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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_congregational-historical-society-1.php

EDITORIAL.

In recent months our Society has sustained very heavy losses, both its President and its Treasurer having passed on to that branch of the Church we cannot see. Dr. Nightingale was a veteran, alike in years, in the service of the Churches, and in historical research, and in his public life he will be most missed in the town of Preston, where he exercised a lifetime's ministry, and in our Society, to which he had belonged from the beginning. In a series of posthumous articles which has appeared in the *Blackburn Times,* and which ought to be published in more permanent form, Dr. Nightingale has told the story of his life from his early years in Tockholes (where there was the Mother Church of the Blackburn district) down to his retirement. His *The Ejected of* 1662 *in Cumberland and Westmoreland* will always be the book of reference on its subject. Dr. Nightingale gave himself without stint to the work of research, and Congregationalism had reason to be proud of the achievements of one who had none of the advantages of early education.

Mr. H. A. Muddiman was a younger man who came more recently to the work of the Society. One of the Rev. W. Pierce's deacons at Highams Park, he accepted the Treasurership of the Society at Mr. Pierce's request, and put enthusiasm as well as efficiency into his duties. Many people are members of the Society to-day owing to a personal word from Mr. Muddiman, who never shirked any call to serve the Society or the Churches.

We tender to Mrs. Nightingale and Mrs. Muddiman and their families our respectful and affectionate sympathy, and give thanks to Almighty God for all that He enabled His servants to do.

* * * *

A large audience of members, delegates and the general public assembled to hear Mr. G. H. Hunter Blair's lecture on "The Roman Frontier between Tyne and Solway" on Tuesday, October 11th, during the autumnal assembly of the Union at Newcastle. Mr. Hunter Blair's knowledge of and enthusiasm for his subject and the excellent lantern slides provided a most interesting and illuminating meeting. By the kindness of local friends an expedition to the Wall was arranged and took place on the Thursday afternoon, though

heavy rain unfortunately caused the curtailment of the excursion to the nearer and in some ways less interesting and historic sections of the frontier.

* * * *

The Annual Meeting of the Society will take place on Tuesday, May 8th, at the Memorial Hall, when, after the private business, Mr David Chamberlin, the Managing Editor of the London Missionary Society, will read a paper on "Massachusetts—a Congregational State." In view of the forthcoming pilgrimage to the United States, which synchronises with the tercentenary of Endicott's expedition, this lecture is of peculiar interest, and members are urged not only to be present themselves but to bring this meeting to the notice of our modern pilgrims and invite them to attend it. The Annual Meeting this year is of particular importance in view of the vacancies in the offices of President and Treasurer.

* * * *

In these days of Church Extension it is well that all the denominations should learn from the experience of others, and we have been glad to see Mr. Seymour J. Price's *A Popular History of the Baptist Building Fund.* (Kingsgate Press, 7s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.) Mr. Price tells in an interesting way of the work of this Fund, which was established in 1824 to do the work of a Chapel Building Society. The rules for its management are printed and they are of great interest to-day. The first two we print herewith. Even in the twentieth century some of the points mentioned in paragraph 2 call for consideration :—

1. That the Cases to be relieved from this Fund, be Cases of the Particular, or Calvinistic Baptist Denomination, from any parts of the United Kingdom : information being first obtained respecting doctrinal sentiments, etc., from friends resident in the district.

2. That, in the examination of Cases, regard be had to the following points :—

That the erection, repair, or enlargement, was necessary.

That the parties concerned sought the advice, and obtained the sanction of respectable individuals belonging to neighbouring Churches, before they began to build.

That nothing has been expended in superfluities, or wasted by mismanagement.

That the people themselves have contributed according to their ability.

That there is a reasonable prospect of the place being adequately supplied with the ministry of the Word.

With this book should be read Mr. Price's *Coming of Age*, which has been privately printed and which tells of the twenty-one years work 1906-1927 of the London Baptist Property Board. Our own denominational Church Extension Committee could, we think, get suggestions from the experience of the sister denomination by reading these books.

* * * *

As part of the Jubilee of the Sheffield Congregational Association in 1927 the Rev. Harold Thomas has just written a History of the Work of the Association during the last fifty years. It is a handy little account, though it is a pity that more care has not been taken in details: two attempts are made to spell Fairbairn's name and they both fail. Mr. Thomas, too, has some very sound things to say about Church Extension, for example :—

" A number of ' Dont's ' for the inhabitants of the new housing schemes will of necessity include : ' Don't imagine you cannot have a Church if you have only a cottage room or a drawing-room for the meeting : remember the beginnings of Wycliffe Church, and Scrooby Manor house, and the Upper Room at Jerusalem : where will the Lord's Supper ever seem more really the seal of fellowship, and the bread be broken with greater thankfulness ? Don't seek for your congregation only the nice people (*i.e.*, those of your temperament) or those of your political type, for in so doing you will hinder the witness your new fellowship will bear to the power of the Master to break down these human walls of division, and to make from all types one new and perfect society. Make your fellowship of those who believe that of such fellowship is the Kingdom of Heaven, however ' impossible ' they may seem to be at first. It is no hobby that you are starting, but life's holiest, social task. In doing it you will know the peace the world cannot give."

* * * *

Nobody can speak with more authority about Richard Baxter than Dr. F. J. Powicke, one of our own members. Dr. Powicke has collected from Baxter's writings his references to Cromwell, and has drawn on his knowledge for full annotations. His Introduction to this study of the relation of Baxter to Cromwell, with the first instalment of the text and notes, appears within : three further instalments, in subsequent issues, will complete the study.

The Forbes Library.

Southgate Chapel, Gloucester.

THE Editor has asked me to write a brief account of the Forbes Library in the possession of Southgate Chapel, Gloucester. My qualifications as a contributor to the *Transactions* of a learned society are very slight; but as I once had the honour to be for more than fourteen years minister at Southgate, and because I am in love with all that belongs to my native county, I venture to step in rashly where a wiser man might hesitate.

James Forbes was the first Nonconformist minister in the city of Gloucester. He was a Scotchman by birth, a Master of Arts of Aberdeen, and after being at Oxford he came to Gloucester Cathedral as a young man of twenty-five to be one of Cromwell's Weekly Preachers. This was in 1654. He held the position for six years, until the restoration of the king in 1660, when the appointment terminated. Dr. Frampton, the Bishop and later on one of the Non-jurors, tried to persuade Forbes to conform in 1662; but there was different blood from that in him, and he refused, as his near neighbour Richard Baxter refused. For very many years Forbes seems to have been hunted about the county; once we hear of him being protected at Elmbridge Court with the drawbridge up; another time he is imprisoned in Chepstow Castle; but he had all the while a band of followers in the city who were devoted to him and to his ministry, which he managed somehow to carry on amongst them. When quieter days came and the numbers about him grew, this little company of Christian folk were able to build for their worship the church in Barton Street, now the Unitarian Chapel, and there from 1699 to 1712 he exercised his ministry. In the latter year he died at the age of 83, having been connected with the city through the whole of an adventurous period of fifty-eight years. Forbes was a scholar, a man of profound spiritual gifts, and he must have possessed a wondrous power of attaching men to him. Probably there has been no more remarkable career in Gloucester since. His name is worthy of a place

alongside of Baxter and Howe in the Puritan tradition of the West. Forbes was buried in the Barton Street Church, beneath the Communion Table, and the stone above his grave bears the inscription which can still be seen :

Jacobus Forbesius, A.M. ;
in hac civitate annos circiter 58
Fidelis Christi Minister, et Testis Veritatis ;
et Pacis Evangelicae aeque studiosus ;
Obiit 31 Maii, Anno MDCCXII
Aetatis LXXXIII.

