

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)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

John Pendarves, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy

IN HIS recent book Dr. B. S. Capp¹ has done much to supplement and correct the picture provided by Louise Fargo Brown in her classic study² of the Fifth Monarchists. Nevertheless it seems possible that at two significant points his own understanding of the movement requires correction. First, he seems to suggest that it was one of the essential characteristics of the Fifth Monarchists that they claimed "the right and indeed the duty of taking arms to overthrow existing regimes and establish the millennium".³ Yet, in the course of his own work, he provides evidence that the Fifth Monarchists were divided about *when* to use violence⁴ which suggests that some of them were far from clear on the crucial point as to whether they should take any such initiative before the return of Christ. Secondly, Dr. Capp seems to visualize a number of congregations as composed wholly of Fifth Monarchymen constituting a separate sect alongside those of the Baptists and Independents in spite of a denial which he himself quotes.⁵

In this paper it is proposed to examine the career of John Pendarves in order to see whether a clearer picture of Fifth Monarchy ideals and practice can be determined in his particular case. It is not here claimed, should a somewhat different picture from that of Dr. Capp emerge, that this should wholly replace his but rather that there is still room for clearer definition in this matter. John Pendarves has been chosen for several reasons: partly because there is more evidence available about his views and activities than about many others who make fleeting appearances in the story of the Fifth Monarchists; partly because the circumstances surrounding his funeral have considerable interest in the context of that story and partly because he left a significant number of followers behind him with radical political views.⁶

His early years can be swiftly surveyed. On 9 February 1637/8 John Pendarves, aged about 15, of Crowan, Cornwall, matriculated from Exeter College, Oxford, with his elder brother Ralph.⁷ Evidently money was short and they had the status of servitors. What later happened to Ralph is unknown but John became a Bachelor of Arts 3 March 1641/2, just a few months before the outbreak of the Civil War.⁸ There seems to be no evidence for John Pendarves' whereabouts or his occupation during the early part of the war and it is not known when or how he reached Baptist convictions. Anthony Wood, the Oxford antiquary, suggested that it was only "at length, after several changes, he settled his mind on Anabaptism".⁹ Of course Wood is not a sympathetic witness but many men of the time

did move leftwards ecclesiastically, and sometimes politically, one step at a time. Furthermore, there seems no evidence to suggest that Pendarves became a Baptist before about 1650.

It seems that, sometime after the death in 1643 of William Tickell, the vicar of St. Helen's Church, Abingdon, John Pendarves was appointed his successor—presumably after the town fell finally into the hands of the Parliamentary forces in May 1644. The circumstances of the appointment are, again, unknown but it is possible that George Kendall, fellow of Exeter College and rector of St. Nicholas, Abingdon, since 24 August 1643,¹⁰ may have had something to do with it. Kendall was certainly known afterwards for his radical ecclesiastical sympathies.¹¹ It is possible, in the unsettled conditions of the 1640's, that Pendarves never did receive episcopal ordination. Nevertheless, amid what seem to have been the reasonably congenial surroundings of a garrison town, Pendarves appears to have pleased a number of the borough's leading citizens sufficiently well for the chamberlain's accounts to record, during 1644/45, a payment "to Mr. Pendarves the minister for his pains, £5".¹²

The income of the vicar of St. Helen's at this time seems only to have amounted to £20 *per annum*.¹³ This was augmented by the efforts of the Committee for Plundered Ministers although A. E. Preston seems to have overstated the case when he wrote that Pendarves "profited considerably" from their grants.¹⁴ These were not, on the one hand, particularly large and on the other, it seems to have been one thing for the committee to promise and quite another for them to provide the sum promised. On 10 June 1646 it was ordered that the salary of the minister "of the garrison and market town of Abingdon" should be augmented by the sum of £50 *per annum* out of the inappropriate tithes of the parish.¹⁵ Nevertheless, six months later, 22 December 1647, a further entry confessed that the grant had "been hitherto fruitless" since the tithes were no longer "under sequestration". Instead, therefore, it was decided that £22.9.2½ should be reserved for Pendarves from the rectory of Buckland some few miles away and that certain unnamed "tenants of the premises" should be responsible for clearing the remaining arrears.¹⁶

Less than a month later, 14 January 1647/48, it was apparently discovered that this arrangement too had proved impracticable. It was therefore decided that the whole £50 should now be paid from the income formerly derived by the dean and chapter of Windsor from the parishes of Newbury, Enburne and Greenham. This sum, it was somewhat unexpectedly decided, was to be made available for the maintenance of such ministers "as this committee shall approve of to officiate the cure of the church of St. Helen's". Perhaps Pendarves had indicated some unwillingness to stay in view of the uncertainty of his income.¹⁷ He did stay, however, although his salary continued to prove difficult to secure and, more than a year later, 14 April 1649, it was noted that he was still "much more than one

year's rent" behind. The committee who acknowledged the need "of maintaining an able and constant minister in the said church" but also that the town was itself "very much impoverished by the late wars", now recommended that £50 (due 25 March) should be paid directly to him by the treasurers for the bishops' lands.¹⁸

From 25 December 1649 John Tickell¹⁹ was minister of St. Helen's²⁰ for it seems that Pendarves had moved to Wantage early in the summer of that year. In consequence, the Committee for Plundered Ministers asked that £50 already promised from the income of Wantage parish church to supplement a stipend at Maidenhead should be paid to Pendarves instead.²¹ The argument was that if they wanted "a godly and orthodox minister" like Pendarves they must pay him adequately.²² After complaints from Maidenhead it was agreed to review the matter. When the committee, aware that the sequestered minister already drew one fifth of the Wantage income, met on 31 January 1650 they decided that "the said fifty pounds a year be paid unto Mr. John Pendarves, minister of the parish church of Wantage."²³ How long Pendarves held this appointment is unclear but it seems certain that his period there began in June 1649 though it is not known how long he remained.

It must have been at Wantage that, 18 January 1649/50, his name was entered as one who had signed the "Engagement" of 11 October 1649: "I do declare and promise that I will be true and faithful to the commonwealth of England as the same is now established without a King or House of Lords".²⁴ This, Parliament had decided, must be subscribed by any minister before admission to any benefice. His signature does not necessarily prove any particularly profound commitment to the revolutionary programme: many others whose support of doctrinaire republicanism was at best half-hearted, subscribed and, on the whole, "only the most rigid of the Presbyterians refused".²⁵

Financially Pendarves had one piece of good fortune. A certain Richard Wrigglesworth, a native of the nearby village of Marcham, was sufficiently impressed by his gifts as a preacher to bequeath £800 to found a weekly lectureship at Marcham during the summer and at St. Helen's Church, Abingdon, during the winter. Wrigglesworth, a citizen and fishmonger of London, specifically requested in his will, which was proved in 1648, that while Pendarves remained in the Abingdon district he should undertake the lectures.²⁶ In fact, it is probable that he held the post until his death in 1656.²⁷

Unfortunately none of this evidence that John Pendarves was receiving state support up to, at least 1650, quite apart from the income from Wrigglesworth's legacy, will serve as a pointer to the date at which he became a Baptist. The pressure on Baptist leaders to refuse all stipends from ecclesiastical sources outside their own congregations did not build up for some years after 1650.

