

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

Transactions

of the

Baptist Historical Society.

Dissent in Worcestershire during the Seventeenth Century.

THE Established Church was re-modelled on Presbyterian lines in 1646. Between 1 September 1642 and 30 January 1648/9 the Journals of Parliament show 952 cases in which one or other house nominated ministers to parishes, over-riding the rights of patrons, and often displacing royalist clergy. But with February 1648/9 the Presbyterians ceased to control Parliament, and dissent could show itself, unchecked by the army. Thenceforward Separate Churches could easily come into existence in every part of the country, whereas before that date their existence was illegal, and most precarious.

Dissent in Worcestershire was first represented by Baptists. In Baxter's autobiography, he says that he first saw them at Gloucester, where they were opposed by Winnell the local minister. This man published his sermon, with the Baptist objections, and his reply, by 5 September 1642. A few months later Baxter took refuge at Coventry, where he was drawn into debate first with a Baptist tailor, then with Benjamin Cox, the refugee rector of Sampford Peverel in Devonshire, "an old Anabaptist minister and no contemptible scholar."

The town of Kidderminster was dissatisfied with

2 Dissent in Worcestershire during the Seventeenth Century

its vicar, and he offered £60 for a lecturer to be chosen by fourteen trustees; Richard Baxter held this post from 1646 till 1660, when it was abolished.

Soon after Baxter came to the county, John Tombes returned to his birthplace at Bewdley, and we must look at his earlier experiences. He had been at Oxford, where his career had been brilliant. As an academic lecturer he had already seen how slender were the grounds for infant baptism by 1627. After preaching at Worcester, he became vicar of Leominster, where he tried to reform the parish. As a consequence he was expelled by the royalist army in 1641. Therefore on 4 January 1642/3 the Commons sent him as Lecturer to All Saints, Bristol. Here a Baptist finally convinced him that infant baptism could not be supported by any text he knew; therefore when he took refuge in London during September, he began to discuss the question within ministerial circles. A meeting was held about the matter in January 1643/4, and resulted in his sending a Latin essay on the matter to the Assembly of Divines. Meantime he was in charge of the parish at Fenchurch which had been left by the royalist rector, Ralph Cook. As he would of course evade the baptizing of infants, the parishioners naturally were dissatisfied, and he lost this position. Fortunately the two legal societies at the Temple needed a preacher, and as they had no infants to christen, there was no difficulty about holding this post, which was offered him, and which he occupied about four years.

Meantime his Latin essay met with no direct reply, but was handed about privately; he found that he was being preached at in many London churches, while yet no one would discuss with him. Stephen Marshall preached expressly on the point, and the sermon was published. When he replied in print in

December 1645, a storm broke out, and he was at length dismissed from the Temple.

Now his native town, Bewdley, was within the parish of Ribbesford, where John Boraston seems to have been incumbent. But there was a chapel in Bewdley, where christenings were not needed, for these were the prerogative of the parish church. The people of Bewdley invited Tombes to take charge of the chapel, and this suited him well. Further, as the rector of Ross held two other posts and was a royalist, while the vicar of Ross also held two other posts and was a royalist, the Presbyterians had displaced both in September 1646. A resident vicar had been appointed, but the rent of the rectory was given to Tombes on condition he preached there sometimes.

In Bewdley he now openly preached Baptist principles at the parochial chapel, and having won several adherents, he organized them into a distinct Baptist church. This is apparently the first case of the kind, and is not exactly to be matched elsewhere, though afterwards at Hexham a lay lecturer at the Abbey did while thus officiating organize a Baptist church. It is not surprising that some comment was made, and that Tombes saw the advisability of a change. On 9 August 1649 he was appointed Master of Katherine's Hospital at Ledbury, whereupon he surrendered the rents of Ross. At the end of the year Richard Baxter challenged him to an open debate in the Bewdley chapel, and it occupied eight hours on 1 January, when each man consumed a quart of sack for which the town paid.

This advertised the Baptist cause, and Tombes was busy training young men for propaganda. Thomas Bolstone entered the army, and attained the rank of captain. Richard Adams had a Baptist career at Mount Sorrel in Leicestershire, then in London at the

famous church of Devonshire Square. The third, John Eckels was competent to take charge of the church at Bewdley when Tombes left.

This occurred when the country was settled, and when therefore he could peaceably resume his lawful post as vicar at Leominster, whence he had been forcibly ejected. It may be said, as we take leave of him, that at Ross, Ledbury, Hereford, Abergavenny, and Leominster, he publicly debated on Baptist principles, with the result of causes being established in each place. So great was his importance that when Cromwell appointed Tryers to test the qualifications of all men presented to livings, he was placed not on a county committee, but on the Central Board. It should be noted that while he held numerous posts, they were not simultaneous, and Richard Baxter writing in ignorance of the dates of his resignations, did him some injustice as to pluralities.

Baxter thought it wise to supply the gap left by the utter failure to introduce the Presbyterian system in the county, so he drew together a few score of the ministers by April 1653 by an Agreement. This was signed by Boraston of Ribbesford and Bewdley, Oastland of Bewdley who had succeeded Tombes at the chapelry, Baldwin of Chaddesley Corbet, Woolley of Salwarpe, Serjeant of Kidderminster, Francis of Dodderhill, Fincher of Worcester, Browne of White Ladies Aston, Bryan of Old Swinford, Spilsbury of Bromsgrove, Juice of Worcester, amongst others.

But Baxter made no attempt to unite the Baptist church at Bewdley, which was now in charge of Eckels. His business as clothier possibly centred at Bromsgrove, or else led him far afield, and he had imbibed the spirit of propaganda from Tombes. Soon he enlisted members at Bromsgrove, who were on the Bewdley roll by 1651.

That year the whole Regular Army came into the county, and the "crowning mercy" of a victory at Worcester ended the civil wars. Now that army abounded in Baptists, and it is not surprising that we presently hear of Baptists at Worcester.

Baptists had associated in London as early as 1644, when seven churches put out a joint confession. The precedent had been followed in Berkshire and in the west and in the midlands. It was now followed all around the shire of Worcester, by two groups.

The church at Hexham sent a letter to Tombes on 26 July 1653, which elicited a joint reply from the churches of Weston-under-Penyard, Lintile or Leint-hall, Hereford, and Wormbridge, in the county of Hereford; Forest of Dean and Netherton in Gloucestershire; Abergavenny in Monmouthshire; Bewdley in Worcestershire. This shows a group of eight associated churches all due to the labours of Tombes, who signed as pastor of Leint-hall, eight miles north-west of Leominster. The church at Bewdley had two elders, Thomas Bolstone, the erstwhile captain, and Philip Mun, while Robert Goodlad was a third who signed. The letter approves the idea, started in June by the Baptists in Ireland, that Associations should be organized everywhere.

The second group lay more to the east, and after comparing their doctrines at Warwick, organized on 26 June 1655 at Moreton-in-the-marsh, other five churches being Bourton-on-the-water, Alcester, Tewkesbury, Hooknorton and Derby. On 15 September 1657 this was joined by the church at Leominster and Hereford; and in Easter-week 1658 the churches at Gloucester and at Bewdley were proposed for reception. Another meeting on 5 and 6 October was at Gloucester.

In that year the Congregational churches also drew together in an Assembly at the Savoy in London. The leader for this part of the country was Anthony Palmer. In 1653 or 1654, when Oliver desired to find how far the Gathered Churches approved his policy, he was addressed not only by the Tombes group, but by a Gloucester group at Stow, Bourton, Oddington and Winchcomb, of which Palmer, then incumbent at Bourton was the most eminent man. Although there is no trace of a Congregational County Union then, yet the Savoy conference, with its revision of the Westminster Confession, did produce a denominational feeling.

In January 1658/9, the Baptist church at Worcester began a minute-book, in which Thomas Fecknam recorded the names of seventeen men and twenty-one women. Also he noted that on 12 and 13 April 1659 the midland churches met again at Alcester, when Worcester joined, and proposed two queries for discussion. He does not record when the church was formed, but if he be the Thomas Fecknam whose elegy was published at the end of 1695, as seems certain by the coincidence of six years in prison, then he began preaching before 1645. This would account for the size of the church at Worcester in 1659.

When the Presbyterians regained power in 1659, the lot of the Gathered Churches became hard, and Fecknam ceased keeping minutes. In 1660 however, at the Restoration, every royalist rector and vicar who had been displaced in the last twenty years, now reappeared and re-entered on his living. Thus Canon Tomkins, rector of Broadway, might at once send off a Mr. Wall, vicar there. William Woodford, rector of Upton, displaced Benjamin Baxter. Lee, vicar of Chaddesley Corbet, might resume at the expense of Baldwin senior. Richard Beeston had to

give up the rectory of Bredon to Mr. Sutton. Thomas Warmestry at once returned to his living.

A few Presbyterian clergy thus were ejected at once; and in every case where they had obtained possession, except on the nomination of the legal patron, that patron might now exercise his rights, and they would have to go. This seems to have been the case with Richard Moor at Alvchurch.

Then came the enforcing of the oaths of allegiance and of supremacy on all clergy. Tombes wrote to show that these oaths could be taken without hurt of conscience, and thereby he forfeited the little sympathy he had ever had from Baptists generally. Many Presbyterians could swear allegiance, but not that the king was supreme governor of the Church of England. Any refusal to take either entailed the loss of the living.

Meanwhile the Gathered Churches found at once that Elizabeth's Conventicle Act of 1593 was again enforced. There is hardly a minute-book anywhere which records what was done for the next few years. Our information has to be gleaned from Quarter Sessions records and casual allusions.

Thus the Baptist church at Worcester had a preacher at Claines, Robert Humphreys. For holding services in his house, he had everything of value distrained under warrant from Colonel Sandys of Ombersley. William Pardoe, who had worked in the city and at Tenbury, was excommunicated and lay in jail 1665 to 1671. In a spasm of mercy during 1663, fourteen Baptists were released at Worcester. Thomas Fecknam was in jail in 1667, and we know it was the county jail, whence we infer that he was arrested outside the city; we shall soon see where.

Yet although a new Conventicle Act was passed in 1664, the Worcester church dared reorganize on

10 February 1666/7, with John Edwards and Elisha Hathaway as leading members. The numbers after all the persecution were still eleven men and ten women.

Courage for this step would be gained by the results of the fourth Act of Uniformity in 1662, when every clergyman who would not promise to conform absolutely in worship, doctrine and discipline to the restored Church of England, had to retire in August. This led to many more secessions of Presbyterians. Oastland retired from Bewdley, Spilsbury from Bromsgrove, Westmacot from Crophorne, Serjeant from Stone, Bryan from Old Swinford, Browne from White Ladies Aston, Read from Witley, Baker, Moor, Juice and Fincher from Worcester. At Moseley, Joseph Cooper was so loved that he stayed despite the Act, without conforming; being arrested in December, he was sent to Worcester jail for six months, and the very day he was released, he preached again.

It was not usual thus to defy the law so far as to continue using the public buildings, but many of these ministers did defy the Conventicle Act, and continue preaching, in private houses. Thus at Worcester, Thomas Badland gathered a congregation in 1663, and many a little band became accustomed to meet regularly, though the Presbyterians could not on principle organize separate churches.

There are signs of the activity of William Pardoe, a General Baptist, in many parts of the county: as a result he was thrown into prison in 1664 and was not freed for seven years. The temporary Conventicle Act indeed ran out in 1668, but it was not hard to find other laws under which a man could be kept in jail. Still, the archbishop of Canterbury was dissatisfied, and sent a circular round all his bishops, to collect from all incumbents of livings particulars as to conventicles held in their parishes. These were

summarised by the bishops, and their summaries were all copied for Sheldon. The result is that we have a long list of returns as to men who were bold enough in 1669 either to entertain their neighbours for worship, or to lead them in it. To understand the comparative insignificance of the ejected ministers, we must remember that they were required to swear they would make no attempt to reverse recent laws as to Church and State, or else were required to remove five miles from any place where they had ministered and any corporate town. So that if they did continue preaching, it could only be non-political preaching, or preaching to strangers. It is not surprising that many of them gave up the ministry. They did however cluster at King's Norton, Bromsgrove, Worcester, Alcester, Stratford, Pershore and its neighbourhood, and Redmarley.

It is noteworthy that while they hung back, the pastors of the Gathered Churches were bolder, and are heard of in many places. At Worcester both the Baptist and the Congregational churches met openly. At Lapworth and Alcester the Baptists met, while at the latter place the Presbyterian attracted the chief people in the town. Most interesting is the state of affairs along Bow Brook, at Feckenham, Bradley, Inkberrow, Kington, Dormston, Grafton Flyford. Thomas Feckenham of Worcester, and John Eckels of Bromsgrove were reported again and again, as working with Henry Hanson in this group of villages. The Baptist leaven has never quite ceased to work here, though Inkberrow seems the last remnant of that activity.

On the basis of these reports, Sheldon secured a permanent Conventicle Act, and persecution was renewed for a year or two. But towards the end of 1671 the king became convinced that another

insurrection might result, and he devised a plan of suspending the law, licensing certain places for worship and men as teachers. The experiment lasted barely a year, but it enables us to see the men who were bold enough to declare themselves, yet subservient enough to take as a favour what many claimed as a right.

Far to the north, at Dudley, David Jones took out a license to conduct Congregational worship, while at Oldbury, Old Swinford, Hagley, Kidderminster and Bewdley the Presbyterians qualified. The Baptists did not apply for a license, but met without one.

At King's Norton, Wythall and Wetheroak Hill, Presbyterian worship was sanctioned. From Bromsgrove John Spilsbury put in an early application for Congregational worship, but the licences seem to have miscarried, though they were taken away, and he had to secure duplicates in September and November.

Up the Teme valley, across the Severn, Presbyterians obtained licences for houses at Eastham and Suckley, while Baptists came between at Kyre. But no one seems to have resided there capable of leading; the ejected ministers had gone to Stanbrook and Redmarley, and we cannot tell who really preached.

The state of affairs at Worcester has been obscured by two or three blunders in the licence office. Badland, Fincher and Woolice (late of Salwarp) applied together on 13 June for licences; and it shows one effect of Baxter's drawing men together that two styled themselves Presbyterian, one Congregational. It also shows how slowly the lines disappeared, to see that they preached at three different places; not for fifteen years, under the harrow of persecution, did they learn to come together into one church.

The Baptist church was slower to ask and only did so in December. Then William Randall took out a licence for his own house at Ombersley, and Elizeas Hathaway for his in the city—mis-spelt "Glocester." And further, by some blunder whose origin we cannot easily trace, they were both styled Congregational in the Entry Book; their own applications do not survive.

This leads us to scrutinize with some care the knot of people styled Congregational at Tewkesbury, Cleeve, Winchcome and Bourton-on-the-water, who all applied together in May through Owen Davies, and obtained their licences in June. Hy. Collett and Joshua Head are known as Baptists, and it would seem that the whole group were of the Tombes-Jessey type, wavering as to communion, though the preachers themselves were Baptist.

Along the Avon there were no Presbyterians, but Thomas Worden of Broadway led in April by seeking Congregational licences to preach there and at Chipping Campden; in July other places were licensed at Evesham and Birlingham, and in November others at Ashdon and Cropthorne. The other preachers were John Westmacote and John Ward, with Thomas Ingles at Honeybourne. These all appear to be Pedobaptist.

When we compare this list of men with the churches of to-day, the sad truth becomes evident that few of them show any continuity. A paper read at Birmingham to the Congregational Union in 1916 by Mr. Wimbury claims only three evangelical pedobaptist churches surviving from the seventeenth century. The work of Baxter was continued at Kidderminster by Thomas Baldwin from Chaddesley Corbet. The pedobaptist dissenters of Worcester settled down into one church under More and Badland, and the worship in Angel Street still shows traces of the

12 Dissent in Worcestershire during the Seventeenth Century

Presbyterian stateliness. At Stourbridge, Gervase O'Brien, late rector of Old Swinford, held together the Presbyterians who in 1688 built a meeting-house in Coventry Street. Outside these three towns, the other causes faded away, that at Bromsgrove lasting longest, till past the middle of the eighteenth century.

It was the Baptists who began earlier, and endured better. Bewdley dates from 1649, Worcester from 1651, Pershore 1658, Bromsgrove 1666, Upton 1693; then in the next century came Evesham, Dudley, Westmancote, Shipston-on-Stour and Cradley, while work at Broadway begun from Evesham in 1788, resulted in a Congregational church early next century. The Countess of Huntingdon fostered another church at Kidderminster in 1774, and presently new churches on the Stafford border arose at Langley Green and Dudley.

John Tombes as a Correspondent.

JOHNS TOMBES (1603-1676) is known to fame primarily as the Baptist protagonist in the disputations that characterised his age. His oral debates were numerous, but his pen appears to have been even more active than his tongue. Most of his books, and they numbered 28, were controversial. As a correspondent little is known of him. Now, however, we have two letters which he sent to Sir Robert Harley in 1642, just on the eve of the Civil War. From them we learn of his sympathy and also his desire to keep his friend well informed as to the course of events locally.

Sir Robert Harley (1579-1656) was an M.P. and Master of the Mint. His home was at Brampton Bryan Castle, in Herefordshire. He was made a Knight of the Bath by James I. at his coronation. Sir Robert served on many important committees of the House of Commons during the Long Parliament, and on December 15th, 1643, he succeeded Pym as a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. In 1643 his castle was besieged by the Royalists for six weeks; he was in London at the time, but his wife, Lady Brilliani Harley, ably defended it until the siege was raised. The next year it fell to the Royalists. In 1646 Harley's losses during the civil war were estimated at £12,550. "Earnest for Presbytery," a man of pure life, devoted to religious observance, he loved to befriend the Puritans and Dissenters. His correspondence in course of time passed to his grandson, Robert Harley, the first Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, the founder of the Harleian Collection of books and MSS. in the British Museum. These letters of Tombes went along with other MSS on Welbeck Abbey in 1741 on the death of Edward, the second Earl of Oxford, for his MSS., etc., were inherited by his only daughter and heiress, Lady Margaret Cavendish Harley, who in 1734 had married William Bentinck, second Duke of Portland. Most of the Harleian MSS. were transferred to the British Museum, but many historical papers and letters remain at Welbeck Abbey. The treasures of the library are only partially known to readers of the Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission.

Through the kindness of His Grace, the Duke of Portland, K.G., and the courtesy of his Librarian, Mr. R. W. Goulding, we are able to

12 Dissent in Worcestershire during the Seventeenth Century

Presbyterian stateliness. At Stourbridge, Gervase O'Brien, late rector of Old Swinford, held together the Presbyterians who in 1688 built a meeting-house in Coventry Street. Outside these three towns, the other causes faded away, that at Bromsgrove lasting longest, till past the middle of the eighteenth century.

It was the Baptists who began earlier, and endured better. Bewdley dates from 1649, Worcester from 1651, Pershore 1658, Bromsgrove 1666, Upton 1693; then in the next century came Evesham, Dudley, Westmancote, Shipston-on-Stour and Cradley, while work at Broadway begun from Evesham in 1788, resulted in a Congregational church early next century. The Countess of Huntingdon fostered another church at Kidderminster in 1774, and presently new churches on the Stafford border arose at Langley Green and Dudley.

John Tombes as a Correspondent.

JOHNS TOMBES (1603-1676) is known to fame primarily as the Baptist protagonist in the disputations that characterised his age. His oral debates were numerous, but his pen appears to have been even more active than his tongue. Most of his books, and they numbered 28, were controversial. As a correspondent little is known of him. Now, however, we have two letters which he sent to Sir Robert Harley in 1642, just on the eve of the Civil War. From them we learn of his sympathy and also his desire to keep his friend well informed as to the course of events locally.

Sir Robert Harley (1579-1656) was an M.P. and Master of the Mint. His home was at Brampton Bryan Castle, in Herefordshire. He was made a Knight of the Bath by James I. at his coronation. Sir Robert served on many important committees of the House of Commons during the Long Parliament, and on December 15th, 1643, he succeeded Pym as a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. In 1643 his castle was besieged by the Royalists for six weeks; he was in London at the time, but his wife, Lady Brilliani Harley, ably defended it until the siege was raised. The next year it fell to the Royalists. In 1646 Harley's losses during the civil war were estimated at £12,550. "Earnest for Presbytery," a man of pure life, devoted to religious observance, he loved to befriend the Puritans and Dissenters. His correspondence in course of time passed to his grandson, Robert Harley, the first Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, the founder of the Harleian Collection of books and MSS. in the British Museum. These letters of Tombes went along with other MSS to Welbeck Abbey in 1741 on the death of Edward, the second Earl of Oxford, for his MSS., etc., were inherited by his only daughter and heiress, Lady Margaret Cavendish Harley, who in 1734 had married William Bentinck, second Duke of Portland. Most of the Harleian MSS. were transferred to the British Museum, but many historical papers and letters remain at Welbeck Abbey. The treasures of the library are only partially known to readers of the Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission.

Through the kindness of His Grace, the Duke of Portland, K.G., and the courtesy of his Librarian, Mr. R. W. Goulding, we are able to

reprint the Tombes letters, along with an enclosure which is an account of a disturbance in Leominster Church on the 31st July, 1642, when Matthew Clarke refused to read the King's answer to the Parliament. Clarke was a minister at Ludlow, eleven miles away; his son, of the same name, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, was ejected from Narborough, in Leicestershire, in 1662.

ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

"To the noble & right worthy Sr Robert Harley, Knight of the Bath, these present."

Sir,

At the instance of this bearer Mr Miles Hill mercer not longe since Bayliffe of this Borough of Lemster, brought into debt by losses in trading, yet conscionable to satisfy creditors, for w^h ende he now repaires to London, intending to make ouer some estate of Landes to them for a time, but in the meane time wanting imployment for his maintenance, desires to be employed in some place fitt for him, I humbly request you that if there be any way wherein you may helpe him, you would vouchsafe your favour & assistance to him. God hath vouchsafed to call him home to himselfe so farre as my selfe and others, as Mr Flackett of Bucknill, Mr Becke of Sapy, can iudge, and we doubt not but he will proue faithfull, & vsefull, & therefore conceive our selues bounde to tender his case as the case of a Christian brother, w^{ch} I embolden my selfe to Comend to your pious thoughtes, & your selfe & greate affaires to the Almightyes tuition, resting

Your worship's in most humble observance,

JOHN TOMBES.

Lemster. June 20, 1642.

The relation of Mr Matthew Clerke of the disturbance at Lemster in the County of Heref. in time of Divine service July 31, 1642, at the time when

the Assizes for the County of Heref: was kept at Hereford, & the Bayliffe (being Shieriff also of the County) and the Justice of the towne were absent at Hereford.

As service was towards an end Mr Wallop Brabazon a Justice of peace for the County & one of ye chiefe in the Comission of Array a parishioner of Lemster having bene at the Assizes the day before came into the Church the day aboue named, & sate himselfe downe behind the minister Mr Clerke (in the absence of the vicar) in the reading pew. Edmund Steade Churchwarden & John Scarlett & William Caswall the younger accompanying of him. The psalme growing towards an end I rose vp to goe to the pulpit. Mr Brabazon stayed me & reaching forth a booke vnto me siade Sr The King requires you to reade this. I not knowing who he was craued his name, who told me his name was Brabazon. Mr Brabazon (said I) I conceive The King doeth not require me to reade it here. Yes that he doeth saide hee, & wth that shewes mee the kinges order for the reading of it in the frontispice of the booke. On wch casting my eye, Sr (said I) it is to be reade in euery church by the parson vicar or curate of the same. And I am neither parson vicar nor curate of this place. Yes said he you are curate for the time being. No (said I) I am a stranger here intreated to preach, & no curate here. You shall reade it (said he) But I will not (said I) You asked my name (said he) tell me what is yours. Clarke (said I) Of what place (said he) Of Bitterly answered one that was by. Churchwarde (said he) take notice of his name. He refuseth to obey the Kings order. The Kings order (said I) bindes not me to reade it in this place. Ile make you reade it (said he) Neuer here whilst you liue (said I). And so I brake from him to goe to

the pulpitt. Stay him cryed he to the rude people that were in the way, let him not goe vp into the pulpit to preach. I care not (said I) a rush whether I preach or no. You shall heare of this (said he) & you shall heare of this (said I) Remember (said he) he threatens me. Remember (said I) he interrupts me in time of Diuine seruice. Stay him cryed he againe Downe wth the roundheade cryed they that had planted themselues in the way to the pulpit hauing staues & some swordes being some of the voluntiers (as was reported to me) that were to goe to Yorke wth horse. And vpon that they came all about me, & encompassed me about. Vpon that M^r Brabazon came out vnto me in the Ile where they were about me. I offered you the booke to reade (said he) & you threatned me. You threatned me first (said I) saying I should heare of it. And then I told you [you] should heare of it. What shall I heare (said he) That I haue giuen you a good & a lawfull answer w^{ch} might satisfy any reasonable gentleman. Oh (said he) a good & a lawfull answer. Yes (said I) & herevpon he began to be somewhat pacified towards me. But the rude people who flocked about me some wth swordes by their sides their hand on them others wth staues in their hand cryed againe Downe wth the round head, Downe wth the round head. Vpon w^{ch} cry the women in the church (fearing they had knocked me downe) gaue a greate shreeke. Vpon that M^r Brabazon endeauouring to keepe them off from me swore saying What are ye all mad, they still pressing toward me & crying downe wth the roundhead. Edmund Steuens said to M^r Brabazon S^r you are a Justice of peace I hope you will not see a gentleman to be murdered among vs. No said he I desire him to preach & I'll bring him to the pulpit. Then one Thomas Williams & Captaine Stepkin said to Steuens (as he told me)

what a prating do you keepe, meddle wth that you haue to doe wthall. All that I desire is said he that the gentleman may not be wronged. About this time one of them stepping out wth his cudgell ouer my heade said, shall I downe wth him. Mr Brabazon cryed what are you mad. And thus for some while some of them were for their knocking of me downe others of them were for the keeping of them off from me & the getting me into the pulpit to preach vnto [them] w^{ch} I was very vnwilling considering the tumult. But as soone as I was quietly in the pulpit it was noted that most of those that came wth swordes & staues went out of the church & returned as sermon was done. Coming downe from the pulpit & calling for my hatt I said Mr Edward Dalley This Eckley (being an exco^municate person) stood against the reading pewdore in the afternoone to keepe me from coming forth to preach so as the churchwarden was faine to remoue him. This tumult put women into such frights that they Continued long after distemperd.

[Then comes a list of names of those who cried roundhead.]

S^r

I haue sent vnto you this relation copied out of one written by Mr Clarke that whereas I doubt not but you haue heard a report of this disturbance you may haue true intelligencé thereof. Thereby you may perceiue in what estate we are in Herefordshire. Vnless some speedy course be taken to reduce thinges to a better way in that County I looke for no other then ouerawing by force, & for my selfe death & expulsion; on [blank] (as I am told) the forenamed Stepkin & Henry Toldervey stricke vp a drume for footmen to goe to Yorke or for such a [blank] as the malignant party intends. Here in Worcester they intend to putt the Comission of Array in execution

again & haue appointed this day seuennight to that end. Our helpe is in the name of the Lord who hath made heaven & earth. The Almighty be wth you.

Your worships in all humble obseruance

JOHN TOMBES.

Frō Worcester, August 5, 1642.

I am told that Mr Brabazon & Mr Conongsby were together late on Saturday night precedent to this disturbance. And that on the Lordes day in the afternoone a papist going through Ludlow reported there that the preacher at Lemster was carried away to the Assizes for not reading the Kings answer to the Parliament. By w^{ch} may be gathered how thinges are plotted.

[Addressed]

To the right worshipfull & worthy Sr Robert Harley knight of the Bath at his lodging in Channel Rowe in Westminster these present.