Three years after his death the church was divided by deep theological differences which led to the secession of about half the members. The seceders met for awhile in the Cobblers' Hall, Kimbrose. After a time they built a sanctuary for themselves in Southgate Street, on the site of the ancient church of St. Owen's, a church which was destroyed during the siege of Gloucester. It was for very many years the custom for the vestry meeting of the old parish of St. Owen's to be held in the schoolroom of the old Southgate Street chapel. This old building was pulled down and the present building erected about the middle of last century. At the time of the secession in 1715 it was arranged that those who remained should have possession of the permanent property, *i.e.*, the building and the endowment, and that those who left should have the portable property *i.e.*, Mr. Forbes' library, and the Communion Plate. In this way the Forbes Library came into the possession of the Southgate church.

My immediate authority for this statement is the Preface to the Catalogue of the Library made by the Rev. Henry Shaw, who was minister at Southgate from 1881 to 1887, when he removed to Urmston, Manchester, where he fulfilled a long and able pastorate until his death in 1912. Mr. Shaw was a man of sound learning, and he investigated all that concerned the Library with the greatest care. His Catalogue of the Library fills four MS. volumes in his own handwriting. The first three volumes give the full titles of the books, with brief annotations of his own upon many of them ; and the fourth is an Index. The Preface to which reference has been made is in the fourth volume, and is signed " Henry Shaw, 1887." The Preface to the first volume of the Catalogue also bears Mr. Shaw's signature, and is dated 1884 ; so that the compil-

ation of the Catalogue represents three or four years work, an evidence of care and of devotion to the Library which those who value such treasures will understand. Perhaps I ought to add that the books are now protected behind locked glass doors, and no book can be removed from the shelves, nor the Library used in any way, without the permission of the deacons of the Church. But the deacons are always glad at any time for those who wish to see the Library to do so, on a proper letter of introduction either to themselves or to the minister of the Church.

The Forbes Library is the library of a Puritan minister and scholar of Forbes's own day. It was left by him for the use of his successors in the ministry of the Church which he established. Mr. Shaw's Catalogue gives the titles of 1,250 books ; but he adds this note at the end : " Besides the books that are entered in these volumes there is a number of books in very bad condition which it is not worth the trouble of entering." The initial letters of Mr. Forbes's name together with his motto will be seen in nearly all the books : " J. F. *Suprema, optima ; Fugit hora ; Ora, labora ; Spe experto.*" It is for the most part a library of Puritan theology, with a very fair representation of the Reformation both abroad and at home. The early Puritan martyrs are represented by Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, in a rare and valuable collection of Tracts. Other sets of old Tracts include a set on the Sabbath Controversy, a set on Baptism, a volume of State Tracts relating to the Government and privately printed in the reign of Charles II, a number of Quaker Tracts, some connected with the " Society for the Reformation of Manners," and a few dealing with affairs in Scotland. Mr. Shaw carefully indexed all these.

The Reformation leaders are represented by Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and Erasmus ; and there is an Elzevir edition of the *Colloquia*. There is also a copy of Martin Bucer's *De Regno Christi* (1557), but it is not in good condition. The early Reformers in this country are represented by Foxe, the martyrologist ; John Knox ; and Thomas Cartwright. There is a first edition copy of Knox's *Answer, etc.* (1560), of which a copy of the 1591 edition is in the British Museum. The later Puritan and Nonconformist divines are represented by Baxter, Bunyan, Burroughs, Caryl, Fuller, Calamy, Goodwin, Owen, Manton, and many others. The works of Baxter are an extraordinarily fine collection, and must be one of the most

complete in the country. The copy of the *Reliquiae* is a fine 4to of 1696, with a frontispiece portrait of Baxter. The earliest copy of the *Saints' Rest* is a 12th edition of 1688. I believe that the Rev. T. G. Crippen examined this Baxter collection more than once, and almost cast envious eyes on it for the Memorial Hall; but there are some things that are not even for the Memorial Hall. Not far away on the shelves is a 4to of Locke's *Essay*—a second edition (1694), with portrait of Locke.

There is a fair collection of Bibles in the Library. Perhaps the best is a Geneva Bible, 8vo, 1610, with which is bound up the Book of Common Prayer 1613, and the Psalter. The Prayer Book is a Black Letter. There is a Beza's *Novum Testamentum*, folio (1603), and there are two later Bezas, a folio of 1642, and a 4to of 1635. The oldest book in the Library is *De Lyra's Commentary on the New Testament*, a folio Black Letter, with illuminated capitals (1492), but it is only in fair condition. There is also a copy of De Lyra's *Commentary on the Old Testament*, a folio Black Letter (1507). One of the most interesting books in the library is a fine copy of Archbishop Laud's famous Prayer Book for the Church of Scotland. It is a Black Letter, folio (1637), printed at Edinburgh "by Robert Young, printer to the King's Most Excellent Majestie."

Such are some of the more interesting things which the library contains. The most perfect Black Letter book is, in Mr. Shaw's judgment, the copy of Sleidane's *Chronicle of our Times*, a folio of 1560. For many of these details I have had to refresh my memory from Mr. Shaw's Catalogue, as it is nine years since I last examined the library myself.

In the Church safe there are preserved some letters written to Mr. Forbes, and also a MS. diary of about 1660 belonging to the Rev. John Forbes of Tilligonie, who was probably the brother of James Forbes. Several of the more valuable Tracts are also stored in the safe; and there is also a very interesting MS. parchment document relating to Purton, in Wiltshire. It is a warrant issued in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Charles II, under the Conventicles Act, for fining certain persons for worshipping in the house of Margaret Shurmer at Purton, and stating the amount of the fines to be paid in each case. There is also a document of a somewhat similar kind relating to Dissenters in Gloucester.

Those who read all this with the eyes of the trained anti-

quarian will see many gaps, and much that they would like to improve in what I have set down. I can imagine Dr. Powicke ranging his eyes along the shelves and bringing out treasures in a rich feast for his readers. But I have no skill or learning such as makes Dr. Powicke a prince amongst us in the literature of Puritanism. Still, it has been delightful to drift back for an hour to former days when I spent many a happy evening among these old books. Sometimes I was able to arrange to show our congregation some of the treasures they had, and especially the Bibles and Prayer Books, and some of the works of men who made our early Congregational history. I remember an afternoon when I was reading Baxter's *Reliquiae* in the vestry, and the newsboys went by outside, shouting a speech by the then Bishop of Gloucester, in which he was misunderstanding our Nonconformist position in the very way in which Baxter had to meet misunderstanding in his day. There on the table, on the open page before me, was the answer in Baxter's own words. So things come back; and I can recall now the store which we all set on the Library, looking on it with justifiable pride. Probably there is no greater treasure in its kind in any of our Congregational Churches throughout the country; and certainly there are no more moving incidents in our Congregational history than the story of Puritanism in Gloucester and in the county. And I can never quite forget how close I once had that story about me, till I could almost see the manner of men these scholars and spiritual masters were who laid the foundations of our liberties; and I know in my heart that among them there was not a truer nor a braver man than James Forbes.