Meanwhile, John Atherton provides some interesting if prejudiced information about the early Abingdon Baptists mingled with a sharp

attack on John Pendarves, in a pamphlet published in London in 1654. Since Atherton held Pendarves chiefly responsible for his excommunication he entitled his piece *The pastor turn'd pope*. The sequence of events and even the central issues involved are difficult to disentangle but it is clear that the quarrel between them resulted, at one stage, in a public confrontation between the two men before the mayor of Abingdon in St. Helen's Church. From Atherton's statement that he had "walked three years or thereabouts, with Mr. Pendarves and his company" before breaking with them in August 1653²⁸ it seems that the congregation had existed, and Pendarves had been their pastor, since sometime in 1650 at the latest. At the same time a random remark by Atherton that Pendarves had denied any responsibility for the practice of anointing the sick with oil by some members of the congregation on the grounds that this happened "before he was pastor and he did not approve of it",²⁹ seems to imply that the congregation may have been in being before Pendarves had become its pastor and even, perhaps, before he belonged to it. Evidently, as late as 1653, Pendarves was still lecturing at St. Helen's (presumably under the terms of Wrigglesworth's will),³⁰ and, according to Atherton, Pendarves had coveted "a canon's place at Christchurch".³¹ Whether or not this story were true the very existence of the rumour suggests that in 1653 Pendarves was not credited with any strong convictions against such an appointment and the salary that would go with it.

Atherton also claimed that Pendarves had persuaded his congregation to send him to preach in the west country not because he was really needed there but because his wife Thomasina wanted to visit her father. The clear implication was that the pair were less than honest in persuading the church to help defray the cost of their journeyings.³² Whatever the truth of this allegation there is plenty of other evidence that Pendarves was deeply involved and widely known among Baptists in the west country. His earliest known links are with Dartmouth. Thomasina Pendarves was the daughter of Thomas Newcomen, a merchant of Dartmouth, a leading supporter of the Parliamentary cause there and one who had invested in Irish land.³³ When he died he bequeathed her a one-sixth share in his Irish property.³⁴ Her brother Elias was father of Thomas Newcomen (1663-1729), the famous engineer and pastor of the Dartmouth Baptist church.³⁵ Evidently Pendarves had already gained some powerful friends (probably, locally, Thomas Newcomen) for, on 25 November 1651, the Council of State decided to ask the mayor of Dartmouth to ensure that a local minister, Anthony Hartford, should allow "Mr. Pendarvis, or any other godly minister", the use of the pulpit in one of the two parish churches of the town.³⁶ After receiving, 2 January 1651/52, "a petition from several well-affected persons in Dartmouth, that Mr. Pendarvis may preach in St. Saviour's Church, Dartmouth", the Council of State wrote again to the mayor this time asking him to arrange for Pendarves to preach there "every

Lord's Day after 4 p.m. and on Friday afternoons, and at other times when Mr. Hartford does not exercise".³⁷ Evidently Pendarves was away from Abingdon for an extended period during the winter of 1651/52. Robert Steed,³⁸ who had become the Baptist pastor at Dartmouth by 1656 had probably been one of Pendarves' church members at Abingdon. Pendarves and Robert Steed joined with others to produce a pamphlet together in 1656.

There is other evidence that John Pendarves was active in the west country where he was known not primarily as a Fifth Monarchist but as a Baptist leader. For example, the church at Kilmington took the following decision, 14 February 1653/54: "it lying as a grievance upon the spirits of many of the members that there is not a pastor amongst us it is agreed upon that brother Hitt draw up an epistle to brother Pendarves to desire him (if he be not otherwise engaged) to be the man. And the members in general to bring in what arguments they can to move him thereunto. Or, if in case he cannot be dismissed from the place where he is or see sufficient grounds for his coming among us that he would use his utmost endeavours for the procuring of one who is both able [and] faithful for the carrying on of so great work".³⁹ Unfortunately the Kilmington Churchbook gives no further details of what happened as the result of this approach to Pendarves. Two months later Pendarves, with another representative from Abingdon, was at Bridgewater for "the more orderly ordaining of brother Thomas Collyer" for his work of "gathering and confirming the church". The part here played by Pendarves is somewhat ambiguous but it seems that he favoured the act of ordination but opposed its completion with the laying on of hands.⁴⁰ At all events there is no doubt at all that he was personally committed to the work of the Calvinistic Baptist churches in the west country. It is known that Pendarves was also present at the Western Association meetings held at Chard in September 1655, at Wells in April 1656, and probably at Bridgewater in April 1655.⁴¹ From Bridgewater a letter was sent to the Irish Calvinistic Baptists warning them against pride of dress and wasteful expenditure on "fleshly deckings and gay attirings" on the one hand and, on the other, against dependence for the payment of their ministers "on the maintenance of the magistrate . . . especially when churches are of sufficient ability to maintain their ministry if they improve their outward substance faithfully and not in superfluities". From Chard the letter to the churches which was signed by both Thomas Collier⁴² and John Pendarves, was concerned to provoke the readers to pray God "uncestantly untill, the Spirit be poured out from on high" but there appear to have been no political overtones to the occasion. On the other hand, at Wells, in April 1656, the last meeting in the west country which Pendarves is known to have attended, the letter drawn up by the messengers and sent to the churches suggests the writers were imbued with a deep sense that a crisis in church history was at hand. Nevertheless the language was still the rhetoric of preachers expecting a

great shift forward in God's purposes upon earth and the context was that of missionary effort rather than of any kind of political revolution at all.

