---

A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php

# Samuel Eaton (d. 1639)
# Particular Baptist Pioneer

ALTHOUGH the main outlines of Samuel Eaton's later years were made available to the curious over half a century ago[1] his career, together with the hitherto unpublished documents which throw light upon it, deserves further notice as part of the story of the period before the publication of the 1644 *Confession.*

Eaton first appears as one of the congregation of semi-separatists led by John Lathrop[2]. Samuel Eaton was, in fact, present when, on Sunday, 29 April, 1632, it was surprised while at worship by a pursuivant of William Laud, then bishop of London, a man called Tomlinson or Tomlyns. Apparently the gathering was made up of some forty-two people who had met together that day in the home of a brewer's clerk in Blackfriars whose wife was a member of the church. The names of all those who were present were taken but it seems that not all were kept in custody[3]. Those who, like Eaton, were imprisoned were taken to[4] "Mayden-Lane in London, that being the Bishops Prison".

On 3 May, the Thursday after their arrest, both those who had been imprisoned and those who had been released on bond appeared before the Court of High Commission. This court was one of the major instruments used by the Anglican episcopate, from the 1580's until its abolition in 1641, for the suppression of puritans and sectaries.

After some preliminaries the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, harangued the prisoners accusing them of ingratitude to God, the king and the Church of England for holding unlawful assemblies which made[5] "rents and divisions in the Church". He challenged them to name anything that was amiss with the Church of England and assured them that "if any thing be not agreeable to the word of God, we shalbe as readie to redresse it as you". Perhaps, however, he betrayed his real attitude towards them when he complained that "you are unlearned men that seeke to make up a religion out of your owne heads". Bishop Laud had less to say on this occasion probably because he had already made up his mind that they were "desperatlie hereticall".

When, later in the proceedings, Samuel Eaton and three women of the congregation were asked why they had attended a conventicle while they should have been in church it was Eaton who answered[6], "We were not assembled in contempt of the Magis-

trate". To this the Bishop of London sharply replied, "No, it was in contempt of the Church of England". But Eaton had more to say in their defence: "It was in conscience to God . . . and, we were kept from Church, for we were confyned in the house together by those that besett the house, els divers would have gone to Church and manie came in after the sermons were done'. This desire to meet both separately as a covenanted community and together with parish congregations whose ministers took a puritan position had been a characteristic of this group since its foundation by Henry Jacob in 1616.

However Dr. Laud now intervened again to assert that the prisoners had made a habit of conventicling: they had, he said, been known to meet at Lambeth and in a number of other places. Furthermore, he alleged, "they have in their meetinge bookes printed against the Church of England". The Archbishop then resumed his interrogation by asking, "Where were you in the morninge before you came hither to this house?" In reply Eaton told him that they had been at home with their families and when asked what they had been doing he answered, "We read the Scriptures and catechized our families . . . we did nothing but what you will allow us to doe". He was then asked to take the *ex officio* oath but refused. This oath, which was generally disliked and mistrusted by puritans of all shades of opinion, compelled a defendant to incriminate himself in answer to articles alleged against him by the court. Since such a practice conflicted with the traditions of English common law it was unpopular with the common lawyers as well as with those who suffered most directly from it.

After the three women had been questioned and had also refused the oath *ex officio* all the prisoners were committed once more to the New Prison from where it was decided they should be brought for the next hearing "to the Consistorie at Paules, because of trouble and danger bringinge so manie prisoners as there were over the water to Lambeth". At this second hearing, held on 8 May[7], Samuel Eaton tried to clarify his own attitude to the oath *ex officio*: "I doe not refuse it, though I doe not take it: it is not out of obstinacie, but, as I shall answere it at the Last day, I am not satisfyed whether I may take it". Nevertheless it is unlikely that such a position was distinguishable, as far as his judges were concerned, from a blunt rejection of the oath altogether. In consequence, as his widow was late to tell the House of Commons, he was kept in the New Prison[8], "halfe a yere & no cawse shewed, but his refusing the Oath Ex Officio". At the end of this period and at considerable expense, Eaton managed to secure a writ of *habeas corpus* and sought his release on bail, by an application to the King's Bench. When this was refused "because he sought to be relieved at the Comon Law" the Bishop of London had him transferred to the Gatehouse prison for six months close confine-

ment. During eight or nine weeks of this second period of imprisonment even his wife was kept from him and, when caught on one occasion "looking to the wyndow, wher he lay" she was threatened with being put in the stocks herself. Eaton then secured his liberty once more for "a few weekes" until the machinery of the Court of High Commission caught up with him again. When this happened he was committeed to prison for a further "yere & a halfe" because of his continued refusal of the *ex officio* oath[9].

