to proselytise in the country (Thurloe). In the spring of 1656 the government's informers reported growing excitement in the Swan Alley congregation; now led by Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper, who had come from New England in 1651, and had since held, and lost, on suspicion of disloyal designs, a post in the Tower of London. In July there was a meeting of London Fifth Monarchists, which "concluded the time to be now, and the means, by the sword." They next sought the co-operation of the so-called "Commonwealthsmen" (who favoured a republic, ruled by democratic Parliaments). These, however, desired to restore in some shape the Long Parliament, "while the constitutional aims of the Fifth Monarchy men were either purely negative or absolutely vague" (Firth, "Last Years of the Protectorate"); and a conference between leading representatives of both parties led to no result save an interrogation of these leaders before the Protector's Council. They were, however, left at liberty; and near the end of the year there was a release of Fifth Monarchy prisoners. Rogers and Feake resumed their attacks on the government. On January 5, 1657, at All Hallows, the latter declared that in substance monarchy and popery were still maintained. Another ex-prisoner, however, the Baptist preacher, Simpson, condemned Feake's aversion from civil government, as did other leading Baptists, some saying that those who tried to interpret obscure prophecies, like Daniel and Revelations, were fools (Thurloe). (Dr. Whitley has kindly pointed out to me that by this time the Seventh Day controversy was becoming the centre of attention to Simpson and most other Fifth Monarchy Baptists). There was, however, a London congregation of Baptists concerned in the designs of Venner's following. These are known to us in some detail from some minutes of the Coleman Street meeting, recently reprinted by Mr. Champlin Burrage in the "English Historical Review" (October, 1910). Arrangements were adopted for the

choice of various kinds of officers, and Venner was elected chief captain. A rendezvous was appointed at Mile End Green, whither arms and ammunition were to be transported, and the conspirators were to proceed from various points in the City, on April 7. It was hoped to surprise some government troop of horse, and after executing its officers, and such men as resisted, to appropriate their horses, "because the Lord hath need." Any booty that might be acquired was to go into a common treasury, applicable to the maintenance of the conspirators and their families. A Declaration was printed, and plans made for distributing it in London and various parts of the country. These proposals were not carried through without opposition from some dissenting brethren, among whom at one point "a very unsavoury and uncrucified spirit appeared." They accused the leaders of self-seeking. One objected that: "1, the ancient wise Christians are not with us, as Mr. Harrison, Carew, Mr. Rogers; 2, the time is not come by two months" [42 months (Rev. xi. 2) from the Protectorate, December, 1654]. Ultimately some members withdrew. The Baptist meeting also doubted if the time were come, while there was such disunion among the saints; and there were such mutual distrusts and recriminations between them and Venner's meeting, that the latter resolved to proceed without them. At last, however, there was prospect of an understanding, and in the hope of their coming in, the rising was postponed to April 9. Its programme was embodied in "A Standard set up, etc., William Medley [son-in-law of Venner], scribe," 1657—Christ, the supreme law-giver; the Scriptures, as His revealed will, the sole law; a government of "men of the choicest light and Spirit," chosen annually by "the Lord's freemen" (who would also choose district judges); the government not competent, however, to alter "any of the Foundations of Common Right and Freedom," once agreed upon; "save in case of a further convincing light," and then by law; no taxes in time of peace, and only by law and the people's assent in time of war, the charges of which shall fall chiefly on its occasioners, the Beast and his officials; no tithes, or fixed salaries, for ministers; "the Lord's people, of what opinion soever, besought to come in with us in this Bottome."

Thanks to the efficiency of Thurloe's system of espionage and information, timely notice reached Whitehall of a suspicious gathering in Shoreditch. The house was surrounded, and about twenty men, armed and spurred, were seized, together with some money, arms, and ammunition, bundles of declarations, and a standard bearing the red "lion of the tribe of Judah" and the motto, "Who shall rouse him up?" Venner, Medley, and others

were confined in the Tower and elsewhere. Harrison, Rich, and some other Fifth Monarchy leaders were arrested on suspicion, but released after a few days. In February, 1658, when danger threatened the Protector's government from a conjunction of hostile parties, Cromwell, on his personal warrant, had Harrison, Rogers, and other eminent Fifth Monarchy men arrested. Their chief offence was circulating seditious pamphlets among the army, e.g., "Some Considerations . . . for . . . the Faithful," etc., 1657. The authors of this tract ask "whether Jesus Christ is not by the saints as his battle-axe to break and consume both the magistratical and ministerial authority of the Beast [Cromwell] and his horns, before his personal coming"; and agree "to arm against, resist, and openly oppose them, and do our utmost endeavour to force the power out of their hands," while we "own and approve of such a magistracy as is according to the heart of God," Rom. xiii. 3. The dissolution of Parliament (February) provoked further violent talk from Fifth Monarchists. In April, the Coleman Street meeting was raided, those present arrested, including Cornet Day and John Canne, Baptist, and sentenced to a fine of £500, or a year's imprisonment. Feake also brought the authorities down on him again, but was released, as was Rogers, on April 16. Harrison and others recovered liberty after Cromwell's death, September, 1658.

With regard to the complicated political intrigues that followed that event, it must suffice here to say that Fifth Monarchists had their full share in them. In May, 1660, Charles II. was proclaimed in London. Harrison was already again in the Tower; in the autumn he, first of the regicides, was tried and executed. This exasperated the Fifth Monarchy men, who doubtless realised that their cause was desperate under the new régime. Venner led the Coleman Street meeting in planning another rising. It, too, had its manifesto, "A door of hope," in which the conspirators devoted their lives to the cause, and vowed not to sheathe their swords again "until Mount Sion became the joy of the whole earth. . . . For that we are purposed . . . to go on to France, Spain, Germany, and Rome, to destroy the Beast and whore." On Sunday evening, January 6, about fifty men broke out into the streets, challenged passers, shot down one who declared himself for King Charles, terrorised the city till Wednesday, held at bay the troops sent to quell them, refused quarter, and were not disposed of till the King's Life-guards and another city regiment had turned out. Venner (wounded) and a number of others were taken alive, tried, and executed in various places. Clearness of complicity in this rising was claimed by "several Anabaptist societies in a humble representation to the king" (January 30).

Here the story of the Fifth Monarchy as a serious movement ends, though there were abortive plots, or rumours of plots, for several years longer.

A passing strange, and to this day a moving story!—of men from whose virtues, as well as mistakes, we can still learn much, and in whom there is surely not a little for us to admire. These were men of vision and faith; and that a faith so clear and convinced that they were ready to stake life and liberty and all in a conflict against the world, for a land of promise which after all existed, so far, only in their dreams. We, no doubt, think it strange and almost laughable to see men deciding the gravest political movements by reference to obscure prophecies, actually counting on the resurrection of the two witnesses (Rev. xi.), and so on. Some, perhaps, were reckless adventurers, but only a minority. Most were sincere, and not a few were high-minded men. Their errors were largely due to ignorance of the true way of reading Bible prophecy, their extravagancies to the extraordinary difficulties and trials of their situation; their fight, if misguided, was, after all, a whole-hearted fight for liberty, both civil and religious; and grandly noble, if impracticable, is their ideal of a rule of the saints.