[Matthew Clarke was only at the beginning of his troubles. He was driven from his living at Ludlow, and therefore the Lords and Commons stationed him, on 17 March, 1642/3, at St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, whence they sequestered John Squire. On 15 March, 1644/5 the Lords ordered him to Westwinch restory, in Norfolk, and here he was among congenial neighbours. When, therefore, peace was restored, the country was mapped out for presbyteries, and the details for Salop were published on 29 April, 1647, and Ludlow was chosen as the centre for the fifth classis, it is significant and exceptional that there was no minister there: Clarke had not chosen to return to his own living. This is the more to his credit as the stipend was presently augmented by £30 a year. The vacancy was filled by a returned emigrant, Richard Sadler; he, however, found the feeling of the country against him, and was summarily ejected in 1660. Tombes was quite right in seeing the probability of his own expulsion. Calamy indeed blunders in date, saying that he was driven out in 1641, which is clearly disproved by these two letters. But in the latter half of 1642 he did find his position untenable, and on 4 January, 1642/3 the Commons appointed him Lecturer at All Saints, Bristol. Only in 1653 did he resume residence at Leominster.—Editor.]

Sheffield Baptists in 1685.

THE earliest notice of Baptist life in Sheffield is found in Adam Taylor's "History of the English General Baptists," Vol. I., 320. There we read that "there were several general baptists, A.D. 1700, at Sheffield, in Yorkshire: who applied to the Lincolnshire association for assistance. Mr. Hooke [Joseph Hooke was the Messenger and of Bourne Hackenby], at the request of that meeting, went over to set in order (what was wanting among them; and several other ministers visited them. This supply was continued till 1703, when they appear to have chosen Mr. Edward Howard [one of the founders of the association] for their pastor. . . . the expenses of all these journeys were paid out of the chest."

The Hollis family, who were leading Baptists in London, came from South Yorkshire; one of these was Thomas Hollis (1634-1718), the founder of the Hollis Hospital, Sheffield, who also endowed churches at Doncaster, Rotherham, and Sheffield. Alas, these churches did not long survive.

There is, however, a collection of MSS. at Welbeck Abbey, belonging to His Grace, the Duke of Portland, K.G., and in it is to be found a written certificate of commendation from the Sheffield Church for one of the poorer members of the church, named Jane Newman, dated 1685. She seems to have gone on a pilgrimage, and possibly she was compelled to seek relief as she journeyed. At any rate she reached London. Through the kindness of Mr. R. W. Goulding, the Librarian at Welbeck Abbey, we are able to present a copy of the certificate. It reads as follows:—

Wee the Church of Christ meeting in Sheffield in Yorkshire who are in the Fayth and Practise of those six Principles specified Heb: 6. 1, 2, Doe send Christian Salutation unto any Baptized Congregation of Christ, where these Lines may come, either in England or elsewhere, who are in the same Fayth and Order of the Gospel with us according to the

aforesayd Principles Heb: 6: wishing Grace, Mercy and Peace to abound unto and amongst you in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Beloved Brethren, These are to Certifie you that the Bearer Jane Newman is a Baptized Beleiver in full Comunion with us, Whose Life and Conversation soe far as we know, hath been as becometh the Gospel of Christ, Her therefore we recommend to you, as one meet to be in Comunion with the Church of God, Desireing you to watch over her in the Lord. Furthermore wee doe hereby satisfie that Shee is a very poore Widdow formerly the Wife of John Newman, a Man of an honest Life and Conversation, and was [blank] his Life in fflanders leaveing our poor Sister in great want with three small Children. She alsoe hath had much Sickness and now is desirous to Travell in Search of her ffreinds and of her late Husband's Freinds, Hath desired this our Letter of Comendation; Therefor wee recomend her unto you as a fit object of your Christian Charity, Desireing you to Administer to her Necessities as you shall see fit, As well knoweing that if you give but a Cup of Cold Water to a Christian, you shall not loose your Reward. Now unto the Protection of [blank]

and subscribe ourselves your

Thomas James	Sam. Ellison Elder
William Newton	Rich: Stafford Elder
Rich: Simms	George White Deacon
	Owen Charleton Deacon

Sheffield, November the twentie seaventh 1695.

[The above is in one handwriting, but this note is added in another hand, evidently pour encourager les autres.]

Collected at Mr Kiffin's Meeting House Nine Shillings anid Sixpence.

Rich: Adams.

Richard Adams was the ejected Vicar of Humberstone, Leicestershire, who was assisting Kiffin at Devonshire Square, as the Rev. Daniel Dyke, M.A., has done before him. On the death of the latter, he was called to be joint elder with Kiffin, and was ordained to that office in October 1690.

[John Newman may be the man who represented Horley at the Midland Conference of 1651, where also Valentine James of Hackthorne appeared. George White went to Stonehouse in Staffordshire, whence, in 1687, he removed to Dockhead, the scene of a brief ministry by Richard Adams. Richard Newton of Shrewsbury in 1692 may be connected with this group.]

Certificates of commendation seem to have been given by other churches. Thus, in July 1699 one was brought to Spalding from the church at Cowley, in Middlesex. This was for a person who had lost by fire, and who was going to see his brother at Barton-upon-Humber. Help had been given apparently by the churches at Wantage, Hook Norton, Horley, Scaldwell, and Emprigham. Spalding took a collection for the case and it amounted to 6s. 11d.

Thus was fulfilled the injunction, "Bear ye one another's burdens." Even the Particular Baptists of Devonshire Square accepted the counsel of the General Baptists of Sheffield, and so fulfilled the law of Christ.

ARTHUR S. LANGLEY.

Some Memorials of the Mercer Family.

By SIR WILLIAM J. COLLINS, K.C.V.O., M.S., M.D., B.Sc.

TRADITION asserts that the Mercers came from Normandy with the Conqueror; theirs was certainly a very ancient family in Sussex and for generations it has been fondly held that land in that county was allotted to Norman progenitors by William after the Battle of Hastings.¹ In Edward III's reign a Thomas Mercer was Member of Parliament for Arundel.² Between 1541 and 1549 the will of George Mercer was proved at Rye.³ Mercers appear in the registers at Wivelsfield from 1626 and continuously for two and a half centuries subsequently.⁴ One branch of the family appears to have settled in Scotland; a Mercer described as "a Scottishe Merchant" traded with France in 1389.⁵ Several Scottish Mercers, William of Aberdeen (1605-1675),

¹ See papers printed by the late Arthur Hall (1897), author of "Three generations of a Godly House" (1896), and asserted to me by the late Miss Adelaide Mercer (d. 1917), the last of the Ditchling family, in 1910.

² Sussex Archæological Collection, Vol. xxx., p. 185.

³ Ibid., Vol. xxxii., p. 131.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. xxxv., pp. 47-49.

⁵ MS. in Miss Flint's (of Sedlescomb) collection containing extracts from the Prerogative office of Canterbury by Charles Blunt of Cross-in-hand, Hurst Green, Oct. 17, 1853.

Hugh of Aberdeen (1726-1777), James of Perthshire (1734-1804), and Andrew of Selkirk (1775-1842) are noticed in the National Dictionary of Biography. I have notes of a John Mercer of Hawkhurst, Kent, who died in 1626-7 and had three sons, John, Thomas and William, and a daughter who married Lawrence Dawe of Burwash, Sussex; also of Thomas Mercer, Yeoman of Penhurst, living in 1648, who had a son John; also of William Mercer of Hastings living 1640, of William and Thomas Mercer of Fairlight, living *circâ* 1640-50, and Thomas Mercer, Yeoman of Dallington, living 1703. The Records of the Prerogative Office of Canterbury contain numerous references to Mercers between 1689 and 1717, notably to Christopher Mercer of St. Paul's Shadwell (d. 1689), William Mercer of Westminster and of H.M.S. "Dragon" (d. 1692), Daniel Mercer a wealthy merchant of London, buried at St. Christopher's, whose will was proved May 12, 1692 bequeathing large legacies and lands in Ireland, and Lieut. James Mercer who served under General Wade and died 1715.⁶

The Kent and Sussex groups of the family were to be found in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries scattered between Maidstone on the East and Lewes and the valley of the Ouse on the West with *foci* at Cranbrook, Sedlescomb, Ditchling, and Wivelsfield. In the seventeenth century many of the Mercers, probably under the influence of Matthew Caffyn, "the Battle-axe of Sussex," became associated with the General Baptist movement and ardent supporters of that liberal form of dissent from the Anglican Church. On January 15, 1691, a certificate was made in the Barcombe district (near Lewes) for "a meeting for

⁶ See Some memorials of the Dendy Family, by the author, in Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Vol. v., p. 129.

Anabaptists held at the house of Thankful Hunt in Ticehurst and John Mercer.⁷

For eighteenth century information of the Mercer family I am chiefly indebted to a collection of papers in the possession of Miss Flint of Sedlescomb, great grand-daughter, through both her father and mother, of Joseph Mercer (1746-1834) of Hole Farm near Sedlescomb, and of Mary Cook (1763-1788).

The arms borne by Robert Mercer (1785-1849), of Lewes and Southwark, who married Sarah Hathaway the eldest daughter of John Treacher of Stamford Hill were:—"Per pale argent and sable, three grey-hounds courant, counter-charged; on a chief gules, three leopards' faces: crest a greyhound, in full course argent. Motto: '*Ubi Libertas ibi Patria.*'"

Such pedigree of the Kent and Sussex Mercers as I have been able to construct, from the fragmentary sources that have come to my hand, commences with Robert Mercer, born in 1625 and buried at Willingdon Church, near Eastbourne in 1717. The parish register contains the entry, "Robert Mercer a very ancient man was burried January 17th 1717." He is described as of Tunbridge Wells, Wateringbury and Offham. He married Elizabeth Beach of Beddingham, near Lewes, and had three children, 1 Joseph, 2 John, 3 Elizabeth. The two latter may be briefly dismissed. Elizabeth (1659-1710) married Robert Killie, died without issue and was buried in Southover churchyard, by Lewes. John Mercer (1662-1704) married 1 Elizabeth Benge, 2 Elizabeth Beach widow of — Messenger, and had five

⁷ Sussex Archæological Collections, Vol. xxx., p. 60. (I found a similar certificate of an Anabaptist assembly, given by the archdeaconry of Lewes in June 1716 for the house of Henry Wood at Ditchling "at the request of Nathaniel Webb the Preacher," among Miss Flint's collection.)

children, 1 John, 2 Mary, 3 Henry, 4 Elizabeth, 5 Joseph. He was buried at Brighthelmstone.

Joseph Mercer the eldest son of Robert (1658-1736) acquired farm lands in Kent near Maidstone, and in Sussex at Keymer and at Sedlescomb. He married Susannah Allison of Cuckfield who died of small-pox in 1713 and was buried in a railed grave on the S. side of Sedlescomb Church, near Battle. They had four children, 1 Robert Mercer (1687-1740), 2 Susannah (1692-1722) who married John Brooke of Northiam and had issue; 3 Elizabeth (b. 1697) married William Browning of Canterbury and had issue; 4 Thomas Mercer (1703-1744) a distiller in Maidstone and Southwark who married Sarah Bedwell (1703-1752) of Maidstone and had one child, Susannah, who married 1 Mr. Dowding an Attorney of London, 2 Mr. Chapman a stationer of King Street, Cheapside.

Robert Mercer (1687-1740), the eldest child of Joseph, married Mary Miller (1692-1771) of Hellingly. He farmed lands at Isfield and Sedlescomb, and was buried at Hellingly.⁸ They had two sons and two daughters who survived infancy, 1 Joseph, 2 Thomas, 3 Mary, and 4 Susannah. Mary, born in 1718, married William Marten of Telscomb. Susannah (1720-1746), like her brother Thomas, married into the Tempest family who were Seventh-day Baptists of Cranbrook; her husband was George Tempest (d. 1797); both were buried at Bodiam. A sister of Mr. George Tempest,

⁸ On April 11, 1919, I visited Hellingly churchyard and discovered the grave where so many of the Mercer family were buried. It is a fine old carved stone sarcophagus, but the lettering is in places barely decipherable. Here lie buried Robert Mercer (1687-1740) and his wife Mary, daughter of Mr. Henry Miller, and their sons Joseph, Robert, Henry, and Thomas, also the wife of the last named, the surgeon of Lewes, and William Tempest Mercer his son, and others. The next adjacent tomb is that of the Millers.

Penelope, married a Mr. Whittaker of Manchester Square, London, and Tunbridge Wells, and through him was connected with the Romilly, Rous, and Hamlyn families. Robert Mercer represented Warbleton at the General Baptist Assembly at Chichester in 1721. Also in 1724 at Horsham with Matthew Caffyn of the Horsham community and Robert Chatfield from Ditchling. In 1728 Brother Robert Mercer and Brother Bengue were appointed to preach the sermon in 1729. Robert Mercer's name appears as Messenger at the Assembly at White's Alley in 1732, 1733 and 1734, representing Warbleton. In 1735 he was chairman of the Assembly at Glasshouse Yard. He again represented Warbleton as Messenger in 1736, 1737 and 1739, the year prior to his death. A Thomas Mercer represented Warbleton at the Assembly in 1714.⁹

The two sons of Robert Mercer, viz. Joseph (1711-1747) and Thomas (1716-1779), were also strongly identified with the General Baptist community in Sussex during the eighteenth century, and both married wives of the same faith. Thus Joseph of Isfield married at Street, near Ditchling, Mary, the daughter and heiress of Richard and Martha Webb of "Fanners," Wivelsfield. Sarah Webb, sister and co-heiress with Mary Webb married Israel Paine of Brighton (1669-1757). Thomas, who practised as a surgeon at Lewes, married Bridget Tempest (b. 1719), daughter of Major Tempest, F.R.S. and J.P., who was a General Baptist preacher. He owned lands in Ewhurst and at Cranbrook. Dr. Thomas Mercer represented Dover at the General Baptist Assembly in 1743 and Ditchling in 1744. In 1743 Dr. Mercer and John Sayer conveyed land at Southover, by Lewes, to Joseph Mercer (his brother) of Isfield, Michael Marten of Ditchling, Stephen Agate of Ditchling,

John Caffin of Clayton, Benjamin Webb of Patcham and others for the purposes of a General Baptist Meeting House.⁹ Dr. Mercer was the author of an essay entitled "The Doctrine of Believers' Baptism asserted and vindicated in a short and plain discourse, 1738," which was printed in the Baptist Historical Society's *Transactions* for January, 1919.

Dr. Thomas Mercer (1716-1779) and Bridget Tempest had three children who survived infancy: 1 Thomas Mercer (b. 1750) apothecary of Lewes and afterwards of Wallingford, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. Dunner of St. Botoph's, Aldersgate, Citizen of London; 2 William Tempest Mercer (1752-1786), Surgeon of Lewes, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Michael Chatfield of Court Gardens, Ditchling; 3 Susannah (b. 1755) married Thomas Babington of Chatham. Dr. Tempest Mercer of Lewes who died early, aged 34, and was buried at Hellingly, had by his wife, Elizabeth Chatfield, one daughter and three sons.

The Chatfield family from whom Mrs. Tempest Mercer came were like her husband's, one of very ancient settlement in Sussex, and also prominent in the General Baptist community. There were Chatfields (or Cattesfeldes) in West Meaton (near Ditchling) assessed to poll tax in 1378. Later they are described as of "Bedyles" or Ditchling manor and of Street. Robert Chatfield of Street who died in 1736 founded the General Baptist meeting house at Ditchling. The Chatfields are connected with the Motts, Clarkes, Nettlefolds, and Chamberlains.

The youngest son of Dr. Tempest Mercer, Robert Mercer (1785-1849) also married into a well known

⁹ Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptists. Edited by Dr. Whitley. Vol. ii., Minutes of the years 1724, 1731-39.

General Baptist family, his wife being Sarah Hathaway Treacher, daughter of John Treacher (1755-1838) of Stamford Hill and grand-daughter of the Rev. Benjamin Treacher (1722-1766) minister of Glass House Yard and Fair Street, Horsleydown, and Sarah Dendy his wife. (See *Baptist Historical Transactions*, Vol. II., No. 4.)

With the numerous progeny of Dr. Tempest Mercer and Sarah Hathaway Treacher we reach contemporary history. Suffice it to say that their eldest son, John Mercer (1816-1897), left England for America in 1833 and after adventurous times during the Mackenzie rising settled at Chatham, Ontario, where he became sheriff and was highly respected. He married Bethia Sarah Morrison of Norwood, sister of Rev. Alexander J. W. Morrison, M.A. One of their daughters married Mr. McWhinney of Toronto.

Reverting to the family and descendents of Joseph Mercer (1711-1747) of Isfield and Mary Webb, who mostly remained in Sussex and maintained their faith in and around Lewes, at Ditchling and at Sedlescomb, it may be said that one only of their children, Joseph Mercer (1746-1834) married, and had issue. He lived at Hole Farm, Westfield, near Sedlescomb and Battle. This was one of several estates in the neighbourhood which were long in the Mercer family. Others were Jacobs near Sedlescomb, which was held by Mercers for 200 years, Brickwall, The Stream and Oaklands, and another at Brede. Joseph Mercer married Mary Cook (1763-1788), she being then fifteen and they had three sons and two daughters: 1 Robert (1780-1861) of Jacobs, 2 Joseph (1787-1883) who married Lydia Cruttenden; 3 Richard (1788-1868), (one of whose daughters, Adelaide, died lately at Ditchling, the last of that name in that picturesque Sussex village with its quaint Anabaptist meeting house and burial

ground). The two daughters were: 1 Mary who married Mr. James Flint of Kingston,¹⁰ near Lewes, and 2 Sarah who married Mr. Thomas Johnstone. Joseph Mercer who lived to eighty-seven and owned land at Hurstpierpoint, Clayton and Wivelsfield as well as at Sedlescomb, and his young wife, Mary Cook, who died at twenty-five lie buried in the sarcophagus shaded by chestnut trees guarding the entrance to the parish church which crowns the hill at whose foot Sedlescomb nestles round its village green. Here also lie buried Robert Mercer (1780-1861), and his wife Anne (1783-1856), Joseph Mercer (1788-1883), also Jane Catt (d. 1856) who appears to have been connected with the Mercers, an interesting link with another old Sussex family. Robert Mercer (1743-1802) of Southover, the unmarried brother of Joseph Mercer (1746-1834), also lies buried here; his name appears in a deed preserved at the Westgate Chapel at Lewes dated 1778, when he was appointed one of the new trustees for the Southover meeting house along with Dr. Tempest Mercer (1752-1786), John Chatfield, Peter Marten of West Dean, William Marten of West Firle and others.¹¹ In 1823 Chatfield was the only survivor and among the new trustees then appointed was Samuel Flint of Lewes. Two years later the Eastport Lane meeting house was merged with the West Gate Chapel.

The Mercer family in the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries afforded typical examples of the General Baptists of those days. They and their connections linked up the anti-Calvinist dissenters

¹⁰ At the little village of Kingston there was formerly a General Baptist Chapel and burial ground, now a barn and yard, opposite the Manor House.

¹¹ Transactions of the Unitarian Historical Society, Vol. i., part 2, May 1918, "The deeds of the Westgate Chapel, Lewes," pp. 188-9.

of Kent and Sussex as the Dendy-Treacher Connection linked up those of the Buckinghamshire group with the Sussex group. Dr. Whitley has traced the General Baptists of the Thames Valley to the Lollards and Wycliffism as a source, while the S.E. of England group had affinity and associations with the liberal Mennonites of the Low Countries. Kent with some fifty separate communities in the seventeenth century, of which some eight or nine continue to this day (such as Bessels Green, Cranbrook,¹² Chatham, Headcorn, Deal, and Dover), was even more impregnated with this "dissidence of dissent" than Sussex. The latter county claimed some twenty-five communities in the seventeenth century of which only six now remain (viz., Horsham, Lewes, Northiam, Ditchling, Billinghurst and Chichester), some of them leading a rather precarious existence.¹³ The Annual General Assembly of the General Baptists formed a rallying ground for the families of the faithful who largely intermarried. They thus kept alive their simple Biblical Christianity and were enabled to compare experiences under persecution and ostracism, until toleration and freedom were achieved. No one can turn over the family records of these "tender folk," whom obloquy and opposition could not daunt or dismay without increasing one's regard for those who, in dark and difficult days, were content "to walk by faith and not the letter's sight and read their Bible by the inward light."

¹² I visited the quaint little wooden General Baptist Chapel at Cranbrook, on October 13, 1919. It stands by the smithy, where the road branches off to Canterbury. I was informed that service was only held there once in six weeks, and attended by a few elderly persons.

¹³ Minutes of General Assembly of the General Baptists, Vol. i., pp. lix.-lx. and lxx.-lxvi

Baptists in the Colonies till 1750.

THE Atlantic seaboard of N. America attracted European settlers from 1599 onwards. With the foundation of Georgia in 1732, all the coast from Florida to Fundy was under English control. Many of the provinces had been organized deliberately as refuges for sects oppressed in their fatherland; Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Georgia are good examples.

Baptists therefore who found life difficult in Wales, England, Ireland, Germany, naturally turned their eyes hither. It might have been expected that they would migrate to the oldest colony, Virginia, or to the twin provinces of Massachusetts and Connecticut, settled by the Puritans. But in the Old Dominion the Church of England obtained a legal establishment as in the mother country, and therefore this colony proved the least attractive. And in New England the Puritans showed themselves even more intolerant; they arrogated powers of self-government, shipped back some Episcopalians who desired to worship according to law, established their own style of worship and taxed all residents to support it, and made life bitter for all who dared oppose their ministers. Even in Plymouth Colony, independent of the others till it was united with Massachusetts under a royal governor in 1692, something of the same persecuting spirit had developed. So the earliest Baptists could not keep a footing on the mainland, but

took refuge on the islands where they were less liable to interference.

From a Baptist standpoint, the period down to 1750 is not divided by any accession of kings; the landmarks are purely local. Chief among them are: 1639, first permanent church in Providence, near Rhode Island; 1663, settlement at Swansea in the Old Colony; 1671, separation of the Seventh-day church at Newport, Rhode Island; 1682, migration of the Maine church to Charleston, S.C.; 1689, migration of the New Hampshire church to Piscataway, N.J.; 1696, Seventh-day Yearly Meeting established; 1706, Philadelphia Association of Particular Baptists; 1719, arrival of German Baptists at Germantown; 1730, separation of German Seventh-day Baptists at Ephrata; 1739, arrival of General Baptist Messenger for Carolina and Virginia; 1739-41, 44-48, tours of George Whitefield.

It was these journeys of Whitefield which quickened religion and brought about the foundation of many Calvinistic "New-Light" churches, which mostly became Baptist. They also raised up many other evangelists, nearly all Calvinist, who travelled widely, and gave such an impetus to the Particular Baptists, that in a short time they felt themselves the Regular Baptists, and the Generals became negligible. All the more important therefore is it in this formative period to insist that there were at least seven types of church: General, Particular, General Seventh-day, Keithian, Rogerene, German, German Seventh-day; in 1738 no one could have foreseen which had a future, and which had none. The next few years were decisive; whereas by 1750 there had been more than a hundred Baptist churches founded, some of the Generals were extinct, others were changing, the Keithians had melted into the Regulars, the Rogerenes were stagnant, the German Seventh-day were so

extremely eccentric that it seemed improbable they could survive long on such lines. The Germans were prolific, but unenterprising; the Particulars were full of zeal.

The usual American plan is to deal with the churches, state by state. It seems more natural to trace the real genetic history of the different movements. If the early churches be plotted on a map, they show a thick cluster round Narragansett Bay, others near the mouth of the Thames, a thick cluster between the mouth of the Hudson and the upper Delaware, others up Delaware bay, with a group at the mouth of the Ashley and Cooper rivers. Early settlers clung to the water-ways; wagon-roads were not yet.

The first Baptist church was due to Roger Williams, and arose at his plantation of Providence in 1639; but it remained sterile till the nineteenth century, and except for setting an example seems of no historic importance. The settlers at Piscataqua (now Dover, New Hampshire) where there was a church under the Puritan clergyman Hanserd Knollys, heard of the incident, and the church was troubled so that the minister returned to England in 1641, and the Baptists moved round near to Providence, settling on Long Island, but not organising. Some members of Cotton's church at Boston, who had sided with Sir Harry Vane against the ministers, and had been expelled, went north with John Clarke as their leader, then came round to Narragansett Bay and bought an island which they re-named Rhode Island. Here they established a church, which presently received as members some Baptists from London, and by October 1648 if not earlier the whole church was Baptist. While both these were Calvinist, they were soon reinforced by other English immigrants, of the

General or Arminian type. Dispute was so keen that in each place it was found wiser to separate, and by 1656 there were two churches at Providence, two at Newport. The English General Baptists soon found their way to the Six Principles mentioned in Hebrews vi. as elementary, and adopted these as fundamental. As they planted new settlements at North and South Kingston and at Tiverton on the mainland, and then at the most westerly point of the territory secured by the charter of 1663, they seem to have adopted naturally the plan of a yearly General Assembly which had been maintained from 1654 in the mother country. Unfortunately no records survive, before 1710, nor did any antiquarian appear, as in Southwark, to gather up any scattered minutes: but the Six-Principle Baptists were certainly the first to organize in America.

The beginnings of Baptist churches in Massachusetts were very difficult. At the end of 1642 the lady Deborah Moody with two other women were presented at Salem for denying infant baptism, and they withdrew to Long Island. Early in 1644, at the same place, W. Witter was charged for the same offence, and another man at Hingham; hereupon a law was passed enacting that Baptists should be banished from Massachusetts. Obadiah Holmes of Reddish and Didsbury, who had been at Salem since 1638, migrated to Rehoboth in the Old Colony, where he joined the church of the Standing Order. Roger Williams had been minister at Salem, and now Charles Chauncey at Scituate ceased baptizing infants; Witter was punished again in 1646, but not expelled the jurisdiction. Correspondence brought out complaints from Winslow that the Old Colony churches were leavened. It was however 1648 before things came to a head, when a man was presented at Dover on the same count. Hereupon Clarke of Newport with

Mark Lucar from London crossed into the Old Colony, deliberately, to spread Baptist principles. They baptized Holmes and others at Seekonk, whereupon the minister of Rehoboth excommunicated them. Massachusetts wrote to the Old Colony, to stop the movement, and as the Baptists held house to house meetings, the legislative of the Old Colony, passed a law forbidding this, though it was the very thing the original Pilgrim Fathers had done; under this law, Holmes was presented in 1650. Next year Witter asked for a visit at Lynn, and Holmes went with two others; they were arrested, two were fined, he was whipped. On returning home, he and eight friends were presented afresh at Rehoboth, and seeing that the old Colony, was inclined to become as intolerant as the men of the Bay, they all withdrew into Rhode Island. In 1653 Henry Dunster, head of the college at Cambridge, declared himself Baptist. He had to resign, and was succeeded by Chauncey, who by this time had overcome his scruples. Dunster crossed the border and settled at Scituate, where he died in 1659, not having founded a Baptist church.

The end of the Commonwealth period induced John Myles of Ilston to quit Wales with his Baptist church and its records. The little company settled within the Old Colony, in 1663, and it is singular that they were guided to Rehoboth. As they were duly fined in July 1667, they bought land further north and formed a new township which they called Swanzey. Thus the township which had once seemed to end a period of wandering and strife, expelled three successive Baptist leaders, Williams, Holmes and Myles. The Swanzey church became leavened with Arminian adherents, and within thirty years it divided.

The arrival of Baptists from London and Dart-

mouth precipitated the formation in 1665 of a church in Boston. Dwelling like the church of Pergamos right in the capital of the persecuting power, it is a marvel that it survived; but it did hold on its way, without any sister church on the mainland for seventy years. But manifestly it was tinged with the conservatism of the State Churches around, for when the Whitefield revival came, it was unresponsive, and a second church arose in 1743. By that time the new stir had caused the formation of causes at Sutton, South Brimfield, Bellingham, Leicester; and the impetus was given which was destined to bring Baptists to the front of the evangelical denominations in New England.

The year 1682 was a turning-point. For six years the valiant Holmes had been pastor of Newport, succeeding Clarke and Lukar; he now passed to his reward. His sons Obadiah and John went on to Pennsylvania, and about the same time Thomas Dungan who had spent a short time on Rhode Island, went further, and established the first Baptist church in that province, as will be described presently. Massachusetts was now in bad odour with the home government, and dared no longer enforce the penalty of banishment, which had been reiterated ten years earlier: and though a Baptist meeting-house had been nailed up, it now came into regular use. To the north at Newbury a second church was openly formed, but it soon disappeared, perhaps because some of its members shared in the remarkable migration now to be mentioned.