Meanwhile, in the early 1650's, John Pendarves seems also to have been fairly active in Abingdon and in the villages round about in Berkshire and Oxfordshire. Jasper Mayne (1604-1672), who had been presented to the Christchurch living of Pyrton during 1648, confronted Pendarves, 11 September 1652, in a public dispute over baptism held in the parish church. Mayne, who evidently desired not to afford his opponent more than the absolute minimum of publicity, did not even give Pendarves' name in his published account but did mention that the latter had been active in the parish of Chinnor some six or seven miles north-east of Watlington.⁴³ Whoever actually won the day at the disputation itself is uncertain but it seems that Pendarves' cause went forward for there were soon to be Baptist churches at Watlington and, on either side of Chinnor, at Kingston Blount and Bledlow.⁴⁴ Later, it appears, Pendarves and his friends were active at Childrey near Wantage for, in September 1654, the rector, Edward Pocock (1604-1691) was accused of having denied "some godly men the liberty of preaching in his pulpit". The "godly men" involved were John Pendarves and one of those mentioned by Atherton as a preacher among the Abingdon Baptists, "one Mr. Steed". It may have been an echo of this affair which caused John Owen to write defending Pocock to John Thurloe against an impending threat of ejection some months later.⁴⁵

Pendarves, however, was not merely content to preach his convictions in the surrounding countryside and to see tiny new congregations set adrift as flimsy rafts upon the choppy seas of the Great Rebellion. His congregation at Abingdon was one of the founder members of the Abingdon Association in 1652/53 and he shared in a number of the meetings including the crucial gathering, 16/17 March 1653, when the basis of association was agreed. It is difficult to tell just how considerable a part Pendarves himself took in the meetings because, although it is clear that he did not attend every time, in a number of cases the names of the messengers who represented the various congregations were not recorded.⁴⁶ What is clear is that through the association, and the part played in it by Benjamin Cox,⁴⁷ John Pendarves had close contact with the London Particular Baptist leaders and, in particular, with the church meeting in Petty France.

It seems that in the Abingdon Association Cox and Pendarves arranged some form of division of responsibility for, in 1655, Cox seems to have taken care of the links with the new Midland Association (after an initial meeting apparently arranged by both men)⁴⁸ and, until his death, as was seen earlier, Pendarves visited the meetings of the Western Association. It is even more clear, from the records of the Abingdon Association, that while such potentially explosive

political questions as that concerning the payment of tithes were discussed⁴⁹ there is no evidence that the question of violence against the regime ever appeared on their agenda.

In all this there is clear evidence that in the period down to his death in September 1656 John Pendarves was heavily involved in the national programme, especially in the home counties and the west country, of the Calvinistic Baptists. He was heavily involved as an evangelist, as a pastor and as an adviser over a wide area in the south of England. When the Abingdon Association's messengers met at Tetsworth in September 1656, just after the news of Pendarves' death had broken, they decided that one of the matters they must seek God to discover was that "he would acquaint us with his mind and end in his late dispensation in taking from us our deare brother Pendarves, while he was yet young in yeares and a constant instrument in his hand of much good unto his people, that we and others concerned herein may make a right use of this stroke of the Lord".⁵⁰

Two years earlier John Atherton had claimed that at harvest-time the year before (1653) he had been with Pendarves in London. There Pendarves had told him that General Fleetwood (Cromwell's son-in-law and Lord Deputy in Ireland 1652-5) wanted him in Ireland. Certainly Fleetwood was well known for favouring the Baptists and he may well have been Pendarves' patron. At all events he had told the Lord Deputy that he could only go to Ireland if his church would release him. But, although the church at Abingdon was in fact ready to let him go, Pendarves discouraged them because he feared the sea journey and the dangers which he might meet with in that unsettled land. This unguarded confidence, if so it were, Atherton was only too willing to turn to his own use later but, whatever the truth of this incident, this affords another evidence that Pendarves was not only active in Baptist circles but was beginning to thrust himself on the notice of the men in power as perhaps himself a coming man.⁵¹

So far there has been no evidence of John Pendarves' own involvement with the Fifth Monarchists. In fact there is some literary evidence to suggest that Pendarves had some contacts with Henry Jessey, a Fifth Monarchist whose political views appear to have been moderate,⁵² a Baptist who allowed those who had not been baptized as believers to join his church and who probably worked more easily with the Independents than with the closed-membership Calvinistic Baptists with whom Pendarves was himself largely involved. As early as 1651 (?) Pendarves had been one of those to sign a manifesto printed by Henry Jessey in his *Scripture-Kalendar* (1652) for the first time which argued against the common, pagan names for the days of the week and the months of the year. In addition the last section of Pendarves' own tract entitled *Arrowes against Babylon* (1656) included some "queries for the people called Quakers" which seem to have been borrowed from a piece originally written with Henry Jessey.⁵³ The earliest evidence now known suggesting that Pendarves

was actively involved with the Fifth Monarchymen dates from February 1655. Even this is far from suggesting, as claimed by Dr. Capp, that Pendarves joined with Harrison, Courtney and Simpson to argue "that the Protectorate was illegal, and that arms could be taken up against it without sin".⁵⁴ The passage actually cited suggests that those who held these views were Harrison, Carew, Courtney and Rich while Pendarves, with two others, was present to balance, on the Fifth Monarchy side, the group of "severall sober Christians and Ministers" gathered as witnesses by the Protector and his Council. The point that needs to be made is that no opinion whatsoever was directly attributed to Pendarves himself on this occasion by John Thurloe.⁵⁵

Other evidence of Pendarves' views must be sought in his writings of 1656. First there is a letter to Robert Bennet, the Cornish Baptist leader, dated from Abingdon, 21 March 1655/6.⁵⁶ In this letter, which is obviously part of a longer correspondence, there is a reference to John Tillinghast, a writer of Fifth Monarchy tracts who had died the year before: "I am not wedded to Tylinghast in all things but this I confesse: I am apt to thinke that it's probable the word for the season is most like to bee with that remnant who prefer Jerusalem above their chiefe joy—they are not many comparatively..." The tone is moderate, it would be difficult to discern the slightest note of threatened violence and the time was shortly before the meeting of the western Baptist churches at Wells where Pendarves expected to meet Bennet. It was probably after the meeting at Wells that John Pendarves joined four others (Abraham Cheare of Plymouth, Thomas Glasse of Bovey Tracey, Henry Forty of Totnes and Robert Steed of Dartmouth) in publishing a small pamphlet of general exhortation addressed to their congregations "in this day of . . . great expectation" entitled *Sighs for Sion*. Of these Thomas Glasse was believed to have become a leading Fifth Monarchyman after 1660.⁵⁷ Again there was nothing in this piece which went beyond the enthusiastic exhortation of the association letter from Wells which was mentioned earlier.