It might have been desirable to add a brief summary of their principles, but limitation of space forbids, and perhaps they have been sufficiently indicated in the course of the narrative. One further point, however, may still be touched—the relation between Fifth Monarchists and Baptists. It can be briefly stated. The Fifth Monarchy party embraced members of various religious denominations. As Rogers told Cromwell, "That Fifth Monarchy principle . . . is of such a latitude as takes in all saints, all such as are sanctified in Christ Jesus, without respect of what form of judgment he is." With Rogers, however, "saints" meant practically members of Congregationalist Churches. And no detailed exposition is needed to show a special kinship between Fifth Monarchy on the one hand and those churches on the other, with their exclusive acceptance of the Scriptures, as the rule of faith and practice, their belief in the Spirits' illumination of each individual member, and their strong discontent with the existing conditions of church and state. We might, then, expect beforehand to find many Baptists in the ranks of Fifth Monarchy. We have seen that this was actually the case. But we have also seen that as the movement developed, Baptists tended to draw off from it; and from the first there were many who kept clear of it; and, on the whole, we may follow Gooch's statement ("English Democratic Ideas in the 17th Century"), "Except in the case of Canne, who was more a Millenarian

than a Baptist, every authoritative declaration of principle leads us to regard the English Baptists as an orderly and relatively conservative society. The typical Baptist is to be found, not among those who haunted the meetings of the Millenarians, but in such men as Tombes, the friend of Clarendon and Sanderson, in the learned Jessey, and in the saintly Hanserd Knollys."

### **Captain John Spencer.**

A long record in the State papers about this pioneer of lay-preaching, confirms our suggestions on page 128. On 10th April, 1650, when Major-general Harrison was putting the militia into safe hands, Spencer was made lieutenant-colonel in Yorkshire, to assist Lidcott. Next year he and Captain Kiffin were directed to enlist the well-disposed around Theobalds, a royal manor on the edge of Middlesex and Hertfordshire, to which Theobalds Road led, there being a special King's Gate into it just north of Holborn—facts with a peculiar interest for friends of the Kingsgate Press. In 1653 he began a close association with Colonel Packer, who with him and Kiffin and three others received on 7th July a warrant entitling them to preach in any pulpit whatever. On 7th February, 1654, he joined Jessey and Highland in moderating the heat of Simpson's congregation at Allhallows. On 5th December, 1655, he and Packer were of a body of officers who tendered advice to Cromwell, received graciously; on 10th March, 1656, the pair joined in a recommendation to Major Bourne. On 24th September, 1657, the same Council which granted the ruined site of the Convocation House to the unlucky Simpson, granted Spencer £60 yearly as preacher: this was adjusted next March to £50, and he was appointed to Theobalds. In June, 1659, he was commissioned again as captain under Packer, and in November was at the Ayr garrison. Here he formed another Baptist church, with twenty-three privates and corporals of his company, but the Clarke papers tell how Monk got him and Colonel Sawrey ousted. The colonel retired to Broughton Tower in Lancashire, and founded the church now known as Tottlebank. The captain retired to Theobalds, where he had acquired the manor, said next June to be worth £10,000. The Act of Oblivion and Indemnity possibly assured him in this, but when in 1664 he was accused of a new plot to raise Westmorland, a good pretext was given. The Dutch ambassador reported on 10-20th August, 1665, that he was in prison. These facts link up the author of 1639 and 1642 with the rich captain Spencer of Hertford in 1669, who in 1672 was licensed for Baptist worship at Cheshunt.

## Thomas Tryon, 1634-1703.

**A**S Baptists we are sometimes charged with claiming, on the slightest pretext, any considerable person as an adherent. Claims need to be distinguished by our critics and ourselves. For instance, the broad assertion that John Milton was a Baptist, apart from some qualifying epithet, may be too inclusive; for the full confessions of faith, the genius and temper of the Anabaptists of the seventeenth century, in England, cast no spell upon him. It was our practice with regard to baptism by immersion he approved; the integrity of our mode, when traced to primitive precedents, he endorsed. It may be in one point of contact only, that men may be in harmony with us; this should be scrupulously indicated. Candour and precision should characterize our statements; we must not be more courteous in our inclusions, than jealous in our disclaimers.

Thomas Tryon, the subject of this brief sketch, held no ambiguous relation to our body at one period of his life. This he makes abundantly clear in his "Memoirs." He was in full fellowship with a church of "Anabaptists" in London for a period; was the genuine contemporary of John Bunyan—being born six years later—and must have read some of the stirring pamphlets of John Milton still wet from the press. He is here introduced simply as an illustration of the influence of Baptists in London during the seventeenth century upon the young life of the country, that then, as now, poured into the Metropolis. Though he did not remain in fellowship with our people, his first inspirations to a singularly noble life were received from them. Having been acquainted with the writings of Tryon for some time, and always annexing any little volume that came to hand, I at last fortunately stumbled upon his "Memoirs—written by himself." It is a curious, introspective, physiological, psychological little book. In temper calm and confident more resembling Franklin's Life than Bunyan's Grace Abounding, yet at times reminding one of the latter, though lacking its passion and grip.

He opens his life's story by anticipating that people may attribute to him wrong motives in his effort; but affirms that his aims are:

"First, to make an acknowledgment and erect a monument to the Divine Goodness, for his manifold mercies. Second, to engage my own heart to a more humble frame, and great thankfulness for many mercies received. Thirdly, to encourage others, by the example of God's gracious dealing with me, to a cheerful dependence upon his Providence in the ways of Humility, Industry, Temperance, Cleanliness, and Mercy, which are always accompanied with an inward peace and satisfaction of mind, and conduce to a greater knowledge of God, and themselves, than otherwise they can attain to."

Tryon's origin was a very humble one. His parents were named William and Rebecca, who resided at an obscure village called Bibury,<sup>1</sup> in Gloucestershire. Where Thomas was born "in the year 1634; on the 6th of September, at a little before Eleven of the Clock, in the forenoon." His father was a "Tyler and Plaisterer, an honest and sober man of good reputation, but having many children, was forced to bring them all to work betimes." "About five years old," he says, "I was put to school, but I scarcely learnt to distinguish my letters, before I was taken away, to work for my living. Being about six years of age, I had a dream wherein it pleased God to shew me the Kingdom of Love, and the Kingdom of Darkness. I thought that God appeared to me and talked with me Face to Face in a very friendly and loving manner." Many other dreams he had, and attached much significance to them as factors in his life; he affirms that "they pointed out the Work the Great Creator ordained me for." In subsequent years he wrote a book on "Dreams," providing a more rational philosophy on this subject than some writings advance.

At first he was employed in spinning and carding wool, and when eight years of age could earn two shillings a week. At eleven he varied spinning by keeping sheep. At twelve he assisted his father. At "thirteen years old," he says, "I could not read, and I bought a Primer." Having become possessed of two sheep he gave one to a lame young man to teach him to make letters that he might write. From this time he seems to have made good progress. Are these short and simple annals of a poor lad too mean for record? I think not.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not Bilbury as stated in the New Edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica.



Now follows the great change in his life. Between seventeen and eighteen, he says:

“Having saved Three Pounds by my management of my sheep, I went directly for *London*, and with the money bound myself Apprentice to a Castor-maker at *Bridewel-Dock*, near *Fleet Street*, and I informed my Father what I had done, and he was well pleased, and commended my conduct. My master was an honest sober man, one of those so called *Anabaptists*. After I had been with him about Two Years, I inclined to that Opinion; and was Baptized after their way, and admitted into a congregation of them.”

It is this passage that is so pertinent to our purpose. Words could not make a fact clearer. Possibly the name of his master, his church, and his minister; also some entry in a church minute book, with his name in a roll of members might be found; but a search for these particulars, I have not, at this time, been able to make. The passage is a distinctly creditable testimony to the high-toned character of the London Baptist of the mid-seventeenth century; and of the religious nurture extended by the prosperous citizen to his rustic apprentice.