A. T. S. James.

Ambrose Barnes:

A Newcastle Puritan.[1]

He was a man that would keep Church duly,
Rise early before his servants, and even for religious haste
Go ungartered, unbuttoned, to morning prayer,
Dine quickly upon high days, and when I had great guests,
Would even shame me, and rise from the table,
To get a good seat at the afternoon sermon.

IT is just three centuries ago since this great but little known representative of the type that Shakespeare drew was born, the closing day of 1627. His long life of eighty-three years is an epitome of the history of his time. He saw five sovereigns on the throne, lived through the Commonwealth, perhaps the noblest period of that history, when for the first time before or since English religious life controlled English political action— saw the Restoration which followed, then the Revolution, down through the reign of William and Mary to the time of Queen Anne. He saw as he said "the Cap, Mace and Sword, the symbols of Civic Authority, carried one day to the Parish Church, another day to the Mass House, and yet another day to the Dissenting Meeting."

His Ancestry and Training.

When Lady Bowes of Streatlam, near Barnard Castle—the family into which John Knox had married half a century before, and into which one of our own Royal Princes married in recent years—induced the famous Richard Rothwell to bring the evangel to that district in 1617 she was apprehensive of danger to him from "so fierce and surly a people." He said "If I thought I should not have met the Devil I should not have come, he and I have been at odds in other places, and I hope we shall not agree here." But even the Devil has his statute of limitations, and we find Rothwell's quaint biographer, Master Clarke, saying that :—"He had at Bernard Castle so

[1] See the *Memoirs* (Surtees Soc., Vol. 50); Clarke's *Lives*; Gillie's *Historical Collections*; Grosart's Preface to Reprint of Gilpin's *Demonologia Sacra*; Newcastle *Council Reports, &c., &c.*

many judicious and experimental Christians that people came from London, York, Richmond, Newcastle, and many other places, to see the order of his congregation."

Among his spiritual children were such local families of substance as the Stodarts, the Dodsworths, the Sandersons, the Vanes of Raby and the Barnes of Startforth; and old Dissenting causes still survive from these times. The year of Rothwell's death, 1627, was the year of Barnes's birth. He was educated at the Grammar School at Barnard Castle "where his modesty and sweetness got him the love of his master, his progress drew the eye of the stranger, and his pleasantness and wit made him the darling of his schoolfellows, among whom Amber-Rose was their nickname for him." It was said of him that "in youth he delighted in his book, in manhood he applied himself to business, and in age he fixed his mind on religion." He came to Newcastle the year after the Scottish occupation as apprentice to William Blackett, merchant adventurer. Diligent in business, there is a story told of him and a fellow apprentice, one of the Salvins of Croxdale [a family still there] who was also his bedfellow; the latter kept such disorderly hours that Barnes never knew when he came to bed, while he himself was so assiduous that the other never knew when he got up. His master entirely confided in him; in time all the weight and burden of a great trade being laid upon him. He made visits to trading centres on the Continent, and was allowed to make ventures on his own account. Doubtless he was familiar with the sight of Charles I, while a prisoner in Newcastle; he had stood back from kissing the Royal hand while a boy at home, where his uncle Dodsworth was Keeper of the Royal Buckhounds, and when the King was handed over by the Scots to the Parliament Barnes was one of the "tellers" for the counting of the Ransom.

His Civic Life.

Barnes was a member of the Common Council of Newcastle soon after his apprenticeship expired, and as an Alderman was perhaps the youngest on record. His Puritanism made him a reformer. He took care that the laws were not sharpened against the good and blunted against the bad. He set a good guard on all balls and masques, shows and plays, and upon inferior officers that they did not squeeze those in their custody; he strove hard against drunkenness, and was utterly

against the buying of places, as he was against the racking of men, or rents; he was dexterous in allaying quarrels, inexorable in cases of blood and duels, and in cases of wrong thought that restitution might pass for satisfaction. He took orders about the size of the loaf, saw that no fish or flesh was brought to the shambles unwholesome, that there was no inequality of rating, that the public buildings were kept in good repair, that the hospitals had discreet overseers and that charities were put to the use intended. A restless enemy of vice, he laboured till he had extinguished gross immorality, and brought in a reign of sobriety and civility among all sorts. Young as he was he was destined by the town for the mayoralty, but the Restoration put an end to that, as to other good things.

His Churchmanship.

He believed that all godly men were united in that which made them godly. Col. Axtell the Baptist, Wm. Penn the Quaker, Papist, Protestant, and Puritan clergy sat at his table —and he was accused of being all three. When a Nonconformist he made a practice of occasionally hearing Conformist preachers, holding that Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, might associate in hearing the word of God. "*After all our controversies he apprehended the last debate would not be between Conformist and Nonconformist, but between Protestant and Papist.*" In discipline and in the substantials of the Gospel none were more resolute and constant. Like Archbishop Usher, he was inclined to vulgar Christians, rather than the learned, for Godly persons of whatever rank had mighty power with him; with them he was most familiar and at home. He joined the Christian Church first as a candidate for membership of the Independent Congregation which worshipped under Cuthbert Sydenham in St. Nicholas during the Commonwealth. Later he sat under William Durant, who was of the same "way," and he died in communion with the Presbyterian Congregation at Close Gate under Richard Gilpin and Benjamin Bennett, although at an earlier period he had "kicked" at some of the findings of the local "Classis" and declared that "Presbytery went lame of a leg for lack of power to compel." His youngest son Thomas carried on an Independent ministry in the town for the first generation of the eighteenth century, as John Rough had done in the middle of the sixteenth.

His Confession of Faith.

His "Confession of Faith" has the following, made in public on joining the Church:—"To point out the time of my espousal to Christ, to show you, as I may term it, my wedding ring, or the precise article of union, truly I am not able. But when fear and doubt do arise, the way I take is to enquire what principles have been emplanted in me, and what fruit or issue they should have. The Lord Jesus is precious to me, he is unspeakably precious. I am come out of the wilderness leaning on my Beloved."

His Nonconformity.