It is likely that such experiences at the hands of the authorities as these did something to stimulate the debate which had begun some time earlier among the members of Lathrop's congregation between those whose attitude had hardened into a complete repudiation of the Church of England and those who still did not wish to take such an extreme position. Episcopal persecution could certainly have an effect additional to the creation of mere personal bitterness among its victims: it also had a doctrinal significance for at least some of those who suffered it. After all, since the earliest days of the English Reformation it had been taught that a persecuting church, by pursuing this very policy, proved itself to be a false church. Eventually, on 12 September 1633[10], some ten members[11] "being dissatisfyed with ye Churches owning of English Parishes to be true Churches" were released by Lathrop's congregation to form their own separate community which would, like the older Separatists, draw the bounds of its fellowship more narrowly holding even puritan members of the Church of England "guilty by association". These were afterwards[12] joined by eight others, among them Samuel Eaton. A note was appended to the record, not to say that Eaton was then in prison, although he probably was, but that[13] "Mr. Eaton wth Some others" received "a further Baptism".

The simplest view of the circumstances surrounding this baptism of Samuel Eaton may well be the right one[14]: that he had come to hold the view that only believer's baptism was true Christian baptism and that it was administered to him, perhaps while he was in prison, by John Spilsbery. It must be recognised that the only authority for Eaton's baptism by Spilsbery is a fragment of verse from John Taylor, a self-appointed scourge of the sectaries, but there seems no reason to doubt the fact to which it bears witness.

Spilsbery, according to John Taylor[15],

> ". . . rebaptiz'd in Anabaptist fashion
> One Eaton (of the new found separation)
> A zealous Button-maker, grave and wise,
> And gave him orders, others to baptize".

Eaton's baptism "wth Some others" implies that for a period in the 1630's there was at least one congregation in London, that with which Eaton, and later William Kiffin, were linked, which contained members taking different views about whether or not

Christian baptism should be restricted to believers. Later, if, as seems likely, this was the congregation William Kiffin led[16], it came to practice "closed membership".

During this imprisonment, once more in the Gatehouse, Aquila Weekes, the keeper, added to Eaton's difficulties[17] by insisting that he lived in the common gaol until he had discharged a debt of £4 incurred during the course of his earlier close confinement. However it appears that he was released before 9 October 1634[18] since on that day the Court of High Commission decided that he and John Lathrop[19] should be apprehended once more. It is, in passing, worth noticing that Eaton's stay in the Gatehouse overlapped part of the period when Mrs. Traske maintained her lonely sufferings there on behalf of the Saturday-Sabbath: the London prisons would be one of the places where sectaries of differing views would be almost certain to learn something about one another.

According to his widow Eaton was not actually imprisoned again, although the Court of High Commission was still seeking both him and Lathrop in February 1635 for "their keeping of conventicles"[20], until 1638. This was in spite of the fact that Eaton was among those surprised by[21] "both ye sheriffs, & then Veasy ye Pursevant" at a meeting at Queenhithe on 21 January 1637. On this occasion names were taken but some money also changed hands and Veasy only committed four people to the Poultry Counter. His final arrest[22] by John Ragg, pursuivant to William Laud who was now Archibishop of Canterbury, took place at home. He was taken from there to Newgate Gaol "and ther he remayned one whole yere, notwithstanding all the meanes he used for his Liberty". It is of this last imprisonment during which "by reason of the closenes & noysomness of the Prison, And for want of Aire" he died that most is known.