A further passage bears cordial witness to the equity and consideration of his employer. “Sweating” does not seem to have been a vice of the time. The severities he endured, at this period, were all self imposed. He says:

“I was not put upon this tedious daily working by my master; for in our trade 'tis customary for apprentices to have a certain task allotted them; which task being handy at my trade, I not only fulfilled with ease, but by that my assiduous working, earned Five, Six, or Seven Shillings a week, which my master always readily paid me; and therewith I furnished myself with Books, paid my Tutors, and served all my occasions, but indeed, having no other way to raise money, was thereby forced to work thus early and late.”

Tryon, however, did not abide in close fellowship with the Baptist community; his words are: “I continued in that opinion about Three Years: In which time I was mightily addicted to reading and study.” The memoir now becomes disappointing, not chiefly because our author ceases to meet with his Baptist brethren; for he does not seem to have broken with them in any violent manner; but because he gives no detailed account of his association with any other body of Christians. It is, however, clear that for about five years he assembled for worship with

Baptists; and they have the distinction of instructing him in spiritual truth, and of receiving him into Christian communion.

Following the sequence of events as recorded in the "Memoirs," we are next brought into contact with his study of astrology, a science much in vogue at this time; many of its professors being men of sincere philosophic spirit, others mere charlatans. This he recognises in forcible language. His personal indebtedness to this pursuit is thus stated:

"But the great benefit I found in this study, was, That it enabled me in some measure to discern the Complexion and Qualities of Animals, Minerals, and Vegetations; for no judicious man can deny the influence of Celestial or inferior Bodies; and therefore he that is most knowing in their Natures and Operations, he distinguishes best the Natures and Qualities of the things of this World, and likewise best understands the humane Nature, and himself; for there is an Astrology within Man, as well as without him. A Microcosmical Sun and Moon, and all the rest of the Planets, we carry about us; that is, the qualities of our own Natures correspond with, and are derived from the seven grand qualities, or glorious Governors of the great world."

It was now, he says, about his twenty-third year:—

"And the blessed Day-Stars of the Lord began to arise and shine in my Heart and Soul, and the Voice of Wisdom continually and most powerfully called upon me for Separation and Self-denial; and through his great Mercy I was enabled to obey, retrenching many vanities, and flying all Intemperance; for then I betook myself to Water only for Drink and forbore Eating any kind of Flesh or Fish, and confining myself to an abstemious self-denying Life."

Thus Tryon received his vision and call to his prophet-like service; and never was man more devoted to his ideal, nor more consistent in its advocacy, both by teaching and example. From this time he became an apostle of the "Simple Life"; only much more simple than advocated to-day. The amount of nutriment he subsisted upon at times was incredibly small. Abstinence from all strong drinks was strictly imposed. He opened a relentless attack upon the insanitary conditions of the people; and introduced many social reforms. He was regarded as a fanatic by many. His sincerity was so transparent however, his teaching so humane, and his advocacy, both by speech and writing, so eager and continuous, that he secured many disciples. Dietary, including vegetarianism, and spare at that; cleanliness; light

clothing; care of mothers and infants; self-denial, abstinence, and temperance in their fitting degrees; fresh air and gentle exercise, etc.; indeed, a programme so extended was imposed, that in instructions at least the simplicity of the system seemed stultified. He imposes what he calls a "Pythagorian Life, in meats, drinks, exercises, and communications." He is a radical reformer. His call is for an austerity so noble that only heroic spirits will bid for it. For instance, his "Wisdom's Dictates," published 1696, contains many such aphorisms as the following:

"In this way there are no Inns no Ale Houses, but a few poor Cottages; their Beds are clean straw; and the most currantest Money that goes amongst these poor People is Self-denial and content, and their Watch Word is, *Let all Flesh be silent.*"

Being an omnivorous reader he must have been acquainted with some of the works of Jacob Behmen, then being translated by John Sparrow. Traces of his "Theosophy" are found in many passages of Tryon. Thus:

"Thou art to believe that as all the illuminated and beautiful Creatures both of the Celestial and Terrestrial Globe, are the works of the Eternal Creator, and have his Image and Signature stamped upon them, each according to its kind: So likewise, that his Paternal Love, Care, and preserving Power, is equally dispensed to each in due measure, according to its kind, even to the meanest of them."

Another factor in shaping this man's philosophy and character would be Quakerism. This movement was a swiftly rising tide, beating in upon his young manhood, that would take him on its crest and bear him forward. A nature so inward and independent of forms, would inevitably yield to its offer of buoyancy and liberty in the spirit, combined with simplicity of life; albeit the leather garments of George Fox might cause a twinge in his conscience in after years; for were not such garments once the living skins of beautiful creatures, that must, of necessity, be murdered for such vile uses! Certainly the Quakers left decided marks upon him. Hear him on the "Inner-light":

"That every man that is born into the world, is endued with an Eye or Ray of Divine Light, for a Director and Guide to the Mind and Soul; which Holy Voice is as certain, constant and regular in its motions, advices, illuminating echoing, and corresponding operations, as the Illustrious Lamp and Light of the World, the Sun; by whose shining Beams,

and warming splendid Rays, all the Children of the Creator are preserved and sustained."

These elements went to the making of many men of this period. "Muggletonians," "Fifth Monarchy men," and others. They did not always issue in a character so spiritual, clean and sweet as Tyron's. He was on the gentle, humane, and practical side of life, an anticipation of John Woolman himself. He carried to the end something of the same vigour of thought, and robust character, imparted by his early "Anabaptist" teaching, but cast off something of its severe Calvinism, and ceased to attach due importance to the New Testament ordinances. He organised a sort of family religion, with services in the homes of the people. Thus there were "Governors and Inspectors over Ten families." "You shall keep one Day in a Week as a Sabbath," he says; "that is, you shall set apart one Day in a Week, for Prayer and Worship of the Creator, which Day shall be *Sunday*, or any other Day that the public Government has ordained." Respecting place and manner of worship he says: "Learn to know thy Teacher in thyself, and then thou wilt need no Houses of Brick, Stone, Timber, or outward Temples, to meet for God's worship, but every man shall withdraw himself from the noise of men, and worship the Lord alone in the centre of their souls." At meal times he inspires the following: "Before eating, the Head of the Family shall have a silent Pause for about Three Minutes, and then shall speak something in praise of the Eternal Creator." And the same at the close.

Another effort at the regeneration of society is registered in these records. A Christian Republic—a Holy Commonwealth—was aimed at. A pure, loving, spiritual community was the desideratum. But through lack of idealism, charity, and spiritual power; through want of binding fibre and sincere union, the heaven-born conception is not realized; and the high-minded prophet and his lovely dream, are to-day as though they had not been. No, not quite! Seeds of social reform, of holy ideals, were sown, which are still bearing fruit.

In returning to the "Memoirs," I can only touch a few salient points. Tryon married and became the father of two sons and three daughters. His wife did not share his ascetic views, possibly to be noted as one element of failure. He took voyages to Holland and Barbadoes in connection with his business. "At about thirty-five years of age," he says, "I attempted to learn music, and made pretty good progress with the Base-viol." This seems to have been the only recreation he had. He is described physically as being "of middle stature. A little sloping,

slender but very compacted, active and nimble. Aspect discovering something extraordinary; his air cheerful, lively and brisk, but grave with something of austerity though he was of easiest access. Through his great Temperance, Regularity, and prudent management of himself, by the strength of his Spirits and Vigour of his Mind, he was capable of any fatigue even to the last." He died on the 21st of August, 1703. John Dunton, in his "Life and Errors," says of him: "He was a man of sweet temper, an excellent husband, and very sincere in his dealings." A testimony not to be despised, coming from such a quarter. He was the author of many books, most of which appear below.