One other attempt had been made more to the north as early as 1681. A company of settlers from the west of England included several Baptists headed by W. Screven, whose father in 1656 had signed the Somerset confession for the church at Somerton. From them, and others who previously had had to

content themselves with the Standing Order, a Baptist church was formed, with Screven as its pastor, duly recognized by the sister church in Boston, and its pastor Isaac Hull. The local authorities at once set themselves to stamp it out by fine, imprisonment, bonds to conform, &c. After a year and more, the church decided to follow the gospel advice, and being persecuted in one city to flee to another. Hearing of the good terms offered to settlers in Carolina, and the provisions for religious liberty drawn up by Locke and incorporated in its charter, the whole church migrated to the district at the mouths of the Ashley, Cooper and Edisto rivers. Here they were speedily joined by other settlers direct from England, and the church of Charleston dates its origin from 1683. From the start it embodied Calvinists and Arminians, and as had already happened, these soon preferred to separate and organise different churches rather than wrangle in external unity. Besides those members who lived on the neck which became the seat of government, there were others on Stono creek, who united with the General Baptist group, and more on Edisto island, who united with the Particulars. This latter group shifted in the next generation to Euhaw island, and in 1746 decided to accept the responsibility of being a separate church. The General churches, though fed at intervals by fresh immigrants, were untouched by the fervour aroused by Whitefield, and slowly decayed; by 1787 there was no further use for their Charleston property, which passed to the more energetic body.

Other Baptists who found that life under the New England persecutors was intolerable, made their way direct and via Long Island to New Jersey. With affection for their northern home they transferred its name Piscataqua to their new settlement at the mouth

of the Raritan, where they organised in 1689. The name of Thomas Killingsworth from Norwich assures us that this church also contained G.B. members, but the division which was to be expected took place on another line of cleavage, sixteen years later. This had already taken place on Rhode Island, and we may note the fresh development at Newport.

In London there was a General Baptist church which after one or two rather rapid transformations had come to believe that the Seventh-day was the Sabbath not for Israel alone, but for Christendom. A few pamphlets were published on the question, and the extreme eccentricity of some of its adherents did not utterly discredit it. Some immigrants to Rhode Island held this view, and after an attempt to live as peaceful members of the Newport G.B. church, they separated in 1671 and founded a Seventh-day church. Some of them went further afield, and in three years a second was established at New London. New adherents were won, mostly within the confines of Rhode Island, for Connecticut was not fond of dissent. It was manifestly difficult for them all to assemble each Saturday, and there were mutual difficulties in the way of their worshipping with any other church. They seem to have settled down to domestic worship, accounting themselves all members of one church, whether living on the island or on the mainland. They took the name of Newport, although they had no building there appropriated for the purpose; it was not the custom in that colony, as some royal commissioners remarked with surprise. To prevent leakage, a Yearly Meeting was organised in 1696, and at once there followed singular developments.

George Keith, a Friend from Aberdeen, became surveyor-general in East New Jersey and then school-master in Philadelphia. Here he came to suspect a

tendency of Friends towards Deism, and founded a new society, usually called Keithian Quakers. He was naturally led to return to Britain that he might oppose Quaker heresies at their source; and thus his colonial societies were left without any leader. One of them at Newtown in Pennsylvania adopted the Seventh-day Baptist position in 1697. Though no others seem to have swung quite so far, next year the Keithians at Philadelphia, Nottingham and New Providence declared themselves Baptist.

The example of a second community observing the Seventh-day strengthened the principle of other believers, and encouraged them to stand out in distinct churches. So from the Piscataway church which had already had such a disturbed history, there separated the Seventh-day observers in 1705. And three years later the brethren near Westerly decided to account themselves a separate church, when it proved that most of the brethren now belonged to the mainland group, not the island. Then came a pause, till two new waves of immigrants gave fresh opportunities in Pennsylvania.

The former of these was Welsh, and epoch-making, as will presently appear. But a few Welshmen who pushed up the Schuylkil and the French Creek, where they commemorated their early home of Nantmel, were persuaded in 1726 to adopt the Seventh day. And four years later a settlement of Germans a little further inland headed by Conrad Beissel, were won to the same belief; they established far the most remarkable of all Baptist brotherhoods, which as it held aloof from the English is better described in another connection. It sent out one colony far to the frontier which just survived 1750, and was then exterminated by the natives at the instigation of French priests.

The remaining Seventh-day churches arose in more conventional methods. In 1737 the Welsh and Irish round Cohansey on Delaware Bay separated from the church, and named their community Shiloh. Three years later a similar division took place at Swansea on Narragansett Bay. In 1745 settlers from Stonington and Westerley who had built between the Shark and Squam rivers in Barnegat, and had hitherto been content to be regarded as members of Piscataway, organised at the Shrewsbury church, on the prompting of a deputation from the German Ephratists. It was already clear that New Jersey was to be a stronghold, as Plainfield testifies to this day. Perhaps it was not yet clear that a Seventh-day community can hardly adjust itself to life in the midst of those who have different social customs. The country was by no means crowded, and only in another century was it found wise to secure a sheltered asylum in the hills of North-western New York where the Seventh-day could be a day of rest without dislocating a mixed community.

One other minor movement took place in these early days, the first in Connecticut. John Rogers drank of the apocalyptic vials, and bid fair to travel in the footsteps of his earlier Fifth-Monarchy namesake. Other peculiarities were silent worship, ostentatious work on the Sunday, and quiet manual labour during their own services on Saturday. His energies were chiefly exerted at New London where he separated from the Seventh-day Baptists in 1680, accounting nothing obligatory unless it were expressly ordered in the N.T., and objecting strongly to all use of medicine. After some twenty years he had sufficient influence for Gurdon Saltonstall to condescend to an open debate, which was published by Rogers in 1701 at Philadelphia. Once having ventured into print, he had the presses of New York and Boston working to

spread his Epistles, especially to the Quakers and Seventh-day Baptists. It must have been a blow that Peter Pratt retorted in 1725 on the "New London Quakers, the disciples of John Rogers"; and as the founder was dead, his son of the same name took up the cudgels. All this time the Puritans were steadily oppressing them, and a little colony of Rogerenes moved into northern New Jersey, where after two experiments they settled on Schooley's mountain in 1734. Despite the press and persecution, there was no great accession, and the movement remained almost a family gathering traceable down to the revolution, and negligible.

On the island of Martha's Vineyard, part of the Old Colony, Baptists went among the natives, and by 1693 organised an Indian church at Chilmark. As the natives gradually died out, this disappeared; but it deserves to be remembered that the claims of the aborigines, so well respected by Roger Williams, were met in the deepest things. A second church was formed for them on the mainland in 1741. The neighbouring island of Nantucket had as its leading citizen Peter Folger, miller, weaver, blacksmith, surveyor, trusted to keep the records and be clerk of the courts. He was a member of Clark's church, but apparently did not organise his neighbours into a separate body. And the Baptists on Block island were content with the same domestic worship, accounting themselves to belong to the same church with headquarters at Newport.

Across the western border of Rhode Island, there was more enterprise. Perhaps it was felt that John Rogers was prejudicing the whole Baptist cause by his eccentricities, and that it was desirable to send a sane preacher. Certain it is that opposite New London on the other bank of the Thames, Valentine Wight-

man went from Clarke's church in Newport to raise the General Baptist flag at Groton in 1705. Not only did he keep it aloft, but he went to New York on preaching tours, and by 1714 had the pleasure of baptising Nicholas Evers, a brewer from Wiltshire, and organising a G.B. church there under the protection of the governor. New London itself was occupied in 1726, but soon came disasters. New York disbanded, selling its meeting-house; the New London Elder proved of bad character and wrecked his cause. Wightman rallied Evers to come and help him, so that the Groton church survived the shock. And then Wightman was cheered by the news that while his own tours had apparently done little, yet at Wallingford, north of New Haven, the reading of Delaune's Plea for the Nonconformists in 1731 had resulted in the formation of a Baptist church. Wightman had constantly to champion Baptists, and a famous debate of 1727 against the parish minister of Colchester, is typical of the denominational attitudes: the Standing Order cleric would not debate whether compulsory taxation for his support had any N.T. warrant, and contented himself with asserting that it was legal in Connecticut. From the inhospitable clime of New England, it is time to turn to the more genial atmosphere of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, both developed under the auspices of William Penn and the Friends.

There was one church near Sandy Hook which was encouraged to organize in 1688, after members had been drifting in from the intolerance of New England for some time. Such was Obadiah Holmes of Manchester, who had been so cruelly treated at Boston in Massachusetts, and came to the peace of Middletown. Two of his descendants crossed to the Delaware, and did good service at Philadelphia, where

Judge John Holmes refused to entertain a suit by Friends against Keithians, on the ground that the charter guaranteed religious freedom. But this Middletown church did reproduce the strife between Generals and Particulars before the century ran out, and under the Welsh influence settled it in 1712 by 42 of the 68 members subscribing the confession published at London by Elias Keach in 1697. The English immigrants seem always to have included General Baptists, who indeed were not only the older, but were perhaps the more numerous till the end of the seventeenth century. They never won any from the Particular Baptists, but never could amalgamate; they either died out slowly from sheer want of energy, or became mere raw material to be moulded by the more energetic Calvinists, or if there were still *esprit de corps* they resented the latter seeking to alter their basis, as in the well-known case of Benjamin Keach. But as least America was never subjected to the influence of Matthew Caffin, and the G.B. churches never displayed any weakness as to the deity of the Lord. Their languour is typified by Henry Sator, who arrived in 1709 in Maryland, where the laws offered no hindrance to work. Yet though his house was always open to ministers, 33 years passed before a church was organised at Chestnut Ridge. This was due to Henry Lovell, a New Englander ordained at Piscataway in 1732, but soon expelled for bad behaviour: this evinced itself both at Sator's church and at its daughter at Opeckon in Virginia, so that they as well as Kehukee in North Carolina were left devoid of ministers, and in their need turned to the Philadelphia Association just after the middle of the century.

The pioneer of better things was Thomas Dungan, a refugee from Ireland. After calling at Rhode Island,

he went up the Delaware, and settled some 25 miles above Philadelphia. He was joined by refugees from Radnorshire, and they formed a Baptist church in 1684, calling it Cold Spring. All the Irish and Welsh immigrants hither were Calvinists, and the churches they formed seem never to have had any serious difficulty such as we have constantly noticed hitherto from the presence of G.B. settlers. Dungan may have chosen his site badly, but he was a good itinerant and became known. One day there landed at the capital a young man in gown and bands, who was taken for an episcopal divine and was invited to preach. In the sermon he was stricken with shame and avowed himself an impostor, able to sustain his part only because he was a son of a Baptist minister at Southwark, Benjamin Keach. In his remorse he sought out Dungan, was baptized, and returned to do in earnest what he had done for fun. By 1689 he had gathered a church on the banks of the Pennepek, a creek slightly above Philadelphia; though five were from Wales, five from England and only one from Kilkenny, yet the church was named Lower Dublin. Elias Keach now took up the work of Dungan, and soon had outstations at Burlington, opposite Cold Spring, in Philadelphia itself, at Chester down river, and even at Cohansey down the bay. The exact relation of these groups to Lower Dublin was not precisely defined, and various dates are assigned for their separate existence. Young Keach returned to England in 1692, and the Cold Spring church disbanded in 1702. Between these dates the Keithian movement had produced a new kind of Baptist, which fortunately did not hold aloof from others. And a new influence entered in this decade which proved dominant.

A Welsh element has already been observed, in Roger Williams, John Myles, and the founders of

Lower Dublin. With 1701 there arrived a colony from Pembroke and Carmarthen, which before leaving Milford Haven had organized into a church under Thomas Griffith. After experimenting at Philadelphia and Pennepek, they bought about fifty square miles in Newcastle County, named it Welsh Tract, and removed thither. By subsequent fixing of boundaries this is now in Delaware State. The church numbered 37, and had men with strong convictions, which they pressed on all the churches in Pennsylvania and Jersey, so that soon baptism was followed up by the laying on of hands, every member of a church signed a covenant, and public worship was enlivened by the singing of original hymns. By 1706 a Philadelphia Association was formed, which has been active and regulative ever since. The Confession of 1677 was translated into Welsh by Abel Morgan with amendments by the two Keaches on these points, and 122 members of the Welsh Tract church signed it in 1716. The Association in 1742 approved the revision, which has ever since been current, and is still standard in the South. Ministers from the Welsh Tract overflowed in all directions; within the half century Cohansey had Nathaniel Jenkins, while his son was at Cape May, Abel Morgan at Middletown, Griffith Jones at Duck Creek in Delaware. When news of the happy settlement reached Wales, another large colony came out in 1711, and settled eighteen miles west of Philadelphia in the Great Valley. Another group founded Montgomery in 1719 with Benjamin Griffith of Cardigan as pastor, and William Thomas in charge of a branch at Hilltown. Welshmen did much in stiffening the Keithians and bringing them into line, as at Brandywine and Southampton. Yet if they supplied the moulding force, we must not overlook the materials supplied by English from Ireland; if all

were as prolific as Dungan, this must have been most important, for eighty years after his death, more than 600 people claimed him as their ancestor.

A colony of thirty members left Welsh Tract in 1737 and settled on the Peedee river in South Carolina. Hitherto the scales had been very even in Virginia and the Carolinas between the Generals and the Particulars, but the appearance of this sturdy Welsh Neck church decisively tipped the balance, which could not be redressed by the appearance of a Messenger from the G.B. Assembly to Stono. For George Whitefield had now begun his wonderful journeys, and the churches that sprung up in his wake were both Calvinist and aggressive. There was very little direct contact, yet his superintendent of the Orphan Home at Savannah, Nicholas Bedgegood was baptized, and in the second half of the century became useful in promulgating Baptist views.

In New England, Whitefield's influence told differently. There arose new churches, separate from those of the Standing Order, which were petrifying. Not only were most of these destined to go further and become Baptist; but the animosity of the Established Church was diverted chiefly to them, so that pure Baptist churches were able to arise without special and prompt persecution. Thus the first decade of the new era saw the rise of thirteen Baptist churches in Massachusetts and Connecticut, nearly trebling the number in that district.

New York was all but immune. Some New Jersey settlers crossed the Hudson to Fishkill in 1740; others organized in their own province at Scotch Plains; and one or two who went to New York city instituted domestic worship to which came also ex-members of the defunct G.B. church. Just over the

Connecticut border was a little church at Horseneck, Stamford; and the Oyster Bay church on Long Island was technically in the province. Such was the low state of the Baptist interest in what was destined to be the Empire State. Its improvement was due to John Gano, who did for the Middle States what his brother Huguenot, Francis Pelot, did for South Carolina.

Two other bodies of Baptists remain for notice, both due to immigration to Pennsylvania from Germany. The "Colleges of Piety" which arose there in imitation of the Collegiants who originated at Rynsburg in Holland, led in a few cases to the adoption of Baptist principles. This can be traced in von Hochenau's Confession of 1702 at Detmold. Even in the Palatinate there was no love for dissenters, and when Penn travelled to advertise that land was granted cheaply to those persecuted for conscience sake, emigration rapidly swelled, and brought to his province a most extraordinary assortment of refugees. Among them were many Baptists, the denomination dating from Alexander Mack; the early settlers sent back such good reports that every German Baptist community crossed the ocean, leaving none at all in their former land. They are not to be confounded with the Mennonites; their new neighbours called them Dunkards, Dunkers, Tunkers, but they style themselves German Baptist Brethren.

An offshoot from them adopted the Seventh-day, and clustered at Ephrata near Lancaster. Here many hermits lived in cabins, others were organised into a brotherhood, which was matched by a sisterhood, the two communities having extensive buildings for dormitories, refectories, worship, industries of many kinds, including a printing-press and bindery whence went forth propaganda works and much done for other

Germans. Around the central cluster of buildings were many farms taken up by more ordinary German Seventh-day Baptists. About 1750 these were at their zenith, but the celibate communities attracted few recruits, and the advent of Lutheran pastors drew off the younger generation, so that the sect to-day barely survives at Snow Hill. A colony that had gone along the Shenandoah valley, to Virginia and across the mountains into the Mississippi basin seemed in 1750 most promising; but the French were aiming to dominate that region, and exterminated the settlement seven years later, the few prisoners dying in a monastery in France. The Ephrata community deserves notice for having founded Sunday-schools a generation before they were gathered in England; seeing that the needs of frontier settlements claimed the children as workers, they used the Saturday to teach their own children, and the Sunday to teach the children of those who took that as their day of rest.

The main body of the German Baptists clustered round Germantown, though a fresh immigration from Gimbshheim in 1749 caused the settling of Bermudian in York county. Christoph Sauer is well known as a leading printer, who not only did for his compatriots all that his rival Franklin did for the English, but also published for them a Family Bible, before any Bible in English had been printed in America, and followed it up with a pocket Testament and a Psalter. Alexander Mack had a son of the same name, who travelled widely and then settled down in 1748 to shepherd the community. To him it is usually ascribed that they increased and so became an important factor in the life of the province, though their retention of many customs long since abandoned by English Baptists causes them often to be regarded with some amusement. To-day they number nearly 100,000.

The Baptist Board Minutes.

Continued from VI., 118; Notes on page 69.

A List of the present Members of this Body, June 27th, 1820.

1774; John Rippon; [pastor of] Carter Lane; [original residence quite obliterated and replaced by] No 17 Dover Place, New Kent Road; Died Dec. 17th 1836.

1774; Will^m Button; [late of Dean Street.]

1780; Timy Thomas; [of] Devonshire Sq^{re}; [at] Lower St Islington.

1784; Tho^s Powell; [of] Mitchel St. Old St; [at] Holloway; Died Jan 11th 1846

1784; Ja^s Dore; Died 20.3.25

1793; Rob^t Burnside; [of] Farmer's Rents; [at] Snows Fields; [from] Wild St.

1794; John Ovington; [of] Clapham; [at] Clapham. Withdrew.

1795; Tho^s Hutchings; [of] Unicorn Yard; [at] Spa Place, Spa Road, Bermondsey.

1795; Will^m Newman; [of] Bow; [at] Stepney Green [*corrected to* Bow]; [from] Waltham Abbey; Died Dec. 22. 1855

1797; Josh^h Hughes; [of] Battersèa; [at] Battersea.

1805; Josh^h Ivimey; [of] Eagle St; [at] 41 Harpur St Theobalds Rd [*corrected to* 51 Devonshire Street Queen Square]; [from] Portsea.

1805; [Will^m] Shenston; [of Little Alie St]; [residence carefully and thoroughly erased]; [from Eagle St.]¹²²

1805; James Upton; [of] Church St; [at] 4 Brunswick St., Surry Rd; [from] Waltham Abbey. Died 22.9.34.

1810; [J. B.] Shenston; [of no church]; [residence thoroughly erased, as also from whence]¹²³

1810; J. J. Douglas; [at] Chamber St [*corrected to 25 Mary Ann Street, Splid's Fields*]; [from] Carter Lane

1811; F. A. Cox; [of] Hackney; [at] Hackney. Died Sep. 5. 1853

1813; Tho^s Griffin; [of] Prescot St; [at] Stepney Green [*corrected to Bedford Square Melcead*] Removed to Hitchen Hert.

1814; John [*corrected from Joseph*] Kingsford; [of] Battersea Fields; [at] Savage Gardens [*corrected to 144 Fenchurch Street*].

1815; Ja^s Hoby; [of] Maze Pond; [at] Paragon New Kent Road; [from] Eagle St. Died 20.11.71.

1815; Solomon Young; [at] Stepney Green.

1816; Sam^l Bligh; [at] White Chapel; [from] Waltham Abbey.

1816; John Chin; [of] Lyon St Walworth; [at] Grosvenor Street Camberwell [*corrected to Gloucester House Walworth*]; [from] Church St.

1817; John Edwards; [of] Wild St [*corrected to Watford*]; [at, in pencil] 21 Thornhaugh Street

1817; George Pritchard; [of] Kepple St; [at] Thornhaugh Street. 16; [from] Kepple St.

1818; Owen Clark; [of] Chealsea; [at] Chealsea.

1818; Thomas Uppadine; [of] Hammersmith; [at] Hammersmith.

1818; Wil^m Belsher [*corrected from James Belcher*] [of] Burton Cresent [*corrected to Greenwich*]; [at] Clarendon Square Sommers Town [*corrected to Greenwich*].

1819; William Williams; [of] Grafton Street; [at] 6 Frederic St Regents Park.

1819; J. M. Cramp; [of] Dean St; [at] 1 Buckingham place Old Kent Road [*corrected to* Chapel Place, Long Lane, Borough]; Removed to Margate [strictly speaking, St. Peters, 1827].

1819; Richard Davis; [of] East St Walworth; [at] 3 Gt Richmond Place [*corrected to* East Lane]; [from] Chatham [and Plymouth Dock].

1819; Jas Elvey; [of] Clerkenwell Green [*corrected to* St John Street *then to* Fetter Lane]; [*originally no address, then* 97 Arlington Place St. Jno St Road *then* 6 Apollo Buildings

1820; Josiah Denham; [at] 54 Cotton St Poplar. Removed into Country [Lewes 1822]

1820; John Dyer; [Secretary B.M.S.]; [at] Battersea [crossed out]

1820; Edward Lewis; [of] Highgate; [at] Highgate [*corrected to* Upper Holloway; from Manchester.]¹²⁴

[subsequent entries]

1824; Edw^d Steane; [of] Camberwell; [at] Camberwell.

1824; James Hargreaves; [of] Wild Street; [at] 29 Charles Street. City Road; [from Ogden; in 1829 to] Waltham Abbey.

1825; Tho^s Price; [of] Devonshire Square; [at] 10 Durham Place Hackney Road

1825; John Peacock; [of] Goswell Street; [at] No 21 Powel St. Goswell St Rd [*corrected to* 5 Northampton Terrrace City Road]

1825; John Jeffries; [of] Lambeth; [at] 20 George St Grays Walk Lambeth

1826; T. C. Mileham [interpolated, and then above]

1826; Jas Upton Jun^r Poplar [transposed from below next]

1826; Isaac Mann; [of] Maze Pond; [at] Claremont Cottage Stoke Newington [*corrected to 46 Long Lane, Bermondsey.*]

1828; W. H. Murch; [at] Stepney Academy

1828; S. Tomkins; do. do.

1828; Tho^s Hunt; [at] Clapton Upper

This List continued at the end of the Book [rewritten in 1830, when it will be reproduced.]

June 27th [1820]

At this meeting Mr O Clark presented to the Chairman a paper of which the following is a copy— It having been decided by this Society that it is both practicable & desirable to form an Association of the Baptist Ministers, & Churches of London & its environs, and such decision having been unanimously sanctioned by the general Meeting of this denomination held in Carter Lane June 20 1820. Res^d—That a Committe be now appointed to define the objects of such Association and to prepare suitable rules & regulations for its government and the attainment of its general Objects. That Dr Rippon Mr Shenston Mr. Pritchard Mr Griffin & Mr Davis be that Committee, and that they report the result of their proceedings to a special General Meeting of this Society to be summoned by the Secretary for that purpose

After some consultation it was Res^d. That the consideration of the Above Resolution be deferd till 'day forthnight.

July 11th

At this Meeting the resolution proposed for consideration on the 27th of June was finally adopted. Mr Ivimey & Mr Clark were added to the Committe and

it was agreed that they do meet at the Missionary rooms in Wood St on Monday the 24th Ins at 10 o Clock

Dr Rippon having promised to give paper sufficient to print 10000 Tracts—It was this Even^g Res^d—That 2500 of Dr Rylands six views of believers baptism be printed—the concurrence of Dr Ryland to be sought by Dr Rippon

It was at the same time agree'd to request our Brethⁿ Dyer & Ivimey to prepare a Tract on Nonconformity, the basis of which to be Mr Palmers Catechism

Aug^t 8, 1820

Res^d—That the commencement of the monthly Prayer Meeting be postponed till next month.

Res^d That this body be summoned for next Tuesday the 15th Inst, then finally to arrange the List of persons to be engaged in the proposed Monthly Prayer Meeting.

At this Meeting a Report was presented by the Committe appointed June the 27th to define the Objects and prepare the rules of a proposed Association; Which having been read it was agree'd that the further consideration of this subject do stand over till Tuesday Sep^r the 5th, and that the Members be summoned for that purpose.

Aug 22th [corrected from 25th]

Res^d That a Prayer Meeting be held & an Address be delivered by the Pastors of this Society & that as many of the Brethⁿ who are not Pastors, who are so disposed, be requested to join with them in the devotional Exercises.

Aug^t 29, 1820

At this Meeting it was Resolved that the Minute of last Week be confirmed

Res^d That a List of persons to engage in the Prayer Meetings be printed and a Proof sheet brought here next Tesday

Res^d That Brethⁿ Burnside Hughes & Uppadine be written to, to ascertain if it will be convenient for them to attend if their Names are inserted in the List

Sep^r 5, 1820

The body having been summoned for this Even^g there were present M^r Griffin in the Chair Mess^{rs} Ovington Shenston Newman Edwards Ivimey, Pritchard, J. B. Shenston, Button Denham, Douglas, Kingsford, Clarke, Young Bligh, Williams & Davis

At this Meeting was produced a Proof sheet of the List of Persons to be engaged in the Monthly Prayer Meeting. Several alter^{ns} were agree'd to & 500 Copies ordered to be printed

At this Meeting the Report of the Committee appointed June the 27th was read, & the subject thereof was discussed till the time of breaking up when it was unanimously agree'd to Adjourn the further consideration of the subject till next week

Sep^r 12th, 1820

Dr Rippon in the Chair Present Brethⁿ Griffin, Dyer, Newman, Davis, Button, Upton Williams, J, B, Shenston, Douglass, Denham Clarke, Elvey, Lewis, Coles Shenston & Pritchard

At this Meeting the consideration of the Rules of a proposed Association was resumed when several alterations were suggested, and the revision of them committed to the following Brethⁿ Dr Rippon, Dr Newman Mess^{rs} Griffin Ivimey, Dyer, Pritchard & Shenston.

The above Committe to meet on Monday next the 18th Inst at No 15 Wood St at 11 oClock three of whome to be a Quorum¹²⁵

[At this point the secretary who had entered minutes from April 25, ended his work, and no minutes were entered for 27 months. Then without any explanation minutes were resumed in the writing of March & April 1820. William Shenston and Pritchard were joint secretaries.]

Jamaica Coffee-house Dec. 10th 1822. Dr Rippon in the Chair. Brother Dyer as one of the Secretaries to the Baptist Missionary Society in the name of the Committee of that Society invited the Ministers assembling in this place to hold their meetings in future at the house rented by the Baptist Missionary Society N^o 6 Fen Court Fenchurch Street.

After some conversation it was resolved that the Body be summoned for the 17th instant to take this subject into consideration.

Jamaica Coffee-house Dec 17. 1822 [originally, Jan 17th 1822, then Jan 17th 1823] Dr Rippon in the Chair. The subject of removing to Fen Court having been pretty fully considered it was unanimously resolved that brother Dyer having communicated from the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society that a Room in their house in Fen-Court is at the service of this Body that we respectfully accept their kind invitation and the Secretary was requested to make Mr Dyer acquainted with this resolution.

Jamaica Coffee-house Dec 31st 1822 Dr Rippon in the Chair. The subject of removing to Fen-Court was again introduced and there being some difference of opinion it was resolved that the Body be summoned for the 14th of Jan. 1823 to reconsider this business.

Jamaica Coffee-house Jan 14th 1823. Brother Thomas in the Chair. The Body being specially convened to reconsider their acceptance of the kind invitation which they had received from the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society to their house

Fen-Court: after much deliberation it was Resolved, that the further consideration of this subject do stand over till the second Tuesday in next March: and that the Secretary be requested to state that whatever may be the final determination of the Ministers they feel much indebted to the Committee of the Baptist Missionary Society for their respectful attention.

Jamaica Coffee-house March 11th 1823. Dr Rippon in the Chair. The body having been specially summoned it was moved seconded and unanimously agreed that this body do remove to Fen Court, according to the vote of Dec. 17 1822. The Chairman informed the Landlord that it was the intention of the body to remove at Midsummer next.