This is largely because of the petition of one Francis Tucker, B.D.[23], who was himself imprisoned in Newgate for debt. The petition complained bitterly of the freedom which Eaton was allowed in and out of gaol by its keeper. According to Tucker the gaoler had allowed Eaton, actually within the prison, to preach to congregations of seventy people and more. On these occasions he had not only asserted that "Baptisme was the Doctrine of Devills" but that bishops were "heretickes, Blasphemers, and Antichristians". When Francis Tucker had asked the keeper to put an end to such irregularities as these the latter not merely told him to mind his own business but also that if he disliked Eaton's conventicles he, the gaoler, was quite prepared to move Tucker's quarters, presumably out of earshot, "into some worser place of the Prison". Meanwhile the keeper himself graced one of Eaton's meetings with his presence and "havinge viewed the said Assembly hee said there was a very faire, and goodly Company and stayinge there some season departed without any distaste thereat". Tucker

went on to claim that in spite of the fact that the gaoler had been charged by the High Commission to take special care of Eaton he had "several times" allowed the latter to go out of the prison to discharge preaching engagement and that "dayly" many people were allowed to visit him to hear him preach. But when Tucker had again protested the keeper replied with "most vncivill Language" and, he alleged, Eaton himself had reacted not only with "abusive words but allsoe blowes". According to Elizabeth Eaton Samuel's last imprisonment was only for a year and his death, according to the anonymous "T.S.",[24] took place in late August 1638. By 1638 there can be no doubt that when Eaton spoke of baptism "as the Doctrine of Devills" in the hearing of an Anglican such as Francis Tucker he meant paedobaptism since members of the Jessey congregation who were dismissed[25], 8 June 1638, to join with John Spilsbury were said to be "of ye Same Judgment wth Sam: Eaton" holding that "Baptism was not for Infants but professed Beleivers".

The last straw, for Francis Tucker, was when his sister-in-law, who had come to visit his wife while she was ill, herself "fell exceedinge sicke". Yet against the advice of a doctor who had said that to remove her would be to endanger her life the keeper insisted that she should be moved and this was followed, the day after, by her death. To add insult to this heartless injury the room thus vacated was then handed over to Eaton as "the most convenient place in the prison for keepinge his conventicles".

There is some difficulty involved in discovering the identity of the gaoler concerned in this scandalous affair. Tucker's letter was undated but he asked that the sheriffs of London and Middlesex for the year, Isaac Pennington and John Wollaston should be asked to investigate his allegations and to report to Archbishop Laud. The earliest date for the letter is thus provided by the date when the new sheriffs took office: the feast of St. Michael and all Angels, 29 September 1638. The latest date was the burial of Eaton, 25 August 1639. Unfortunately there were three successive keepers of Newgate Prison during the year in which Pennington and Wollaston held office. The first was James Francklin, who had been appointed 13 May 1636[26], and who was dead by 16 October 1638[27], when the new sheriffs had hardly been in office more than a fortnight. The second was appointed by the sheriffs and was John Wallaston's brother Henry who[28] "peaceably executed that place for six weeks". Unfortunately for Henry Wollaston the right of the sheriffs to appoint their own nominee as keeper of the prison was disputed by the aldermen of the City of London[29]. The dispute was taken to the Privy Council and they decided it in favour of the aldermanic bench. The third keeper to officiate at Newgate during the period in which Francis Tucker's letter must have been written was Richard[30] Johnson. When he was appointed, 16 October 1638[31], it was noted that he was servant to "Thomas

Gardner, Esq., Recorder of this City" and that thereafter he was to "have hold exercise & enjoy the same place with all fees pfitts & Comodities thereunto due & of right belonging soe long as hee shall well & honestly use & behave himselfe in the due execution thereof".

There can be little doubt which of these men it was about whom Francis Tucker made his complaints. James Francklin hardly lived long enough to provide a likely solution; Henry Wollaston only survived for six weeks and it was specifically noted that he was discharged[32] without any accusation of misconduct being brought against him (he seems to have been the unlucky victim of a trial of strength between the sheriffs and the aldermen) so he also seems an unlikely identification as Francis Tucker's enemy. On the other hand Richard Johnson seems an entirely plausible candidate.

It was on 22 November 1638 that the sheriffs were instructed by the court of aldermen to enable Johnson to take[33] "quiet possession of the goale of Newgate". His keepership proved a stormy one. In less than a month after his installation his clerk, one Henry Pridgeon, who had threatened to stab him in some quarrel between them, was on 5 December[34] dismissed and sent to another prison until he found sureties for his future good behaviour. Johnson himself did not however escape without rebuke for, at the same meeting of the court of aldermen, a petition of the prisoners against him was received and, although the city fathers decided that he had cleared himself of most of the complaints made against him, he was advised for the future "to Carry himselfe gently and fairely towards the prisoners".