On the last page of the "Memoirs" is this quaint epitaph:

Here lies his Dust, whose Heavenly Mind  
 Mov'd, like Angelick Nature unconfin'd;  
 Which lest his Body shou'd control,  
 He almost work't it up to Soul:  
 What some by Reading, and hard Study wrought,  
 He did compendiously by thought:  
 Such refin'd Notions to the world he gave,  
 As Men with Angels Entercourse might have  
 Shewed how to live on cleanest Food,  
 To abstain from Flesh, and Fish, and Blood.  
 Harmless his Life was, as his Food,  
 Both Patriarchal Primitively Good.  
 His Works will Eternize his Fame,  
 And his best *Epitaph's* his Name:  
 In short, here doth Entombed lie  
 All of Great *Tryon* that could die.

#### Bibliography.

Copies I have seen or possess:

- Way to Health, Long Life and Happiness. Lond. 1683, 1694, 1697. 8vo. 3 vols.  
 The Way to make all People Rich, or Wisdomes Call to Temperance and Frugality. Lond. 1685, 12mo.  
 Pythagoras, his mystic Philosophy revived, or the mystery of Dreams unfolded. Lond. 1691, 8vo.  
 New Art of Brewing Beer, Ale, and other Liquors. Lond. 1691. 8vo.  
 The Good Housewife made Doctor, or Health's Choice and Sure Friend. Lond. 1692, 12mo. Second edition.  
 Treatise of Dreams and Visions. Lond. 1695, 12mo.  
 Wisdom's Dictates: or, Aphorisms and Rules, Physical, Moral, and Divine. Lond. 1696, 12mo.

Letters upon Several Occasions. Lond. 1700, 8vo.

Some Memoirs of the Life of Mr. Tho: Tryon, Late of London,  
Merchant: Written by Himself. Lond. 1705, 12mo: 1708,  
8vo. port.

Lowndes.

Friendly Advice to the Gentlemen Planters of the East and  
West Indies. Lond. 1684, 12mo.

Miscellanea: or a Collection of Tracts on various subjects.  
Lond. 1696, 12mo.

The Knowledge of Man's Self the Surest Guide to the true  
Worship of God, etc. Lond. 1703, 8vo. port.

Watt.

England's Grandure and Way to get Wealth; or Promotion of  
Trade, etc. 1699, 4to.

Dictionary of National Biography Index.

Health's Grand Preservative, 1682.

JOHN C. FOSTER.

## Chamberlen's First-Day Church.

Mr. Champlin Burrage contributes an article to this number which will be found of considerable interest and importance. Contemporary records of early Separatist churches are rare; we have already presented sketches of Porton and Bromsgrove, of Jessey's church and of Stephen More's; to these may now be added the voluminous papers of Dr. Chamberlen's. Dr. Thirtle has given us a study of the man, and has obtained further information as to the latter history of the church, with which he will deal at length. In these notes we confine ourselves to other matters raised by the records, emphasising the unexpected fact that at this period the church was not seventh-day. We propose also to show the entanglement of the seventh-day movement and the Fifth-Monarchy, especially in Baptist circles about 1656-7, and to rectify Dr. Underhill's dating of the Hexham letters in his "Fenstanton Records"; but these matters need to be treated separately in another issue.

### **John More, First Overseer.**

The church had existed at least fifteen months when Chamberlen came to the front. Its leading spirits were using freely the liberty of the press, and we can see what were the topics interesting them. John More had advanced from evangelism to the doctrine of Laying on of Hands, and was about to issue a tract on the Two Little Horns; Apocalyptic was evidently likely to involve him with the men of the Fifth-Monarchy. A comparison with Toldervy's account of the house where he and More lived, shows that a highly hysterical state of fanaticism prevailed there.

### **Naudin and French Presbyterianism.**

A very different element was represented by Theodore Naudin. He had been engaging in discussion with a Reformed Minister at Paris, and brought to this society all the pre-suppositions of French Calvinism, including its sanity and its strong insistence on the Eldership as a means of maintaining order. To this extent there was some sympathy with the plan of the Genevan Bible-notes, so popular with Scotch and English Puritans, and recently legalized by the Long Parliament. These had had their effect in Separatist circles, and the scandals that arose from the perpetual disciplining, are called to mind by Mr. Burrage in the title that he gives to his article. The churches

seemed to meet more for quarrelling than for worship; gossip, family life, women's dress, pastor's sermons—all are called into question and debated, till some one or other is "humbled" and compelled to apologize. The English Separatists at Amsterdam had had a further debate whether such matters were to be dealt with by Elders or by the whole church. Now Naudin to this Baptist circle contributed stress on the Elders.

### **The General Baptist Element.**

If, however, Calvin's influence touched this little company here, we see three distinct points of contact with the school of thought initiated by John Smyth. The women here desired to take an equal part in worship; one or two lampoons tell us that this was specially common among the General Baptists, Mistress Attaway being a favourite butt. Then we find that two members had quitted this society to join Samuel Loveday, and (according to Mr. Burrage's very probable restoration) Edward Barber, each of them a General Baptist leader. John Spittlehouse, moreover, was engaged in a printed debate with Samuel Oates the great evangelist, because Oates would not practise the Laying on of Hands for all believers.

### **One Secession Already.**

Under the guidance of More, there had already been a division, not quite hopeless, for the parent church made a record of the ten men and sixteen women who had separated. None of them made much of a mark. Thomas Roswell in 1656 issued a public reply to thirty queries propounded by the Quakers. Francis Wilcocks in 1659-60 joined with the principal London General Baptists in a declaration to the restored Long Parliament, protesting against renewed Presbyterian persecution, and disclaiming all wish to dictate in politics. These people then were evidently of the General Baptist type rather than the Calvinistic; but if, as Mr. Burrage thinks, they had separated for some "Heresie," we cannot safely judge the attitude of the parent body on this point. It is rather singular that Roswell was at a business meeting as late as Tuesday, 21st February, 1653-4.

### **Enter Dr. Chamberlen.**

To a church with such interests, came a recruit of very different social standing, evidently drawn partly by his compatriot Naudin. Chamberlen was a man of 52, M.D., F.R.C.S., physician in ordinary to James, Charles, and their wives. In social matters he had thought and written; midwives' baths, taxation, had occupied his attention, as Dr. Thirtle has shown. In constitutional politics he had distinct views, had published, had sent a letter to Cromwell. Now when a man of prominent civil position turns to identify himself with church life, he often produces an extraordinary effect in the circle he enters; so Cyprian, Cornelius, and Ambrose had quite revolutionized the churches at Carthage, Rome, and Milan. Chamberlen had already put himself on record as a Baptist, and as upholding lay-preaching. In both



these points he had offended Arise Evans, and Mr. Burrage's quotation implies that Evans and Chamberlen were both in contact with this particular church. At Christmas, 1653, he comes to the front. By April he has quarrelled with all the old leaders, and the story suggests to Mr. Burrage the imminent dissolution of the whole society; though we must not forget the signatures of this church in September, 1654, reproduced already by Dr. Thirtle. To him we leave the later history, with the note that John More turned away from this church, and signed the same Fifth-Monarchy manifesto as member of the church with Hanserd Knowles.

### Members in Ireland.

The army of occupation, settled down in many parts on the soil, included not a few Baptists. But of any at Wexford and Enniscorthy we knew little before. Our chief source was a copy of a letter sent on 24 July, 1653, from London to Wales, enclosed with a call to visitation. This was forwarded to Rippon, and appended to the last volume of his Register. Enniscorthy is not mentioned, but as to Wexford the entry runs: "And a people lately gathered by brother [Christopher] Blackwood, with whom are the brethren Tomlins, Hussey, Neale, Biggs, &c. who have not much help among themselves, but are sometimes visited by Waterford friends." All of these were presumably Calvinists. When we compare the list on this church-roll, Eyre, Walker, Deakin, Worfack, Haddock, we see no point of contact. We have had previous occasion to remark on the rapidity of change in these times; this was the more natural in Ireland since the members were nearly all soldiers, moved about freely. William Deakin was evidently no loss to the church, as he was capable of repudiating his wife: compare Mr. Burrage's note on the case of sister Hownsell, and observe that the Baptist practice of civil marriage was legalized in 1653 by the Nominated Parliament.