Jamaica Coffee-house. March 25, 1823. Dr Newman in the Chair. Resolved that brethren Cramp, Lewis, & the Secretary be the Committee to attend the General Body at Red Cross Street for next year.

Report of the present year. Brethren Coles, Denham & Clarke removed into the Country.¹³⁶

At this meeting a Mr Perkins attended requesting the consideration of his case: resolved that the Secretary inform him that his case cannot be referred to earlier than next Tuesday week.

Jamaica Coffee-house April 8 1823. The case of Mr Perkins having been taken into consideration: Resolved that after having deliberately considered what we heard from Mr Perkins we are unanimously of opinion that we cannot interfere in the business until Mr Perkins has sought reconciliation to the Church and Ministers with whom he was connected at Bristol.

Jamaica Coffee-house April 15. 1823. Dr Newman in the Chair. A letter addressed to the Secretary from Mr Perkins was laid upon the table. After much conversation it was Resolved that this body, having

already replied to the application of Mr Perkins, decline proceeding further in the business and have returned his paper unread.

Jamaica Coffee-house June 24 1823 Dr Rippon in the Chair. The time being come for the removal of the Society from this place to Fen-Court the Rent being paid up to this day and the usual gratuity presented to the Waiters the Secretary was requested to summon the body for next Tuesday the 1st of July to meet at N^o 6 Fen-Court at 4 o'Clock in the afternoon that the meetings of the Society in that place may commence with solemn prayer to God.

Fen Court July 1st 1823. Dr Rippon in the Chair. Present brethren Dr Newman, Mess^{rs} Ivimey, Davis, W. Shenston, J. Shenston, Cramp, Kingsford, Pritchard, Douglas. Visitors Mess^{rs} Exall, Mileham, Fisher and Cattle¹²⁷

It having been agreed that as this was the first meeting of the Body at Fen Court some time should be occupied in prayer the Chairman called upon the following brethren successively to engage, Dr Newman, brethren Shenston and Ivimey, and the Chairman concluded. Parts of three Hymns were sung

It having been mentioned that a large place near Mile-End Whitechapel might be obtained for preaching brethren W. Shenston J. Shenston Davis and Ivimey were requested to make inquiries and report on Tuesday next.

Fen Court July the 8. 1823. The inquiries concerning the place for preach near Mile End Whitechapel not proving satisfactory it was given up.

Fen Court. Feb. 3 1824. Present Mr Dyer (in the Chair) Upton, Ivimey, Shenston, J. Shenston, Dr Newman, Griffin, Lewis, Cramp, Douglas, Pritchard. Fisher visitor.

Brother Ivimey having introduced some remarks on the subject of the Slave trade it was resolved that he be requested to correspond with Mr Buxton for the purpose of obtaining such information as may assist this body in any subsequent measure they may deem it expedient to take.

Mr Steine having been proposed at a former meeting resolved that he be received as a member of the body. Resolved that the members of this body be summoned for Tuesday the 17th instant to consider and revise the existing laws of this society.¹²⁸

Fen Court. Feb. 17. 1824. Present Dr Rippon, (in the Chair) Mess^{rs} Davis, Shenston, Belcher, Bligh Williams, Kingsford, J Shenston, Douglas, Dr Newman, Griffin, Young, Cox, Edwards, Lewis, Dyer, Cramp, Pritchard.

The Rules of the Society having been read it was Resolved, that the word "three" in Rule II be altered to six.

Resolved. That the application to the Secretary, required in the third rule, be changed from written to verbal.

Resolved. That the second Tuesday in every month be the day for discussing subjects.

Resolved. That brother Bligh be requested to become joint Secretary with brother Pritchard.

Fen Court March 30. 1824

Present. Dr Newman (in the Chair) Mess^{rs} J. B. Shenston W. Shenston, Davis, Lewis, Douglas, Bligh.

Report of this Society for the year 1824 to the general body, meeting at the Library Red Cross Street.

That Mr Stein of Camberwell has been admitted member of this Society

Resolved. That brethren W. Shenston J. B. Shenston and Bligh be the Committee for next year.

Fen Court. April 6. 1824

Resolved that Mr Hargreaves of Wild Street be admitted a member of this body.

Fen Court. April 13. 1824

Present, Dr Newman (in the Chair) Messrs W. Shenston, Williams, Cramp, Dyer, Kingsford, Young, Lewis, Bligh.

Resolved, that, an application having been made to this body for advice respecting a place of worship in Rotherhithe occupied by a Church under the pastoral care of Mr Norris, that brethren Dyer and Kingsford be deputed to make such enquiries as they shall deem necessary.

Fen Court. May 4. 1824

Present Mr Cramp (in the Chair) Messrs Davis, Kingsford, J. B. Shenston, Williams, Lewis, Bligh.

Resolved, on the Motion of Mr Kingsford, seconded by Mr Davis, that the members of this Body be summoned for Tuesday June 1 [after two alterations] to take into consideration the falling off in the attendance of this body, since its removal from the Jamaica Coffee House.

Present Dr Newman (in the Chair) Messrs Dyer, Young, Hargreaves, Lewis, Upton [Bligh *obliterated*] Douglas, Pritchard, Ivimey, Kingsford, W. Shenston, J B Shenston, Bligh.

Resolved, that Mr Thos Price, of Devonshire Square be admitted a Member of this Society

Fen Court April 12. 1825

Present Dr Newman (in the Chair) Messrs Ivimey, Davis, Hargreaves, J. B. Shenston, Pritchard, Lewis, Cramp, Bligh

Report of this Society for the year 1825 to the General Body meeting at the Library in Red Cross Street

That Mr Price of Devonshire Square has been admitted a member of this Society

That Mr James Dore of Walworth died Mar 20th. Resolved, that Brethren Ivimey, Davis, & Hargreaves be the Committee for the next year

Fen Court Aug 2 1825

Present. Mess^{rs} Pritchard, Belsher, W. Shenston, J. B. Shenston, Dyer, Bligh

Resolved, that the Body be summoned for this day fortnight to consider the proposal of two ministers to become members of this society.

[The minutes continue scanty, recording chiefly (1) only new elections, which are duly summarised in the list of 1830; (2) dissatisfaction with the place of meeting, and scant attendance; until:—]

Fen Court Oct^r 28. 1828

Present Dr Newman (in the Chair,) Mess^{rs} W. Shenston, J. B. Shenston, Lewis, Dovey, Young, Mileham, Gibbs & Bligh.

Resolved, that the Secretary be requested to apply to Mr Ivimey for the old book containing the Minutes of the transactions of this Society.

[After meetings on Nov. 25, Dec. 2, Dec. 23]

Fen Court Feb 25. 1829

Present, Dr Newman (in the Chair,) and about 18 brethren (whose names were not taken)

Resolved, on the Motion of Mr Dyer, that the Body be summon'd for the 10th of March to take into consideration how far it is consistent on our parts to retain a public and acknowledged connexion, as

Ministers of the Gospel of Christ, with Men whose sentiments we consider to be wholly opposed to the Gospel.¹²⁹

[after meetings on Mar 10, 24, 31, Nov 3]

Fen Court Nov. 17. 1829

Present Dr Newman (in the chair) Messrs Ivimey, Williams, J. B. Shenston, Thomas, Dovey, Young, Murch, Dyer, Davis, Lewis, Douglas, Kingsford and Pritchard.

Resolved unanimously, that this body, having heard, with much regret, of the removed, by death, of their esteemed brother, Mr Samuel Bligh, do, by this minute, record their affectionate remembrance of him, and of his services, as one of the Secretaries of this body, during more than the last five years of his life.

Resolved unanimously that Mr J. B. Shenston be requested to take the office of Secretary, become vacant by the death of Mr Bligh.

[He proceeded to draw up a new list of members, which he subsequently continued, and annotated, and forged, till the book was full by 1836.]

A compleat List of the Members of this Body January, One thousand Eight Hundred & Thirty NB those marked * are not members of the General Body at Red Cross St, see [Feb. 1830]

- 1774 Rippon John DD; [Station at] Carter Lane Tooleys St; [Residence] N^o 17 (New Kent Road) Dover place Died Dec. 17. 1836
- 1794 Ovington John; Clapham; Clapham. Withdrew
- 1795 Newman Wil^m DD; Bow Middlesex; Bow Middlesex; [From] Waltham abbey Essex
- 1797 Hughes Joseph A.M; Battersea Died 3.10.33; Battersea

- 1805 Ivimey Joseph*; Eagle Street Holborn Secretary to Bp Irish Society; 14 Southampton Row Russel Square [*corrected to* Devonshire St Queen Sq]; [From] Portsea Died 8-2.34
- 1805¹³⁰ Shenston William*; Little Alie Street; Bedford Square Mile End; [From] Eagle Street died 27 June 1833
- 1805 Upton James sen^r; Church Street Blackfriars; 4 Brunswick St Surry Rd; [From] Waltham Abbey died 22.9.34
- 1810¹³⁰ Shenston John Brittain Member of General Body 1800; Eldon Street (Sabbatarian) & Crouch End Hornsey Midx The Secretary; 244 Shoreditch; [From] Church Lane Whitechapel (General Baptist) John Brittain & Dan Taylor. [Subsequently added] Mr Brittain his Uncle from the park Meeting now Suffolk Street
- 1810 Douglas J J; Mary Ann Street Speeds fields St Georges East; [From] Carter Lane Died 22 May 1843
- 1811 Cox F. A. LL.D; Hackney Librarian to the London University & Secrtary to the Baptist Home Mis^y Society; Hackney or at the Universtaty [in Gower Street]; Died Sep. 5. 1853
- 1813 Griffin Thomas; Prescott St Goodmans fields; Bedford Square East. Removed to Hitchin
- 1814 Kingsford John (Gen^l Body 1802) [Residence] 147 Finch Street; [From] General Baptists
- 1816 Chin John; Lion St Walworth; Gloucester house Walworth [*corrected to* 2 Grosvenor St Camberwell]
- 1817 Edwards John; Watford Hertfordshire Secretary to Bap. Home Mis^y Society; 21 Thornhaugh Street [*corrected to* Clapham Surry]. Died 7.6.81

- 1817 Pritchard George; Kepple Street Secretary to the Baptist Irish Society; 16 Thornhaugh Street [*corrected to 4 York Place Pentonville*]; [From] Kepple Street John Martin
- 1818 Uppadine Thomas; Hammersmith; Hammersmith; Died Sep. 23. 1837.
- 1818 Belsher William; Greenwich; Greenwich
- 1819 Williams William; Grafton Street; 6 [*corrected to 15*] Frederick St Regents Park
- 1819 Davies Richard*; East Lane Walworth; 6 Apollo Buildings Walworth; [From] Chatham Kent Mr Notts Died 17.6.32
- 1819 Elvey James; Fetter Lane Holborn; 5 Green Terrace Spa Fields; [From] Mitcham (Independent) Died 27.1.1842.
- 1820 Dyer John*; Secretary to Bap Mis^y Society; Missionary House Fen Court; [From] Reading
- 1820 Lewis Edward; Highgate; Upper Holloway
- 1824 Steane Edward; Camberwell; Camberwell Died 8.5.82
- 1824 Hargreaves James; Waltham Abbey Secretary to Bap. Building fund; Waltham Abbey
- 1825 Price Thomas; Devonshire Square (place Rebuilt this last year); Spital Square
- 1825 Peacock John; Goswell St Road; 5 Northampton City Rd
- 1825 Jeffery John T.; Gray's Walk Lambeth; 22 Gray's Walk. Removed to New Mill Tring Herts
- 1825 Upton James Jun^r; Cotton St Poplar; 2 Eastcott Place, East India Rd
- 1826 Mann Isaac AM; Maze Pond Secretary to the Baptist Building fund; 46 Long lane Bermondsey
- 1828 Murch W. H.; Theological Tutor; Stepney College

- 1828 Tomkins Sam^l AM; Classical Tutor to do; do
 1828 Hunt Thomas; [Residence] Upper Clapton
 1828 Weare W^m [Residence] Enfield Withdrew
 1828 Brawn Sam^l; Loughton; Loughton Died
 18.4.69
 1828 Rowland J^{no}; Eldon Street Welsh Church; 6
 Tooleys Gateway Tooley Street [*corrected to*
 2 Nonstowe Alley Wilson St *corrected again*
 to Finsbury Sq Princes Sq
 1828 Jay W^m; Burton Crescent
 1828 Hutchings W^m Chelsea Removed to the
 Country
 1828 Dovey W^m; Jamaica Row Bermondsey; No 1
 Jamaca Row Bermondsey [*corrected to 37 King*
 St Clerkenwell]
 1828 Young W^m; Alfred Place Old Kent Road;
 4 Commercial Place Old Kent Rd
 1828 Lewis Benjⁿ*; Dean Street; 21 Warner Street
 Dover Road; [From] 56 Trinity Square
 1828 Gibbs George; Unicorn Yard; Brunswick
 House Peckham
 1828 Woolacott Christopher*; Westminster; 12
 Queen Street Westminster [*corrected to 14*
 Wilmots Street Brunswick Square] Died 2.1.79
 1828 Dawson Jabez; Blandford Street; 27 Win-
 chester Row Edgware Rd Remove to
 Sheerness
 1828 Eason Tho^s* Homerton; 22 Norman Build-
 ings St Lukes [*corrected to No 18 Roberts St*
 Hoxton nr New Ch] Removed to Chatteress
 1828 Blundell Tho^s; Withdrawn July 23. 1832 [written
 over a complete erasure]; Mill Hill Grammar
 School finally went into the Est. Ch.
 1828 Jay W^m*; City Road; 15 Chapel Street Penton-
 ville Removed to Hertford when Renounced
 the Ministry

- 1828 Davies J. J.; Tottenham; Tottenham
- 1828 Thomas Thos; Henrietta Street; 36 Hunter St
Brunswick Sq^r [*corrected to 6 Kings Terrace
North Lower R pentonville*] to Wales Died
7.12.81
- 1828 Birt Isaiah; Hackney (Dr Cox's); Hackney;
Died Nov^r. 1. 1837
- 1828 Southwood Wm*; Kensington; Notting Hill
Square [*corrected to 10 Holland St Kensington*]
Removed to Dunmow Now in America
- 1829 Smith Jas.; Ilford [*corrected to Shoreditch*];
Ilford [*corrected to 7 Trafalgar place Nacty
Road*] Died Feb. 11. 1839.
- [subsequent additions]
- 1830 I[ohn D.] Blakeman; Crayford Kent; [From]
Sheerness Isle of Sheppey to Easum [Evesham].
- 1830 John Eustace Giles: Salters Hall Cannon St;
No 9 Lincoln place New North Rd [*corrected
to 1 Lansdowne place Holloway*]; [From] Bristol
College Died 24.6.75
- 1831 Joseph Belcher; Paradise Chapel Chelsea; No
9 King's St Chelsea [*corrected to 6 Union place
Black Heath Rd Greenwich*]; [From] Folkestone
Kent
- 1832 C. Stovel Died 22.10.83; Prescott Street; 31
Princes Sq^r St George in East; from Swanwick
Derby 26 finsbury Circus
- 1832 Woodman C. Bathurst; Wellington place Stoke
Newington; No 6 Ebenezer Ct Shoreditch [*cor-
rected to 4 Habberton St Islington, corrected
again to 3 Gibsons Sq^r Islington*]
- 1832 Ragsdell William; Brentford Midx Withdrew
by letter
- 1832 Dickerson Philip; Alie St Goodmans fields;
No 33 Jubilee place Commercial Rd or 99
Newgate St Died 22.10.82

- 1832 Rothery Joseph; Gee St Goswell St; N. 12
Tabernacle Row
- 1833 Davis Joseph; Church St Blackfriars Road; 28
Gravel Lane Southwark [*corrected to 18*
Hatfield St Stamford St] Died 23.10.81
- 1833 Morris Thomas; Eldon St (Welsh Church); 5
New Gloucester St Hoxton [*corrected to 2*
Georges Build^s Old St Road] Returned to
Wales
- 1833 Gundry Jonathan; Hendon Middlesex; [From]
Mr Lewis's Ch. Highgate
- 1833 Davis John; Walworth to the Country
- 1834 Watts John; Maze Pond; 22 Warner St Dover
Road
- 1834 Clark Edmund; Battersea Returned back to
Truro
- 1835 Overbury R.W.; Eagle Street; Wakefield St
Regent Square
- 1835 Cubitt James; Illford; Illford Essex; Stratford
upon Avon
- 1835 Hewlet Sam^l Romney St Westminster; 6
Vincent Street Vincent Sq^r Westminster
- 1835 Green Sam^l; Lion St Walworth; 61 Queens
Row Walworth Died 25.5.83
- 1835 Room Charles; Park Street Borough; 17 Old
Bond St Died 25.5.83.
- 1835 Davis Eliel; Grays Walk; 13 Princes Road
Lambeth
- 1835 Edgecombe J.P.; 50 Wellington St Bermondsey
- 1835 Denham D; 2 Surry Place Surry Sq^r Black-
friars R^d
- 1836 Enoch Crook; Battersea Died 28.6.37
- 1836 Roe Charles Hill; Clapham

[three lines unused, end the second volume]

[Summary of the more exceptional

Minutes 1830-1835, in volume II.]

Early in 1830, Dyer, Ivimey, Richard Davies, Eason, withdrew from the General Body; the Board refused to enter a paper of reasons.

Each person taking Tea, pay Six pence, and a fund be raised to enable the Secretary to pay the remaining Six pence and to discharge the incidental expences of the Board, by a subscription of Eighteen pence Per Quarter.

Mr. Woodrow was deemed Ineligible on account of his not having been the Pastor of a Church.

An opinion was sought by the Trustees of Davis's Sabbatarian Charity Estates as to their dealing with the Mill Yard premises; it was given, and the Trustees referred the matter to the General Body who after four days by a majority of 8 gave a different opinion, on which the Trustees acted during 1831.

The Principles and object of the British & Foreign Temperance Society were approved unanimously on 24 September 1833

An overture from Sussex ministers to convene representatives of all orthodox dissenters & decide on Parliamentary measures, was declined on 12 November, but the Board sympathised with the views as to the alliance between Church & State, pledging to use all legitimate means to dissolve it.

Troubles in the church at Shoreditch, & the refusal of C. B. Woodman to Submit to investigation of his conduct, when no accuser would allege any charge, ended on 25 February with an acknowledgment that nothing had be proved against him.

An address on Slavery to the pastors and members of the Baptist Denomination throughout the United States of America, adopted 31 December 1833, elicited a long reasoned reply from the Board of Foreign

Missions dated 1 September 1834 & considered on 10 November; the gist of it was that the Constitution of the U.S.A. made it impossible to act unitedly, & that the rules of the Triennial Convention did not allow the address to be presented.

Carried by a majority of one in a meeting of nineteen, on 14 February 1834 that it was inconsistent for dissenting ministers to receive the grants of Parliament annually made in their favour.

A petition to both houses of Parliament was adopted on 11 March 1834, to appoint civil registrars of births marriages & deaths, to open the universities of Oxford Cambridge & Durham free of religious tests, to abolish all ecclesiastical demands on dissenters, to permit dissenting ministers to officiate a funerals in parochial burying grounds, to end all grants of public money in favour of any religious establishment.

The Board heard on 27 May 1834 the draft report which the Secretary of the Baptist Union had prepared, "and ordered it to be read accordingly"! It cordially approved the proposal to send two brethren to the Triennial Baptist Convention at Richmond in Virginia, with an address on slavery. On 8 July it united in recommending that the first of August be set apart for thanksgiving that slavery was abolished in the British Colonies.

The objects of the British Voluntary Church Society were approved on 16 December 1834.

On the proposal of the London Baptist Building Fund, agreed to sign no more cases, but refer all to that fund: 17 February 1835.

The second book closes with the list of members as presented to the annual meeting on 17 March 1835. The list was avowedly begun in 1830, and was constantly annotated, with erasures, alterations, additions.

NOTES TO THE MINUTES.

122. This entry has been most carefully tampered with, and the final reading is:—"J.B. Shenston; was a Member of General Body as a General Baptist 1800; 244 Shoreditch; [from] Park Meeting Southwark General Baptist." This is part of a consistent falsifying of records. On the principle *Cui bono?* the falsifier was probably J. B. Shenston. He became Secretary in 1829, and scarcely anybody but a secretary would have the opportunity for a long series of alterations. But when he drew up the list of 1830 he still wrote truthfully, and the entries were so long that he could not subsequently erase all, and was obliged to alter the dates, producing this sequence:—1805, 1810 William Shenston, 1805 James Upton, 1805 John Brittain Shenston, 1810 &c. The erasures in the list of 1820 show one space here of the shape of Will^m, and two spaces below of the shape for J.B. The address erased here was of three words, corresponding to Little Alie St; those words entered below are in the writing of J.B. and not of the original secretary. But a forger needs to be extremely careful, and two entries of 1828 remain on pages 43, 47, which are conclusive:—"Resolved that the senior member, not as respects age but the time of admission, present at our meetings, be always considered as chairman for the afternoon." "Present, Messrs W^m Shenston (in the Chair) J. B. Shenston, &c." This accords with the almost universal order of the two names in the minutes, by whomsoever drawn up. William was a prominent man in Baptist circles, constantly in demand at other churches. At this time J.B. seems to have been very insignificant, and when he did emerge in 1826 and 1829, it was greatly to the damage of his reputation, as the Baptist Magazine shows.

123. The present state of this entry is:—"Will^m Shenston [of] Little Alie St [at] Mile End [from] Eagle Street." All except the surname is in the writing of J.B., not of the original writer.

124. Other ministers within reach were:—W. Bailey of Great Alie street; James Bissett of Stoke Newington; J. Castledine of Hampstead; John George of Shouldham street; W. Groser of New Brentford; David Jones of Old Brentford, from Hereford, settled 31 January 1820; W. Jones of Cateaton street; John Keeble of Blandford street; John Knott of Bow; W. Norris of Rotherhithe; Henry Paice of Lewisham street; Thomas Powell junior of Peckham; Samuel Stennett of Cateaton street. Others who might have been expected within the next ten years were:—Thomas Eason, ordained 16 November 1820 for a church soon meeting in Homerton row; William Young, ordained 1 January 1821 over the church in a new chapel on Alfred place, Kent road;

W. House, ordained 23 May 1821 for Ship place, soon removed to Enon chapel, Clement's lane; W. Dovey, ordained 27 November 1821 for Short's gardens, soon removed to Maiden lane, Covent garden; Evan Herbert, recognised 9 April 1822 for Soho chapel, Oxford street; Robert Upton, recognised 7 May 1822 for Gray's walk, Lambeth; Daniel Davies from Merthyr, ordained 26 June 1822 for Broad wall, Stamford street, Blackfriars road; Evan Evans of a Welsh church that built in Moorfields, 1823; his successor of 1827, J. T. Rowland; John Stevens of York street, St. James square; Christopher Woollacott of Westminster, 1824; John Foreman of Hill street, Regent's park. On 17 July 1821 died John Bolton, once pastor of Spencer Street; 2 August William Button, once of Dean Street; 8 November William Smith, once of Eagle Street.

125. The matter was shelved till 18 March 1830. Though Associations were common outside London, and though many "general meetings" including laymen urged a L.B.A., yet this Fraternal always declined to move. The monthly meeting for prayer was the only other metropolitan gathering.

126. John Coles to Wokingham, Josiah Denham to Lewes, Owen Clarke to Taunton.

127. Exall from Tenterden, Mileham from Portsea, Fisher from Liverpool?, Cattle from Keynsham. Perhaps they had stayed after the meetings of 17 June.

128. The rules had been adopted four years earlier. See page 109 of this volume.

129. This refers to the fact that the Baptist Board was linked in the "General Body of the Three Denominations" with five or six General Baptist ministers, and about a score of men on the Presbyterian Board who were avowedly Unitarian. In February 1830 the minutes of March 10 were ordered to be cut out; four lines remaining on this page give only a few names of those who attended. The difficulty was tided over till 1836 when there was a disruption. Meantime some Baptists notified that they would not remain members of the General Body, though they would remain members of the Board. Their names were starred in the 1830 list. On the other hand there were General Baptist members of the General Body ineligible to this Board; and there were Particular Baptist ministers who did not care to belong to either.

130. These two dates were subsequently half erased and interchanged, with the result of making it appear that William Shenston joined in 1810 before Upton in 1805; the difference in ink and the erasure are quite obvious.

A Conscientious Objector of 1575.

A Controversy between S. B., "An English Anabaptist," and William White, Puritan, now first printed from the manuscript in "The Seconde Parte of a Register," in Dr. Williams' Library, London.

Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D., B.Litt.

IN 1575 there occurred one of those Smithfield fires that cast a lurid light on the toleration accorded by Queen Elizabeth's government to religious dissidents. In the last issue of the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society (VI., 192), mention is made of the fact that on Easter Day in that year, some thirty Anabaptists from the Low Countries were arrested at a house in Aldgate. Evans (*Early English Baptists, I., 151ff*) gives a long account of their examinations and bearing before the authorities. The Bishop of London (Sandys, not Grindal, who had been translated to York five years previously), put four questions to them, to be answered "Yes" or "No," with the consequences of freedom or death. The questions were as follows, the answers being indicated:

- "1. Whether Christ did not assume His flesh from the body of Mary? We replied that He is the Son of the Living God.
- "2. Whether infants should not be baptized? We cannot understand matters so, for we read nothing of it in the Scriptures.
- "3. Whether it was lawful for a Christian to attend to or discharge the duties of a magistrate's office? We replied that our conscience would not suffer us to do so; but we consider the magistracy as a minister of God for the protection of the servants of God.
- "4. Whether a Christian was allowed to take an oath? We again replied, our conscience would not even allow us to do so, for Christ said, 'Let your communications be yea, yea, and nay, nay.'"

Five of the number signed a recantation, in which they spoke of their previous views as "damnable and detestable heresies," and promised to join the Dutch Church in London and abandon "all and every Anabaptistical error." The rest—the numbers vary slightly in

the different accounts—remaining firm in spite of much persuasion and threatening, were sent back to prison, "fettered as before: the women were confined at Newgate, together with a young brother, but they were all released and transported. The young man, however, was tied to cart and scourged, and afterwards whipped out of town. We were in the midst of thieves and malefactors. These the bishop and a preacher worried, lest they might be corrupted by us and deceived."

To his great honour, John Foxe, the martyrologist, wrote a letter to the Queen, pleading for clemency, a letter acknowledged with gratitude by the prisoners, who sent to Foxe a defence and explanation of their opinions (Evans prints both Foxe's letter and the Anabaptists' acknowledgement). The interposition was fruitless, however, for, though two others were liberated, and one died in prison, two finished their course at Smithfield on July 22nd.

Astonishingly little information has come to light concerning the Anabaptists in this country up to the time of this incident. Apart from R. C.'s [Robert Cooche] tract, *The Confutation of the Errors of the Careless by Necessity* (c. 1557), extracted from John Knox's reply in *Trans. Bapt. Hist. Soc.*, IV., 88ff, no work by an English Anabaptist of the period is known, and Cooche's is entirely concerned with election and predestination.

It is, therefore, difficult to discover exactly what views such Anabaptists as were in England held; all that can be gathered from references by contemporaries is that the Munster atrocities had cast such a shadow over the name that it was enough to damn individuals or opinions if they could be labelled "Anabaptist," much as with the terms "Radical" or "Socialist" at different times, or with "Bolshevik" to-day. Innumerable illustrations could be given. Cf. Index to *Cal. Seconde Parte of a Register*, "Anabaptism, Puritans deny charge of, I., 26, 84, 85, 105, 144, 229; II., 80." That the Anabaptists were themselves conscious of the odium attached to their name appears from the letter of one of those arrested in 1575, quoted by Evans, I., 153: "We had to forsake our friends, our country, and our possessions, on account of tyranny, and fled as lambs from a wolf, only because of the pure, evangelical truth of Christ, and not for uproar or faction's sake, like those of Munster, whose views are an abomination, of which we have been slanderously accused."