He suffered much under the rigors of the Act of Uniformity and its bye-products, not so much, like his fellow Nonconformists, from the Civic authorities, whose policy was one of *laissez-faire* (they said you could not do business with a man six days in the week and persecute him for his religious opinions on the seventh), but from the Ecclesiastical. His house was closed, or he lived in it by stealth; his business, such of it as he had not ventured in the lead mines of West Durham and Cumberland, was ruined, and he himself often a fugitive. Judge Jeffreys had been sent down to deal more vigorously with matters, and it fretted him much that he could not catch Barnes. The latter had a water-stair to the Tyne from his house in the Close, whence he could slip across to the other side, where he kept a horse. Jeffreys, like the master who sent him north, would drink till two or three in the morning, suffer the next day from the effects of it, and make all with whom he came into contact suffer. But he got a nasty jolt one day in Newcastle. A "meeting" of young men twenty to thirty in number for religious purposes had been "raided" and brought to the Assize direct. Looking at them with contempt and disdain, and singling out one who from being in his working dress looked the meanest, he barked: "Can you read, sirrah?" "Yes, my Lord," said Thomas Verner, the youth in question. "Hand him the Book!" said the Judge, and the Clerk handed him the Latin Testament, which he opened without design at *Matt.* VII 1-2. "Ne judicate. Ne judicemini," he began to the astonishment of Jeffreys, who thought he had only an ignorant mechanic to deal with. "Construe it, sirrah!" thinking to intimidate him. "Judge not lest ye be judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged," was the immediate response. Jeffreys recovered himself

sufficiently to send them back to prison till next Assize, on the absurd charge of high treason, his theory being "take the cubs and the old foxes will appear." One of them at least did, for Barnes went to London and pleaded before the Council with such effect that that charge at least was withdrawn, although they were not released till long afterward. Jeffreys got another jolt on meeting Barnes as the latter was leaving, and he himself entering, the Council.

But Barnes had his compensations in the esteem of his fellows, in the fact that he always had warning of a "visitation," that unknown to him a rigid Conformist paid his fine week by week for non-attendance at his Parish Church, and that Vicar Marsh would slip along privately after nightfall, to the dark house in the Close, to call upon him, putting the blame of the proceedings against him upon the misfortunes of the times.

His Public Character.

He never made an enemy but upon public account, for neither promises nor threats made him decline from public justice or service. He kept company of necessity with those who in worldly estate were above him, but he was far removed from ambition. He excelled in composing difficulties by umpirage, and was successful even with that irreconcilable Richard Baxter and his wife, once when at table with them. The matter in debate was the Commonwealth. "I like not its spirit," cried Baxter, driven into a corner: "Nor like I yours!", retorted Mrs. Baxter, doubtless with more reasons than she could state. He was often consulted by the trading and county families regarding their wills, and as often had the case of estates and children thrust upon him. Lord Derwentwater called him the "honest Whig"; Lord Paulet paid him honour as a father; the Duke of Devonshire treated him as an intimate; the Duke of Newcastle considered him capable of higher things than ever he aspired to. He had stood before Kings, before Chas. I as a youth, before Chas. II as a man. In the matter of the Toleration James II would pass no business but Mr. Barnes must be advised of it. Some thought the King had found Barnes's weak side. He thought he had found the King's blind side. "Can you tell me anything of one Barnes, you who come from Newcastle?", said King William to an adviser?" "Yes, as honest a man and as good a subject as your majesty has in the three Kingdoms!", was the answer. "And I am glad to hear it," said the King, who lived to prove it.

His Way of Life and His End.

Tall of stature and well made, not fat though well furnished, with complexion fresh and sanguine, he went very straight in body to the last; of a clear, firm, healthful constitution, and a presence manly and majestic, always very neat in his clothes, he loved to have everything about him very cleanly. Except when strangers dined with him, he seldom in his fullest estate dined upon more than one dish, with a piece of cheese, a little ale, and sometimes wine, after dinner. A dish of coffee and a piece of bread were his usual breakfast, and for the most part some light thing for supper. Nine o'clock at night was his bed time, unless something kept him up, and four in the summer and five in the winter his constant hours of rising. He would lie nowhere but in one of the uppermost rooms in his house, and till a year or two before he died would never have a fire in his chamber in the rainiest weather, or in the sharpest frost. In the December before his death he, as usual, took his journey into the worst parts of Cumberland, to pay his miners before their Christmas holidays.

Returning from a call upon Lord Derwentwater (who was later beheaded), then in town, he felt his cloak grow heavy, and was sore faint and weary before reaching home.

But the Lord's Supper being the day (Sunday) following he would not be hindered. It was noted that he lifted the Cup to his lip a little unevenly, but he rose from the table like a giant refreshed. He died in full assurance, his last words being, "I know in whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able to keep what I have committed to him." He was in the eighty-third year of his age, and was interred on March 26, 1710, in St. Nicholas Churchyard.

When many years after the grave was opened to make room for one of his family, an aged man, seeing the skull, which another held in his hand, broke into tears with these words: "Lord, what are we! that was once the wisest head in the North of England."

We need our father's nobler ways,
  Old virtues founded on their faith,
Their quiet homes, their ordered days,
  Their joy in work, their calm in death.
Shall we who love them, not proclaim
  Their merits for the present need,
Take censure on our modern shame,
    Take heed! Take heed!

R. S. Robson.

Whitefield and the Newspapers, 1737-1741.

THE following advertisements and items of news are from London newspapers of nearly two hundred years ago. They explain themselves. They prove that in 1739 Whitefield was the subject of more talk than any other man in London; that he had a "bad Press"; and that, as the sequel showed, a "bad Press" could not kill his ministry.

At that time the Wesleys or Westleys attracted comparatively little notice from the newspapers. The "Methodists" were the followers of Whitefield.

Apparently the "mob" or the "giddy Rabble" was ready for the Revival of Religion.

The *Old Whig* was dead in 1739. It represented the Dissenting interest. Its two notices in 1737 were not unkind. For "Dissenters" see also the extract from the *London Evening Post*, May 26-29, 1739. W. J. PAYLING WRIGHT.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Jan. 6, 173$\frac{7}{8}$.

The Rev. Mr. Whitefield married four Couples on Board last week that are going to settle in Georgia.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Feb. 17, 173$\frac{7}{8}$.

Last week Several Papers, with the following Words, were put on the Desks of Several Churches of this City—The Prayers of this Congregation are desired for the Preservation and safe Voyage of the most Reverend Mr. Whitefield now going to Georgia.

Old Whig, Oct. 6, 1737.

[The Rev. Mr. Whitefield] so much followed and whose Preaching is so deservedly approved of, preached at Six in the Morning at Cornhill, at Eleven in the Tower, at Three in the Afternoon in Old Fish St., and at Five in the Evening at St. Clement Danes, when every church was so crowded that numbers were obliged to withdraw from want of room.

Old Whig, Oct. 27, 1737.

[Mr. Whitefield preach'd at St. Mary at Hill. Crowded Audience. Collection (22l.) the largest ever known there]. 'Tis believed that if he will accept of the Rectory of the said Parish upon the Resignation of the Rev. Dr. Snape, the Parishioners . . . will present him thereto.

London Daily Post, Feb. 16, 173$\frac{8}{9}$. [Advt.]

A Letter concerning a Sect of Modern Enthusiasts, call'd Methodists, to which is annexed an extraordinary instance of the great

Meekness, Humility and Modesty of Mr. Whitfield, one of their Leaders, lately manifested at the Church of St. Margaret's, Westminster.

London Daily Post, Feb. 19, 173⅝. [Advt.]