Time was growing short for John Pendarves: he was to publish only one other tract himself and his last writing was to appear posthumously. His *Arrowes against Babylon* (1656) contained a dedicatory epistle which asserted that the urgent need of his generation was to press on towards the complete reformation of the ecclesiastical structures then erected in England. His reason for believing that this could be done was the succession of acts of God which had, in recent years, begun to destroy the main pillars of Babylon in England—government by bishops and "their grand supporter", the monarchy. Yet, he lamented, many were seemingly content with the task of reformation as far as it had now gone but this was no "right reformation according to the word of God; to which our solemn Covenant binds us". So, in the first main section of his tract, he asks, "Hath not the Lord eminently appeared against

king, bishop, Scotch presbyter, who refused to allow God's Israel go free from the hard bondage of a forced conformity to the national church-worship?" It was not, he believed, sufficient to bear verbal witness against the corruptions of the churches. God's people, he claimed, are called "to hold forth a true baptism, and church-worship, and so by a contrary practice to bear their testimony in the strength of God's Spirit and truth against that false way".⁵⁸ He then went on to speak of the spiritual dangers to which indiscriminate baptism of infants could lead and afterwards warned the ministers and members of congregations "separated from the parish way" that they too should consider whether, by accepting the parish church's sprinkling as adequate, they, "though themselves refuse to sprinkle such children yet strengthen the hands of those who do?"⁵⁹

Like his colleague Thomas Collier⁶⁰ Pendarves argued that the continual danger of the Christian churches was that of falling back from Christ to Moses. Hence he complained of "the unwarrantable mixture of legal and Gospel-worship and worshippers accounting this nation a church after the likeness of the Jewish nation, not by regeneration, but by fleshly generation, gathering together in a pretended church-body the visibly godly with the ungodly, withal promoting again tithes, offerings, consecrated places, altars with many other such like Jewish ceremonies which were typical and to cease in Gospel days".⁶¹

It was this part of his tract which swiftly drew three counter attacks from Puritan ministers. Possibly the first to rush into print and certainly the nearest geographically was John Tickell, minister at St. Helen's. Tickell had just decided to form his people into a covenanted congregation and the primary purpose of his pamphlet was to expound his ecclesiology.⁶² Nevertheless, he evidently felt the pressure of the local Baptists (he called them Anabaptists to drive home his point) and took the opportunity towards the close of his tract to hit back. Three of his lines of attack are of considerable interest although each for a different reason. First, said Tickell, presumably speaking from knowledge of the local Abingdon Baptist congregation, the Baptists had abandoned the "solemn church-reading of the Scriptures" and the "singing of psalms" in worship.⁶³ By such practices they were obviously cutting themselves even further adrift from orthodox Puritan traditions. Secondly, he pointed out that Baptists could fall into gross errors and brought up the double north country scandal of "the pretended Jew at New-castle and the pastor at Hexham" which had embarrassed Pendarves' co-religionists in 1653.⁶⁴ Finally Tickell asked with biting irony, "Were all the late providences of God in these nations by him intended (as you pretend) to confirm Anabaptistry?" Since this was precisely what Pendarves did believe the irony was probably lost on him. But Tickell immediately followed up this thrust by asking whether it was not "a providence that God raised up a deliverer (the Lord Protector) whom your tribe abhorre, though they can

(some of them) take his pay, when the necks of the ministry of England lay all at once on your block and there wanted but the fatall blow".⁶⁵ Obviously he was referring to the Parliament of the Saints in the last months of 1653 and, equally obviously, he knew that Pendarves and his people were likely to be opposed to the Protectorate and all its ways.

William Ley's tract was published after Tickell's, which it mentions,⁶⁶ and was in Thomason's hands by 12 June 1656. Since Ley was minister in Wantage he too lived sufficiently close to be able to speak from personal knowledge of Pendarves and of the Baptist congregations in Wantage and round about. Ley also may have felt himself to be under direct pressure since he claimed he had decided to answer the *Arrowes against Babylon* because he feared "the insolency of some of your own party and the proximitie of the danger to some of my own flock".⁶⁷ In answer to Pendarves' demand that men should study the propheticall Scriptures Ley asked: "what points would you have us study? Is it the saints carnall reigne with Christ a thousand years? A thing that I hear of late hath much tickled the fancy of sundry of your followers".⁶⁸ This is the first hint of an enthusiasm for millenarian teaching in the local circle of Pendarves' people and to this matter it will be necessary later to return. He also commented unfavourably upon the Baptists' willingness to allow baptism by others than their pastors and made what may have been an attack on Pendarves' widespread local influence and itinerant leadership (we know from the Association Records that there was a shortage of leadership in some of the village communities of Baptists within the association). Hence Ley asked, "Whether it be lawfull for a pastor to be circumforaneous and to take care of severall Churches at a remote distance. . . . And whether this doth not justifie the popish and prelatieall clergy in their large commendas (*sic*) of one man to plurality of benefices?" Finally Ley opened up another question upon which quite evidently he and Pendarves took opposite sides: "Whether those that seem to desire the coming in of the Jews do not only err in politics but also in piety. The ears of some men being more open to novelty than truth and the spirit of men more prone (in this present juncture of time) to sedition then subjection".⁶⁹ In the summer of 1656 the question of the entry of the Jews into England as the result of the mission of Manasseh ben Israel the previous autumn was obviously a very live issue.⁷⁰

Christopher Fowler in Reading also found a few pages in one of his tracts to take up some of Pendarves' allegations in *Arrowes against Babylon* but only in a general way. However he took occasion to ask a pertinent question in a generation when one or other of the sectaries of the time had taught almost every imaginable heterodoxy: "whence came all the blasphemies and errors against the Lord Jesus, his nature, his office, his blood, his merits, his ordinances, his word, his day? Did they come out from our congregations or from the Separation?"⁷¹ It is worth noting that in none of these replies to

Pendarves, two of them by men who had every reason to know him and his followers quite well, was there the slightest hint that they knew of anything he had said which would suggest that he believed that violent action was required of any of the saints to prepare the way for the Kingdom of Christ. Both Tickell and Ley appear to have been aware that Pendarves and his friends were likely to be hostile to the Protectorate and to believe in the imminence of the millennial reign of Christ upon earth but that appears to be all.

In the second section of his writing, entitled "Endeavours for reformation in apparel" Pendarves had shown the other side of his concern—from the prophetic he had turned to the pastoral. He explained that he came to write to explain why a number of the godly had become convinced that the Lord was "clearly witnessing to their consciences against their superfluous ornaments on their apparel". His arguments were partly theological but, somewhat surprisingly, the near approach of the end of history was not set forth as a motive. Rather did he argue first, that those who claimed to have risen to new life in Christ should abandon the ostentation which had marked their former life and then, on partly practical grounds, "from the present apparent wants and straights of divers poor precious saints that lack to be supplied with things necessary who, by reason of sickness, weakness or want of stock to manage their honest trades are unable to provide for themselves and theirs so that they may attend on God without distraction".⁷² The last section, mentioned earlier, was composed of the "queries for the people called Quakers".