Occasionally scholars have discussed the influence of Anabaptism on the teaching of Robert Browne and his successors, but as yet there has been no real and systematic research concerning Anabaptist congregations in London, Norwich, and elsewhere. As so little evidence is available, it is all the more remarkable that the execution of 1575

and its significance have been overlooked, even by such capable students as Dr. Rufus Jones (chapter on "Anabaptists in England," in *Studies in Mystical Religion*) and Mr. Champlin Burrage (chapter on "The Anabaptists in England before 1612," in *Early English Dissenters*). There is a real opportunity for investigators in this field. Perhaps some student will be stimulated if words written by the present writer [*A Week Among the Friends*, 1917] are repeated: "In the century before that in which George Fox began his work, there were in many parts of the country bodies of worshippers—sometimes having much in common with the Anabaptists or the Family of Love—whose views were much akin to those of Fox's followers, and it is very desirable that some scholar, Friend, or other, should begin from Rufus M. Jones' *Studies in Mystical Religion* and *Spiritual Reformers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, and discover if there is any connection between the emergence of the Quaker movement in 1646, and what looks like an inchoate Quakerism in the reign of Elizabeth."

Not only are there documents relating to the episode in the Record Office, but Evans deals with it at length, and there are references in many printed works, e.g. to mention only two, *Parker Correspondence* (Parker Soc., 479), Neal. *History of the Puritans* (1822, I., 273). Stowe, in his *Annales* (1631, 679), gives the facts so clearly as to deserve quotation:

"1575. On Easter Day, which was the 3 of Aprill, about 9 of the clocke in the forenoone, was disclosed a congregation of Anabaptists Dutchmen, in a house without the barres of Aldgate at London, whereof 27 were taken and sent to pryson, and foure of them bearing fagots recanted at Pauls Crosse on the 15 of May in forme as followeth. . . The 21 of May, being Whitsun even, one man and 10 women, Anabaptists Dutch, were in the Consistory of Paules condemned to bee burnt in Smithfield, but after great paines taken with them, onely one woman was converted, the other were banished the land. . . . The 22 of July, 2 Dutchmen Anabaptists were burnt in Smithfield, who died in great horror with roaring and crying."

Dexter (H.M. and Morton), *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*, 107-9, has some interesting extracts literally translated from a contemporaneous account (1579) of the episode. "Een Nieu Liedeken gemarckt van twee Frienden opgheoffert tot Lonnen in Enghelant, An. 1575. Op die wüss 'Babel is nu ghevalen'" (A new song composed by two friends sacrificed in London, England, in the year 1575. To the tune "Babel now is fallen.").

In his *Early English Dissenters*, I., 64, Mr. Burrage says: "While a few isolated Anabaptists are reported to have been in England at this period, there appears to be no good reason for doubting that the

Anabaptists were then generally unknown in this country. However, about 1576 there seems to have been some fear prevalent that Anabaptism might spread among the English, for it is said that in that year a [Confutation was published, and also Bicknoll's work, c. 1577]. After 1577 (?) for some years England was not especially troubled by Anabaptistical tendencies, though Robert Browne, in 1582, says he and his followers have been called 'Anabaptists' because of their attitude towards magistrates." This whole passage should be considerably revised in the light of this execution, and of frequent references in the State papers and other places. Especially does it seem possible that Edmond Bicknoll's work, mentioned by Mr. Burrage, and assigned by him to about 1577: "A swoorde against swearing, conteyning these principal poyntes, 1. That there is a lawful use of an oth, contrary to the assertion of the Manichees and Anabaptists," might have been written while the views of the Anabaptists of 1575, illuminated by the fires of Smithfield, were before men's minds. One quotation will serve to show the similarity between the points Bicknoll urges in "Anabaptista and Manachei," and those White presses on S.B. (1579 ed. Biiij verso—5 recto): "1. Gods commaundement unto his people, to swear by his name. 2. [Swearing by strange gods forbidden.]. 3. The example of God, swearng for our capacitie. 4. Examples of Patriarkes, Prophetes, Apostles, and Christe hym selfe, which in no case can be contrary unto God his father."

With the situation now detailed, it is possible to turn to the document here printed. In the present writer's *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, a calendar of manuscripts now in the Dr. Williams's Library, an important item dealing with these Anabaptists is briefly summarised. It chronicles a lengthy controversy between S.B., of whom nothing is known other than appears from this conference, called by the heading "an English Anabaptist"; and William White, an able, if somewhat acrid, Puritan disputant, whose Puritanism approached, if it did not sometimes become, Separatism.

The discussion arises from and concerns the opinions propounded by the imprisoned Anabaptists. The wearing and use of weapons, the employment of oaths, and the individual's attitude to princes and magistrates, are all considered, and it is clear from White's "post-script," that another letter deals with the first question put to the Anabaptists, the Incarnation.

S.B. strongly sympathises with the Anabaptists, of whom he always speaks as "the children of God"; he refuses to wear a weapon or go to law; he is willing to suffer for the Gospel, but not to fight for it; he will not take an oath, neither will he trust to the wisdom of men, however learned, meaning "to leane to a more sure pillar than

Mr. Calvin." By a question to one of the prisoners, he obtains a denial of the allegation that they held women in common, and he is content to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for those whom he believes to belong not to a sect, but to the religion of Christ.

On the other hand, White, in strong language, accuses him of schism and heresy, because he belongs to a "handful in a corner," and condemns the universal church; and of pride and arrogance, because he despises learning and the writings of learned men. Throughout the discussion White continually insinuates that S.B. and his friends are opposed to all authority and government, but S.B. protests his obedience to the Queen, and claims he has spoken no word "against Magistrates."

From the conference we gather that S.B. was a carpenter, who has not been to the University, and has little time for study, as he desires to live on no man's bounty. Though he is resolute and unwavering in his opinions, his tone throughout the discussion is restrained and humble, in this contrasting favourably with that of his opponent, whose manner is so overbearing and violent that he appears to far less advantage here than when fighting for liberty before bishops and ecclesiastical commissioners.

White calls himself a baker, and Neal is probably correct in describing him as a "substantial citizen of London," for there seems to be no ground for the statement—made by many historians following Fuller—that he was "beneficed in London." A brief sketch of White by the present writer (*Trans. Cong. Hist. Soc.*, VI., 4ff.), summarises his life and writings. [It is of interest to note that "William White" was the name of one of the "Mayflower" passengers, and a signatory to the covenant; there is no evidence to show whether there was any relationship between the namesakes.] When it is recognised how strongly he was opposed to "corruptions" in the English Church, and how far he was willing to go and how much to suffer to secure reforms, it is hard to see how he could maintain his position against S.B. Knowing, by bitter experience, and on more than one occasion, what imprisonment for conscience meant, he nevertheless makes no protest against the imprisonment and execution of the Anabaptists; telling the Commissioners that he and his fellow Puritans "resist not, but suffer that the authority layeth upon us," he remonstrates with S.B. for taking exactly the same stand. Similarly (*Brook. Lives of the Puritans*, I., 145-8n) he protests when the Lord Chief Justice makes use of an oath, and yet he has no patience with S.B.'s scruples concerning swearing, and who would imagine that it is S.B.'s opponent who speaks thus concerning princes and magistrates (*The Seconde Parts of a Register*, I., 100f):

"How if thei will not lead the way? Are we discharged? hath none made promise to keepe God's lawes but princes, prechers, and magistrates? or neede not we keepe and do his lawes except thei command us? or shall we be excused by saying, the Magistrates would not suffer us to do his will? or by saying, we would have done this, but all the learned were against us? All this will be none excuse for us; it will be sayde to us, Search the Scriptures, for in them you thinke to have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me; and we shall not be judged by our Magistrates and the wordes that thei speake [In England] there is not such asking what God will and comandeth, as what the Injunctions, what the Advertisements, etc."

One or two new facts concerning White appear in this bare chronicle of his life and writings:—

1567. June 20. Appears before Bishop Grindal, &c., as one of the leaders of the congregation taken worshipping in the Plumbers' Hall. His bearing suggests that he is young, bold, and outspoken; he knows the methods of the Genevan Church, and argues for the "Genevan book," urging that the practice of "the best reformed churches" should be followed. (The account of the examination is reprinted in Grindal, *Remains* (Parker Soc., 201ff), from *A Parte of a Register*, 23ff). Must have been released, for
- 1567/8. Mar. 4. "william whighte at St. Jones Strete (?)" appears among 77 names of a congregation taken at the house of James Tynne, goldsmith, St. Martin's-in-the-Field. (Burrage II., 9.)
1569. Apl. 22. Is discharged from Bridewell with 30 others—altogether 24 men and 7 women. (Burrage, II., 12.)
1569. Dec. 19. Again before Bishop. (Sec. Parte Reg., I., 64.)
1571. Does not appear in references to Richard Fitz's congregation, and is free, as writings show. (The present writer deals with some doubtful points concerning Separatist congregations in London at this time in a volume to be published almost immediately.)
1572. Writes a preface, "to have bene set before the Admonition to the Parliament" (printed in *The Seconde Parte of a Register*, I., 82). His close connection with Field and Wilcox appears in many ways.
1573. Dec. 21st. Thomas Wilcox writes to Gilby. "Our brother White and others with him are committed to Newgate" (Baker MSS., Vol. 32, No. 23. Cambridge University Library).
- 1573/4. Jan. 18. Appears before Commissioners and committed to the Gatehouse. (*The Seconde Parte of a Register*, I., 99, and *Brook, Lives of the Puritans*, I., 145-8n.)

1575 and 1576. The document here printed, subsequent to which no reference to White has so far been discovered.

The following papers by, and concerning White are given in *The Seconde Parte of a Register*. Numbers 58 and 65 are anonymous, but they come in the midst of White's writings in the MS. *Seconde Parte of a Register*, and may safely be attributed to him.

No. 37. I. 64. A letter to Bishop Grindal, Dec. 1569.

No. 46. I. 79. "Certaine griefes, conceived of B. Jewell's sermon" [1571].

No. 47. I. 80. "An awnswer to B. Horne[s] . . . , sermon" 1571.

No. 49. I. 82 "A preface to have bene set before the Admonition to the Parliament" [1572].

No. 58. I. 97. "That the Church of England is not a perfect Church, as some men suppose." [1573.]

No. 60. I. 99. Mr. Whits examination before the Commissioners" 1574.

No. 61. I. 100. "A brief of such things as obscure God's glory" [n.d.].

No. 62. I. 101. A letter to Edward Deering. [1574?]

No. 63. I. 102. A letter to a recusant, "Friend Dover," [n.d.]

No. 65. I. 107 A letter to the Earl of Huntingdon. [n.d.]

add the present manuscript:

No. 64. I. 103. "Mr. Whites Writinges. A Conference between a Christian and an English Anabaptist." 1575 and 1576.

On the whole, the manuscript now printed for the first time is an excellent example of Elizabethan religious controversy, and it will be read with no little interest at a time when non-resistance and the Christian's attitude to weapons and war are again the subjects of keen disputation. It will be noted that the kinship of the Anabaptist with the Quaker appears alike in this particular and in the matter of using oaths and law courts.

The document needs little in the way of editing, but it may be of service to make clear that the course of the controversy was as follows, after oral conferences:—

1. White. "My brief note."
2. S.B. Letter, referred to by White as "your former letter," or "your other letter."
3. White. "Mine answer," all not extant, followed by
4. S.B. "Your replie," dissected here by White, and
5. White. Answered by him in sections in the present letter.
6. S.B. Marginal comments.

Although there is some repetition, especially when White sums up

or repeats his opponent's argument before replying to it, the reader is carried along—with perhaps the exception of the exposition of Hebrews 6 in No. 27—alike by subject matter and dialectical display.

It would not be right for me to close this brief introduction without an expression of thanks to Dr. Whitley for various suggestions and emendations.

ALBERT PEEL.

[The temper and the argument of S.B. will be best appreciated by taking his letter as a whole, omitting White's answer marked by himself W, reading only the paragraphs marked B.—W.T.W.]

MR. WHITES WRITINGES.

A Conference between a Christian and an English Anabaptist. Before I awnswer to your reply, wherin, as allso in your other lettres, you indevor covertly to hide the grossenes and ground of your error, I have thought it good therfore to set downe the originall and first cause of all our conference and writing, that it may the better appeare to what scope, end and drifte you alledge and applie chieflie all those Scriptures and examples in your replie and saide letter contained as foloweth.

The originall and first cause of all our conference and writing began (as you knowe) by finding you in Newgate with those ix Anabaptists that were banished, where in conference with one of them, I alledged Mr. Calvin, and offered her the booke to have read his wordes, which she refused, saying she or thei did not depend upon men. To whose wordes you added as seemed to confirme hir, that if there had never bene moe bookes but the holie Scriptures onely, they had bene sufficient etc.

You also demanded of them of them [*sic*] in my presence without any cause offered, if they helde women to be common,¹ as it seemed to mee allso, even to drawe from them a purgation thereof, and to justifie them in the reste. Also at the same time and place, being come from the leades above, where thos saied 9 Anabaptists were, into the neather hall, I tooke you aside and told you that I did not believe that you were inclyning to the sect of the Ana[ba]ptists, because I had often heard such report of you, but because I had now taken you with the manner &c. To which you awnswered that you would never conceile that with your mouth which you believed in your harte, which was that of longtime you have thought it unlauffull to weare weapon, wherupon I required of you that we might have some conference about that matter; and that you would note the same with any other pointe you stood

upon, which thinge you promised to do, but before you performed your promise I mette you againe in Letch lane, where in like conference you affirmed that if a thief or a murtherer did come to robbe or kill you would perswade that he should not kill or robbe, and escape by flying if you could, but you would not use nor weare weapon nor resiste in any maner.²

Further you declared the losses you had sustained by divers that did withhold your right, but you would neither contend in lawe, complaine to the magistrate, nor warne them to the Courte of Conscience, declaring what a terror of conscience you you had for once warninge one thether. And in conclusion you greatly blamed Mr. Wiburne³ for using law against Ditcher etc, with much other like talke tending to the same or like effect, and this was the originall the first and onely cause of our conference, to the defence and approbation wherof both your firste letre and this your replie to my awnswer doth chiefly tend. Now to your reply upon mine awnswer as foloweth

B.1.

The grace of god holy spirit be with us now and allwaies. Amen.

W.

That god will take from you the spirit of error⁴ and lies, and give to you and continue with us both his grace and spirit of truth I adde to your Amen. So be it.

B.2.

Mr. White and brother in the lord, I have received your great and plentifull letter, thanking you most humblie for your great curtesy you would vouchsafe to take so great paines to write to me, being so simple and rude in understanding as I am; but God make me to understand his truth. Amen."

W.

It pleaseth you to begin your replie with verie plausible words: first: calling me Mr and Brother etc.

2: termynng my letre greate and plentifull

3: you give most humble thanks ectc.⁵

and lastlie: you cast your self downe, as it were, at my feete, in a shew of acknowledging your simplicities and rudenes in understanding etc.

Of all your great curtesie I must rest indebted somewhat. For though I acquite some part of your kindenes in calling you Mr. B. and brother, yet can I not adde in the lorde,⁶ nor account your lettres great and plentifull in any good matter, but penned and

applied to a most diuclish purpose: and therefore I could better have accepted both of you and them, if with lesse commendation, thanks, and shew of submission, you had yielded to the truth of those points in which we disagree. But it may be doubted that notwithstanding your shew of simplicitie, and rudenes in understanding, yt will fall out in the end that in your owne conceit you thinke of yourself and your owne secte to be wiser and to understand more then the whole world besides.⁷

B.3.

I did not thinke seing occasion so serued you would have writen no sooner, but that at the first sight you had bene able to have confuted my reasons, and the force of my matter, but the scriptures alledged by me, sinfull wretch, and writen with my unskillfull hande, be not so easilie confuted.

W.

Even now you begin to shew that howsoever before you pretended simplicitie and rudenes in understanding, yet you thinke very well of your self (as the rest of your secte doe). For where you have Ironicallie and in mockage saide that you did not thinke but at the first sight I was able to confute your reasons etc., you presentlie adde but the scriptures alledged by me, sinfull wretch, and writen with my unskillfull hande . . . be not so easilie awnswered. By wch wordes⁸ you bewray this meaning, that in your opinion thei can not be awnswered.

B.4.

I alledged in talke and in writing that I thought it not lawfull for me to revenge my wrongs done unto me by extremity of lawe, nor to requite any blowes given me with the like, concludinge therby that I neede weare no weapon.

W.

At the time and place before cited, that is to saye, with those Anabaptists in Newgate you there and then not by a conclusion but in plaine wordes affirmed that of long time you have thought [it] unlawfull to weare weapon: which opinion with other like you also affirmed in our second conference, and do indeuour to approve and defend in both your lettres. And albeit you would covertly hide your errors by saying it is not lawfull for you onelie to revenge wrong, and to requite blowes, yet is it manifest by the opinion and practise of you and your secte that you condemne as unlawfull, not onely the revenging of wronges and requiting of blowes etc, and that for & among your selves

onely, but do also condemne the lawfull use of lawe, the use of weapon etc, among all Christians, and so consequently all Christian Magistrates which use lawes, weapons, and munition for government and defense of their people and countries: but this doctrine you did not observe or had not well learned when you your self did weare weapon, and also at another time did not onely requite blowes with the like, but did offer a brother⁹ injuries and threatened to breake his head, that offered to you neither blowe nor evill worde.

B.5.

But you say that those things which the lord hath sanctified in their lawfull use to his holie Church ought not to be refused of any member of the same. To which I briefly awnswer, that there are things sanctified to all the whole Church, and yet may be refused of some members of the same without displeasing of God: as, for example, god hath ordeined wyne to comfort the hart of man, and yet may some live and drinke no wine, as did the Rechabites, and yet please god. The Scripture saith that mariage is honourable among all men, and St. Paul saith, let everie man have his wife and everie woman her husband, yet may not some men be without wives and some women without husbandes? Yes, for St. Paul commended the unmarried state better.

W.

I thought, as wrote in my former lettre, that I had to deale not with a contentious cavilling brother: but I finde my self now greatlie deceived, for besides many cavills wherof I shall have cause to speake after, as occasion is offered, you in these wordes before cited do shew your self not onelie a caviller, but also a very enemye,¹⁰ in falsyfying my wordes. For where in my former lettre I say that those things which God hath sanctified in their lawfull use to his whole Church ought not to be condemned as unholy by any member of the same, you for my wordes *ought not to be condemned as unholie, do adde ought not to be refused*: and then you triumph before the victorie, in awnswering your owne wordes, which deserveth like praise¹¹ as a man to fight with his owne shadowe. And because here you awnswer not me but your self, I might justlie leave you without awnswer. But least you should seeme to[o] wise in your owne conceipt, take this for awnswer. First, albeit the Rechabites refused to drinke wine, yet thei did not condemne the drinking therof as unholie or unlawfull, as you do those things

before cited. Secondly, as the Rechabites obeying their fathers will in not drinking wine please God, so their disobeying their fathers will in not dwelling in tents, did not displease God. Thirdlie, neither Rechab nor any other (except you will graunte a more ancient popedome than that of Rome) hath any authoritie to forbid the lawfull use of gods creatures as unholie to the faithfull and thankfull receivers therof. Forthly, the example of the Rechabites is not set downe to teach that absteiners from wine and other gods creatures do please god better than the faithfull and thankfull receivers therof, but to reprehend the disobedient Jewes, who were lesse careful to obey and fullfill the commandments of god their heavenlyfather, than the Rechabites were to obey and do the commaundements of their earthlie father. Likewise touching mariage, that some men may be without wives and some women without husbandes I graunt, so that none condemne mariage as unholie and unlawfull for Christians, as do the papists in their priests etc, and as you and your secte do the use of weapons, the use of law etc; neither doth Paul commend the unmarried state better, but by reason of the incommodities and troubles which mariage hath more than single life, and especially in time of persecution.

B.6.

So most men are given to revenge and fewest to suffer; do those that will not revenge, stand in a more daungerous state than the revenging and bloudthirstie man? doth the shepe of Christe his shepfold? (or els can he hurte the wolfe, though he be his greatest enemie, or any of them which are out of the shepfold)¹² ledd before the shearers & are dumbe not opening their mouth?

W.

This which you inferre would better have folowed yf you had firste sayed: as most men are given to mariage, and fewest do live unmarried, as most men do drinke wine and fewe abstaine, so most men are given to revenge, and fewest to suffer: which lacke of order I onelie note to decke your ignorance,¹³ and to commend the benefits of learning, which you and your secte to[o] little regarde, and to[o] much neglect and contemne. But to the matter: with those most which are given to revenge you seeme to include all that are not of your minde, and with those fewe that suffer you include your self and your secte. And by your demaund: whether those that will not revenge do stand in a more daungerous estate than the revenging and bloudthirsty man

etc. you do as it were inferre that all those that contend in law, that weare and use weapon, and that use the defense of the magistrate, are but revengers and bloudthirstie men. This is the charitie and perfection of you & your secte, who in respecte of your selves, one handfull in a corner, do condemne the universall Church of Christ as revengers and bloudthirsty men. Your demaund if Christs shepe doth or can hurte the wolfe is the same question that your two companions which were executed did often use, saying, where finde you that the shepe persecuteth the wolfe: by which wordes you shew this meaning, that you account you and your secte shepe, and all the princes and magistrates that punish you, and other heretiques to be wolves. Behold one parte of your obedience to princes and magistrates¹⁴: the rest will appere hereafter.

B.7.

Though Christ call his a litle flocke, you shall finde in all ages it hath not bene great. You know how many were in the time of Noah, how many were in Sodom, how many false prophets were against Micheas, how many were against Elias, how many were there that received Christ, when he came among his owne, his owne received him not? if you marke this, you may say with Esdras, there is much earth for pots, and but little for golde.¹⁵

W.

My wordes in my former letter, to which you here awnswer, are these. Though Christe call his a litle flocke, yet is it universall and 10000 times greater than a poore deceived secte, which neither is, was, or ever shall be universall. By which wordes I laboured to diswade you from the felowship of your secte, to joine and keepe unitie with the Church of Christe which is universall. So that you had here chieffie to prove¹⁶ that your secte was, is, and ever shall be universall, and that Christe his litle flocke is not universall nor greater than your deceived secte, which thing you not once touch, but alledge divers scriptures and examples, to prove the smallnes of Christs flocke, which thing was not nor never was in controversy betweene us, otherwise than before is saide. and to what end you urge those scriptures and examples I know not, except you account you and your secte Noahs and Christ his Church the old world, you etc. Lothes¹⁷ family and Christe his Church Sodom, you and your secte Micheas and Elias, and Christs Church false prophets, you metall for gold and Christe his Church metall for

pots—except I saie unto this end I know not to what end you should recite the same.

B.8.

And wheras you call the deceived poore, it is most seene that in this world these be the richest, and goddes true Church the poorest, it is shee that must wander in the deserte, with he[r] two wings from the rage of the Dragon, she must be condemned and despised & put up all her injuries. As concerning the universall Church I shall have occasion to speake of her after

[W.].

Indeed in my former lettre, I call you & your company a poore deceived secte &c, and not onelie the deceived poore, as you say, to which you should have awnswered. But that you passe over with a discourse of the rich and prosperous estate of the wicked in this world, & the poore afflicted state of Christs true Church, which matter allso is not nor was not in controversie betweene us, except you covertly account your secte¹⁸ the true Church, which must wander in the desert to be condemned, despised, etc., which meaning you the rather seeme to have in that having immediately before saide that Gods true Church must be afflicted you presently adde. As concerning the universall Church, I shall have occasion to speake of her after, so that you make a difference betwixt gods true Church mentioned before, and the universall Church of which you promise to speake after.

B.9.

Where you bid me shew better groundes for my parte, I can laye no better foundation than the holie scriptures, which is the pillar & ground of truth, on which truth god graunt me to builde and no other. amen.

Thus much by the occasion of the wordes of your firste syde of paper.

[W]

It is true that in my former lettre I willed you, either to keepe unitie with the universall Church of Christ, or els to bring better better groundes to prove your dissent lawfull, as in my saide lettre etc. So that in your awnswer you were to shew upon what groundes you leave the unitie and felowship of the universall Church of Christ and joyne your self with a sect of hereticks, or els to leave your saide sect and keepe unitie with the Church of Christe. But this you passe over with this awnswer—you can lay no better foundation than the holie scriptures, but not shewing here what scriptures those be which are your founda-

tion.¹⁹ So that you seeme here to graunte as much as before I charged you with, which is, that the whole scope and drifte of both your lettres, and all those scriptures and examples therein alledged tend to no other end than this, to prove those pointes which you affirmed in talke, and also your dissent and separation from Christs Church lawfull. Touching your generall foundation of holie scriptures etc, I awnswer, As I graunt holie scriptures understood and alledged by the same spirit by which they were first written to be a strong foundation and the pillar of truth, so being understood and alledged by that lying spirit²⁰ which deceived Achab, and hath deceived all heretiques in all ages, as it doth you and your sect at this present, as thei and you pervert and abuse the same, is a verie weake foundation and the pillar of lies. But upon this foundation and no other you pray God you may build, with Amen to that prayer, and thus you end all that you tooke occasion to awnswer as you confesse after, to the worst of my letre,²¹ wherein my awnswer to the former letre was inclosed, which it pleaseth you to name my first side of paper.

Now foloweth your replie to myne awnswer to your former letter.

B.10.

As I saide afore so say I still, I spake those thinges of my self, those that are otherwise minded have learne[d] further than I have done. The Scriptures that moved me therto I alledged, which I gather by your writing you thinke be not aptly or truely applied, but when you come in place where as you thinke you have confuted them, I will either yield or shew you the cause why I do not.

W.

You proceed in your replie affirming that you spake those things of your self, not namyng what things,²² but by adding those which are otherwise minded, have learned further than you have done, you seeme not onely to justifie your opinion touching those things here unnamed, but allso condemne the judgement of all which are contrarie mynded, as though their learning, not agreeable to your opinion, did passe the boundes of truth. What those things are here unnamed you partly name in the 4 place, but more plainlie in my brief note before this mine awnswer, wherein I shew the originall cause of all our conference. Touching those Scriptures which move you to your saide opinion, & my dislike of your unapt and untrue applying of the same, I referre to your appointed place, where you promise either to

yield or els to shew cause why you do not. But this I must tell you by the way, there had not bene a fitter place to awnswer²³ this matter than where I required the same, which was the last point you handled, as in the 9th place appeareth.

B.II.

And first in your long discourse, that princes are ordeined of god, and set up by the ordinaunce of god, I marvaile much why you should make this discourse to me, for I have neither to you nor to any other at anytime said otherwise, but confesse with Paul that thei be ordeined by god, and thei that resist them resist the ordinance of god, and so purchase to themselves damnation; and I confesse that I owne unto them all reverence, feare, dutie, and obedience, both in bodie and goods, as much as is due to Cesar, and you shall not, nor any other, speake so much of obedience to princes, nor of their calling, but I will subscribe to it; yea, if all men were of my minde, Kinges shoulde live without feare in their kingdomes; so many in this realme and other Countries would not rebell and lift up thei swordes against their princes: thei would onelie suffer for the gospell, and not fight for the gospell, contrary to the example of Christe.

W.

I blame you not for using many wordes to purge your self in this pointe, for it toucheth the quicke,²⁴ not so much toward your body and goods by our prince, for contemnyng and condemning lawfull things by her lawes commaunded, as of gods judgements toward your soules for secluding your selves from the Church of Christe to joyne with a secte of heretiques. But to your wordes. And first touching your great marvaile why I should make such a long discourse to you that princes are ordeined of god, which marvaile would easilie be removed, if you would consider that to deny that Christians may contend in lawe, may use and pray defense of the magistrate, and also weare and use weapons etc, is such a denyall of the lawfullnes of magistrates as all your pointed protestation can not cleare you therof. For albeit you say with Paul, thei are ordeined of God, that whoso resisteth them procureth to himself damnation, that you owe unto them all reverence etc. as much as is due to Cesar, and that neither I nor any other shall speake so much of obedience, nor of their calling, but you will subscribe to it, all this notwithstanding, your subscription is but with tongue and hand, for your deed & harte sheweth contrarie, of which I shall have occasion to speake more after. But if you will now know

wherin I awnswer—in joyning yourself with a secte of heretiques and secluding yourself from & contemning all publike exercises used in Christe his Church in England, wherunto not onely a prince by her lawes, but also god by his law doth commaund. But, say you, if all men were of your minde kings should live without feare. Indeede (if you meane as you say) kings should live without feare, either because you will not use nor weare any weapon, or els because you would neither use nor have a king, which your sect saieth is a vocation contrary or against the perfection of the gospell. You adde further: Thei would onely suffer for the gospell and not fight for the gospell. By which wordes you shew your dislike of the warres in other countries about religion; but as I for lacke of judgement and understanding their case can not altogether commend them, so wiser²⁵ then either you or I or 10000 such dare not condemne them. Neither doth the example of Christ so binde us to suffer for the gospell, but that in some case we may also fight for the gospell, of which I shall have occasion to speake more hereafter.