Obviously enough, against the background of the dispute with the sheriffs, the aldermen would be rather unwilling to hear compaints against their nominee too sympathetically. Yet, on August 13 1639[35] the aldermen felt compelled to set up a committee which included the sheriffs to "heare and examine the Complaints made against the keeper of Newgate". The accusations were not specified but they could well have included those made by Francis Tucker. The committee of investigation reported about a fortnight after Eaton's death. The record of their report is not very informative. They explained, 12 September 1639[36], that since Johnson would have to answer for some of his crimes "else where" they had confined their attention mainly to "that sordid crime of drunkennesse the cause of all disorder and tumult". They had, they said, concluded that the keeper was "very unchast incontinent and intemperate" and that since all other crimes stemmed from such failings as these they felt that the other unspecified charges could be reasonably accepted as true also. In view of this is is a remarkable fact that Johnson was not finally dismissed until a meeting of the court of aldermen, 23 November 1641[37], on the grounds that prisoners were escaping and that "great disorders are there Continually comitted". His explanation for the escape of two thieves

was that he had agreed "vpon their great importunitie to goe home to their houses with a Keeper". Hardly surprisingly they did not return to the gaol. Neither did Johnson for the patient Henry Wollaston was sworn in as his successor there and then.

If this identification of the man complained of by Francis Tucker with Richard Johnson is correct it seems more likely that the co-operation Samuel Eaton received from his keeper was based upon hope of reward than upon any concern for true religion.

Eaton's burial, if the account that survives is accurate, was a rather messy business although the practice of his friends was quite in line with the traditional separatist view that funeral services and the ecclesiastical paraphernalia which accompanied them had no Scriptural foundation[38]. "T.S.", the otherwise unidentified witness of the burial, saw a crowd of about two hundred "Brownists and Anabaptists" accompany the body to the grave. There they cast it in[39] "& wth yr feet, in stead of spades cast & thrust ye mould till ye grave was allmost full". Then they paid the grave-digger and told him not to secure a minister to do anything further. This burial, "in ye new Church-yard neere Bethelem", must have been one of the earliest of a dissenter in what was to become their regular cemetery of Bunhill Fields.

So Samuel Eaton died, a staunch and stubborn witness for the the cause of believer's baptism, who belonged to the circle from which the later leadership would spring to guide the nation wide policies of the Particular Baptists.

**Document 1**

**Francis Tucker's petition to Archbishop Laud**

To the most Reverend Father in God William Lord Arch-bpp of Canterbury his Grace Primate and Metrapolitan of all England.

Humbly sheweth The most humble peticon of Francis Tucker Bachelor of Divinity and Prisoner in Newgate for Debt.

That whereas there is a Samuell Eaton Prisoner in Newgate committed by yor Grace for a Scismaticall and dangerous Fellowe That the said Eaton hath held diverse Conventicles in the said Gaole some whereof hath bin to the number of 70 persons, or more, and that hee was permitted by the said keeper openly and publiqly to preach vnto them, and that the said Eaton hath often times affirmed in his said Sermons, that Baptisme was the Doctrine of Devills and its Originall was an Institucon from the Devill and oftentimes hee would rayle against yor Grace affirminge that all Bpps were heretickes, Blasphemers, and Antichristians. That the said keeper haveinge notice hereof by the peticoner, whoe desired him to bee a means that these greate resorts and Conventicles might bee prevented and that hee would reproue the said Eaton for the same, and remoue him to some other place of the Prison.

That herevpon the said keeper in a disdainfull manned replyed that the peticoner should meddle with what hee had to doe, and if hee did dislike the said Eaton, and his Conventicles he would remoue the peticoner into some worser place of the Prison, That at this time there was a Conventicle of 60 persons, or more, that the said keeper cominge into the Roome, where this Conventicle was, and the said Eaton preachinge vnto them and maynteyninge dagnerous Opinions, havinge viewed the said Assembly hee said there was a very faire, and goodly Company and stayinge there some season departed without any distaste thereat, to the greate encouragemt of the said Eaton, and the said persons to frequent the said place &c. That the said keeper had a strict Charge from the highe Comission to haue a speciall Care of the said Eaton, &c, that since this the said keeper hath severall times permitted him to goe abroad to preach to Conventicles appointed by him the said Eaton. That dayly there doth resorte to the said Eaton much people to heare him preach.