It is interesting that it was with Christopher Feake⁷³ that Pendarves joined in the high summer of 1656 to produce a second preface to an anonymous tract⁷⁴ expounding certain apocalyptic aspects of the teaching of *The prophets Malachy and Isaiah*. There seems little doubt that Feake, at various times during the 1650's, did favour violence as the solution to the earthly problems facing the saints. Feake's preface contained a sharp attack on the Protestant churches in England which compared them "to the Jewish church and state in the days of Christ and his apostles in respect of their superstitions and persecutions, of their hatred and enmity to the pure ways of Christ". His condemnation embraced both the former episcopalian establishment under the late King and also the Cromwellian establishment under "the present Tryers".⁷⁵ This was dated 14 July 1656. Pendarves, whose preface was dated 10 August 1656,⁷⁶ could well have read Feake's contribution before composing his own. At all events he was certainly more cautious and pointedly omitted to name names. Nevertheless, this whole document needs careful examination for this is the first and only time at which Pendarves is found clearly and unambiguously co-operating with one of the Fifth Monarchy war party. Had he now abandoned the doves to join the hawks for the few short weeks which remained of his life? Certainly his preface asserted that those who followed in the footsteps of the

prophets of old were "hated and misused by the men of this generation"⁷⁷ and that the reader of this work would be helped to see "greater abominations, then probably thou hast hitherto observed veiled over with specious pretences and a large profession".⁷⁸ He then accurately summarised what was to follow with the words, "The following discourse sets forth in a type, by comparing together many remarkable words in the prophecy of Malachy and Isaiah, a most refined apostasy of a professing people, after a reformation begun. Their words, though first spoken to others, are declared to light on us saints and professors in this generation".⁷⁹ The apostasy to which Pendarves referred, as the context makes clear, was that of the present failure of the Cromwellian regime. Such a backsliding, he wrote, must shortly bring judgment in its train and God would therefore "certainly ere long shake off and cast out . . . a generation of light and loose professors".⁸⁰ He closed his preface with the solemn warning that, while those who wished to reject the arguments of the tract which followed would certainly be able to find excuses to justify them, those who came to it seeking the truth "are like to reap precious benefit thereby".⁸¹

It is perfectly clear that, while Pendarves was not the author of the book and could even have disagreed with minor details of interpretation within it, he was thoroughly committed both to the general outline of the teaching it gave and to the outlook of those who sponsored it. The argument of the tract was, in general, simple enough: originally the biblical passages with which it primarily dealt referred to a time of apostasy after a period of reformation in old Israel, a time in which the outward forms of religion were widely and carefully observed but a time when a heartfelt concern for the glory of God above all was absent from both the nation's leaders and from most of its people. Only a remnant remained faithful.⁸²

However, England's leaders regarded the warnings of the remnant and their calls for national repentance as rather "endeavouring their destruction" than as a necessity to avert the coming judgment. The judgment, the purging, would begin with the outward church, "this professing Sion" and Christ's coming for this judgment will not be "in person but in Spirit (though that personal appearance will take place in due time also)". It was stressed that the righteous and faithful remnant was to play no active part in this section of the drama of the last times: the process of judgment would be carried through without their aid.⁸³ By this assertion the writer made it plain that, whatever troubles were threatened from on high, the government of the Lord Protector need not fear that he and his friends were planning to make their own violent contribution from below: "the great design of our Lord at this his coming (as hath been already proved) is to fit and prepare his Sion for the doing that great work of his in and upon the world he hath decreed she shall carry on before he comes himself in person".⁸⁴ It appears that Pendarves and his friends here anticipated two stages in the intro-

duction of the Fifth Monarchy: first, there was to be a dramatic outpouring of the power of the Spirit upon the Church both to cleanse it of the unworthy and to enable it to prepare the way for the coming of Christ in person. Then, only after the Church had completed its task of preparing the way, would Christ return. Meanwhile, in the immediate present, the faithful must continue to bear their testimony against "the apostasies and evils of the times" both spiritual and civil—including an over powerful militia which was being used to persecute the saints.⁸⁵ At his Second Coming, visibly, personally and triumphantly, but not until then, Christ would use "Sion as his battleaxe"⁸⁶ but no attempt was made to fill in the details of what this might involve. What does seem clear amid the clouds of eschatological rhetoric is that Pendarves was not here committing himself to any programme of violence aimed at bringing in the Kingdom but rather to a summons to repentance and preparation for the coming of the Spirit in judgment and power to cleanse and invigorate the true people of God.

It is worth noting two other characteristics of this exposition. First, it shared, with much other apocalyptic speculation of the time, a belief that the biblical prophecies had a "special and peculiar relation to the professing Gospel-church in England with its territories and dominions".⁸⁷ Secondly, the concluding section of the tract stressed the duty of the righteous remnant to seek unity among Christians. Its application of the relevant verses of John 17 stressed an oddly modern note: "Labour with all your might after union: seek out uniting principles upon which an honourable union upon the right foundation may be wrought: union! union! union!"⁸⁸

By what now seems a strange coincidence John Pendarves preached the sermon, which was to be published posthumously, to the Baptist congregation meeting in Petty France, London, on the same day, 10 August 1656, that he apparently completed his preface to *The prophets Malachy and Isaiah*. His sermon, published in 1657 as *The fear of God*, was drawn not from his own draft but from shorthand notes made while it was being preached and therefore the possibility cannot be ruled out that Pendarves' own convictions may have been blurred in the process. Nevertheless, if it fairly represents the direction of his thinking it is of considerable importance as demonstrating Pendarves' continued evangelistic and pastoral concern. The sermon opened with the preacher laying considerable stress on the order in which the various truths of revelation were manifested in the course of the New Testament: eschatological matters were treated last. Pendarves stressed his belief that men must first close with Christ as saviour, then they should be baptized as believers, then they should be gathered into a true church order according to the Scripture pattern and only then should they attempt to come to grips with the mysteries of the Apocalypse. There were, he said, some who "are busying themselves in the understanding of the highest discoveries of God in this book of the *Revelations* and yet are not settled upon

the foundation of the Gospel, nor brought into the order of it; and, therefore, as to many that are soaring high in these things, I desire they would consider whether they have not unadvisedly leaped over those foundation truths, which they should have minded in their going on to those glorious truths revealed in the *Revelation*".⁸⁹ Granted believers were rightly founded upon Christ and members of a true church he was then, of course, most anxious that they should be fully informed of the teaching the Scriptures gave concerning the Last Things. Meanwhile, however, he urged upon his hearers the importance of a true and living fear of God to "fit saints for that glorious God will bring them into and by the signs of Christ's coming it seems to be nigh: that distress that is upon the nations speaks something to it".⁹⁰ While such fear of God "is a flower that doth not grow in nature's garden" but is "a precious effect of the Spirit of Christ in the heart" it can be nourished by pondering God's sovereign power and goodness. Hence, Pendarves advised, believers should be "much in the observation of God's hand of providence abroad and at home" and should labour "to eye God in every dispensation that befalls ourselves or others" so as to "see God in mercies and eye God in afflictions when his chastising hand is upon us, for, were our hearts in such a frame as to eye God continually it would much work and increase this fear".⁹¹

The picture of John Pendarves' convictions which can be obtained from the evidence which remains of his life work and fragmentary writings seems a clear one. Right down to his death he was actively involved in the missionary programme and organisation of the Calvinistic Baptists but he also stood with those who expected the establishment of the Fifth Monarchy, Christ's personal millennial reign, in the very near future. While opposed to the Protectorate and its policies as obstacles to the complete reformation of Christ's church in England Pendarves appears to have given no support to plans for the violent overthrow of the government. His death in September 1656 from "the plague in the guts"⁹² marked the end of a promising leader among the English Particular Baptists but hardly, it appears, the end of a revolutionary. He left no will but his widow, who was to continue to live in Abingdon for some years to come, obtained letters of administration for his estate in March 1657.⁹³

While, as has been seen, there is no evidence that Pendarves' writings supported the violent overthrow of the Protectorate, it is necessary to consider the true significance of the gathering at Abingdon for his funeral and the activities of his disciples in the district during the period after his death and down to the Restoration.