# Supplement to "Transactions"

(VOL. II., No. 3)

OF THE

## BAPTIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

---

### The Origins of the Modern Baptist Denomination.

By Principal Gould, M.A., President of the Society.  
Being a Tercentenary Paper read on 25th April, 1911,  
to the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

**I**N the year 1611 there returned to this country a small company of Christian people, who for the previous four or five years had been living as exiles in Holland. Whatever they had or lacked they brought back with them very settled convictions on these four points :—

1. That in matters of religion there should be absolute liberty.
2. That the Church of Christ is a company of the faithful.
3. That baptism, as the initial rite of the Church, should be administered only on a profession of faith.
4. That every community of believers is autonomous—subject only to the Headship of Christ.

Not separately, but in their combination, those tenets were new to this land, and thus combined they came to stay ; and we, counting them a sacred inheritance, look back across the three hundred years and reverently thank God for the brave-hearted men and women through whom He was pleased that so great a boon should descend. It is worth while for us to fix our thoughts on those servants of His—to recall, though it must be in very fragmentary fashion, the conditions and

circumstances amid which they entered themselves into possession of the truths which they were to transmit. It is an old story, often re-told, and in these last years re-told by the Secretary of our Union with such accuracy and power, that any detailed recital of it in this Assembly may well appear needless. I shall confine myself to the attempt to answer three questions, which might be raised by any to whom the subject is unfamiliar: (1) Why had those people been in exile? (2) What did they learn in exile? and (3) Why did they return to England?

(1) WHY HAD THEY BEEN IN EXILE ?

Did England at the outset of the seventeenth century not afford a fit home for any reasonable free men? Had there not been a Reformation whose beneficent effects—interrupted no doubt during the reign of Queen Mary—were enjoyed again to the full with the accession of Elizabeth, and under that “most high and mighty Prince James,” whose praises greet us as soon as we turn the cover of our Authorized Version? Well, there had been a sort of a Reformation: the papal supremacy was indeed gone, and its place was taken by the supremacy of the Crown—matters ecclesiastical were controlled not by a foreign court, but by the court at home—but for the rest, so far from there being a *re-forming*, the change effected was so slight that clergy who did not scruple the loss of the Pope’s supremacy, found it possible to hold under Elizabeth the cures they had held in Mary’s reign. Dr. Dexter, commenting on “the very mild form of the Reformation in England” at the time to which I am referring, says: “Upon Elizabeth’s accession almost the whole clergy was Romanist, but out of 9,400 priests apparently less than 200 resigned, although of course the extreme Romanists now took their turn abroad. . . . . Like priest, like people.

Comparatively few of the laity, however bigoted Romanists, felt obliged, during the first five years of Elizabeth's reign, to absent themselves from the Churches with their modified service." And if the more moderate Romanists were not aggrieved by the course taken at the beginning of that reign, they found little cause of complaint afterwards. For throughout from first to last the Queen's policy was one and unchanged. Her aim, pursued with untiring and relentless energy, was *Uniformity*. Men should think as she thought, and worship as she dictated. She signaled her accession to the throne by an Act of Uniformity, to compel the attendance of all her subjects at the parish churches. Then followed the appointment of a Court of High Commission to see that the Act of Uniformity was made effective, and that its pains and penalties were duly enforced. Next by the Queen's command so-called "Advertisements" were issued yet further to promote unity in doctrine and practice, and to this end forbidding all unlicensed preaching, prescribing the vestments of officiating clergy, the posture of communicants, and even the ordinary garb of all "ecclesiastical persons." That was but the beginning of woes. Harder and harsher measures followed culminating in the Act of 1593, condemning persistent Non-conformists to banishment or death.

Looking back upon it from this point of time one is struck—apart from its religious aspects—with the incredible folly of such a policy. Remember that the 16th century was ushered in by the Renaissance. The oppressive slumber of Mediævalism had been broken; men were aroused to look out upon the recovered glories of the ancient world; but the thought which was wakened and stimulated by the achievements and ideals of the past, quickly turned in those who were most awake to contemplation of the unideal present and its most clamant needs. It was an age of quickened thought and enquiry, and

fearless criticism of what had been accepted with least of question, and certainly with least hope of change. What Rudolf Sohm has said of the 15th century applies with equal force to the 16th: "In the abuses of the Church, in the degradation of spiritual things, in the troubling and stopping of those springs from which the commonwealth draws its moral nourishment, the instinct of the age recognised with unerring certainty the causes of the wide-spread corruption. The Church was merged in the world. The salt had lost its savour . . . . therefore, through all the joy of the Renaissance, through all the rejoicing which breaks forth from this renewing of the life of art and learning, ever and ever louder the great cry resounds. . . . 'Reformation of the Church in heart and members.' Reformation, not merely of the scholarly and æsthetic life, but of that which is far harder—the religious life." How true that is of what men term admiringly 'the spacious days' of Queen Elizabeth. And yet she cherished the illusion that by sheer force of intolerance she could in such a time constrain the thought and repress the righteous demands of her subjects.

Perhaps when we remember that the principle of religious liberty was still beyond the range of vision of such really great and enlightened men as Luther and Zwingli and Calvin, we may wonder the less that it did not come within the purview of Tudors and Stuarts. But the things which were hidden from the wise and prudent, and the world's great ones, were revealed to the lowly and undistinguished. For when we go on to speak of the leaders of this and the other dissenting party, whose existence repressive measures served to disclose rather than to check, we speak of those who were interpreters even more than leaders—they made articulate and gave practical effect to thoughts and intents already formed and waiting for expression in the poor and unlettered. Notably it was so in

the case of Robert Browne—that meteoric man, who flashed out with such brilliance, but whose clear shining was so transient. Cherishing thoughts of reform beyond any which had been realized so far, he goes from Cambridge to Norwich sometime in 1580, because he hears that in that city there were many ‘very forward’; and he finds those forward people, not waiting to be persuaded, but ready to go with him the full length of renouncing a communion, in which believing and unbelieving were blended without distinction, in which there was scarce any attempt at discipline, and which was in an unscriptural subservience to the State. As Mr. Shakespeare has said: “Congregationalism arose partly in opposition to the episcopal form of government in the Church of England, but much more as a protest against the complete obliteration of the distinction between the Church and the world.” To restore and maintain that distinction was uppermost in the minds of Robert Browne and his friends at Norwich, as they solemnly entered into covenant with one another and constituted themselves a Church, appointing its own Ministers, determining the character and conduct of its meetings, giving liberty to any to “protest, appeal, complain, exhort, dispute, reprove, etc., as he had occasion, but yet in due order”; and enjoining that “all should further the Kingdom of God in themselves, and especially in their charge and household, if they had any, or in their friends and companions and whosoever was worthy.” So with lofty purpose and brave assertion of the liberty of Christian manhood these Separatists started their ‘Reformation without tarrying for anie’ (to use the familiar terms of the title of one of Browne’s books), and without stopping at any intermediate stage achieved at a bound, so to say, an independency in direct antithesis to the uniformity which was being thrust upon the nation with all the powers of the State.