That the peticoner reprouinge the said keeper for his said Contempts, hee therevpon abused him with most vncivill Language, and further caused the said Eaton to abuse the peticoner not only in most abusive words but allsoe with blowes.

That the peticoners wife beeinge verie sicke in the prison and her Sister cominge to vissitt her fell exceedinge sicke, and weake that in revenge of the said former Grudge the keeper threatned the peticoner to remoue his said Sister, wherevpon the peticoner asked the Advise of a Doctor of Phisicke whether shee might with Safty bee remoued, whoe seeinge the said sicke person said that if shee were remoued out of the prison, it would much endanger her life, which the said keeper heard from the Doctor, yett notwithstandinge this, and notwithstandinge the said keeper was offered any rate for the Chamber where shee lay, the said keeper caused the said sicke person to bee removed, whoe the very next day after dyed: That presently after the said Removall the said Chamber was by the keper assigned over to the said Eaton, it beeinge the most convenient place in the prison for keepinge his conventicles.

The peticoners most humble Suite is that yor Grace will bee pleased to take the Premisses into Consideracon, and forasmuch as most parte of the witnesses to proue the said Contempts are Prisoners in the said Gaole for debt to to referre the examinacon thereof to Isaac Pennington, and John Wollaston, Sheriffe of the Citty of London, whoe maye reporte the truth of the particulars abouesaid to yor Grace; And in the meane tyme to take such further Course with the said keeper, as in yor Graces graue wisdom shalbee thought fittinge.

And the peticoner
shall euer pray &c.,

**Document 2**
**T.S's letter concerning the burial of Samuel Eaton and the sufferings of Mrs. Traske**

Mr. Alsop, I wrote to you the other weeke, how yt I had beene wth Eaton. This is further to let you understand yt upon sunday, being Aug. 25. I was accidentally at his buriall, for being to visit one in Bethelem coming home, I met Brownists adn Anabaptists (I thinke) at least 200 wth Eatons corpes, so I went back wth ym to see how they would bury yr dead, & I observed how they answered such as met ym, demanding who yt was to be buried, they said it was one of ye Bishops prisoners, but when they came to yo grave, it being made ready for ym in ye new Church-ward neere Bethelem; they like so many Bedlams cast ye corpes in; & wth yr feet, in stead of spades cast & thrust ye mould till ye grave was allmost full: then they paid ye grave-maker for his paines, who told ym yt he must fetch a minister, but, they said, he might spare his labour.

I could wish yt you would certify my Lord of this, also yt I had beene at ye gatehouse to visit Mrs. Traske, who hath laien in ye new prison wch is dissolved, & hath beene in ye gate-house: in both prisons 11 yeares. She was committed for keeping Saturday for her Sabbath, whe would neuer shew any thought of relenting, nor petition (neither suffer others) for her liberty, for yt she conceived yt God (who knowes what is best for her) hath caused Authority to put her in this place, she will not open her mouth against Authority, nor cannot endure those yt so do, but will take ym up most sharpely, she will receiue no gifts from any, thinking it a curse to beg or borrow; I could never heare yt she had any more yn 40s yearely in annuety, paid her; she would neuer (yt I could heare) eate things pleasant to ye tast, & being committed refused to bedde wth her husband (although both in one prison) saying, that they were comitted to suffer, she hath not eaten any flesh these 7 yeares, neither (for ye most) drunke any thing but water, she will not go out of doores to take ye aire, saying yt is not for her, neither (saith she) hath ye keeper Authority to let me: so she growes aged & melancholy, & (If my lord his Grace thinke fit) rather yn she should lye there to dye, I wth some other would be bound to bring her in, if she should be called for, & so let ym turne her out of doores, else she will neuer goe, so leaving this to his Grace his wisedome, I rest At comand.

Since I wrote these lines, thoughts came into my mind touching this buriall place in ye citizens keeping: how profanely kept, and used, sometimes to tenter & drye fustians: & to be a comon receptacle for schismatique sectaries ,sometimes excommunicate persons (as perhaps this Eaton was) to bury yr dead in what forme or fashion they will. Now whether this might not be amended by Dr. Worrall in whose Parish (I thinke) it is or els Authority by appointing some man to doe yt office A good way to prevent ye

frequent going of schismatiques wth yr traines thither. And besides ye dead would not there lye unburied as some times I heare they do, all ye night.