Dr. Capp describes the gathering for the funeral as "a massive Fifth Monarchist rally" and, while he suggests that Thurloe was probably wrong to believe that a Fifth Monarchy rising was in prospect, he reports that when the question was put, "*whether God's people must be a bloody people (in an active sense)*" it was carried with enthusiasm.⁹⁴ There are, in fact, two contemporary accounts of what

happened at Abingdon on this occasion. The earlier, from Pendarves' friends and entitled, *The complaining testimony of some of Sions children*,⁹⁵ claimed that wholly unnecessary violence had been used by the government's troops against a group of innocent mourners. The second pamphlet, which was partly written to answer *The complaining testimony*, argued that a minor and thoroughly justified piece of police work had been inflated into an atrocity story. It was entitled *Munster and Abingdon*.⁹⁶

Apparently, shortly after Pendarves' death, his friends determined to bring his body up the Thames to Abingdon for burial. The government appears to have been thoroughly alarmed and fearful that the occasion might be used for a show of strength or worse by the Fifth Monarchists. In consequence, eight troops of cavalry under Major-General Bridges were stationed seven miles away at Wallingford to deal with any disturbances which might develop.⁹⁷ Meanwhile the company which had assembled for the meeting included at least nine members of the church at Abingdon and thirty-three other men from Oxford, Hull, London, Totnes, Dartmouth, Exeter, North Walsham, Norwich and Cornwall.⁹⁸ They had come, so they were later to claim, not merely to perform "the last office of love" for Pendarves, whom they described as "Minister of the Gospel and pastor of that congregation at Abingdon" but also "to entreat earnestly of the Lord, that he would be pleased to own the present meeting, that the light which he hath given in amongst the body of his people inquiring after his minde and will in this day, might be so gathered into one as that we might be able to read his minde and will, together with our duty, on this dark and gloomy day. And that he would pour forth a plentiful portion of his Spirit upon the remnant of his faithful ones, whereby they may be enabled to prosecute his minde and will so made known unto them".⁹⁹

On Tuesday, 30 September 1656, Pendarves' body was interred "in a new burying place, before a garden (for such a one of late hath bene procured at the townes west end) and in Oxestreete".¹⁰⁰ The next day was spent, apparently mostly in prayer, at Pendarves' home. There, according to *The complaining testimony*, as they waited upon God they experienced "such tokens of his presence, by his smiling countenance through our Lord Jesus Christ, such quicknings of his Spirit, such melting and brokenness of heart, such tastes of his peace and joy, such renewings of first love, such endearing of saints to each other, such longings after the glory of God, and groanings for the prosperity of Sion as some ancient professors affirmed they seldom experienced the like".¹⁰¹

However all this may have been, a very different account of the meeting was carried to General Bridges at Wallingford. To him it was reported that "the question being started there by one in prayer, whether God's people must be a bloody people (in an active sense) was carried by the same in the affirmative".¹⁰² While there is every possibility that such a question as this would be raised at such a

gathering and that such a decision, in favour of violence, should be reached it must be remembered that the source of this report is not known but is certainly hostile, that the context of the decision, if it were accurately reported, is unknown and that the later history of the saints in and around Abingdon, as will be shown, shows no inclination toward violence at all. However, this report precisely matched the fears of the government in London: it looked very much as if an advent testimony meeting was upon the verge of being transformed into an outbreak of red revolution. Yet it seems there was no actual clash between the troops and Pendarves' friends until the Thursday morning when, quite early, while some of the latter were preparing to set off for the day's meeting, three troopers clattered into the courtyard of the Lamb Inn where they had been staying. After the three had talked with a fourth who had earlier taken a room in the same inn "as a spy, to take notice and give information of what he could hear and see done amongst us"¹⁰³ the soldiers proceeded to search several of the rooms in which the visitors had been staying and eventually took away a "hawking-bag" belonging to one George Allom, a messenger from the church at Exeter, with some manuscripts of his.

After protesting ineffectually over this act of confiscation some of the saints left for their day's meeting only to find on their arrival that the house was barred against them by two troopers. They then sought to carry on their meeting in the open marketplace. After someone had offered prayer and another had spoken for a while "our brother Jones of Longworth in Barkshire, an ancient grave Christian, who was formerly persecuted by the bishops, proceeded with a word of exhortation". While another man was speaking, a member of the Oxford congregation named Allen, the soldiers sought to harass the gathering sufficiently to break the meeting up. Afterwards more troops, commanded by Major-General Bridges himself, visited the inns where the visitors had been staying and arrested as many of them as they could find. After this series of arrests and interrogation all but five were released.¹⁰⁴

In *The complaining testimony* the writers were specifically concerned to clear John Tomkins of Abingdon "an elder of the church at Abingdon, being well known for his grace, cautious and very sparing of his expressions at all times" of the allegation that he had both challenged a soldier to a duel and that he had made wild boasts that the assembly at Abingdon could count on the support of thirty thousand others.¹⁰⁵ For the opponents of the gathering it was claimed that there was an identifiable undercurrent, at the very least, of political rejection of the Protectorate manifested by the cry of one of those who was present: "we are not for Cromwell's kingdome".¹⁰⁶ On the whole it seems that the soldiers behaved with some restraint: it is clear that some people were knocked about but no serious injury appears to have been done to anyone present. For the friends of John Pendarves it may be said that there was no suggestion from either source that any of them were armed or equipped for any kind of

violence. If the outcome of the deliberations at Abingdon can be judged from what happened, or rather, failed to happen, afterwards those who favoured violence against the Protectorate were a minority which included few if any of the local Baptists.