A Vindication of the Rev. Mr. Whitefield from the many Aspersions cast on him by Those who pretend to be Friends of the Church of England, or Friends of the Dissenters, or of any who call themselves Quakers. With an Appendix proving from Mr. Whitefield's Continuation of his Journal that his Scheme of Religion is perfectly new, and not borrowed from any of the above (as hath been asserted); and that he is not only the most modest but the very best Explainer of Scripture, so far as the said Continuance has any Relation to Revealed Religion.

by MOSES METHODICUM

Formerly a Savage but since converted by Mr. Whitefield.

Craftsman, April 7, 1739. (cf. *Read's Weekly Journal*, same date.)

Some arch Wags having advertis'd on Saturday last the arrival of Mr. Whitefield at London and that he would preach on Sunday last (April 1) at Bow, near Stratford, Several hundred People hurried down there to hear him, but to their great Mortification were disappointed. *Mr. Whitefield has many Fools.*

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, April 14, 1739.

We hear that Methodical Madness rages still at Islington notwithstanding the Cold Weather and that a House is hir'd in the Lower Street *for the Disordr'd* and three Doctors are to attend four days a week.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, May 5, 1739.

On Monday it having been given out that Whitefield was to preach at Whitechapel Mount, a great number of People resorted thither, but were disappointed ; by which means the Last as well as the First of April was made equally memorable to the giddy-brain'd Followers of that Gentleman.

Read's Weekly Journal, May 5, 1739.

The Vicar of Islington and the Vestry of that Parish after an Agreement to chuse five on each Side to take into consideration the Disturbances occasion'd there lately by the Methodists, met Wednesday Morning and unanimously resolv'd that neither of those Gentlemen should be suffer'd to preach there again. . . .

The followers of Parson Whitefield have done a vast deal of Damage to the Tombs and Gravestones in Islington Church Yard.

Universal Weekly Journal, May 5, 1739.

Yesterday se'ennight fifteen Women, inhabitants of the Parish of Islington, under the influence of the New Method came Arm in Arm, three in a Row, with downcast mortify'd Looks, preceded by a young Man repeating verses of the Psalms which they sung to

a dismal Melancholy Tune. It is supposed they came to visit their Brethren and Sisters in Bethlem in their Tour through Moorfields.

Universal Weekly Journal, May 5, 1739.

On Saturday last the rev. Mr. Whitefield (being denied the use of a Pulpit) preach'd to a prodigious Concourse of People on a Tombstone in Islington Church Yard; last Sunday morning he did the same from the Wall near Bedlam; and in the afternoon near the Gallows on Kennington Common to a vast number of People. . . .

We hear that on Sunday next the rev. Mr. Whitefield is to mount the Rostrum at the top of the Monument, there to preach and expound the Scripture to a large Company of his Admirers who are to stand in St. Paul's Church Yard.

Read's Weekly Journal, May 5, 1739.

The same Evening about six o'clock Mr. Whitefield preach'd to a great Concourse of People on Kennington Common from the same Text the Rev. Dr. Trapp made use of last Sunday at Christ Church out of Ecclesiastes *Be not over Righteous*, etc. But the People waiting a long Time for the Preacher, Dr. Rock[1] cunningly took The Advantage of his Absence and talk'd so pathetically to the Multitude of the Efficacy of his Packets that he dispos'd of Abundance of them; and 'tis thought the Quack for the Body made greater Profit that Afternoon than the Quack for the Soul.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, May 5, 1739.

A much more extraordinary *Itinerant* who lately made a Progress to the Western Parts of *England* . . . where from *Tombstones* and *Market-Crosses*, on *Commons* and *Mountains* he preach'd to vast Numbers of ignorant People . . . yesterday I heard with great pleasure that the Grand Jury design to present these Scandalous disorderly Meetings . . . There is something so extravagantly ridiculous in the Behaviour of this young Man.

Read's Weekly Journal, May 12, 1739.

Several fine Ladies who used to wear French Silks, French Hoops of four yards wide, Tete de Mounton Heads (or Bob-wigs) and white Satin Smock Petticoats etc. are turned Methodists, and followers of Mr. Whitefield whose Doctrine of *the New Birth* has so prevailed over them, that they now wear plain Stuff-Gowns, no Hoops, common Night-Mobs and plain Bags for Jenny's.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany and Craftsman, May 12, 1739.

Mr. Whitefield has signified to his Followers that his itinerant Preaching has given such Disgust to the Civil Magistrates that he has received an Order from the Lord Mayor, for his own Security, not to be taken raising any Disturbance within the City.

---

[1] "Dr. Rock," like other Quacks, advertised in this Journal.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, May 12, 1739.

The Mr. Westleys have not yet gone so far as Mr. Whitefield. . . . the Mr. Westleys are less justifiable or, rather, more guilty than Mr. Whitefield because they are men of more Learning, better Judgment and cooler Heads, . . . Let them go to their proper Companions, their Favourites, the Dissenters, and utter their Extemporary Effusions in a Conventicle. . . .

The Daily Papers inform us that a Person was in imminent Danger of Suffering Violence, only for expressing a Dislike to Mr. Whitefield's Conduct in Moorfields . . . hundreds of the ignorant Multitude will innocently be corrupted.

N.B. Since I wrote my Letter I heard the Lord Mayor has forbid Mr. Whitefield erecting his Stage in London and the Justices of the Peace will act as the Duty of their Place requires, it they follow his Lordship's Example.

Read's Weekly Journal, May 19, 1739.

Mr. Whitefield designs this Day at Seven in the Evening to preach from the new Pier of the intended Bridge at Westminster, for the Benefit of those that travel by Water.

Hooker's Weekly Journal, May 19, 1739.

During the time of Mr. Whitefield's Preaching on Kennington Common, a man well-dress'd dropp'd down dead . . . Two or three others fainted . . . with the Heat.

Read's Weekly Journal, May 26, 1739.

On Sunday last the Rev. Dr. Trapp preach'd his fourth and last Sermon in answer to Mr. Whitefield and the Methodists, showing the Nature, Folly, Sin and Danger of being Righteous overmuch; which Sermons are now printing at the earnest Request of his Audience. . . .

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, May 26, 1739.

Among many other constant Attendants of Mr. Whitefield, Shock Egerton, the most dexterous Pick-Pocket about Town, lately return'd (before his Time was Expir'd) from Transportation . . . makes a better Collection than in any of the Plates handed about.

London Evening Post, May 26-29, 1739.

On Tuesday last the Rev. Mr. Whitefield called at Hitchen on his way to Bedford and at the Desire of Several Dissenters was prevail'd on to return there on Friday last, at which time several Hundred Dissenters of that Parish and the neighbouring Dissenters attended him; but being denied the use of the Church, he mounted a Table in the Market-Place, on which the Bells were set aringing; He afterwards retir'd to the Place of Execution, and according to his usual Method, sung a Psalm; and began to harrangue his Auditors with an Extempore Sermon, on the 12th of John, the latter

part of the 21st Verse . . . but being overcharg'd—he was obliged to break off abruptly.

Daily Post, June 1, 1739.