B.12.

And wheras you bring in many examples of those that have made requests to kings, I have at no time spoken against it, but that it is lawfull as thus: If one more mightie than I should defraude me of my goodes, I thinke I may speake or sue for it by way of request, if I thinke I may obtaine it, and also be sure that no hurte may come to the partie by the meanes of my suite.

W.

You graunt here that it is lawfull to make suit unto kinges, but yet with thes eircumstances: 1. by way of request, 2 beeing sure to obtaine, 3 against your superior, and lastly, being sure that no hurte may come to the partie therby. And why not, I pray you, against your equall or against your inferior though the matter rest doubtfull, and also the party both restore your owne²⁶ and be blamed, punished, or damnified for wrongfully withholding the same. And also, if it be lawfull to sue to kinges, why not at the law and also at the Courte of Conscience? both which you by expresse wordes denied to me, as is saide in the originall of the conference And further if you will not sue against any nor reveile offenders, but by your rule above saide, and that you be sure no hurte maie come to the parties, you must keepe counsaile with whores, bawdes, thieves, traitors, heretiques etc, if you know any such,²⁷ for thei being

reveiled must be punished, hanged, headed etc as their demerits deserve by the lawes of god and our Country, and by keeping Counsaile with any such you are guiltie of their sinne, and deserve the punishment.

B.13.

But this I thinke to be verie evill, if an evill man should revile me, calling me rebell and such like, and if I by friendship and extremitie of lawe, might condemne him in 100 marks, and so he will not or is not able to pay me, and I cast him [into] prison till he satisfie me, to the undoing of his wife & familie, in this doing doth my light shine before men? or are thei occasioned by this evill facte to glorifie the heavenly father? Christ saith, be mercifull, as your heavenly father is mercifull. If you be friendly to them that be friendly to you, what reward shall you have? the verie infidells do so. Marke the example of him to whom his Master forgave the great debte to[ok] his fellow by the throate for 20d.

[W].

That which you here so much dislike is indeed in some case to be disliked, but not in everycase to be condemned. God and the consciences of such as deale so, must be the onely judge²⁸ whether thei do well or no. He whome you seeme chiefly to touch & note for example herein, can shew better reasons (I doubt not) for his doing than you or I and 100 such can shew cause to the contrary; and thus much will I say in his defense whome you note your example by: that partie which reviled and dispised him the mynister of Christ²⁹ & of God did revile not onely him & Christs mynistry, but Christ also and God himself, accordinge to this saying, *He that despiseth you despiseth me etc.*, so that his light shineth never the lesse before men, nor God is never the lesse but much more glorified, by the lawfull punishing of such a one. But (as it seemeth) your common quarrell is under pretence of dislike with the rigor of the law (as you terme it) covertly as your maner is, to condemne the lawfull use therof. That which you alledge how Christ biddeth us to be mercifull, and that to our enemies, willing us to marke him to whome his lord forgave the great debte, which tooke his fellow by the throate for 200d, which it pleaseth you to name 20d,³⁰ doth not make to the contrarie but that my light may shine and god be glorified by punishing of a wicked person, as for example if a godly brother and faithfull subject should finde your crewe at your next meeting, and cause the magistrate to

apprehend you all, should not his light shine and god thereby be glorified, when the reprobate hereticks should be punished, & the deceived elect converted? I trow yea.

B.14.

And now to your proof for wearing of weapon, and using the same. Those examples that you bring in can not persuade me neither to use weapon, nor to weare them. And first you bring in the example of Abraham, which was before there was any law given, then Josua under the law, and all the Judges and kings after, which did that they did by the commaundement of god. And now we are not under the law but under grace, by the gospell, and our state is altered, and we are delivered from the rigour of the law and the ceremonies thereof by the bloude of Christe.

W.

My proofs for wearing and use of weapon are such, that albeit they can not move or persuade you, neither to use nor weare weapon, yet can you not confute my proofs and examples, neyther do you yield therto, nor shew cause why you do not as you promised in the 10 place. I referre you to the better view of my proofs and examples in my former lettre, which in effect are these which folow: Sith wearing and lawfull use of weapon hath not onely bene used of all godly in all ages, but also approved and commaunded by God himself, and the lawfull use not abrogate by Jesus Christe (as you and your sect do fondly imagine) who in no pointe is contrarie to his father. Also sith god vouchsafeth to be called the god of battell and a manne of warre,³¹ who teacheth mens handes to fight and their fingers to warre, as witnesseth David. And further it is sette downe in the scriptures by the holie ghoste for a miserable thraldome when there was no smith in Israel to make weapon for defense, and also is noted among other things a great punishment of god to take away *the man of warre, the captaine, and the cunning artificer etc*, as in my former lettre. All which you thinke is sufficiently awnswered by this cavill, that Abraham his usinge of weapon was before the law, that the Judges and Kinges did that which they did by the commaundement of God, that we are delivered from the law and the ceremonies thereof etc. Note nowe your proper confutation of my proofs with an apt alledging and applying of scriptures,³² & substantiall approbation of your opinion. Abraham used weapon before the law was given, ergo Christians may neither use nor weare weapon in

the time of Christ & the gospell. Judges and Kings did that which thei did by the commaundement of god, ergo Christian princes & magistrates may not weare & use weapon by the commaundement of god. We are not under the law, but under grace, ergo we are delivered³³ from the law and ceremonies therof, ergo etc., by which last sentence you seeme to graunt that to weare and use weapon is a part of the rigor of the lawe, and allso of the ceremoniall lawe, and if that be so I pray you shewe what signification the wearing and using of weapons had, for all the Ceremonies of the law had their signification.

B.15.

And where you alledge Nehemiah, how in the building of the temple the people defended themselves with bowes, spears, & shields, to what purpose is it to alledge that example, except you would go build a new materiall temple, for this spirituall temple which that did figure must be builded with spirituall weapons, which before I alledged; and yet you can not finde that thei were commaunded to build it with weapons in their handes.

W.

If malice did not blinde you with great desire to cavill, you might easily see that I alledge not the hystorie of Nehemiah for the building of a new materiall temple, but to prove the wearing and use of weapon lawfull, which you deny. Which I prove, in that god did approve the use & give victory by the meanes therof, & that even in the building of his holy temple; & though as you say I do not finde by expresse wordes that thei wer commaunde to builde with weapon in their handes, yet this I finde: that when the enemies conspired they first prayed to god, secondly thei appointed watch and ward, thirdly, god allowing their doings and accepting their prayers brought their enemies counsell to nought, & lastly thei conceived assurance that god would fight for them, all which is a sufficient approbation of their lawfull use of weapon. And this example in like occasion is to be folowed of all Christians³⁴ in all ages as at this day; for example, if the Turke, the Pope, and like enemies should conspire against Christ his Church in England, it were the part of the prince, rulers, prechers, and people, first to pray to God, secondly to put on armor & to appoint watch & ward day & night, thirdly, to proceed still in building gods spirituall temple, by preching his gospell, having gods booke in the one hand, and the pike & halberde or other weapon in the other hand:

and thus as in other cases we must suffer for the gospell, so in this and like cases (as in my awnswer to the 11 place) Christians may & oughte to fight for the gospell. Your spirituall weapons before alledged be in my former awnswer sufficiently awnswered, and shall againe be touched, as place and occasion is offered.

B.16.

You say that in all the new testament there is not one worde against the use and wearing of weapon; & I thinke you can not alledge one commaundement nor any example of any that have faithfullie embraced Christe stroke one stroake with hand or weapon; as for Peters sword wherwith he stroke off[f] Malcys eare doth smally make for your purpose, for that Christe rebuked him for his fact and healed the servants eare, & as I saide afore in my last lettre, how Christ sayeth *All that strike with the sword shall perish with the sword.*

W.

It is true which I say that in all the new testament there is not one word against the wearing and lawfull use of weapon. But there is a rule prescribed to souldiers, whose vocation & calling is to weare and use weapons. And Christe himself in saying to those which apprehended him *you be come out as it were against a thiefe with swordes and staves etc*, doth therby graunt³⁵ a lawfull use of swordes and staves and other weapons in apprehending of thieves. And god provided by his lawe that he which in apprehending a thief slew him with weapon being in the night, should not dye nor suffer any damage for the same. Allso if to weare and use weapon had bene unlawfull Christe would have suffered no swordes in his company. Which lawfull use of weapon is not³⁶ proved unlawfull by saying that there can not be found any one commaundement or example of any that faithfullie embraced Christe that stroke one stroke either with hand or weapon. In which wordes you seeme to graunt that all those which strike with hand or weapon are no faithfull embracers of Christe: which is a hard judgement to all princes, magistrates, warriors, parents, maisters, executioners. Touching Peters striking off[f] Malcus eare, as it maketh not for you nor any whit against me, but rather with me in that he had a sworde, which if it had bene unlawfull Christe would not have suffered³⁷ as is saide. Neither do I make any mention therof, but it pleaseth you here as in other places, (belike to seeme to saye something or having pleasure to heare yourself speake) to propound questions and awnswer the same. By

your wrestinge of Christes wordes, *he that striketh with the sword shall perish with the sword* you at once convince yourself both of ignorance and error, of ignorance in that you seeme to understand that Christ without exception saith *he that striketh &c shall perish &c.*, of error in that you denie the lawfull use of the sworde, for it is manyfest that Christ speaketh of such as use the sworde unlawfullie,³⁸ and not against such as lawfullie use the same, as magistrates, souldiers, executioners may do, who have the swordes put into their handes by God, and not for nought, as saith St. Paul Rom. 13.

B.17.

Allso I shewed you out of Peter how Christe suffered for us leaving us an example that we should folow his steppes: shewe me in the printe of any of Christes footestepes, that he dyd resist by force, and then I will subscribe to you, shewe me the steppes of any of the Apostles who folowed our saviour or any of the godly in the first Church, and this shall both be retracted and recanted. He that worketh not needeth no tooles, he that resisteth not needeth no weapon, and Christ saith *the servant is not greater than his master, nor the disciple above his lorde.*

W.

Now that the wearing and lawfull use of weapon is not onely proved by example of all godly in all ages but also by the approbation and commaundement of god himself, & of Christe also (as is saide) and not one worde for disproof of it in all the new testament, now, I say, you bring in the example of Christe to disprove & confute the same, as though the example of Christe condemned as unlawful the wearing and lawfull use of weapon. You require to see the printe and use therof in the footestepes of Christe, & then you will subscribe. But if you will subscribe to nothing but that you finde the printe and use of in the footestepes of Christe then you must also deny mariage,³⁹ for Christe was not married, you must deny the dwelling in houses, for Christe had no howse. this you graunt in the 32 place, you must deny to have judges, for Christe would be no judge, you must deny to have a kinge, for Christe would be no kinge (both which your sect doth) you must deny to punish offenders, for Christe would not punish the adulteresse, to which end it seemeth you alledge that texte, as in the 25 place. All which things with a number moe, you can not shew the printe or use in the footestepes of Christ his example. will

you not therefore subscribe to these as lawfull? but condemne the same, as you do the use & wearing of weapon & contending in law etc. Thus whilst you endeavor many waies to avoid the snare you are fallen into the pit which you most feared. To your saying (he that worketh not needeth no tooles) I awnswer, let him to whome God hath appointed no worke be without tooles, and then see how well that foloweth which you inferre. You also alledge this saying of Christe, but verie aptly *the servant is not greater than his lord &c.*, upon which sentence I will conclude & leave you to conclude upon that which foloweth. As Christe did neither use nor weare weapon &c, no more must those that will be Christ his perfect disciples, upon which followeth: Christe had no wife, Christe had no house, Christe would be no judge, Christe would not punish adultery, Christe would be no kinge, Ergo etc.

B.18.

And where you bring in the souldiers that came to John Baptist for that he had them not leave of[f] being souldiers, & cast away their weapons, & so you conclude we may use weapons. but as you trulie alledge he bad them *do no violence &c.*, & how can a man be a souldier but he must needes do violence, leave of[f] from violence & leave of[f] from being a souldier. As when Naaman the Syrian spake to Eliseus, and desired god to be mercifull unto him, that when his king went into the temple of his Idoll Rimmon, & that he must bow before the Idoll, the prophet bade him go in peace, not that he gave him licence to bow before Rimmon, but knowing if Naaman would have peace of conscience, he would no[t] bowe before Rimmon; even so John Baptiste knew if the[y] did leave of[f] oppression, they would not be soldiers.

W.

Sith you still prosequete this matter. I must still follow your humor in awnswering you. It is true that I bring in the soldiers that came among others to John Baptist, who because (as I have saide) he doth not bidde them leave of[f] to be souldiers, but prescribeth them rules to observe in their vocation, & therof conclude that to be a soldier, to weare & use weapon is not unlawfull for Christians. You graunt I trulie alledge that he bade them *do no violence*, and then you demaund how a man can be a souldier, and not do violence, adding this conclusion leave of[f] from violence, & leave of[f] from being a souldier. You may also make a like demaund how a man

can be a prince, a magistrate, an executioner, & not do violence, & then conclude, leave off[f] from violence & leave off[f] from being a prince, a magistrate, an executioner. But as St. John in this place, so Christ to the centurion, Peter to Cornelius, & Paul to the Jailor doth teach them to be Christians,⁴⁰ and yet not to leave their vocations of being captaines, souldiers, jailors etc, to which allso agreeth this saying of St. Paul, *let every man wher in he is called therin abide with God.* Now if you can shew me where Christ and his apostles have willed any in becoming christians to leave their vocations you have saide somewhat. Your long discourse of Naaman the Syrian, and your exposition of the prophets bidding him farewell, with your conclusion therupon, as it maketh nothing for the proof of your opinion, so is the same farre fetched, and doth manifestly shew your arrogant boldnes, in thus abusing the scriptures,⁴¹ and allso your malicious ignorance in not making difference betwixt souldiers, the wearing and use of weapon etc. which God hath approved and commaunded (as in my awnswer to the 14 place) and the bowing before an Idoll, which god so expresselie and so often forbiddeth⁴² in the holie scriptures.

B.19.

And for that Paul was brought afore Fœlix by the 2 centurions, you reade not that it was his request to have those armed men though the chief captaine did send them, and Pauls trust was not in them but onely in god, for you reade in the same chapter how the lord afore stood by Paul, and bad him be of good courage, shewing him that as he had testified and borne witnes of him at Jerusalem, so should he do at Rome, which promise more strengthened and confirmed Paul than the 2 centurions with their 200 souldiers; as for example, if you yourself were cunstable, deputy, or governor, & I being your prisoner & delighting not in armed men and weapon as you see, yet if you wolde send me with souldiers and armed men to some other place or prison, I could no[t] lette you, nor being a prisoner it became me not though I esteeme it not.

W.

Allbeit St. Paul required not those armed men nor put trust in them but in god, by whome he was more strengthened than by those 472 armed men, which is pleaseth you to name 200,⁴³ yet did he not refuse those meanes offered of god as unlawfull, & further by causing that conspiracy to be made knowne to the chief captaine by his sisters sonne St. Paul did as it were not

onely pray defense or not to be brought forth as the conspirators desired, but also approved and used those meanes as lawfull. And as in this place so in the 21 chapter of the same, god who hath all meanes, did yet use a like meane to preserve Pauls life, which if it had bene unlawfull it is likely god would not have used, & St. Paul would have refused the same, & also reproved the captaines as well as he did the high priest for striking him contrary to the lawe, which you by an example with a long discourse say it was not his part so to do being a prisoner; also you say well if I were a cunstable; you seeme [to] allowe no such office among Christians, and surely I will allow no such souldier or watchman when I am a captaine or cunstable.

B.20.

Then you say that weapons be the holie guifte of god, and that we may use them, so that we have not a revenging mynde. I am perswaded never since the time of Christe that none hath revenged himself by weapon but he had a revenging mynde.

W.

Plaine dealing would awnswer to a whole point, and not catch here a word and there a worde, to cavill at, as not onelie in this place but also in many other. For I say not onely that weapons be the holie guifte of god, but also conclude of all those points wherof I had spoken before with these wordes. Now let this be the conclusion of all, that sith magistrates, lawes, and weapons be the holie guifts of god, let us the more diligentlie take heed that they be not defiled by our fault, which we shall avoide, if we take away a revenging minde; so may we use the same as necessitie requireth, and not offend against that commaundement by which revenge is forbidden to Christians, as in my former lettre. Thus farre it pleased you not to recite, but thinke in resiting a piece you have confuted the whole, even by your bare perswasion, that since the time of Christe none hath revenged himself with weapon but he had a revenging mynde. In which worde you againe bewray an evill meaning in that you except not princes,⁴⁴ magistrates, & executioners etc., who may execute their office by cutting of[f] evill members even by death with a mynde as free from revenge as a father correcteth his naturall childe. Here if I would cavill with you I mighte aske whether any before Christ did revenge himself without a revenging mynde, and whether men may not use weapon for defense without a revenging mynde, and resist

violence with a mynde free from doing violence; and also whether a man may not have a revenging mynde, though he neither strike with weapon nor with hand, but I will not revenge a Cavill with another cavill.

B.21.

The godly father which you alledge is to be folowed as he foloweth Christe; for your 2 kindes of resistance I briefly awnswer, that if we suffer and love him that doth us no hurte, it deserveth as much thanke as an evill servant that is corrected for his deserte, & taketh it patiently. Also I graunt to you we may eschew injuries by fleeing or running, and by circumspect dealing in our affaires. Also if Christes meaning be as you saye that we should withdraw hart and hand from revenge, I can not see how there ought to be any resistance any maner of way. In this pointe I like your judgement well, & stand to those wordes, & marke the residue and you shall finde you ought to lose both coate & cloake, rather than you ought to resiste.

W.

That godly father, whome I alledge in my former lettre is Mr. Calvin, whose wordes you burie in silence, which be these— Those which deny the lawfull use of magistrates, lawes, weapon, etc. do therewithall despise the holie ordinance of God, to which you awnswer he is to be folowed as he foloweth Christe,⁴⁵ which if you would do you would soone leave your pievish secte, and joine with the Church of Christe as he did. My 2 kindes of resistance you brieflie awnswer, but shew not what thei be. The first kinde is wherby we repell injuries without hurte, which may be; the 2 kinde is wherby we do requite injuries with the like, which may not be. These be also the wordes of a godly father whome you substantially confute by your brief awnswer, not worthy my awnswer. By your graunte etc. that we may eschew injuries by fleeing or runyng which differ not much etc, you deny all other kindes of eschewing of injuries, as by law, the lawfull magistrate etc as unlawfull. It is true that Christes meaning is, that both harte and hand should be free from revenge, and yet if you had any eies or godly sight, you might see a lawfull resistance one maner of way that is without hurte. And as well as you like me in this pointe, and marke you the rest as you liste, yet shall you never prove but that christians when time and occasion serve may eschew injuries with a harmlesse resistance.⁴⁶

B.22.

Neither did Christ deny his former doctrine, in that he offered not his other cheek to the high priests servant, when he strake him; what milder manner of speach could be in man, then to say, *If I have done evill, beare witnessse of the evill, but if I have not why strikest thou me?*, this Christe saide to shew his humilitie, and to be an example to us, and allso to bring that wicked man to repentance; as he saide unto Judas, *betrayest thou the sonne of man with a kisse?*, and as he looked backe upon Peter that thei might know their unkindnes to so loving a lord and milde a saviour. And herein I am perswaded I may folow Christ in resisting, seeing you account it resistance. As for example, if an evill man should strike me without cause, I may say unto him these wordes or such like, Friend, if I have done you any injurie, I will make you recompence; if I have not, why strike you me? And as Paul used himself in the same case, I am perswaded I may do the same, which is farre from revenge.

W.

I say in my former lettre that if Christ had so meant, as you understand him, he did not observe his owne doctrine, for being stricken on the one cheeke, he turned not the other. To which wordes you here awnswer, that Christe did not denie his former doctrine etc. in that he offered not his other cheeke etc., but if to offer the other cheeke and not to offer the other cheeke be not in wordes contraries, I know not what are contraries. Your discourse of Christs milde awnswer, his humility, his purpose towards him that strake him, towards Judas, towards Peter &c doth allso serve verie aptlie to prove the matters in conference,⁴⁷ as allso that not turning the other cheeke is a turning of the other cheeke is agreement in wordes. Here allso you do falsifie my wordes, for I say not that Christe did revenge or resist, but that he turned not his other cheeke, according to his wordes, which you so much urge.

B.23.

And as for Christs wordes, of the right eie and the right hand if thei offend us, to plucke out or to cut of[f], thus I understand it. If my hand begin to shedde bloud, or to stretch out to any other unlawfull thing to the hurt of my neighbour, I ought so to mortifie and to slay that earthlie member that it should have no such power and strength to do the like. And likewise by plucking out the eie, if my eie begin to behold vanitie, I

ought to make such a covenant with mine eie that I should rather lose the use of it than it should cause me to offend.

W.

Of Christs wordes, *resist not, sweare not &c* I say in my former lettre, you may not urge such maner of speeches further than is meant. For when Christe saith likewise, *if thy hand offend thee, cut it of[f], if thine [eye] offend thee plucke it out*, yet he meaneth not that we should cut of[f] our hand and plucke out our eie so ofte as thei do cause us to offend; which thing you graunt by your long discourse how you understand the same. But why do you not understande these saied wordes of Christ literallie as thei stand, as well as these wordes, *resist not, sweare not, turne the other cheeke, give also the cloake &c?* you can shew no cause⁴⁸ why you expound the one and urge the other, saving that your will is a lawe in this matter. I might here also aske, if you might not as well and rather to mortifie your hand and eie, if thei offend against god, as if thei offend to the hurte of your neighbour; which onelie you do here name.

B.24.

But you say that which was a transgression when Christe came was also a transgression before he came. I will not contend, but briefly aske this question. Where do you finde this to be a transgression before Christe came, that a man might put away his wife, if she found not favour in his sight? which Christe sheweth no man may do except it be for fornication. Where do you finde that Davides having moe wives than one and the godly fathers before David as *Abraham & Jaacob*. to be a transgression of the lawe? but that Christe bringeth it to the first institution and the new testament biddeth *every man to have his owne wife and every woman her owne husband*. Where do you finde that to resist injuries was a transgression of the law, untill Christe came and said *resist not?*

W.

In your former lettre you say, before Christe came, it was thought no sinne to hate, to sweare, to resist etc., all which Christ at his coming proved to be manifest transgressions of the lawe etc. To which I awnswer in my former lettre—That which was a transgression of the lawe when Christe came, was also a transgression of the law before he came; to which wordes for awnswer you say you will not contend, but briefly aske this question. But I may justlie aske you. why you omitte to

awnsuer me?—touching St. Pauls words rebuking the Corinthians about contending in law⁴⁹ which ye abuse to prove that christians may not at all contend in law: but this seemeth of the best of my lettre, & you say you awnsuer but to the worst therof. Now to awnsuer your brief question or rather questions, for there be three of them. Your firste for a man to put away his wife I finde a transgression before Christ came, even by your owne wordes, in that Christe reformed that abuse by the first institution:⁵⁰ also that god, the author of mariage saith, *A man shall forsake father and mother and cleave unto his wife.* Your second for a man to have moe wives than one at once, which in one respect was permitted by god as in Deut. 25., but in all other respects I finde the same a transgression, in that god saith—a man shall cleave unto his wife as to one, not unto his wives as to moe at once, touching which read Mal. 2. 14. 15. Your third, for a man to resist injuries with the like, I finde a transgression before Christe came, by these wordes. *Say not thou I will recompense evill,* and againe *Say not, I will do to him as he hath done to me* Proverb 22. et 24c. Thus have I awnsuered your brief question not with asking a question, neither have I cavilled with you by saying *Abraham & Jaacob* were before the law &c, and David was under the lawe etc, and we are delivered by the gospell etc., with which and like wordes you cavill⁵¹ at all the scriptures & examples which I alledge before the lawe, under the lawe, and in the prophets.

B.25.

If Christe came to fullfill the lawe by executing the rigour of the lawe, why did he not commaund the adulterous woman to be stoned to death? Much more I might say in this, but I will not be tedious unto you.

W.

You so catch lines and wordes to cavill at that you ofte force me to recite my formes wordes and the occasion therof. To disswade you from your pievish secte and wicked opinion I in my former letter saide to you thus: you may not frame to your self any private exposition of any scripture contrarie to the judgement of the universall Church, to which Christ hath promised his spirit &c., which spirit is one not contrarie to the giver therof, neither is Christ contrary to god his father, nor the lawe against the gospell etc.—touching thosse points we treat of as in my saide lettre. To all which instead of awnsuer

you aske this question, as seemeth by the occasion of the last lines, where I say that Christe is not contrary to god, nor the law to the gospell, you, I say aske, if Christe came to fullfill the law etc? why did he not cause the adulterous to be stoned? etc. By which words not myne but of your owne coyning you you again bewray an evill meaning. Firste in that the same sentence is by your sect urged⁵² to prove that among christians there ought to be no other punishment but excommunication. Secondly you seeme to have the same meaning by your oft repeating that we are now *not under the law*, but *under grace by the gospell*, that we are delivered from the rigor of the lawe by the bloud of Christ. Now to awnswer your question not with a question that Christ did not commaund the adultrous woman to be stoned I collect 2 causes. First, because authoritie to punish did onely belong to the magistrate, and Christe was no temporall magistrate. Secodly, she was to be convicted by two or three witnesses, according to the lawe, and Christe though he he had bene a magistrate, yet had he lacked witnesses, for her accusers fledde and left her alone, as you may reade Joh. 8. That much more which you might have saide touching this matter shall be awnswered when you have saide all that you can saye.⁵³

B.26.

Now to this point touching swearing. That which you alledge out of the lawe, as *Jerem. 4*, and of *Abraham* how he sware to *Abimelech*. First, *Abraham* was before the law was given, therefore we must folow *Abraham* no further then we have an example with a commaundement, & *Jeremy*, in the time of the law. You know how the heathen used to swear by their Idolls, whome they thought the greatest. The Egyprians by the life of Pharao the king, whome thei most esteemed, yea Joseph himself being amongst them, folowed their corruption in swearing likewise; which is no example for us to folow; and also the people of Israel would swear by god and by Malcom, that is, by the living and true god and by the Idolls, and also would both professe the false religion of Idolatrie and the religion of god; so for the hardnes of their harts, as thei were in putting away their wives, thei were permitted to swear by god, and by swearing is chieffie meant the profession of the true religion of god.