As was seen earlier, the death of John Pendarves was known at the meeting of the Abingdon Association at Tetsworth 16-18 September 1656; yet the records of this meeting give not the slightest hint of any political interests. The churches were concerned with strengthening their links with other Baptists in other parts of the country and with the organisation of their own inner life. At the association meeting following the funeral at Abingdon, held on 30 December 1656, the messengers seem to have been taken up very largely with questions concerning the status and appointment of ministers and not at all with national politics except to agree to advise the churches to have nothing to do with the Cromwellian state church establishment.¹⁰⁷

A little earlier, on 12 December, a further step was taken by the Abingdon Baptists which suggests that they had lost none of the impetus given by John Pendarves' work in the local villages. On this day the new Baptist congregation at Longworth "did first stand up as a church of Christ distinct from Abingdon church". It was there and then also decided, as the new congregation itself recorded, that John Coombes, who had been involved with the work of the Abingdon Association since at least the meeting of 10 June 1653 and who had signed *The complaining testimony*, should be a member and leader at Longworth "to see how the Lord will owne his labour amongst us". In consequence he and apparently ninety-eight others, both men and women, most if not all of them formerly members at Abingdon, joined in covenant together "to give upp ourselves to the Lord and to each other to walke together as members of a church of Christ as the Lord shall give us light, strength and opportunity".¹⁰⁸

Apparently Coombes' work did prosper for, in November the following year, at a Longworth church meeting attended by members from Abingdon, Wantage and Oxford, it was unanimously agreed that the Longworth church members in and near the town of Faringdon should be organized as a separate congregation and that John Coombes should serve them on two Sundays in every three. On 11 December 1657 this agreement was given effect and twenty-three members of the Longworth church were "solemnly given up to walke as a particular congregation of Jesus Christ".¹⁰⁹

While the Abingdon church and its daughter congregations remained closely linked with the Association during the period down to the restoration of Charles II in 1660 they had also subscribed to two more directly political documents in the previous year. The first was *A warning-piece to the General Council* (1659). This was signed by the Abingdon church and a number of other churches in the midlands and the south-west of England,¹¹⁰ together with many of the signa-

ories of the *Essay towards a settlement* which had been published in London, September 1659. The second, a broadsheet entitled *A testimony to truth, agreeing with an Essay for settlement on a sure foundation* was signed by members of the churches at Abingdon, Wantage, Oxford, Longworth and Faringdon. This was virtually a reprint of the *Essay* mentioned in its title which had been signed by such men as Henry Jessey and two others who had been involved with the churches of Thomas Collier's association in the south-west, John Vernon¹¹¹ and William Allen.¹¹² In *A testimony to truth* the signatories from the five churches repudiated "the setting up or introducing any person whatsoever as king or chief magistrate or a house of lords or any other thing of like import". Instead, they asserted that all sovereignty upon earth belonged to God in Christ alone "and, under Christ, as his ministers, a certain number of men qualified and limited according to his Word, ought to be set apart to the office of chief rule and government over these nations as part of Christ's universal kingdom". At the same time they demanded other reforms such as those concerned with the more equitable administration of the law and the end of any "national parochial ministry" and the compulsion of men to maintain it. While the policy thus outlined was a radical and, in a certain sense, a republican one harking back to the Barebones Parliament of 1653 which could hardly commend itself to the men then moving into positions of power in England it carried with it not the faintest hint of a threat of intended violence or revolution. Nevertheless it is hardly surprising that several of the signatories are to be found in gaol in Reading in July 1660.¹¹³

What does all this tell us about John Pendarves and the churches to which he was most closely related? It is clear that by 1655, if not earlier, Pendarves had come to share many of the hopes of the Fifth Monarchymen. He associated with them, he read their writings, he wrote in their support. In short, with them, he not only expected the near approach of the climax of all history with the visible, personal, return of Christ but he welcomed it and sought to prepare for it. In his case, however, it is quite clear that preparation for the Second Coming did not mean political plotting but the preparation of Christ's Church for the new day. Hence his double concern—for the plantation of congregations gathered according to what he believed to be the one biblical pattern and for a deeper and richer commitment among the "saints" who were to belong to them. The first concern led to his emphasis on believer's baptism and the second to the note of exhortation which sounded through all his writings both private and public in 1656. Once this is understood it is not difficult to explain his rather narrowly "denominational" commitment: for him the "closed-membership" Calvinistic Baptists represented the closest he believed he could get to the New Testament Church. At the same time it was entirely possible to believe that the Calvinistic Baptists embodied the New Testament ideal without

being committed to a Fifth Monarchy programme or expectation and it seems quite clear that the congregations with which this paper has dealt were Calvinistic Baptist churches many of whose members may have held Fifth Monarchy views rather than *vice versa*. Undoubtedly the Fifth Monarchymen represented a wider spectrum of views than has always been recognized. In the 1650's these particular millenarian convictions were held by armchair students of biblical prophecy in local churches, by ardent evangelists and pastors to whom they gave a new edge of urgency to the ministry, as well as by political revolutionaries.

NOTES

¹ B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, London 1972.

² L. F. Brown, *Baptists and Fifth Monarchymen*, London 1912.

³ Capp, *op. cit.*, 14.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 46, 77, 91f., 172, 182. Cf. John Rogers, 181.

⁶ A number of Baptists from Abingdon and its locality were present at the gathering for his funeral and they, with other Baptists from the district, also joined to sign *A testimony to truth* which was an almost verbatim reprint of *An essay towards a settlement* produced by Henry Jessey and others in 1659.

⁷ The outlines of Pendarves' career are to be found in *D.N.B.*, somewhat expanded in E. A. Payne, *The Baptists of Berkshire through three centuries*, London 1951, 24-33, and in A. E. Preston, *St Nicholas, Abingdon and other papers*, Oxford 1934.

⁸ *D.N.B.*

⁹ Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, (ed. P. Bliss), London 1817, III.419.

¹⁰ A. E. Preston, *op. cit.*, 220.

¹¹ E. A. Payne, *op. cit.*, 37.

¹² Berkshire Record Office, Abingdon Chamberlain's Accounts, A/Fac 3, 1644-45.

¹³ Bodleian MS 323, f.9. Since this was apparently the amount upon which the original augmentation had been calculated this amount was more likely to be accurate than the £30 mentioned in Bodleian MS. 323, f.5.

¹⁴ A. E. Preston, *op. cit.*, 98.

¹⁵ Bodleian MS. 323, f.9.

¹⁶ Bodleian MS. 325, f.4.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, f.5.

¹⁸ Bodleian MS. 326, f.10.

¹⁹ A. E. Preston, *op. cit.*, 223f.

²⁰ Lambeth MS. Comm. VIa/1, f.5; Bodleian MS. 327, 198f.

²¹ Bodleian MS. 326, f.16; Lambeth MS. Comm. VIa/1, f.6. *Walker Revised*, 71, suggests Pendarves held an appointment in Wantage from 1647.

²² Bodleian MS. 326, f.16.

²³ Bodleian MS. 327, p.17.

²⁴ Bodleian Rawlinson MS. 711, f.8.

²⁵ D. P. Underdown, *Pride's Purge*, Oxford 1971, 265.