Mr. Whitefield, with his usual Success, still continues preaching about Town and collecting Money from his infatuated Auditors; but now assigns a different Use for the Money, viz., a Place of Worship for the poor Salzburghers, not an Orphan House in Georgia. *When will the Rabble's Folly cease.*

Daily Post, June 2, 1739.

We hear that, it being reported that Mr. Whitefield has left to the Public, as a Consolation for the great Loss they must sustain by his Absence, a Pair of Reverend Methodists, there will be lodg'd a Complaint to the Bench of Justices, and they requir'd to put in Force the Act of Charles II against held Conventicles, as this Act stands unrepeal'd, notwithstanding the *generous* Act of Toleration, and it subjects not only Preachers, but Auditors, Constables, Magistrates etc., to Severe Penalties; the first for Countenancing, the latter for neglecting to suppress such illegal Assemblies when regularly inform'd of them.

Daily Post, June 5, 1739.

To the great Satisfaction of the Master-Mechanics about Town (many of whose giddy-brain'd workfolks, Male and Female, have neglected their Business to follow Mr. Whitefield till they have wanted a Sunday's Dinner) that Gentleman is to Embark this week at Rotherhithe, bound for South Carolina. She touches at Philadelphia where the Preacher, no doubt, will to a great Advantage dispose of his Valuable Cargoe, purchased with the Fools Pence he has talk'd out of the Pockets of his Lunatic Audience.

Daily Gazetteer, June 6, 1739.

We are told that he [Whitefield] is another *Moses*, that he is an *Apostolick Man* and true Preacher of Christ's Gospel. . . . Scripture furnishes us with many Examples of Preaching on *Commons* . . . yet it is not clear that any one of these Examples comes up to Mr. Whitfield's Case.

London Daily Post, June 7, 1739. [Advt.]

The Orator [Orator Henley, see D.N.B.] will be Respondent next Sunday for Mr. Whitefield against the Objections of being over-righteous, an Enthusiast, not working Miracles, breaking the Laws of the Church and State, Civil Quiet and Property, propagating Despair, Madness and Idleness; the Case of Hell, Torments, a Doubting Conscience, and all the ridiculous and senseless Cavils, made at that Gentleman and the Methodists by Dr. Tr——, Mr. B——d, H——r, F——N. etc., etc., and other Reverend Popguns proving Whit-Sunday to be for Whitefield.

Daily Post, June 8, 1739.

Yesterday there was brisk Press in the River for Seamen; they Swept away near 2,000. [Beginning of war with Spain.]

The Reverend Mr. Whitefield, who embarked on Monday last on board the Elizabeth for Carolina can't proceed on his intended Voyage on account of the Said Press, the men being all taken out of that ship for His Majesty's Service, so that he is to preach on Black Heath till the Vessel is supply'd with other Hands.

Daily Post, June 8, 1739. [Advt.]

Very proper to be read by all Persons, especially at this Time, as a Preservative against the Principles of Mr. Whitefield and his Followers. The Second Edition of the Doctrine of Assurance . . . by Arthur Bedford, M.A., Chaplain to His Royal Highness Frederick, Prince of Wales.

Craftsman, June 9, 1739. [Advt.]

Dr. Joseph Trapp's Discourses against [Whitefield] . . . Second Edition 1s.

Allowance for purchase of a Number to distribute among the Poor.

Read's Weekly Journal, Jun 9, 1739.

Friday 7 night Mr. Stonehouse, Vicar of Islington, was married at Highgate Chapel to Miss Crisp, a young Lady of a very great Fortune, contrary to the Consent or Knowledge of her Friends. *A fine example for the Righteousness of a Methodist.*

Craftsman, June 9, 1739.

On Sunday night, Mr. Whitefield preach'd his Farewell Sermon at Kennington Common and collected 34l. 5s. for the Orphan-house in Georgia, being to Embark in a few days for Philadelphia etc. Monday between Four and Five in the evening he left London and proceeded to Blackheath etc. The total sum collected by him for several Charities is as follows :—

	l.
For the Orphan-house	966
For the Poor in General	150
For Erecting a Church for the Salzburghers	77
In all	1193

Daily Post, June, 20, 1739. [Advt.]

The Mock-Preacher. A Satyrico-Comical-Allegorical Farce; as it was acted to a Crowded Audience at Kennington Common and many other Theatres. With the Humours of the Mob.

Daily Post, June 22, 1739.

Yesterday it was currently reported that the famous Mr. Whitefield, so remarkable for his Field-preaching, dropt down dead.

Daily Post, June 27, 1739.

Mr. Banj S——d, one of the Principal Followers of Mr. Whitefield, we hear, is dangerously ill, under the Direction of the most celebrated Physician in Town for the Cure of Lunaticks, who has no less than twenty under his Care at present, lately grown *methodically* mad.

Daily Post, June 27, 1739. [Advt.]

A Complete Account of the Conduct of that Eminent Enthusiast, Mr. Whitefield. To which is annex'd

1. A True Character of him, attested by himself.
2. A most useful and entertaining Catechism for the use of Female Methodists.
3. Some Queries sent to Mr. W. at Bristol by the Rev. Mr. Tucker of that City.
4. An Answer to them Supposed to be written by Mr. John Wesley.
5. Some general Remarks on the Answer by the Publisher of the Account.
6. A more particular Reply by Mr. Tucker, the Author of the Queries.

Together with some Remarks on Mr. W's Journal.

London Daily Post, June 28, 1739. [Advts.]

Very proper to be read by all Persons, especially at this Time as a Preservative against Mr. Whitefield and his Followers.

The Nature and proper Evidence of Regeneration. . . . By Ralph Skerret, D.D. . . .

6d. Allowance for Quantity to distribute among the Poor.

The Methodists, a " Satirical Poem " after the manner of Hudibras . . . by T. H.

London Daily Post, June 29, 1739. [Advts.]

The Pious Youth. A Poem. Humbly address'd to the Rev. Mr. Whitefield.

As the Model is design'd not so much for Compliment to the worthy Minister to whom it is address'd as to show the great Regard he discovers to true Religion; and as the Author has Endeavour'd to regulate the Stile, so that it may not be below the politer Taste of Mankind, nor above the Capacity of the meaner Rank of People, 'tis humbly hoped it will not be entirely unacceptable to the Publick.

Answer to the Rev. Dr. Trapp's four Sermons against Mr. Whitefield . . . by Robert Seagrave, M.A. [Third Edition.]

Dr. Trapp vindicated from the Imputation of being a Christian. Occasion'd by a Pamphlet of that Reverend Gentleman against the Methodists.

Dr. Trapp try'd and cast and allow'd to the 10th of May next to recant.

London Daily Post, June 30, 1739. [Advt.]

An Explanatory Sermon on that mistaken Text. Be not righte-

ous over much . . . Being an Answer to Dr. Trapp's four Sermons . . . perverted against Methodists.

Daily Post, June 30, 1739. [Advt.]

A Caution against Religious Delusions. Being a Sermon on the New Birth, occasion'd by the Pretensions of the Methodists, by Henry Stebbing, D.D., Archdeacon of Wilts and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.

Read's Weekly Journal, June 30, 1739.