**Document 3**
**Elizabeth Eaton's petition to the House of Commons**

To the honoble the howse of Comons assembled in Parliament
The humble peticon of Elizabeth Eaton widow.
Humbly sheweth to this honoble Assembly

That the 29th of Aprill 1632 your peticoners husband was by one Tomlyns then servant to Dr Lawd, Bishopp of London, attached and carried to prison in Mayden-Lane in London, that being the Bishops Prison, where your peticoners husband was kept, halfe a yere & no cawse shewed, but his refusing the Oath Ex Officio. After wch yor peticoners husband procured at his great charge, a habeas corpus, and broughte himselfe to the Kings Bench Barr, and tendered baile, wch was denyed to him, and he sent back to the prison aforesaid, because he sought to be relieved at the ComonLaw, & yor peticoners husband was by order of the now Bishopp of Canterbury, removed from thence to the Gate-house goale at Westm, and kept close prisoner for Sixe Monethes, in 8 or 9 weekes of wch tyme yor petr was not suffered to see, or speake wth her said hsuband, But at one tyme looking to the wyndow, where he lay, she was threatned to be putt in the Stocks Yor petrs husband after Sixe Monethes close imprisonmt: obteyned baile for a few weekes, and the tyme expired, he was by the Court of high Comission returned to prison againe becawse he would not yet take the oath & by Aquila Weekes keeper of the Goale, he was putt into the Comon Goale, till such tyme as he did pay £4 for his close imprisonmt. In wch gate-howse Goale yor petr husband remayned one yere & a halfe, and then wth some charge he obteyned Baile & so remayned in Bonds, till such tyme at John Ragg Pursevant to the Archbishop of Canterbury came & entred violently into his howse, and attached him with a warrant from the Archbishopp of Canterbury, and forwith, wthout carrying him before any Magistrate, he haled him to the Goale of Newgate, and ther he remayned one whole yer, notwthstanding all the meanes he used for his Liberty, And by reason of the closenes & noysomness of the Prison, And for want of Aire yor petrs husband was impaired of his health, and so in the prison dyed, leaving yor petr and two small Children, much in debt, occasioned by reason of his so long imprisonmt, and being taken off his calling, and great expences in prison, fees his babeas corpus & Baile, and your petr her selfe was also by one Flamsteed Pursivant to Sr Jon Lamb, assaulted, she being then with child, by meanes whereof she miscarried, & lost two Children, and yor peticoner had also divers bookes taken out of her howse by the said John Ragg and never returned againe.

The premises considered being so lamentable, yor peticoner most humbly prayeth, That the imprisonment, losse of estate, and death of her husband may be taken into Consideracon, by this honoble Court, as also the hurt done to her selfe, and that such satisfaction may be made to yor petr as to yor great wisdomes shall seeme meet.

And yor petr shall (as in duty bound) daily pray for the prosperous successe of yor honoble designes.

NOTES

1 W. T. Whitley, *Trans.B.H.S.*, vol. 1. (1908-09), 219-22, 252.

2 See *D.N.B.*, "Lothropp, Lathrop or Lothropp, John" d.1653 and, for the earlier history of this congregation, C. Burrage, *Early English Dissenters*, Cambridge 1912, vol. I, chapter xiii.

3 "A repository of divers historical matters . . ." MS volume of transcriptions made by Benjamin Stinton c.1712, the Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford. The first two documents there transcribed are often known, respectively, as the "Jessey Memoranda" and the "Kiffin Manuscript". The information in this paragraph, except when otherwise stated, comes from "A repository . . .", 3f., part of the "Jessey Memoranda".

4 Public Record Office, SP/16/499.7. Document 3 translated at the close of this article: "Elizabeth Eaton's petition to the House of Commons".

5 S. R. Gardiner (Ed.), *Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*, Camden Society, 1886, 280.

6 *Ibid.*, 284.

7 *Ibid.*, 294.

8 "Elizabeth Eaton's petition . . ." *op.cit.*

9 This conclusion is based upon the assumption that Mrs. Eaton's round figures of "halfe a yere", "Sixe Monethes", "one yere & a halfe" are slightly exaggerated, as "round numbers" are apt to be.

10 "Jessey Memoranda", *op.cit.*, 6.