[W]

Here againe, as your maner is, you make a long discourse or rather a verie cavill upon my proofs and examples touching

lawfull swearing; of which as in my former lettre by occasion; so now I say againe, that lawfull swearing was never condemned by the law, nor by Christe. For besides that god in forbidding to take his name in vaine doth therby graunt a true use therof, in the 6 and 10 of Deut. he expressly commaundeth to sweare by his name. Jeremy saith an othe is to be taken in truth, in judgement & righteousnes. Christe did oftentimes sweare, Paul used an othe, god also sware by himself. It may not therefore be gathered that when Christe saith, *sweare not at all*, he forbiddeth that maner of swearing which god commaundeth, which the Patriarks, Prophets, Apostle, Christ himself, and God his father have given us an example of, as in my saide lettre. All which you have profoundly and sufficiently awnswered by your cavill that Jeremy was under the law, that Abraham was before the law, that the heathen sware by their Idolls, the Egyprians by their king, and the Israelites by god and Malcom. To which, if I would cavill with you, I might aske whether you make no difference betwixt the law and the prophets, and also what difference you do make betweene the Egyprians & the heathen,⁵⁴ and whether you will folow Abrahams example by commaundement in offering his sonne; but if I should resist or requite cavill with cavill there would be no end of cavilling. But I will come to a speciall pointe gathered by your owne wordes which is, that we may folow Abraham no further than we have an example with a commaundement, by which wordes you graunt that we may folow Abraham so farre. I except his particular commaundement & example touching the offering of his sonne. Stand you to this and I aske no more, to end this matter touching lawfull swearing. First, God commaundeth to sweare, as in the 6 & 10 of *Deut.* before cited. Secondly, the example of god himself, as in *Genes.* 22, and if you will not admit his example, because it was before the law (as you often urge) then take Christs example in the new testament, & St. Pauls⁵⁵ also, who by the holy ghost approveth gods oth in the newe testament, as in the 6 to the *Hebr.* If now you stand to your owne wordes, our controversy is ended touching this matter. Lastly, you adde that as the Israelites for the hardnes of their harts were permitted to put away their wives, so thei were permitted to sweare by god, by which your application, you both shew your grosse ignorance in not understanding the Scriptures, and also your arrogancy, with blasphemous boldnes, in abusinge the same. For as was saide even now, we have gods commaundement together with his example for lawfull swearing. But you have no ex-

ample of any godly, nor any commaundement of god, but the flatte contrary (as is proved in my awnswer to the 24 place) that a man may put away his wife. Againe *Moses* did cause a bill of divorce touching such as did put away their wives, and *Christe* did reforme that abuse, (as is saide in the 24 place) but you can not shew a like bill touchinge swearing by god, nor that *Christe* doth condemne but approve lawfull swearing by his owne example.

B.29 [*sic.* 27.]

But the *Messias* who when he came must teach us all things, knowing it could not be to gods glory nor the profite of the Church, commaundeth we should not sware at all, his Apostle *James* agreeth with him, in the same commaundement, as is before rehearsed. And that which you alledge out of the new testament, as out of the 6 to the *Hebr.* where the Apostle saith that men verily sweare by him that is greater than themselves etc. I pray you marke in the same chap. before, whome the Apostle spake to, & that is to the beloved children of god; then leaving them he cometh to men, such naturall men as *Paul* spake of in 1 Cor. 2. 14, for he speaketh not in the same maner and phrase of speach, as he spake to the beloved in the 9 verse, he saith not, & you beloved, an oth among you is an end of all strife, but leaving the beloved he cometh to men; as *Christ* willeth his disciples to beware of men, for thei should betray them &c., and that which [*sic.* you]. alledge in the 9 to the *Rom.* howe *Paul* calleth *Christe* to witnes, I am perswaded I may call god to witnes in a thing of truth, that I am fully perswaded in my conscience, & yet I can not [see] that that is a swearing by any thing.

W.

I have in my former lettre (as I have here partly touched and somewhat added) so proved this point, that you may (as you do) well cavill at it, but you nor all your sect can never confute the same. Notwithstanding I must still awnswer your cavills where I finde them. You say that *Christ* knowing that swearing could neither glorifie god nor profite his Church, commaundeth not to sweare at all, with whome *St James* agreeth etc. By which you graunt that *Christe* & *James* do forbid that, which (as is saide) both god doth commaund, & allso himself, *Christe Jesus*, *St. Paul*, with others have left us with an example of. You say hereafter that the scriptures have one sweete harmony and concert, but here as in other places you make them

to jarre fowlie⁵⁶ by setting Christe and the Apostle James against god and the prophet Jeremy. God saith, thou shalt sweare; Jeremy saith: an oth is to be taken; Christ, say you, commaundeth not to sweare; with whome St. James agreeth; behold one of your sweete harmonies. But your falling into such absurdities is gods just judgement upon you & your sect for abusing his worde, contemning learning and learned men, & defrauding your selves of publique doctrine and Ecclesiasticall expositions upon the scriptures, wherby you might learne that god commaundeth lawfull swearing, & useth it as a part of his worship, & to the great profite & consolation of his Church, as may be gathered *Hebr.* 6. Wherat you cavill so much with your blasphemous & wicked distinction, willing me to marke the same, which diligently I have, and do thereby see your malice, your ignorance, your wicked and blasphemous abusing of two of the most comfortable sentences in all gods scriptures, which is also a great judgement of god upon you. You proceed in this matter, and shew what I must marke, which is that the Apostle in the 9 verse speaketh to the godly, calling them beloved, and in the 16v. he speaketh of such naturall men as Paul speaketh of 1 Cor. 2, and as Christ meaneth of when he saith, beware of men, in which sense say you the Apostle saith men verily do sweare, and an oth among men is an end etc., but he saith not an oth among you, beloved, is an end of all strife. Behold your blasphemous⁵⁷ and lying distinction or application. but if you had any eies to see the truth, and an harte to understand and receive it, you might see that the Apostle directeth his whole epistle not to such naturall men as Paul and Christe spake of (as you say) but to the regenerate Jewes, which were dispersed: who as he endeth the 5 chap. so beginneth the 6 in rebuking the converted Jewes, for that in long time they had so little profited wherin he proceedeth unto the 4 verse, where he terrifieth them with the daungerous state of such as having once embraced the truth, do revolte and become Apostates and heretiques, as you do, whose judgement with all other wicked he declareth by comparison of the two kindes of earth, both which receiveing the raine &c, yet but one beareth good fruite & receiveth blessing, the other beareth thornes and is neare to cursing. Then foloweth the 9th v., in which, as before he rebuked them, & by the same example terrified them, he now comforteth them saying, Beloved, we perswade ourselves better things of you. In the 10, 11, 12 verses he exhorteth & encourageth them not to fainte in doing

of those good works there expressed, *for that god is not unrighteous to forget the same*, and further desireth them to shew their diligence in the saide well doing, to the full assurance of hope in the end; and that thei be not slothful, *but folowers of them which thorow faith and patience inherited the promises*, adding in the 13 ver. the stability & assurance of gods promise, made unto Abraham and all and all his elect, confirmed by his oth, *who having no greater to sweare by, did sweare by himself*, that he would abundantly performe the saide promise, which promise Abraham, after he had taryed patiently, he enjoyed. And now he cometh to the 16th verse, to your naturall men, and not beloved, as you say. But let it be that the Apostle here speaketh of men generallie, yet here is nothing against lawfull swearing, but rather a confirmation therof. First, in that it is saide: *men verily sweare by him that is greater than themselves*, which is god onely. Secondlie, in that it is saide: *An oth amongst men is an end of all strife*, which is a profite to men and glorie to god. But the Apostles chief purpose is to amplifie the stabilitie of gods promise, in saying: *As men verily sweare &c and an oth among men is an end of all strife, so god willing more abundantly to shew unto the heires of promise the stability of his counsell, did binde himself by an othe*, to end and remove farre away from his elect all distrust and infidelity. *And that by two immutable things in which it is impossible that god should lye we* (gods elect, not such naturall men as you speake of) *should have a strong consolation &c.* Thus according to that talent which god hath given me, I have freed this most comfortable chapter from your blasphemous⁵⁸ exposition and wicked distinction. You proceede and graunt you are perswaded that you may take god to witnesse⁵⁹ etc., and yet you can not see that that is a swearing by any thing. But I pray you, what is lawfull swearing els, but a taking god to witnes, in matters of truth, who is not onelie something, but the greatest thing, & the onelie cause of all things, sinne onelie except.

B.28.

And where you adde heaven and earth etc. Where Christe saith *sweare not at all*, I am sure god is not excepted, which is all in all; and I pray you, what neede at all is there that true Christians should sweare at all. If we be true Christians we ought to believe one another. For he that will give testimony against a man in wordes, will not sticke to sweare falsly, as

Peters false saying well proved, after he had saide falsly, he swore as falslie. And where men should sweare before Judges, and for so many light causes, as men sweare upon books, I finde no such example nor commaundement in the new testament.

W.

When Christ saith, *sweare not at all*, he also addeth (as I saide) these particulars, neither *by heaven, by earth, by Jerusalem* (as in my former lettre) which doth better prove, that in this word *All* lawfull swearing by god is excepted, than your bare assurance prove that he is not. You aske What neede is there that true Christians should sweare &c. I awnswer you must either acknowledge there be some causes or els graunt that Christe and St Paul did sweare without neede, and so conclude thei were not true Christians.⁶⁰ Touching Peters false swearing &c, if you were in as hard a case as Peter was, and left to your self, it is likely you would say and sweare as falslie as he did, which fact is to be condemned. To conclude, god by commaunding to sweare did foresee that there would be needfull and lawfull causes to use an oth, by which god should be glorified and the people profited, when truth is tryed out by taking god to witnes, which you can not see to be a swearing by any thinge. Touching swearing upon a booke, etc., as I dare not condemne a lawfull use therof, so I do not allow any abuse therin. But to sweare before Judges (who seeme to be great moates in your eies) as the same is most usuall so in truth it is most lawfull and needfull, because the hardest matters be decided by them.⁶¹

B.29.

Then you say, if I would view the text well, with a list to understand and yield to truth etc, I trust that god will direct me with his spirite, that I shall not resist the truth. No deceived sect I folow, their companies I haunt not, this mynde and perswasion I received not of men, neither by man, but by the revelation of gods holie worde, with the small exercise I have had in reading of the same. And since I gave my mynde therto, it hath so wrought that it hath made me of a woolf to eat hay with the lambe, and it hath turned my weapons into more profitable tooles, though I confesse I have not, nor do not one jote so neare as Christ requireth at my handes. but if that at any time I have had my slippes, & have not suffred my wrongs and injuries with a contented mynde, and recoyed

therein, I have to aske God pardon, and further to desire him for to worke a more perfection in me.

W.

Touching your viewing of the text &c., I must referre you backe to the place and occasion in my former letre, which is upon these wordes of Christe, swear not at all, of which I say, as I have partly noted in the 28 place, that if you would view the text well, with a list to understand & yield to the truth, & would believe the judgement of the Catholique & universall Church, before a poore deceived secte, you might easilie see that when Christ hath saide, swear not at all, by adding these particulars, *by heaven, by earth, by Jerusalem*, he excepteth that lawfull swearing⁶² which god commaundeth (as is saide) to which before you awnswer, that you are sure god is [not]⁶³ excepted: and here, by trusting that god will direct you, not to resist the truth, both which are verie apt awnswers to the matter. But I awnswer that you have more cause to pray that god will let you see how ignorantly, willfully, and impudently, you do resist the truth. But (say you) no deceived sect I folow, their companies I haunte not, &c. But notwithstanding these your painted wordes, it will appeare hereafter that you so like your deceived secte, & so haunt their companies, that you account your self happie to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water among them. And albeit in saying you received not this mynde from men, nor by man &c., you use therin Pauls wordes, yet are you not directed by Pauls spirit, for he had no such revelation in gods booke. Your small exercise in reading etc., with that company with whome you are to[o] much conversant, hath made you, not of a wolf to eate hay with the lambe, & to turne your weapons into more profitable tooles, but of a lambe of Christe, as was thought, a very flat heretique, & to condemne the lawfull use and wearing of weapon as unlawfull for Christians. And notwithstanding your shew of humility, imperfection, & dissembling confession, with a like pharisaicall prayer for pardon, with an, if you have not, at any time, suffrd your wrongs &c, notwithstanding all which, I say, your arrogancy and pride⁶⁴ is such that to justifie you and your secte you condemne the universall Church of Christe throughout the whole world.

B.30.

Those scriptures that I alledged, as well out of the 2 Cor. 12 [*sic.* 10] and Ephes. 6, what weapons we should use, I do not finde, though you have rebuked, you have not confuted. For

a true Christian must be a spirituall man. for Paul saith Rom 8. *if any have not the spirit of Christ they are not his*, and spirituall men must have spirituall weapon to fight with spirituall enemies.

W.

Your two sentences before alledged the 2 Cor 10 & Eph. 6., to which you here adde a third Rom. 8, all which you urge to prove that both the use & wearing of temporall weapon is is unlawfull for Christians. Which application of yours, because you say, though I have rebuked, yet I have not confuted, I will in part repeat both your application and my awnswer to the same. First out of the 2 Cor. 10 you say that the weapons of our warfare are not carnall but spirituall, and secondly, out of Ephes. 6 you say that a Christian must use the sworde of gods worde instead of the slaying sworde, the shield of faith instead of the worldly warriors shield, the helmet of salvation instead of a vaine helmet &c., and now you adde to the same end that a true christian must be a spirituall man, that Paul saith, *If any man have not the spirit of Christ, the same is not his*, & spirituall men must have spirituall weapons to fight with &c. To which I awnswer in my former lettre that herein you bewray your lacke of knowledge,⁶⁵ which chiefly is by defrauding yourself of publike doctrine, of conference, & of reading Catholique expositions of godly men upon the holie scriptures. For in the place of Ephes. 6 St. Paul having shewed that we wrestle not with flesh & bloud onely, but *against the princes of the darknes of this world, against spirituall wickednes &c.*, he then prescribeth spirituall armours & spirituall weapon, wherwith we may *quench the fiery darts* of these spirituall enemies. And in the place of 2 Cor 10. St. Paul sheweth that the weapons of gods mynisters is the power of gods spirit, by which thei *overthrow all imaginations, vaine opinions, errors, heresies, & whatsoever is highly exalted against the knowledge of God*. Both which scriptures do no more make against⁶⁶ the lawfull use of temporall armour & temporall weapon, than that scripture alledged by the Devill did make for Christ to have cast himself downe from the pinnacle of the temple &c, as in my former lettre. Now whether I have rebuked & not confuted Your two scriptures most falsly applied, let any godly judge, & your 3 sentence now added out of Rom 8, with your conclusion that spirituall men must have spirituall weapon is even as truly applied, & doth make as much against the lawfull use of weapon as these

wordes:⁶⁷ *he that is in the flesh can not please god doth make against the mariage of mynisters.*

B.31.

All the other scripturs Jam 5, 1 Pet 2, 1 Cor 4, Hebr. 11, Matt 10 & 5, Isai 53, Rom 6. &c. you say doth no more make for my proof, than these wordes, *this is my body*, doth make for the papists reall presence. I have alledged⁶⁸ Pet. to this purpose, how Christe suffered for leaving us an example that we should folow his steppes, that is, in not resisting. I alledge Isai. 53, how he also shewed what a suffering Christ he should be, *how he was ledde as a sheepe before his shearer, being dumbe, and openyng not his mouth.* I alledged out of Rom. 6. If we be like Christ in the similitude of his death, we shall be like him in the similitude of his resurrection: the rest of the scriptures I alledged to like purpose, and if the papists *hoc est corpus meum* were as much to the proof of the reall presence as these scriptures do shewe that a perfect Christian must be a sufferer, and not a revenger, they were not farre from the truth: but we know that *Christ is ascended upon high, and sitteth on the right hand of God in heavenly places &c.*

W.

All your other scriptures before alledged & now againe rehearsed as Jam 5, 1 P. 2, 1 Cor. 4, Hebr 11, Matt. 5 & 10 &c. All which (as before I saide I now say againe) do no more make for proof of those points which you affirme, wherin we contend, & to which end you urge them, than *hoc est corpus meum* doth prove a reall presence: and looke what the saide wordes do make for the papists reall presence, & how neare the truth they be, so neare are your Anabaptists, & so much your scriptures in both your lettres, & whatsoever all the whole route of your sect can say, doth make against the lawfull use of weapon, contending in law, or any lawfull eschewing or repelling of injuries. I omitte to examine particularly how aptly & fully all your above saide scriptures are alledged and applied to the prooffe of those points which you affirme.

B.32

But this suffering is so hard to the flesh that it can not embrace it, but it must have delay by fleshly glossing, perswading we may live with the gentills of this world, & receive glory, honour, riches, & magnificence, purchase, build, & whatsoever, & yet be the true servants of God, & have joy in the world to come, Where the true servants of Christe must wander to & fro,

havinge no certaine city. nor dwelling, thei must sell their possessions & not purchase, thei must suffer rebukes & blowes; thei must be hated of all people, though foxes have holes, & the birdes nests, the poore christian may have no place safely to put his head in, thei must be like the Israelites, to stand with their staves in their handes, & with their loynes girt, to flee at all seasons, thei must be brought before kings and rulers, & be whipped, scourged, imprisoned, and be condemned to shamefull death, wheras with the people of this world, all is farre otherwise.

W.

Here is a verie handsome discourse also, & apt to the purpose to prove those points which you affirme, & about which we contend. but to your awnswer. Not onely suffering, but all other pointes of a true christian be hard to the flesh, and yet in Christ, as St. Paul sayeth, his elect are made able to do all things, thorowe Christ that is in them. But suffering, say you, must have a delay by fleshly glosses, perswading that thei may live with the gentils of this world, & receive glory, honour, riches etc., by purchase & whatsoever, & yet be the true servants of god, & have joy in the world to come. By which wordes & that which foloweth you go further than condemning of those points about which we contend. For you seeme to affirme that christians may not receive glorie, honour, riches, etc., purchase, build etc, and be the true servants of Christ & looke for joy in the world to come. But that the true servants of Christ must wander to and fro, have no certaine city nor dwelling, thei sell and not purchase, thei must suffer and be hated &c, & though foxes have holes, the poore christian must have no place safely to put his head &c, as you amplify the same, all which is no awnswer or confutation of my lettre,⁶⁹ but an approbation and confirmation, with an addition of like & greater absurdities than those about which we contend. I graunt that there be times when christians must leave all to folow Christ, & there be times also when Christians may use all your forenamed things in the lord, according to St. Pauls rule 1 Cor. 9. It seemeth also that in this your discourse touching true christians & their afflictions, you chiefly have relation to your owne sect, of whome lately some were banished, some imprisoned, some executed, & one I trow whipped, all which you expressly note &c. who thinke it unlawfull also to have possessions, prince, magistrates &c, & are constrained when your crew is found to wander to & fro as you say, but

yet you, nor the best of your crew, do not observe your foresaide rule, which you say is the case of all true christians, for you are content to abide in a certaine city, to have a dwelling, to buy as well as to sell, & not to wander to & fro.

B.33.

The doctrine of Christe is contrary to the flesh & the lusts therof, the doctrine of the flesh is agreeable to the flesh & the lusts therof; which difference, as I saide afore, the flesh will willingly imbrace. The naturall worldly men which keepe their brethren sterving in miserable prison do embrace it, those that come so farre to London to enrich the lawiers at Westmynster hall do embrace it, but few found to suffer injurie. A small company of those souldiers Gedeon shall finde to lappe water like doggs; one Micheas amongst the false prophetes, also one Elias to allmost 600,000, 12 Apostles amongst 12 tribes.

W.

All this discourse doth still well prove those points which you affirme, & very substantially confute my denyall. But to your matter. I graunt it true that the doctrine of Christ is contrary to the flesh & the lusts therof, & the doctrine of the flesh is agreeable to the flesh &c., excepting your meaning that to contend in lawe, to weare & use weapon, to use imprisonment etc, is a doctrine of the flesh,⁷⁰ which you seeme to graunt by saying, the naturall worldlie men do embrace it, who keepe their brethren in prison, which come so farre to London to enrich Lawyers etc. By which wordes you againe bewray your meaning, and covertly as your manner is condemne use of lawes, of lawyers, of Clients, of prisons & so consequently of Magistrates⁷¹ and all government. And by your comparing those few which suffer to Gedeons 300 souldiers, to one Micheas & one Elias amongst 600,000 false prophetes,⁷² to 12 Apostles amongst 12 tribes, you seeme to account you & your sect to be these few that suffer, & as Gedeons souldiers, Micheases, Eliases, 12 Apostles etc. And all others which use law, lawyers, prisons etc. to be naturall worldly men, false prophets &c. And if here or in any other place I gather contrary to your meaning,⁷³ blame your owne confusion and disorder, both of forme & matter of which you treat. And further that you may knowe my mynde plaine in this matter, be it knowne, that as I allowe not any abuse of lawe, any corruption of Lawyers, any malice or craft of clients, any cruelty of imprisonment &c, so I still advouch all these and those other about which we contend in their lawfull

use not onely verie lawfull, but also very needfull & very profitable, in every christian commonwealth.

B.34.

Allso the foundation which I alledged of the sufficiency of holie scriptures I am sure it is true. For men have & do erre, but the scriptures have one sweete harmony & consent: but Augustine Ambrose, Jerome, Origen Chrysostome, Luther, Calvine, Zwinglius, Brentius, Hemingius, have no such concord, but are one against another.

W.

You alledge for your foundation Joh. 5. 33, Rom 1 16, 1 Cor 4 12 (which is 1 Cor 3 11) 2 Tim 3 16, which you take to be a more strong foundation than to build on any man, which I also graunt, further than men build upon Christ. But see your foundation. In the first place, Christ saith, *search the scriptures &c.*, in the 2 place, Paul sayeth, *the gospell is the power of god to salvation &c.*, in the 3 place he saith that *the whole scripture is given by inspiration from god &c.*, in the 4 place he saith, *Other foundation can no man lay &c* Now all these 4 sentences do prove the authority, power, & profite of holy scriptures, & not that it is unlawfull for christians to contend in law, to weare & use weapon etc.⁷⁴ So that you must seeke another foundation to sette up your frame upon, for this foundation before cited will beare no such burthen. But it seemeth your purpose in alledging the sufficiency of scriptures more than men is to condemne all mens expositions upon those scriptures on which you build that are contrary to your received opinion, as may be gathered by your quarrell against these godly fathers as foloweth. The scriptures say you, have sweete harmony and consent, but Augustine, Ambrose, Jerom, Origen, Chrysostome, Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Brentius, Hemingius, have no such concord, but are one against another. You say here after that you have not bene at the Universitie, but yet it seemeth you are pretie well learned, that have found such discord among these doctors,⁷⁵ I pray you, when you reade them once againe, set downe also what points thei are in which thei so greatly disagree. But be it that these fathers in some small points disagree as men, yet as I have heard thei have one sweete harmonie, consent, and agreement in the most and substantiallest points of gods religion, and therefore as St. Paul teacheth (which is scripture) we are not to quarrell at and

condemne them, but to folow these foresaide fathers, & all others, *as they folow Christ.*

B.35.

And where you burthen me in divers places of your lettre that I am conversant with a poore deceived sect, men of phantasticall spirits, such as deny the old testaments [as M.S.] to belong to christians: First, I awnswer, I thinke the old testament to belong to christians, so much as is not abolished by the newe. And for keeping company with such evill persons as you burthen me, I shall desire you to judge charitablie of me as you would I should do of you. The lord knoweth though I be the most sinfulllest and wickedest wretch in the world, yet my chief desire to be among the children of god, & such as folow the life of Christ most neare, and I so esteeme of them that, I thinke them worthy of all reverence, yea thinking my self happie if I may be but a hewer of wood & drawer of water among them. But from heretiques & such as do not embrace the holie scriptures thorowe the helpe of Christ Jesus, I will flee from them as from a serpent.

W.

It is true that I do often burthen you to be much conversant with a poore deceived sect, and will not leave so to burthen you,⁷⁶ nor judge more charitablie of you untill you forsake your saide secte and joyne with the universall Church of Christe. And here I must tell you againe that for lacke of matter, & no want of good will to be doing, though but very cavills, you, leaving many points unawnswered, do awnswer this matter twice,⁷⁷ as is to be seen in the 7 place, where leaving out sect, which I there & you here expresse, you say the deceived poore, & then frame your awnswer as pleaseth you. You proceede, and graunt so much to belong to christians of the old testament as is not abrogated by the newe. But what is abrogate and what not, you do not declare,⁷⁸ neither will you believe the judgement of any therin that is contrary unto your deceived sect. You would gladly be charitably judged of, but as before I have told you, so will I do, I am forbidden to call evill good, and therefore I may not call an heretique a christian. And that you are an heretique⁷⁹ you can not avoide, with all your often protestation, and by taking god to witnesse (which you can not see to be a swearing by any thing) that though you be the most sinfull in the world, yet your desire is to be with the children of god such as folow the life of Christ most neare; whome you

thinke worthie of all reverence, yea & accompt your self happie, if you may be a hewer of wood & drawer of water among them, but from heretiques and such as embrace not the scriptures you flee as from a serpent. All which you painted protestation, with your abusing of the name of god, doth not, I say, cleare you, but more manifestly prove you to be an heretique. For your great desire to keepe companie with gods children & such as folow the life of Christe most neare you meane not Gods children in his Universall Church,⁸⁰ but your owne sect in a corner, whome you esteeme worthie of all reverence, & account your selfe happie to be a hewer of wood & drawer of water amonge them. Where is now your truth in these wordes, No deceived sect I folow, their companies I haunt not etc. Here also I must put you in mynde of your great marveile, why I should make so long discourse to you that princes are ordained of god &c, & of your protestation with promise, that neither I nor any other shall speake so much of obedience to princes nor of their calling, but you will subscribe to the same etc., but as I saide in the 20th place it is with tongue and penne, not with deed and harte,⁸¹ for all your obedience to our prince & his lawes touching religion, & and touching the defense & government of her Maty, people & country, with weapon, armour, lawes &c, & your great desire to be amongst gods people is come to this, that not onely you dislike therof & seclude your self therfrom, but also do account your self happie to be a hewer of wood & drawer of water among your divelish secte,⁸² whome you account worthy of all reverence, and yet one of those who lately suffered even in the presence of Alderman Gammage, then Shrieve of London, Mr. Fox, Mr. Fuller, Mr. Field, Mr. Winthrop,⁸³ myself, & divers others, did aske whether thei could name one christian prince in the world. Behold one of that felowship unto whome you woulde draw wood & hewe water [*sic*]. To conclude this matter: First in saying you will subscribe to all obedience, & yet disobey, you are a liar. Secondly, in that you dissent from the Universall Church of Christ, you are a Schismaticque. Thirdly, in joyning your self to your divelish sect, you are, as I have saide, an heretique. Fourthlie, if you have felowship with them, & be not of their mynde you are a dissembling hypocrite,⁸⁴ as you were when you rode with a sword, & yet thought it unlawfull to use or weare any weapon. I had almost omitted here one occasion by which you most plainly bewray your self, which is that havinge saide *from heretiques*, you adde, and such as do not embrace

the holy scriptures, you will flee as from a serpent, by which exception & distinction between heretiques & such as embrace the holy scriptures, you shew your favour toward your felowes, who in your eies seeme not onely, but most rightly & alone, even with both armes, to embrace the holy scriptures, for which you not onely have them in great admiration, but allso to me did much commend their knowledge therin and utterance therof, when I found you with them in Newgate (as aforesaide.), and therefore from thence you flee not as from a serpent, but cleave fast to them, as a burre to a frieze. And here allso, if I would cavill, I might aske you where you can name one heretique which did not pervert (which you call embrace) the scriptures; allso how you or any other can be an heretique & not pervert & abuse the scriptures, & further might charge you to be a felow heretique,⁸⁵ with all heretiques, because all heretiques have, as you & your sect do, perverted (which you call embrace, as is saide) the holie scriptures (but I will not cavill here about.).

B.36.

For my confused heaping together of scriptures, I trust not so confused but they were trulie alledged, to the purpose of the thing for which thei were alledged: though I can not frame my stile with such excellency of speach, not in entising wordes of mans wisdom, for I have not bene at Universitie to studie Aristotles divinity. Allso I pray you to beare with me, that I am no more expert in alledging the scriptures, for that I have small time or none, to folow my booke, for that my poore estate will not suffer me, for that my charge is great, which compelleth me more painfullie to folow the world; for that I would faine eate myne owne bread, and not hinder anie man, but truly give unto everie man his owne.

W.