Last Tuesday the Rev. Mr. Whitefield set out for Cirencester in Gloucestershire to visit his Relations in that Neighbourhood. As the Passengers in the Stage Coach walked up the Hill beyond Henley, Mr. Whitefield set them a Psalm.

Read's Weekly Journal, July 7, 1739.

On Mr. Whitefield's *Preaching in* Moorfields *near* Bedlam.

Map, *Ward*[2] and *Taylor* did our Wonder raise ;
Now *Whitefield* has the giddy Rabble's Praise ;
Infatuated Crowds to hear him flock,
As once to France for *Mississippi* Stock
A proof more *Madmen* out of *Bedlam* dwell
Than are confin'd within that Spacious Cell.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, July 21, 1739. [Advt.]

Price Sixpence. A Compleat Account of the Conduct of that eminent Enthusiast, Mr. Whitefield . . . with a most useful and entertaining Catechism for the Use of the Female Methodists . . . an Answer Supposed to be written by Mr. John Wesley.

Daily Gazetteer, Aug. 21, 1739.

. . . . this young Clergyman's Sentiments are not in any way improved.

I will only beg Leave to ask the Adherents of this Extraordinary Person. . . .

Whether he behav'd to the Magistrates of Tewksbury with the Meekness and Modesty of a Christian ?

Whether the Meekness of the Gospel vindicates his entering Tewksbury with 120 *Persons on Horseback ;* and whether Good Sense could let him wonder that *when so guarded* with 6,000 Hearers, *Four Constables on Foot* did not *molest him ?*

Whether in his Conduct to the Mayor of *Basingstoke* he behaved like a good *Subject* of His Majesty . . . and whether he did not discover more of the Drole and Impertinent Man than the Christian ?

Whether his Behaviour at *Basingstoke Fair* and at *Hackney Marsh* was necessary to prove himself a *Preacher of the Gospel.*

---

[2] Mrs. Mapp was a famous Bonesetter. Ward advertised Quack Remedies.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Aug. 25, 1739. [Advt.] (Cf. *Craftsman*, Sep. 8, 1739.]

An Earnest Appeal to the Publick on occasion of Mr. Whitefield's Extraordinary Answer to the Pastoral Letter of the Lord Bishop of London; Intended to vindicate his Lordship from the extravagant Charges and mean Evasions contain'd in the said pretended Answer; and to detect the true Spirit and Design of its Author from his notorious Inconsistence with himself, his Disregard of the Church by whose Authority he preaches and his Treatment of those whom that Church hath constituted his Superiors.

Address'd to the Rev. John Wesley, (Mr. Whitefield being absent.)

Through Desire a Man having separated himself, Seeketh and intermeddleth with all Wisdom. Prov. xviii. i.

Daily Gazetteer, Sep. 6, 1739. [Advt.]

The Life and Particular Proceedings of the Rev. Mr. George Whitefield from the Time of his going to Crisp School in Gloucester . . . Genuine Account of that Gentleman,

By an Impartial Hand.

Read's Weekly Journal, Sep. 8, 1739.

[A Servant of a Tallow Chandler had been committed to the Compter.]

"This Fellow was one of the Enthusiastic Followers of Whitefield [made love to a young lady of fortune] pretended to have a Divine Commission. . . . On his Admission to the Poultry he chaunted forth the 100th Psalm.

Universal Weekly Journal, Sep. 8, 1739. [Advt.]

Eighteen Sermons . . . seven shillings a Hundred . . . real and genuine . . . not spurious or patch'd up from the Works of other People such as Some Persons have published for his [Whitefield's.]

Craftsman, Sep. 22, 1739. [Advt.]

A Short Preservative against the Doctrines reviv'd by Mr. Whitefield and his adherents. Being a Supplement to the Bishop of London's late Pastoral Letter.

Commonsence, Sep. 29, 1739. [Advt.]

The Nature, Usefulness and Regulation of Religious Zeal . . . by Joseph Trapp, D.D. The Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of being Righteous overmuch; with a particular View to certain modern Enthusiasts [by the same Author.]

Craftsman, Oct. 6, 1739. [Advt.]

The Rev. Mr. Wesley's forbidding his Followers reading this Pamphlet has occasion'd this Day to be publish'd a SECOND EDITION of Methodism display'd or Remarks on Mr. Whitefield's Answer to the Bishop of London's last Pastoral Letter. In a letter to Mr. Whitefield or in his Absence to any of his Abettors . . . by James Bate, M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Deptford.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Oct. 20, 1739.

Edinburgh Oct. 9. Tis said the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, whose savoury Journals used to be quoted with Applause by our Scots Seceders, has of late address'd himself to one of these Champions in a Letter, which contains his Opinion of their Principles and in the strongest Terms condemns them as Authors of a Detestable Schism; endeavours to persuade them to return to their Duty, and leave off their Divisive Courses. This letter has given great Offence, as we hear, and Mr. Whitefield from being a Reformer, a Saint, a Shining Light, etc., is degenerated in their Discourses into one whose Heart is corrupted, who will not lift up a Testimony against the Corruption of the Church; in short, as one (Oh Horrid!) that will not rebel against an Authority he swore to maintain.

Read's Weekly Journal, Oct. 20, 1739. [Advt.]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, Design'd to correct his mistaken Account of Regeneration or the New Birth. Written before his Departure from London: then laid aside for some private Reasons; and now published to prevent his doing Mischief among Common People upon his Return from Georgia. With a previous Letter addressed to the Religious Societies by Tristram Land.

Read's Weekly Journal, Dec. 8, 1739. *Craftsman* (same date.)

From Halifax in Yorkshire we hear that by the preaching of the Methodists in those Parts the Spirit of Enthusiasm has so prevail'd that almost every Man who can hammer out a Chapter in the Bible is now turn'd an Expounder of Scripture to the great Decay of Industry, and almost the Ruin of the Woollen Manufacture which in those parts seems to be threaten'd with Destruction for want of Hands to carry it on.

London Evening Post, June 24-26, 1740. [Advt.]

The true Spirit of the Methodists and their Allies (whether Enthusiasts, Papists, Deists, Quakers or Atheists) fully laid open; in an Answer to Six of the Seven Pamphlets (Mr. Law's being reserv'd to be consider'd by itself) lately publish'd against Dr. Trapp's Sermons upon being *Righteous over much*; by which it appears that the said Pamphlets united make up one of the greatest Curiosities that even this *curious* Age has produced.

London Evening Post, July 17-19, 1740.

We hear that a Person in good Circumstances, living not far from Charing Cross, who was always esteem'd for his good Sense, Probity and Virtue, is gone raving mad, since his being the unhappy Follower of the Modern Enthusiasts, having inbibed a Notion from them of believing himself in a State of Damnation; and we hear that a Gentlewoman and her Maid, not a great way from the Said Place, are almost in the same Condition.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Jan. 10, 174$\frac{0}{1}$.

By what ill Fate does it happen [that a Lecture in St. Paul's] should be thus shamefully neglected ? What a reflection is it upon the Age we live in that two or three Enthusiasts or Impostors shall at an Hour's Warning be able to collect a Company of forty or fifty thousand Fools to hear a pack of raving Nonsense about *the Pangs of the New Birth !*

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Jan. 10, 174$\frac{0}{1}$.