No need to disguise from ourselves that the first experiment

of modern times in Independency, save as it was a clear, uncompromising assertion of a great principle, was not an unqualified success. With two or three months of the Covenant-act it became impossible for the community to remain with any measure of safety in Norwich; so they went across sea to Middelburg, in Zeeland. There while Browne, in addition to his other duties, wrote books to enforce the duty of separation, and to show the 'Life and Manners of all true Christians,' his own people—possibly through having in a foreign land little opportunity for other forms of service, devoted themselves too exclusively to the disciplining of one another. No doubt they all had, what Mr. Asquith recently called, the "saving salt of individuality," and in some of them the salt may have been rather in excess. Anyway there were bickerings, and feuds, and sundering of fellowship; and within two years Browne and a remnant of his flock sadly set their faces homeward. But let no one say that Robert Browne had failed. He had done a work that could not be undone, not even by himself—by his vacillations in the years following upon his return to England, or by his ultimate conformity. The true soul of the man had been flung into the effort to give expression to Independency, and that soul of him went marching on, when what remained of him halted, drew back, and passed into sorrowful obscurity.

The effectiveness of what he had done is manifest in nothing more clearly than in the frenzied efforts made by the State-Churchmen to crush out what had come to be known as 'Brownism.' Two men were actually hanged at Bury-St-Edmunds for no greater crime than the "dispersinge of Browne's bookes and Harrison's bookes" (Harrison having been Browne's intimate friend and colleague). All that the bitterest hostility could devise was done to suppress the Separatists and to prevent their communities and conventicles. The story of that

struggle must be passed over here—we may not stay to dwell even on the cruel stringency of the year 1593, when Barrowe and Greenwood and Penry were sent to the gallows, and a considerable proportion of the members of the Barrowist community in London—‘The Ancient Church’ as it came to be designated—accepted the bitter alternative of perpetual exile, and sought refuge in flight.

One fact, however, we must tarry to notice, because it directly concerns those other exiles of whom we are to speak, viz.: that hopes, which had been entertained by Puritans within the Church of England and by Separatists alike, of altered conditions which would come with change of ruler, were doomed to bitter disappointment. James I. might have a less vigorous hand than Elizabeth, but he was no more disposed to toleration than was she. He was inordinately vain of his kingly prerogative, and intended to make it felt in ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs. “For him,” it has been well said, “the true relation between Church and State was that which he found in England, where there were bishops appointed and controlled by the crown, and controlling the inferior clergy by whom the people were instructed.” Said James, “It is my aphorism, no bishop, no king,” and he was resolved to oppose every form of Church policy other than that of Erastian episcopacy. In the early days of 1604 he allowed representatives of the Puritan party—conformists who nevertheless desired to see the Church of England reformed on the lines of Genevan Presbyterianism—to meet him in conference at Hampton Court. But it was only to insult them. Of Christian liberty he declared: “I will none of that; I will have one doctrine and one discipline, one Religion in substance and in ceremony.” To these men with Presbyterian leanings he declared, that Presbytery “as well agreeth with a Monarchy as God and the Devil.” And finally



he left the Conference with the threat: "I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." Convocation met in the same year, and set itself with alacrity to give effect to what it knew to be the royal will. It aimed not only at purging out the Puritan leaven from the Church of England, but at constraining and intimidating all who had separated themselves from that Church. It denounced all such, and all who combined in a new brotherhood and held "that ecclesiastical rules may be without the royal authority"; it enjoined "that every parishioner must receive the communion at his rector's hands at least thrice in the year . . . . that the license of all non-conforming ministers, remaining after such admonition, shall be void; that no religious meeting shall be held in private houses, and that all whom churchwardens, questmen, or assistants regard as schismatics shall be presented to the bishop's court." Those ordinances of Convocation were endorsed by a royal proclamation, "that every minister should read them to his congregation in church once a year." Evidently the change of monarch had brought to Separatists no relief; their outlook was threatening and troubled in the extreme; and the question could not but present itself, whether they could best serve the cause they had at heart by staying to suffer dispersion and bonds, or by holding together and seeking—like the 'Ancient Church,' to which allusion has been made—the asylum of a land in which they might maintain their faith and practice, none making them afraid.

That alternative was faced in 1606 by a community at Gainsborough. In that town and in the adjacent district the "very forward" in religion had been numerously represented. In 1602—or "thereabouts," as Dexter cautiously put it, a church had been formed by covenant—a church having a strong contingent at Scrooby, ten miles away. Distance

mattered less then than in these days of easy transit. In 1606—possibly because it was increasingly dangerous for so numerous a company to come together—the two sections of the church parted by mutual agreement, and the Scrooby section—including Clyfton and John Robinson and Brewster and Bradford—met in the old Manor House, until they, two years later, took the course which their Gainsborough brethren resolved to take without any further delay, the course of voluntary exile.

It is easy to state that resolution as a historical fact, but it is not easy to recover all that it meant to the men and women who made it, all the anguish and heart-break. They loved their native land, though it had treated them so ill; and they loved their homes, and not the less because of the sorrow they had suffered in them; and they had their associations and their occupations and what would be regarded as their worldly prospects—and they rose up and went forth, because to them religion was before all else and far outweighed all else—because in very truth they sought “first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.” Said an old saint of those days and of those same parts, though not of our Gainsborough church, who had followed her husband into exile at Antwerp: “I accounted all nothing in comparison to liberty of conscience for the profession of Christ.” So was it with the Gainsborough church: and for us, reverencing the like devotion wherever and by whomsoever displayed, there is special significance and appeal in the fact that they, in whom the modern Baptists were to take their rise, did manifestly account all nothing in comparison to liberty of conscience for the profession of Christ. Therefore was it they became exiles. But they were not yet Baptists when they left their home for Amsterdam: that was yet to come.

The story of how it came about belongs to the answer to our second question:

## (2) WHAT WAS LEARNT IN EXILE ?

Restricting ourselves entirely to matters religious and ecclesiastical, I do not know that the extent of the changes that transpired in the interval of exile can be appreciated better than by comparing the positions adopted by John Smith, the Pastor of the Church, in the book on the Lord's Prayer, entitled "The Paterne of True Prayer," which he published in 1605, the year before he left England, with the positions at which he had arrived five or six years later. An altogether notable man this John Smith, and wholly unconventional, spite of his name. He had been a Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, had manifested 'forward' tendencies, had fulfilled the office of Lecturer at Lincoln (where he delivered the course on the Lord's Prayer just referred to), had renounced his Anglican orders, and thrown in his lot with the Gainsborough Separatists, and had received from them the only ordination which thereafter counted with him. A man eager, alert, quick to learn, and fearless in practice—men of slower mental habit and less disposed to reconsider conclusions once formed, would be sure to misjudge him and deem him unstable and flighty. He was perfectly aware that he was so misjudged. So in his 'Last Book' he defends himself thus: "Now I have in all my writings hitherto received instructions of others, and professed my readiness to be taught by others, and therefore have I so oftentimes been accused of inconstancy; well, let them think of me as they please, I profess I have changed, and shall be ready still to change for the better, and if it be their glory to be peremptory and immutable in their articles of religion, they may enjoy that glory without my envy, though not without the grief of my heart for them." Take three points in the book of 1605, which may help us to realize how far Smith travelled in the few years he spent at Amsterdam: the use of

liturgical forms in worship, repudiation of Anabaptism, assertion of the right and duty of the civil ruler to interpose in matters of religion.

As to the first of these matters he says: "I do here ingenuously confess that I am far from the opinion of them who separate from our Church concerning the set form of prayer (although from some of them I received part of my education in Cambridge) for I do verily assure myself . . . . that a set form of prayer is not unlawful; yet as Moses wished that all the people of God could prophesy, so do I wish that all the people of God could conceive prayer." Further on he says that "it is safer to conceive prayer than to read a prayer," because there is less fear of "babbling" in the one case than in the other. Yet he adds, without qualification, that "An uniform order of public prayer in the service of God is necessary."