11 "Kiffin Manuscript", *op.cit.*, 10. I have discussed the origins and interpretation of this document in *Baptist History and Heritage*, Nashville, Tennessee, vol. I. 3 (October 1966) "Who really wrote the Kiffin Manuscript?" and vol. II. 1 (January 1967) "Baptist beginnings and the Kiffin Manuscript".

12 The "Jessey Memoranda", *op.cit.*, gives no date for this further secession but the "Kiffin Manuscript" *op.cit.*, has 1633 in the margin against several names, among them that of Samuel Eaton. If this date can be taken at its face value they must have joined the earlier seceders in the same year —which the writer may not have counted as closing until March 1633/34.

13 The "Jessey Memoranda", *ibid.*, the most obvious meaning here is that the baptism took place near ,if not actually upon, the date when Eaton joined the earlier secession.

14 John Taylor, *A swarme of sectaries*, London 1641.

15 Other, more complicated, solutions are of course possible: e.g. at this point Eaton may merely have desired to replace the baptism he had received at the hands of the Church of England (a false church in his view) and his actual conviction that the baptism of believers only was right could have come later. Then the baptism administered by John Spilsbery could well have been the later one. But these more complicated conjectures seem, upon the evidence available, unnecessarily involved.

16 See "How did William Kiffin join the Baptists?", *Baptist Quarterly*. XXIII, 5.

17 "Elizabeth Eaton's petition . . ." *op.cit.*

18 *Cal.S.P.Dom.* 1634-35, 261.

19 Lathrop had already left for New England. See C. Burrage, *op.cit.*, I., 325.

[20] *Cal.S.P.Dom.* 1634-35, 550. Nevertheless, according to *Cal.S.P.Dom.* 1635-36, 504 "Samuel Eaton of St. Giles's without Cripplegate, London, button maker" was before the Court of High Commission 5 May 1636. Presumably ths appearance did not lead to imprisonment.

[21] "Jessey Memoranda", *op.cit.*, 7f. It is not clear whether this date should be 1636/7 or 1637/8.

[22] "Elizabeth Eaton's petition . . ." *op.cit.*

[23] Public Record Office, SP/16/406.64. Document 1 transcribed at the close of this article: "Francis Tucker's petition to Archbishop Laud". Tucker has not been traced in the published records of any of the British universities. But see A. G. Matthews, *Walker Revised*, Oxford 1948, 402.

[24] Public Record Office, SP/16/427.107. Document 2 transcribed at the close of this article: "T.S's letter concerning the burial of Samuel Eaton and the sufferings of Mrs. Traske". Documents 1-2 were partially printed by C. Burrage, op. cit.

[25] This information is collated from the "Jessey Memoranda" at this point and the parallel passage in the "Kiffin Manuscript".

[26] City of London Corporation Record Office, Rep. Book 50, folio 216b.

[27] *Ibid.*, Rep. Book 53, folio 280.

[28] Public Record Office, SP/16/414. 6 dated 1 March 1638/39.

[29] V. Pearl, *London and the outbreak of the Puritan revolution*, London 1961, 329.

[30] Corporation Record Office, Rep. Book 52, folio 280. "Henry" Johnson for "Richard" at this entry was an interesting slip since the other candidate was Henry Wollaston.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] P.R.O., SP/16/414.6.

[33] C.R.O. Rep. Book 53, folio 26a.

[34] *Ibid.*, folios 53b, 54a.

[35] *Ibid.*, folio 262b.

[36] *Ibid.*, folios 278a-279b.

[37] *Ibid.*, Rep. Book 55, folio 231.

[38] B. R. White, "John Traske (1585-1636) and London Puritanism", *Trans. Cong. Hist. Soc.*, vol. xx. 7 (May 1968), 233. In this article additional material concerning Mrs. Traske and other references to "T.S." will be found.

[39] "T.S's letter concerning the burial . . ." *op.cit.*

B. R. WHITE.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ALAN BETTERIDGE, M.A.,
Minister, Durham.
THOMAS J. BUDGE,
Minister, Leicester.
CHARLES S. DUTHIE, M.A., B.D., D.D.,
Principal, New College, London.
IAN SELLERS, M.A., B. Litt. Ph.D.
Lecturer, Padgate College, Warrington.
B. R. WHITE, M.A., D.Phil.,
Tutor, Regents Park College, Oxford.
Reviews by: J. Carrington, E. F. Clipsham, W. E. Moore, B. R. White.