²⁶ Berkshire Record Office, D/Ex 144/3/1 provides a transcript of his will.

²⁷ It was not, according to Lambeth MS. Comm. VII/6, f.6, until 3 April, 1657, that Pendarves' successor, Zachary Mayne, took over.

²⁸ J. Atherton, *The pastor turn'd pope*, London 1654, 10.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 21.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 13.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 16. A search through the records of the dean and chapter of Christ Church has failed to provide any supporting evidence.

³² Atherton, *op. cit.*, 20.

³³ *Cal. State Papers, Ireland, Adventurers 1642-49*, 255, dated 24 June 1654. Also, *ibid.*, 257, 29 May, 1654.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ L. T. C. Rolt, *Thomas Newcomen, the Prehistory of the Steam Engine*, London 1963, 43.

³⁶ *C.S.P.D.*, 1651-2, 31.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

³⁸ Atherton, *op. cit.*, 3, 18.

³⁹ "Kilmington Churchbook", 53. Entry dated "14th of the 12th month 1653".

⁴⁰ B. R. White, *Association Records*, 103.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 78, 80, 75.

⁴² For Thomas Collier see *D.N.B.* and, for his early work as an evangelist together with relevant documents, B. R. White, "Thomas Collier and Gangraena Edwards", *B.Q.*, XXIV, 3 July 1971.

⁴³ J. Mayne, *A sermon against schisme*, London 1652, 21.

⁴⁴ *Association Records, op. cit.*,

⁴⁵ For Pocock see *D.N.B.*, also Twells, H., *The life of the Rev. and most learned Dr. Edward Pocock*, London 1816, 159. P. Toon (ed.), *The correspondence of John Owen, 1616-1683*, London 1970, 83.

⁴⁶ *Association Records, op. cit.* e.g., 126-8.

⁴⁷ B. R. White, "The organisation of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660", *J. E. H.*, xvii, 216-220.

⁴⁸ *Association Records, op. cit.*, 137.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 151, 153-7.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 165.

⁵¹ Atherton, *op. cit.*, 20f.

⁵² B. R. White, "Henry Jessey, a pastor in politics" *B.Q.*, XXV, 3.

⁵³ D. Hollister, *The skirts of the whore discovered*, London 1656, 23.

⁵⁴ B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*, 132f.

⁵⁵ C. H. Firth (ed.), *The Clarke Papers*, II, (Camden Society 1894) 242ff., from an undated letter of John Thurloe to George Monck.

⁵⁶ Folger Shakespeare Library MS. X.1.d. 483.

⁵⁷ B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*, 203-5, 250.

⁵⁸ J. Pendarves, *Arrowes against Babylon*, London 1656, 4f.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁶⁰ B. R. White, "Thomas Collier" *op. cit.*, 106.

⁶¹ J. Pendarves, *Arrowes, op. cit.*,

⁶² J. Tickell, *Church-rules proposed to the church in Abingdon*, Oxford 1656, 1-3.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 18. An account of this affair is given in Roger Howell Jnr., *Newcastle-upon-Tyne and the Puritan Revolution*, Oxford 1967, 249-54. The "pretended Jew" was apparently a Roman Catholic and the Baptist pastor at Hexham, Thomas Tillam had later adopted the Seventh day Sabbath.

⁶⁵ J. Tickell, *ibid.*

⁶⁶ William Ley, *ΥΠΕΡΑΣΠΙΣΤΗΣ or a buckler for the Church of England*, Oxford 1656, 10.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁷⁰ Cf. H. Jessey (?), *A narrative of the late proceeds at Whitehall concerning the Jews*, London 1656.

⁷¹ C. Fowler, *Daemonium meridianum: Satan at noon*, Part II, London 1656, 50. More interestingly Fowler spoke of a recent encounter he had had with a Mr. Chandler who was in the depths of despair fearing himself for ever damned (52f.) whom he had first met at "Hamstead Norrice" some years before: "This man was the first Scholar-Anabaptist that came into this county ten years since. I was sent for to give him and his companion a meeting ten miles from Reading. I went, our discourse was concerning infant

baptism. I laboured to show the oneness of circumcision and baptism in five or six particulars, formed my answer from thence. I saw he could not avoid it, I told a minister by me, this man is convinced, I fear he speaks against his light". This poor creature, Fowler continued, "was first antiministerial, then anabaptistical, then verging to familism, then to rantism, now under total despair. The Lord grant it may not prove final". See *Association Records*, 202 where, at the 22nd meeting of the Abingdon Association a group of disciples, in April 1660, from "Hempstead Norris" sent for counsel on reforming themselves into a church.

⁷²J. Pendarves, *Arrowes*, *op. cit.*, 21.

⁷³For Feake, see the account in B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

⁷⁴Anon., *The Prophets Malachy and Isaiah*, London 1656, (Thomason: 22 September). This may have been written by John Tillinghast (for whom see B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*) and in the margin of p.77 is the following note: "It was in the heart of that blessed servant of the Lord, dear Tillinghast, had he had a longer day to have wrought in, to have presented you with some principles of this glorious union . . ." Pendarves' agreement with Tillinghast, mentioned in his letter to Robert Bennet, supports this identification.

⁷⁵Anon., *op. cit.*, 7f., 14.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, 29.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 19.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 21.

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, 22.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 25.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, 29.

⁸²*Ibid.*, 6, 7, 9f., 30-35, 38. Page numbering began again with the tract proper.

⁸³*Ibid.*, 38f., 41.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, 55.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 44-49.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, 58.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 74.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*,

⁸⁹John Pendarves, *The fear of God*, London 1657, 3.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, 24.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, 29.

⁹²Bodleian Rawlinson MS. D 859, f.162.

⁹³Somerset House.

⁹⁴B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*, 116.

⁹⁵*The complaining testimony of some of Sions children*, London 1656.

⁹⁶W. Hughes, *Munster and Abingdon*, Oxford 1657.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, 86.

⁹⁸*The complaining testimony*, *op. cit.* Preface.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁰⁰W. Hughes, *op. cit.*, 87.

¹⁰¹*The complaining testimony*, *op. cit.*, 2.

¹⁰²W. Hughes, *op. cit.*, 88f.

¹⁰³*The complaining testimony*, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶W. Hughes, *op. cit.*, 93.

¹⁰⁷*Association Records*, *op. cit.*, 168-172.

¹⁰⁸"Longworth Churchbook MS.", unpagged, citations by date. (Angus Library).

¹⁰⁹*Ibid.*

¹¹⁰B. S. Capp, *op. cit.*, 128.

¹¹¹Both Vernon and Allen had been in Ireland and among the south-western churches. *Association Records*, 98, 114, 121, for Vernon.

¹¹²P. Hardacre, "William Allen." *B.Q.*, XIX, 298-308.

¹¹³H. Jessey, *The Lords loud call*, London 1660, 26.