As to the second point, he alludes to the Anabaptists in terms which show that he regarded them with unmixed aversion. He speaks of their "confident heads," into which Satan has inspired "devilish doctrines"; while in another writing, slightly later than 'The Paterne,' he permits himself to ask: "Do you think that God accepteth the prayers and religious exercises of the Papists, the Anabaptists, the Familists, or any other heretics or Antichristians?"

As to Magistracy we find this, with much more to the same effect, in 'The Paterne': "We acknowledge every King in his Kingdom the supreme Governor in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, next and immediately under Christ." And this: "The Magistrates should cause all to worship the true God, or else punish them with imprisonment, confiscation of goods, or death, as the quality of the cause requireth."

Now let us see what changes passed in a few brief years of exile on the thought of the man who had so expressed himself

in 1605. By 1608 Smith had reached the conviction that, not only should no liturgical forms be used in worship, but that even reading the Scriptures from a book was not consonant with the spirituality of worship. He wrote that it was "the invention of the man of sin, it being substituted for a part of spiritual worship." "He urged that the Spirit is quenched by all forms of worship, because the Spirit is then not at liberty to utter itself, but is bounded in. The New Testament churches used no books in time of spiritual worship, but prayed, prophesied and sang out of their hearts." With Smith it would be matter of conscience to press his new views on the attention of the neighbouring community of English exiles—that 'Ancient Church' of which mention has been made—whose chief officers were Francis Johnson (once Smith's tutor at Cambridge) and Henry Ainsworth. The two churches, while remaining distinct, had maintained brotherly intercourse from the time of the arrival of the Gainsborough people at Amsterdam. But this discussion about the use of books in worship strained their relations, and brought about a breach, which was not healed. One cannot but sympathise with Ainsworth when he complains, that Smith "charged us with sin for using our English Bibles in the worship of God, and he thought that the teachers should bring the originals—the Hebrew and Greek—and out of them translate by voice. A written translation was as much a human writing as a homily or prayer written or read."

Ainsworth was himself an accomplished scholar, but even he felt that word about "the originals" to be a hard saying. Maybe it would be felt to be so, if pressed upon the ministry of to-day.

Something quite as unexpected and of far more enduring importance was about to transpire in regard to Smith and his church. It is probable that the more extreme isolation in

which they found themselves through the discussion about spiritual worship had some influence in stimulating a more thorough searching of their own ways and position. Certain it is that a few months later, in that same year 1608, it became clear to them that there had been an initial flaw in their procedure. They had renounced the church in which they had all been baptised as infants, and they had renounced all belief that membership in the Church of Christ is for others than professed believers; so professing they had entered into covenant relationship, but without the rite which, according to the teaching of the New Testament, should follow upon belief and be its sign. The only way open to them to put themselves right seemed to be to begin *de novo*—to dissolve the church and reconstitute it with the initial rite of baptism on profession of faith. It was resolved so to do.

How that resolve was carried out may be told in the words of John Robinson, who had arrived with his flock from Scrooby, and was in Amsterdam at the time of which we are speaking. Robinson says that what took place, as he heard “from themselves,” was on this manner: Mr. Smith, Mr. Helwisse and the rest, having utterly dissolved and disbanded their former church state and ministry, came together to erect a new church by baptism . . . and after some straining of courtesy who should begin . . . Mr. Smith baptized first himself, and next Mr. Helwisse, and so the rest, making their particular confessions.” Naturally such a proceeding, especially Smith’s ‘Se-Baptism,’ excited attention and called forth denunciation. “Baptizing himself!” exclaims John Robinson, “I demand into what Church he entered by baptism!” But to others, who were far from favouring Baptist views, it seemed that Smith had simply carried the fundamental principle of Separation to its logical issue. So Bishop Hall writes to Robinson himself. “There is no remedy. You must go

forward to Anabaptism, or come back to us. . . . He (Smith) tells you *true*; your station is unsafe." Three or four decades later Robert Baylie, the Presbyterian, makes precisely the same point, and presses upon the Independents of his day that, granting their fundamental principle—that of all the Separatists—as to the Church, their true goal is Anabaptism. He says: "The Independents lay a pathway to Anabaptism . . . they esteem not baptized infants to be members of their Church before they have entered in their Covenant; till then they hold them from the Lord's Table and all the acts of discipline as people without the Church and not members of it. If so, their baptism was of so small use that well they might have wanted it to the time of their admission to be members." Smith himself was content to rebut charges of inconstancy in these terms. "To change a false religion is commendable, and to retain a false religion is damnable . . . therefore that we should fall from Puritanism to Brownism, and from Brownism to true Christian baptism, is not simply evil or reprobable in itself, except it be proved that we have fallen from religion: if we, therefore, being formerly deceived in the way of Pædo-baptistry now do embrace the truth in the true Christian Apostolic baptism, then should no man impute this as a fault unto us."

But in one respect Smith was not prepared to vindicate the action he had taken. He had acted under the impression, as he expresses it, "that there was no Church to whom we could join with a good conscience and have baptism from them." That points to the conclusion that in what he had done he was not consciously influenced by the example of any existing Antipædobaptists. But shortly after he seems to have realised that with the Mennonite Baptists, who were numerous in Amsterdam, he was in such accord that he might and therefore ought to have sought baptism from them.

These Mennonites were Anabaptists of the non-political and non-combatant order; they maintained that baptism was for believers only; in church polity they were Independents, but with a close association of their communities for mutual help and advice; doctrinally, they were Arminians. Now in all this Smith and his church were in entire agreement, for they too—unlike the other Separatist exiles—had ranged themselves with the followers of Arminius in the great controversy which for two decades had been dividing Holland and was leading on, at the end of yet another decade, to the Synod of Dort. That Smith did not come earlier to a just appreciation of the Mennonites may be due in part to the strong prejudice he had entertained in other days against any who were branded with the Anabaptist name; and partly to the barrier which difference of speech interposed to freedom of intercourse. The mistake in judgment was no sooner recognised than it was acknowledged. To Smith it appeared that he had erred in ignoring brethren with whom he should have sought association and help; he deemed that such action as his tended to break “the bond of love and brotherhood in the churches.” His feeling was not shared by all in his own church. By Helwys and others it was resented. To them it seemed that Smith was wilfully closing his eyes to light which had come to him in the matter of the liberty of Christian men to found churches. Differences passed into strife, and strife ended in disruption. Smith and some thirty or more, who sided with him, were excluded. They forthwith sought to be received into communion by the Mennonites. This led to very careful and deliberate inquiry, so deliberate that it was not till 1615, after the lapse of six years, that the Englishmen, such of them as survived, gained the fellowship for which they had applied. Meantime John Smith passed away in August, 1612, leaving in his ‘Last Book’ a singularly noble and pathetic document.