Whether the scriptures by you alledged be confusedly heaped together, & how truly thei be alledged, & to the purpose for which thei are alledged I have partly shewed, & will stand to be reformed where I faile upon like condition. But say you, thei are truly alledged, though you can [not] frame your stile with such excellency of speach, & entising wordes of mans wisdom, for you have not bene at University to study Aristotles divinitie &c. To which I first make this request, that when you read over Aristotle againe, shew me what his divinity is, for I know it not.⁸⁶ Now to your discourse wherin you seeme besides a frumpe toward me to shewe againe your

dislike of learning & learned men, in terming the University study Aristotles divinity. As for your desire to be borne with⁸⁷ in that you are no more expert in alledging the Scriptures, is but your common shew of humilitie and simplicity, cast over your intollerable pride, vainglorie, and arrogancie, who not onely despise learning and learned men, but also the Universall Church of Christ dispersed over the whole earth, and that to justifie your sect of hereticks in a corner. Touching⁸⁸ your many lets by which you have small time, or none to folow your booke, to which I wish you that either you had lesse time or els that you tooke better profite by it, being at it. But whatsoever lets you have being a carpenter, the same or the like I have, being a baker, who, be it knowne, have as great care for to eate my owne bread to give to everie man his owne, & not to be chargeable to any, as you or any of your sect.⁸⁹ Your counterfeite humility and covert craving of glory, hath caused me thus foolishly to boaste. If here I should against your dislike & railing⁹⁰ at Universities & learning, which an heathen man calleth the voice of an Asse, prove the lawfullnes therof by the schoolls or colleges of the prophets your awnswer is readie, but that was under the lawe, and we are delivered by Christ, but where finde you schooles or Universities in the new testament, and where can you shew in the printe of any of Christs footestepes that he was schooled in any Universitie? Shew me this also in the footestepes of any of his Apostles, & this shall be retracted or recanted. I guesse this would be your awnswer, because you so often use the same in like cases.

B.37.

And now wheras you bring in not to use weapon to be a condemning of such occupations as live by fighting, brawling, & contending, as lawyers, souldiers, armourers, cutlers, bowyers, fletchers, carpenters, among these I my self am a carpentar, and as yet I thanke god I never eate one piece of bread nor dranke one droppe of drinke by fighting, warring, & contending. As for the other occupations this I say—you must not set up carved images in Churches, because carvers may live therby, nor organs, nor candles, nor such like, to mainteine like occupations, nor schooles of fence and dauncing, to mainteine fencers, ruffians, and dauncers.

W.

Here you triumph,⁹¹ but before the victorie, & thinke you have caught me at a great advantage. but all in vaine. For I say

not that not to use weapon is a condemning of such occupations as live by fighting, brawling, & contending, as you wickedly affirme; but I say to deny, as you & your sect do, that christians may contend in lawe, pray defense of Magistrates, weare & use weapon &c, is not onely a condemnation of all godly in all ages which have lawfully used the same, with all those whose vocation is to live therby, but also a condemning of the lawfull magistrate, which is the highest ordinaunce of god upon earth.⁹² Behold now, how substantially this your cavill doth confute these my wordes, in my former lettre. You proceed and graunt that you are a carpentar, & yet you thanke god like the pharisee, that you never eate a piece of bread, nor dranke one draught of water, by fighting, warring, & contending &c. By which wordes you seeme to graunt that souldiers, warriors, lawyers etc, do eat their bread by fighting, warring, brawling, & contending &c. Then having cleared your self of this cryme, but not the carpenters of the Tower, with other occupations els where that make stocks & carriage for gunnes, with other munition of defense of our prince, her people, & countrey, having, I say, cleared your selfe herof, but not the rest, you go further & say, I must not set up carved Images in Churches, because carvers may live therby, neither organs, candles etc. By which wordes you seeme to graunt no more lawfull use of weapon, armour, lawes, &c than of Images, organs, & candles in Churches. And if this be your meaning, either ignorance or malice hath greatly deceived & blinded you or els your sect hath devilishlie bewitched you, that can now see no difference betwixt Idolatrous Images in Churches, which god so often & so expressly condemneth, & the lawfull use of weapon, armour, lawes &c., which in so many places god approveth, commaundeth, & useth, & no where forbiddeth in the lawfull use therof. Touching defense & dauncing, as I do not alow but utterly condemne the wicked abuse of both, especially of dancing, so though I finde the printe of neither in the footestepes of Christe, yet I dare not deny a lawfull use of both.

B [38]

And as for the magistrate, I am so farre from condemning his authority, that I account them worthie of all feare, reverence, & honour, & if I should do otherwise, I procure the wrath of god to my condemnation, as I saide afore; and thei are no terror unto mee, for that I mynde not to resist or transgresse their lawes, through the help of Christe, but will obey it, not being contrary to gods law.

W.

It seemeth that your conscience doth accuse you in this pointe, both by your often handling of this matter⁹³ as also by your using of many wordes & great protestation to purge your self therin, as before in the 17 place, & now in this. You account them worthy of all honour, and if you should not, you procure gods wrath &c., that thei are no terror unto you, for that you mynde not to resist, nor transgresse their lawes, not being contrary to gods lawes. But your obedience & not transgressing their lawes is partly noted in the 35 place, as the testimony of your hart doth shew the same by your acte[?]. Your saying that you will not resist &c. may the better be believed for that you deny all souldiers, all armour, all weapon, & all vocations that make instruments & munition for defense as unlawfull for christians. Which notwithstanding you are to be trusted as well as the rest of your sect at Mounster, read the storie out of Sleidan.⁹⁴ It seemeth also by that when you have saide you will not transgresse &c you presently adde, their lawes not being contrary to gods law; & in the 11 place you adde, that you will give to princes so much as is due to Caesar, together with your example of disobeying & seclüding your self from Christs Church in England, by all which I say you seeme to graunt that our prince by her lawes doth require more than is dewe to Caesar, & if she do I pray you shew me wherin; for I would not give unto Caesar that which is due unto God.

B [39]

Thus according to the talent that god hath given me I have somewhat boldly & rudely written unto you, yet I trust truly, & have somewhat awnsvered to the worst⁹⁵ of your lettre, as time suffered and as they lay; and I shall desire you to judge the best of me as I do of you. I have not communicated so farre with no man as with you. I trust the lord will so direct me with his holie spirit that in any thing which you thinke is contrary to the truth, as I know nothing; the lord I trust will reveale it to me in his due time.

[W].

You have indeed according to your talent &c, not given you of god, who giveth to his the spirit of truth, but of the divell, who inspireth his with the spirit of lies, & by whose instigation with the help of his instruments, the Anabaptists, you have I say indeed, not onely rudely and boldly, as you say, but also falsly, blasphemously, & reprochfully⁹⁶ awnsvered, and verie

truly as you say to the worst of my lettre, and like true it may be that you did it as leisure served, but most untrue that you awnswer to the same as thei lay. For besides your adding, dimynishing, falsifying, catching, & snatching here a piece, and there a piece, as you confesse, of the worst⁹⁷ of my lettre, that is, whatsoever you could take any occasion to cavill at, & over-slipping those points which you could neither confute nor cavill with, besides all this, I say, you more than once and in sundrie places which I have noted, do make two & contrary awnswers to some one pointe,⁹⁸ & that by your wicked dealing in either, adding to my wordes, as in the 37 place, dimynshing from the same, as in the eight place, or els by falsifyng therof, as in the 4 place. You proceed desiring me to judg the best &c, not without cause you make this request, for the worste is worse than starke naught, but as before I have saide, so shall you finde untill I see better. In that you have not communicated so farre with no man &c, you shall through me take no harme⁹⁹ therby (as I am yet mynded), excepting my promise how I will esteeme of you. You further say that you trust the lord will direct you, that in any thing which I thinke is contrary, he will reveale it. But this your pharisaicall prayer, with your counterfeit simplicities and ignorance is but your usual cloake cast on your pride & arrogancie, which in your opinion not onelie see & know more than I, but also that you & your sect do see & know more than the whole Church of Christe, and are so farre of[f] to believe me touching these things, which I not onelie thinke, but also do know, and upon the warrant of my salvation do advoucht to be contrary to the truth¹⁰⁰: that you will not believe the Universall Church of Christe, no not god & Christe himselfe, whose approbation, commaundement, & example with the example of all godly in all ages I have alledged for a proof of those points wherabout we contend. And notwithstanding your opinion touching the points which I have proved to be contrary to truth, yet (say you) I know nothing contrary and that is because you will neither see, heare, know, nor believe any thing except the same be revealed by the instigation of Sathan, & blowne into your eares by his instruments the Anabaptists,¹⁰¹ whome you esteeme worthy of all reverence & account your self happy to be but a drawer of water among them.

B [40]

Which the lord graunt & strengthen me in that wherin I stand to his truth, & raise me up when I fall, & bring me home

when I wander astray, & open myne eies when I am blinde, & waken me when I am asleepe, for Jesus Christs sake, to whome with the fater, & the holie ghost, be all honour & glory for evermore Amen. Yours allwaies in the lord, as I am perswaded you will do no otherwise willingly. Fare you well. Written the 13 of October S. B.

W.

When you before have saide that you know nothing contrary to truth, adding, the lord I trust will reveile it unto me &c, to which you say here, the lord graunt. But you have greater cause to pray that god will open your eies, ears, & hart, to see, heare, understand, & believe his truth, which he so many waies, & so manifestly doth reveile unto you, against which truth, touching those points in which we contend, you seeme even wilfully as in the broad day light & bright sunne shine to close your eies, to stoppe your ears, & to harden your hart least you should see, heare, understand, believe, & embrace the same. That god strengthen you in that wherin you stand to his truth I adde *Amen*, & touching that which foloweth, I will pray that god will raise you up, for you are fallen, that he will bring you home, for you are gone astray, that he will open your eies, for you are blinde (& who so blinde as he who will not see, & most palpable is that blindnes, which is counted for perfect sight) & so much that the more blinde, by how much you thinke you see better & more than others: to conclude, that he will waken you, for you are on sleepe, that you even snorte in errors; all which god graunt you, if it be his will, for his crucified Christ Jesus his sake, to whome, with the holie ghost, be everlasting praise, honour, & glory. So be it. Thus have I as leisure served, as you say, somewhat awnswered,¹⁰² not to the worst of your lettre, but to the best allso, the begynnyng, the middle, and the end. So leaving you to the judgement or mercy of god in Christ Jesus. In whome yours, as you are his, Wm White. Jan 2. 1575[-6].

And further, as before I have sayed, sith you keepe felowship with the foresaide company, it must needes folow that either you be wholly of their myndes, or els prove your self a very hypocrite, as is saide in the 35 place, for which cause I have sent you herewithall a copie of a lettre written to those of your secte in Newgate, not many daies before 2 of them suffered touching the truth of Christs incarnation according to the holy scriptures, which those 9 that were banished, those

2 that suffered, & those 2 that lately were delivered, with all the rest of your sect, & therefore very likely your self also do most ignorantly, impudently, & damnably deny, which saide lettre touching that error together with myne awnswer to your other errors, I wish you diligently to weigh & consider, & that even as you tender your owne salvation, which I desire as myne owne, notwithstanding I have somewhat sharply written unto you, to awaken your security, to correct your arrogancy, & to reclaime you from your errors, & erroneous company to joyne with the universall Church of Christ without which there is no salvation. And that you may the more deeply consider of your daungerous estate in secluding your self therfrom, I further desire you in the L. Jesus, well to consider of the late judgement of god, upon a brother (as was thought) whose credit among the godly, whose praise in the gospell, whose zeale & continuance in the same, whose persecution & exile for testimony therof was not much inferior to those that suffered most, & gave the greatest testimony (death excepted), who held no such errors, neither did condemne the Universall Church of Christ, nor cut him self therfrom, as you & your sect do, but acknowledged the saide Universall Church as also these members & parts therof: the Church of Christ in Geneva, in Fraunce, in Germany, in Scotland &c; also in London the Italian Church, the dutch & the french, of which he was a member; so that his greatest sinne knowne to man, & as his owne mouth did confesse not many dayes before his dolourous & daungerous end, was that, for judging & condemnyng a part of Christs Church & but certaine members of the same, the heavy hand of god was upon him, which as wofull experience declares never left him untill his owne conscience, hart, & hand, was his owne accuser, judge, & hangman, which saide terrible example none ought to rejoyce at, neither rashly to judge, or curiously to search gods judgement therin, nor yet to insult against any man or matter, especially against the glorious gospell & syncere professors therof, but watch that all men of all sorts be admonished therby. Not surmising that he was a greater sinner than the rest, but that all do thinke as Christ saith Luke 13. that *except we repent we shall likewise perish*. And as every sort may take their peculiar admonition therof as the Atheist & godles man, may conceive that if so heavy a judgement of God fell upon one that so long had professed his gospell, & with such zeale, imprisonment, persecution, & exile gave such testimony of the same, how hard a judgement

resteth for them unles they repent which not onely want like fruits, but also the same glorious gospell, *which is the power of god to salvation to every one that believeth.* 2dly. those which professe the same glorious gospell of Christ Jesus & thinke they stand sure, let them, I say, *take heed¹⁰³ they fall not,* but with an holy & righteous life *confirme their election, & in humility, feare, and trembling worke out their owne salvation:* & as the Atheist, godlesse man, & protestant so the papists with all other hereticks & Schismaticks, & namely you & your sect, may likewise be moved to consider what an heavy judgement of god will fall upon you & your sect except you repent, which not onely do erre, & as in many points so in one of the chiefest of christian faith, but also do separate your selves & condemne, not a part of Christs Church, or but certain particular members therof, but the whole Universall Church of Christ through out the whole world. But here an end. Desiring the eternall & ever living god, for his crucified Christ Jesus his sake that all those which do know or shall heare of the foresaide heavy Judgement of god, may so consider therof, as they may be bettered therby, & learne that good which god would teach us by the same, that with feare & trembling, as saide, we may walke before the lord our god in such holines & righteousnes of life, as by which his name may be glorified, our knowledge, faith & hope increased, our election confirmed, & we in the end everlastingly saved thorow Christ Jesus our onely saviour, to whome with god, his & our father & the allmighty comforter, be everlasting praise, honour & glory. So be it.

It is long since that I wrote your awnswer & what other let soever hath with held the same from you so long, I am perswaded gods providence was the chief lette, that togethr with my awnswer & other lettre, I might also note you the late lamentable example threatnyng, you might be reclaymed & made excuselesse.

To which I will adde, & so require of you not to be denied as you will use meanes for your conversion, that after a time of diligent consideration of my saide awnswer lettre, & late example, we may have further conference with 2 or 4 godly learned prechers indifferently chosen to decyde our controversy, & that so without further writing there may be an end had of all our former conferences and travailles, to Gods glorie, the discharging of my brotherly and christian duty, & to your conversion & salvation, if it be gods will, to whome for the

time I leave you, & in whome yours as you are his, as before is saide Wm White Aprill 4. 1576.

My lettre written to the rest of your sect touching Christs Incarnation I require after reading & good consideration therof to have againe, But touching my awnswer I do onely desire & that upon like condition, that if occasion so serve I may have a sight of yt, the same remayning still in the hand of you or your friends.

NOTES. ✓

All the notes marked M are the final comments of the Anabaptist, S.B., placed by him on the margin on the manuscript.

¹ M. "the[y] utterly denied it."

² M. "God keepeth me and the haire of my head are numbered."

³ M. "His cause you can not defend by the Scriptures." This is, of course, Percival Wiburne (Wyburn, Wyborne), prebendary of Norwich, Westminster, and Rochester, sequestered in 1564 from the vicarage of St. Sepulchre's, London, but preaching occasionally till death in 1606; one of the leaders of the Puritan movement, headed by Thomas Cartwright. Of Ditcher and the law suit, no trace can be found.

⁴ M. "Micheas had not the spirit of error for speaking against false prophets."

⁵ M. "a matter."

⁶ M. "and yet I trust I am the lordes. what Christ doth allow is good."

⁷ M. "I esteeme not for the worldes knowledge."

⁸ M. "It is at your pleasure to gather of my wordes."

⁹ M. "he is sometime a mynister, sometime a mariner, and sometime a merchant. this slanderer that walketh in no vocation you dare call a brother: But speake the trueth, for he lyeth."

¹⁰ M. "are you not faultie in that you burthen me with all?"

¹¹ M. "I seeke for no praise of men."

¹² The meaning here is not clear.

¹³ M. "The wordes revenge and suffer had a relation to the former wordes if you marke it. I know all is ignorance contrary to your minde; call you that detectinge of a mans ignorance to painte him out as a foole?"

¹⁴ M. "Thorow the help of Christ my obedience hath and shall appear to the gracious prince as much as yours doth in all respects."

¹⁵ II. Esdras, viii., 2; not quoted literally from the Genevan version.

16 M. "I will not prove to defend no[r] sects nor heresies, but your words which say the deceived were smaller than the truth, and I say untruth is greater in multitude than the truth.

17 I.e., Lot's.

18 M. "I have no secte, nor am of any secte but of the religion of Christe."

19 M. "I shewed you the scriptures in my former letter, which were these: Deut. 18. 15., Acts 7. 37., Matt 17. 5., Matt 7. 24., Joh. 4. 23., Matt 5. 22, 30, 40, 41., Rom 12. 14., 2 Cor. 10. 4., 1 Pet 3. 8., Esay 53. 2 et 6. 5., 1 Cor. 4. 12, Wis. 5. 1, Eph. 6. 16, Matt. 26. 52, John 18. 22, Matt. 10. 16, Heb. 11. 32, 33, 34, Philip. 1. 7, 2 Thes. 3., Apoc. 7. 14, and divers others which to have rehersed againe would have made the lettre to[o] great and tedious.

20 M. "I must beare this and greater at your handes, for thei saide Christ had a devill."

21 M. "Here Mr. W. seemes to be much moved that I saide I awnswered to the worst of his lettre: he hath my words in writing to shew, I saide to the most part of his letter, and moste he taketh to be worste, and that moveth him without a cause."

22 M. "I named what things in my former letter, which be those which we nowe contende for."

23 M. "I have awnswered both your places at once."

24 M. "It toucheth as much the quicke as though you called me traitor, thief, murderer, or sorcerer, from which things I praise god I am free, and as cleare I am in that you burden me withall: but you & I shall once appeare before the judgement seate of God."

25 M. "worldly wisemen: but I am contented to be called a foole of you, that I may be made wise."

26 M. "We must suffer the injuries of the worlde as Christe did."

27 M. "I know no such, nor keepe company with not [none?] that [be] so evill disposed."

28 M. "Gods word must be the judge."

29 M. "Christe when he was reviled revenged not himself; no more must Christs mynister."

30 M. "by oversight I left out one sipher."

31 M. "So Christe compareth himself to a thief and to a covetous man.

32 M. "Christ is the true expounder of the law, and saith, resist not, and gave us example to folowe his steppes."

33 M. "Though I saide we were delivered from the ceremonies of the lawe, I saide not that weapons were any ceremony of the lawe. I knew it would fall out that wherewith you burthened me you would be found faulty in yourself, by saying I was a caviller."

34 M. "As in building the stony temple they wrought with the one hand, & held the sword in the other, so muste we Christians do: we must worke that men may see our good works, & we must hold a sword in the other hand, the sword of the spirit & the shield of faith."

35 M. "as you do conjecture."

36 M. "which you leave to shewe."

37 M. "Christ did suffer it that the scripture might be fulfilled, among the wicked was he counted."

38 The Genevan note is:—The exercising of the sword is forbid to private persons.

39 M. "Christe giveth us no commandement to absteine from mariage, but gave us commandement that we should not resist."

40 M. "To be true christians is to folow Christ."

41 M. "I would you were so free from layinge untruths to my charge as I am as from abusing the scriptures and arrogancie."

42 M. "Idolatry is forbidden, so is revengement forbidden."

43 M. "The scrip. saieth but 200 besides the seventie horsmen."

44 M. "You would still have something against me for princes, but you hope in vaine."

45 M. "I meane to leane to a more sure pillar than is Mr. Calvin."

46 M. "may resistance be harmless?"

47 M. "It serveth verie well to prove we must not resist."

48 M. "But shew me to strike and revenge how you can obey Christe his words *resist not*."

49 M. "Doth not Paul will them that thei should rather suffer injury: & wher do you finde that if thei might arrest one another by the serjeants, & cast one another into prison?"

50 M. "but you knew it not but by Christ."

51 M. "to alledge the gospell you account it a cavilling."

52 M. "you say it."

53 M. "I have saide enough allready."

54 M. "Yet of the heathen there was a difference betwixt them; the Grecians esteemed the rest barbarians; the Egiptians were a part of the heathen; if I had not named Egiptians, howe could you have knowne my meaning? finde no fault without a cause."

55 M. "But St. Paul useth his taking god to witness in spirituall matters. There is no such commandement that men should sweare at the barre before Judges in the old or new testament."

56 M. "Why do you so triumph? it is no jarre in the scriptures to harken to Christ, the fullfiller of the law; though thei might circumcise their children we may not, and yet not jarre; the Jewes might put

away their wives, and we may not, and yet not jarre; the Jewes might offer sacrifice and we may not, and yet not jarre, etc."

57 M. "Your dealing with me is as the Jewes was with Christ; thei saide, he blasphemeth, it is blasphemy; and though you say I blaspheme, yet I thanke god I am free both in harte and tongue."

58 M. Judge, good reader, wherein I have blasphemed, and marke his spirite."

59 M. "To take god to witnes in spirituall causes, and not in everie trifling matter."

60 M. "If I should use half such wordes, you would say that I blasphemed."

61 M. "True Christians will not hurte one another, and I will not contend with others."

62 M. "It is your wordes, for Christ alloweth no swearing."

63 See B 28.

64 M. "Still I finde you my heavy Judge, but my conscience is cleare, but I trust god will judge you and me more mercifullie."

65 M. "My knowledge is according to the scriptures, and not according to your mynde."

66 M. "It maketh so for my purpose that you will never be able to confute it."

67 M. "These be your common wordes, and such like."

68 M. "Marke, good readers, yf these scriptures are not to the purpose."

69 M. "I shew the cause why this is not received, because it is contrary to the flesh, and very few will receive it, but the doctrine of the flesh must receive."

70 M. "What is a doctrine of the flesh els?"

71 M. "Shew me one word I have spoken against Magistrates."

72 M. "I never read that there were six hundreth thousand false prophetes, as you have noted; if I should have done this I knowe what you would then have saide."

73 M. "You take me contrary in all things."

74 M. "You abuse me: the scriptures I alledged for this purpose were: Matt. 5. 22, 30, 40, 41, Rom. 12. 14, 2 Cor. 10. 4, 1 Pet. 3. 8, Is. 53., Rom. 6. 5, 1 Cor. 4. 12, Wisd. 5. 1, Ephes. 6. 6, Matt. 26. 52, Joh. 8. 22, Hebr. 11. 32, 33, 34, Phill. 1. 7, 2 Thes. 1. 3, Apo. 7. 14, as is to be seene in the 6 leafe, the scriptures in this leafe I alledged that thei are only sufficient of themselves; let the reader judge indifferently of your dealing."

75 M. "I have read their authority in other books, and have heard them brought in sermons that thei all have their errores."

76 M. "Do what god shall permit you."

77 M. "I answered orderly as was in your lettre; more often have you burthened me than I have used my defence."

78 M. "I have declared it, and I say all which is not allowed by the gospell."

79 M. "This is a small thing; Christ himself was called a Samaritan and had a devill."

80 M. "Gods children are in his Church."

81 M. "Whie take you gods office, to judge of mans hearte?"

82 M. "Marke, good reader, I say I thinke my self happie to be in the companie of the children of god, if it be but to hewe wood and draw water, and he termeth those whome it pleaseth him."

83 M. "These are still your salutations, god give you a meeker spirit."

84 M. "Your charity still appeareth, but when you learned the words you wente not unto schoole with Christ."

85 John Foxe, William Fuller, and John Field are well-known names in Puritan controversy. Winthrop, so far, I have not traced.

86 M. "Aristotles' divinitie is Logicke and philosophie, which Paul biddes us take heed no man do spoile us by it."

87 M. "For no evill I have done or saide to you or any I desire not to be born withall, but suspecting your spirit would be thus moved, my wordes being contrary to your minde, that you should not passe the bonds of patience I desire you to beare with me."

88 M. "This messe of unsavourie meat still you set before me, which as Job saieth can not be eaten without salte."

89 M. "I do not charge you to the contrarie."

90 M. "Shewe me any railing word in any of both my lettres; but you have laide your gennes and nets to catch me if you could."

91 M. "If I triumph, it is in Christ, and not in my worde, nor yet in any worldly thinge."

92 M. "I pray god preserve our most noble queene; farre is it from my harte to condemne her grace, but to shew my true obedience toward her grace to the uttermoste of my power."

93 M. "I have no oftener cleared my self than you have laide it to my charge, and I thanke god you have no more cause to burthen me than I have to burthen you; for I am as cleare from contemnyng authoritie as you are or any other."

94 M. "Read you the story, and you shall finde them to agree more with you than with me, for that you seeme not to mislike of the warres in France, and also sticke so to the carnall weapon." An English translation of Sleidanus's work was published in 1560, with the title: "A Famous Cronicle of our time called Sleidanus Commentaries"

95 M. "Here he turneth my wordes from *most* to *worste*, which thing so doth move him."

96 M. "These be but your old speaches."

97 M. "I saide: to the most of your letter."

98 M. "I would you yourself were as cleare from this as I am, taking the scriptures that I alledged for one proof, and putting them for another."

99 M. "I thanke god you can do me no harme, though you have writhed, and wrested, and judged my hart according to your owne pleasure, laying things to my charge that I am free indeed and hart from, that you seeke ever everie way to catch me at some vantage."

100 M. "I dare stand to the scriptures, more than to either you or any other man."

101 M. "I have named none but the children of god."

102 M. "Christs mynisters come in a mylder maner and spirit. St. Paul sayeth: brethren, if any man be fallen by any occasion into any fault you that are spirituall help to restore such a one in the spirit of meeknes, &c. I have not used to you no such gally and bitter wordes, but the tree is knowne by his fruits."

103 M. "God give me his grace to take heed and to learne by the examples of all that god sheweth his judgements upon, that I be not as thei be with whom the Lord so dealeth, as for example Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, with divers others in the scriptures, which are written for an example to us. And as for Bolton, I have to be warned by him as you and any other were, but this be knowne unto you, he spake not to me in a yeare or allmost 2 before he dyed, and for this cause, he saide if the Queene would give him license and money he would make an army, and first go through England, and not leave a papist [alive], and so passe forward into other Countries. Then I asked him if that were according to the spirite of Christ, saying, whereas Christ came to Samaria, and thei would not receive him, when the Apostles would have called for fyer from heaven he rebuked them, and also of the tares sown amongst the good seede, and other such like scriptures as to the same end I alledged. then hee spake his pleasure at that time, and after that never gave me word where he mette me. But I thanke god I have not bene nor am not nor I trust thorow the help of Christ shall never be of his blouddie mynde." John Bolton or Boulton was in exile during Mary's reign, becoming a member of the English Church at Geneva on November 5th, 1556 (Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève* 1555-60). He was closely associated with the Separatist movement in London, 1567-71, a fact which opponents of Separatism in later days did not forget to

emphasise. His name does not appear among the leaders of the Plumbers' Hall congregation examined by Grindal in June, 1567, but he was among the 77 taken in St. Martin's-in-the-field the following March, and among the 31 discharged from Bridewell on April 22nd, 1569. His name is missing from the three papers relating to Richard Fitz's congregation in 1571, and it seems likely that in the interval he had recanted at Paul's Cross, and been excommunicated by the Separatist Church of which he was elder.

In 1591 George Gifford (A short Reply, &c., p. 17) thus refers to him:—

"I said that the fearful end of one Bolton, about twenty years past would not be forgotten . . . for the truth is, he did for the same causes that you do, utterly condemn the whole church of England, and was with sundry others separated from it. And (as it is constantly affirmed) he was an elder in their secret church, and afterward falling into deep despair, he could not be recovered, but did hang himself."

In 1595 Thomas Drakes ("Ten Counter-Demands Pro-pounded") refers to Bolton's suicide, calling him a "first founder" of Separatism, and Thomas Rogers does the same in the 1607 edition of "The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England," quoting Gifford, and calling Bolton "he that first hatched that sect in England which afterward was termed Brownism."

Henry Ainsworth, in his *Counterpoyson* (1608, p. 39), also refers to Bolton, as does John Robinson in his *Justification of Separation* (Works, 1851, II., 57). When a very similar incident occurred in the career of John Child, a Baptist minister, in 1684, no parallel seems to have been drawn. The date of the suicide is not easy to determine. Gifford's "about twenty years ago" would give c.1571, but White, in 1576 speaks as if it had just happened. Possibly Bolton was excommunicated before 1571, and joined the French Church in London (though so far no association with this church has appeared), not "becoming his own judge and hangman" until 1576.