The desire to cite from it must be repressed, and I hasten to say that the earlier negotiations with the Mennonites led to the drafting both by the Smith-party and by the church, then under the leadership of Helwys, of statements of their faith and practice, which tell us with precision for what they then stood and the positions they were prepared to vindicate. These matters, amongst others, emerge with clearness :

1. That these Baptists had received and that they apprehended with utmost distinctness *the principle of absolute religious liberty*. They went further than Robert Browne, who hesitated and wavered in this regard, and further than John Robinson and other Independent leaders who did not hesitate, but consistently allowed—as Robinson's biographer admits—the interference of the magistrate to compel attendance on public worship. In contrast to that listen to Smith's final deliverance on the subject : " That the magistrate is not by virtue of his office to meddle with religion or matters of conscience, and force and compel men to this or that form of religion or doctrine ; but to leave Christian religion free to every man's conscience . . . for Christ only is the King and law-giver of the Church and conscience." No need to demonstrate that Helwys and the rest were wholly at one with Smith in maintaining this doctrine. It was they went home to proclaim it, and to them belongs the glory of being the first to proclaim it in our England—the doctrine of absolute freedom in matters of religion. What that proclamation has meant to this land, and what it means as it wins its way among all truly progressive peoples, it is not possible to over-estimate. And among all who rejoice in that word of liberty there can be none who will not gladly render their tribute of homage to those by whom it was first uttered, and through whose fearless testimony, with the blessing of God, it was made " current coin."

2. Next we notice that, whatever changes passed upon the views of the exiles, they kept unchanged *their concept of the Church and of the independency of the Churches*. Thus Smith affirms that "the outward Church visible consists of penitent persons only, and of such as, believing in Christ, bring forth fruits worthy amendment of life." So in the 'Declaration' of the Helwys-party of 1611, the year of their return—"The Church of Christ is a company of faithful people," and that is followed by this explicit statement: "though in respect of Christ the Church be one, yet it consisteth of divers particular congregations, even so many as there shall be in the world; every of which congregations, though they be but two or three, have Christ given them with all the means of their salvation, are the body of Christ and a whole Church . . . . that as one congregation hath Christ, so hath all . . . . And therefore, no Church ought to challenge any prerogative over any other." If the primary tenets of Independency had not been learned in Holland, at any rate they had not been forgotten or qualified there, in spite of the prevalence in that land of Genevan thought and polity.

3. Once more. *As to Baptism* these later statements of the exiles are in entire accord. Smith's 'Confession' says: "The outward baptism of water is to be administered only upon such penitent and faithful persons as are aforesaid, and not upon innocent infants, or wicked persons." Similarly the Helwys 'Declaration': "Baptism, or washing with water, is the outward manifestation of dying unto sin and walking in newness of life; and therefore in no wise appertaineth to infants." Entire clearness, you observe, as to the *subject* of baptism: entire silence as to the *mode*. No question where the emphasis was laid. Infant Baptism had obscured the demarcation between Church and world: believers' baptism made it distinct again. That was to our exiles of primary

account: to them for the time being the form of the rite was of secondary moment. Not a single contemporary writer in alluding to the strange incident of the Self-baptism suggests that there was anything unwonted in the *manner* of it. Everyone assumes that the mode was quite conventional, the conventional mode being sprinkling or affusion. When Smith and his followers sought fellowship with the Mennonites we read that "the said English were questioned about their doctrine of salvation, and the ground and the *form* of their baptism. No difference (says the Mennonite report) was found between them and us." Benjamin Evans in citing that says: "This statement is singular, as the members of this (the Mennonite) community were not immersionists." He is quite right, the Mennonites practised baptism by affusion, as they do to this day. And so did Smith and Helwys and their Church. Whatever I claim for them, I cannot assert that through them the practice of the baptism of believers *by immersion* was introduced to this land. No, that came later by some thirty years than the time of which we are thinking, came when Calvinistic Independents, seceding from the Southwark Church on the question of Pædobaptism, did lay stress on the mode of baptism as well as on its subject, and sent one of their number to be immersed in Holland indeed, but in connection with an Arminian sect—the Collegiants—which had no existence till several years after Helwys and his Church had left the country, and which did not commence the practice of immersion till 1620. How immersion came to be adopted by the Collegiants is itself an interesting story, but is beyond my province now.

With utmost brevity let me answer the last of the questions with which we started:—

### (3) WHY DID THE EXILES RETURN?

If it was for conscience sake that they had left England, it

was no less a matter of conscience that brought Helwys and his companions back. It was borne in upon them that by continuance in exile they were depriving their own countrymen of a witness they might bear, and were failing to communicate as they should the truths in which they themselves rejoiced. There had come to them, as we have seen, great gains in the years of expatriation: they had found the true word with which to confront religious intolerance; and they had recovered, so they held, New Testament teaching as to baptism, the obscuring of which had been of such far-reaching significance. Of these gains they were stewards rather than possessors, and they longed to fulfil their trust, and to fulfil it among their own people. But before all else it was a true evangelical impulse dictated the return in 1611. I know Helwys wrote harsh things about those who did not share his feeling and remained in the security which a free country like Holland afforded. Make allowance for that, and you will discover the true spirit of the man and of those associated with him in these few sentences from a treatise in Dialogue-form issuing from the church of which he was pastor soon after its settlement in London. One of the characters is made to say: "One thing there is which hath much troubled me and others, and in my judgment hath hindered the growth of godliness in this Kingdom, and that is that so many, as soon as they see or fear trouble will ensue, they fly into another nation who cannot see their conversation, and thereby deprive many poor ignorant souls in their own nation of their information and of their conversation among them." To which another makes answer: "Oh that hath been the overthrow of religion in this land, the best and ablest part being gone and leaving behind them some few, who by the others' departure have had their afflictions and contempt increased . . . if any of these men can prove that the Lord requireth no work

at their hands to be done for His glory and the salvation of thousands of ignorant souls in their own nation, let them stay in foreign countries." But Helwys and his comrades were sure that the Lord had given them a work to do for Him, and knew that He had entrusted them with that which their countrymen most needed. So they hastened home ; bonds and afflictions might await them, but they held not their life of any account as dear to themselves, so that they might accomplish their course and the ministry which they received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. They called to mind that saints of old had overcome "because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony"; and they craved a place in that succession.

Such were the Baptists who returned to these shores and came to this Metropolis in 1611, and such was the purpose they cherished. We do well to think of them, and in these easier times to scan our own loyalty to the Saviour, our devotion to the great principles we profess, and our passion for the salvation of our countrymen, by the light of theirs.

"They climbed the steep ascent of heaven,  
Through peril, toil, and pain ;  
O God, to us may grace be given  
To follow in their train."

## ANNUAL MEETING, 1911.

The Society met in the Council Chamber, kindly lent by the Baptist Union, at 3.30 on Thursday, 27th April. After prayer by the Rev. A. S. Langley, F.R.Hist.S., of Longton, the Reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were presented and adopted. Officers and Committee were elected as under:—

### President :

REV. PRINCIPAL GOULD, M.A.

### Vice-Presidents :

REV. J. H. SHAKESPEARE, M.A.

REV. T. VINCENT TYMMS, D.D.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE WILLIS, K.C., B.A., LL.D.

### Treasurer :

J. W. THIRTLE, Esq., LL.D., 23, Borthwick Road, Stratford, E.

### Secretary :

REV. W. T. WHITLEY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S.,  
53, West Cliff, Preston.

### Committee: THE OFFICERS, with

REV. F. G. BENSKIN, M.A.	HAROLD KNOTT, Esq., M.A.
REV. J. H. BROOKSBANK.	REV. A. S. LANGLEY, F.R.Hist.S.
REV. J. C. CARLILE.	PRINCIPAL MARSHALL, M.A., D.D.
REV. JAS. FORD, F.R.Hist.S.	REV. N. H. MARSHALL, M.A., Ph.D.
REV. J. C. FOSTER.	PROF. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A.
PROF. S. W. GREEN, M.A.	REV. JAMES STUART.

Professor Farrer, B.A., then read a paper on the Fifth-Monarchy Movement, 1645-1661, for which, after discussion, he was thanked. The Society requested leave from the President to reprint in the *Transactions* the paper he read to the Baptist Union two days earlier, on the Origins of the Modern Baptist Denomination.