Expounding-houses lately erected in the outskirts of this city [London] by the Methodists.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, Jan. 10, 174$\frac{0}{1}$.

This Barn is a place where about 20 or 30 Methodists, chiefly Women, rendezvous in order to hear a young School-boy expound, preach, pray and sing Westley's Hymns.

Hooker's Weekly Miscellany, June 20, 1741.

Whence is all the Money to come ? . . . At that Moment a bright thought flash'd (as Mr. Whitefield says) . . . why, says I, we'll send Mr. Whitefield . . . up and down the Country to preach and make Collections for the Hospital, tho' perhaps he may collect enough round Blackheath alone . . . 'tis lawful, you know, to lye and prevaricate with Infants, Drunken Folks, Ideots and Madmen. . . . Therefore 'tis plain that Mr. Whitefield may, with a very safe Conscience, travel the Country and collect Money for the Hospital under other Pretences . . . he may even go so far as to rave, stare, foam, beat his Breast. . . .

We propose to have that Day [Charity Children walk] all the way Singing (not a Psalm of David, but) a choice new Hymn . . . of Mr. Wesley's own composing . . . as the Psalms of David are not half pious enough . . . for the occasions of the Methodists, they have very wisely laid 'em aside, and as piously substituted Mr. Wesley's Hymns in their Room. . . .

Had our Methodists sprouted up in a *Roman Catholic* Soil . . . instead of our hearing of Dr. Whitefield's preaching upon *Mounts* or *Dunghills* we should then have been told of Father *Wesley* the *Jesuit* or Father Whitefield, the Franciscan. . . .

THE REV. RICHARD BAXTER'S RELATION TO OLIVER CROMWELL

As exhibited in his own words

(*Copied from Part I of his Autobiography*)

WITH INTRODUCTORY ESSAY AND NOTES

BY

FREDERICK J. POWICKE, Ph.D.

Author of "The Life of Richard Baxter."

" . . . Cromwell as his comrades knew him and as modern learning has let us know him again [shows] to what height the plant Man can sometimes grow. In the agony of war, in the interminable crisis of revolutionary state-craft, he kept his noblest qualities of mind untired. He was always fresh from nature, open to new spiritual desires and human joys. In the hardest years of his last solitary struggle against unyielding destiny, a meeting with George Fox could move him first to tears, and on another occasion very seasonably to laughter. He sought always, and often with deep questioning, what was right and noble in every choice of action. He could not bear the stiff and dry : in all human relations, his tenderness, his humour, his fellowship were always striving to burst through. For while he aspired to heaven, he had his roots deep in earth." G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, p. 328.

Preface

MY own feeling towards Cromwell is expressed in the eloquent words of Professor Trevelyan which I have ventured to set on the title-page. Since my first reading of Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* I have put him where Milton put him, among "our chief of men," and there are now few careful students of the 17th century who would put him anywhere else. Certainly there are few who would assent to the view of him as an ambitious hypocrite which used to prevail and to pass almost unquestioned. At the same time, one has to bear in mind that this idea prevailed with many who had every claim to be considered good men, and men as devoted as Cromwell himself to the public cause. Baxter was one of these. He became one of these after Naseby (June, 1645). From then onwards Cromwell seemed to him a deteriorating character; and, as time went on, the agent of mischief, terrible and sinister. He seemed so, not merely down to the Protector's death, but no less so in 1664 when all the passages relating to him which are here collected were written. The lapse of time did not change his mind—though once or twice, during the desolate period of the restored monarchy, we find him turning back a wistful glance to the Cromwellian pieties and tolerance.

Baxter, for me, stands also among our chief of men; and it is a melancholy instance of human blindness that these two great contemporaries should have failed to see each other's real self. I have argued in the introductory essay that if they could have been friends (as they had a chance of being), and have learnt to work understandingly together, much that happened might have happened differently, or not at all. Perhaps this is a fantastic notion—though it has come to me as a result of realising that the range and force of Baxter's influence, especially in the months just before the climax of 1660, had a decisive weight on the great middle party of the so-called Presbyterians who held the scales. As it was, however, Baxter, alas! may be said to have done more than any other single person to propagate and perpetuate, in the same party and their descendants, the lying legend of Cromwell's baseness which the Cavaliers adopted and fostered as a matter of course.

The discolouring effect of his prejudice throughout is evident, and can often be removed by a simple statement of the known

facts. One purpose of the notes has been to do this, and another has been to correct not infrequent lapses of memory, or to supplement what he says by things which he omits but which illustrate and round off his narrative.

It is hoped that the notes, as a whole, may help the less informed reader to a fairly vivid picture of the few critical years to which they apply. FRED. J. POWICKE.

Baxter and Cromwell.

WHEN the Civil War began in August, 1642, one of its first incidental results was to drive Baxter from Kidderminster. His work there since April, 1641, had done great things, but it had not converted the lowest class of the people ("the rabble," as he calls them) to his Puritan views; and these, backed by the Cavalier gentry of the neighbourhood, proved too strong for him. He retired to Gloucester. Returning at the end of a month he found them more violent than ever, and realised that till the storm was overpassed he had better seek a refuge elsewhere. He found one at Coventry, and, with short intervals, lived there in quietness for nearly three years. But his place of abode and way of life might easily have been very different. For it must have been just about the time of his settlement at Coventry that there came to him an invitation from Captain Oliver Cromwell to take pastoral charge of his "troop" at Cambridge. This troop, which became the spear-head of the invincible Ironsides, was then in process of formation. Cromwell started to form it even before the war broke out. As soon as he saw war was certain he hurried down from Westminster into his own country and gathered to him, not all sorts of men, but those only whom he regarded as the right stuff for winning through a tremendous struggle, *viz.*, "such men as had the fear of God before them, and made some conscience of what they did." Men of this sort he enlisted and trained, and *so* trained that the rigour of his discipline soon sifted out the unfit. None were left save the comparative few whose pious and ardent patriotism nerved them to accept and endure all that their leader deemed necessary to the end he had in view. In fact, Cromwell's troop may be said to have been fashioned on the principle which created the Separatist movement under Elizabeth. Except in the purpose of its application, the principle was what Robert Browne set forth as the test of a true Church. No wonder, therefore, if the troop developed the *feeling* of a Church, and a desire for some one who might be considered its minister or pastor. We need not doubt that the suggestion to invite Baxter was made to Cromwell by James Berry, his "bosom friend," who, five years before, had in-

duced him to take orders, and had gone with him to Worcester in December, 1638, to witness his ordination by Bishop Thornborough. Much, however, had happened since then, and not least to Berry. There is no record of what brought him into contact with Cromwell—would that there were!—but somehow Cromwell had begun to inspire him already with that personal loyalty which grew ever stronger through all the mighty events of his hero's life, and evoked from Cromwell a corresponding confidence. So we can be sure that the Berry of 1643 was not the moderate Episcopalian of 1638; and he may have thought that Baxter, too, had moved in the direction of Independency. But if so, it would imply that he had not kept his eye on Baxter, and did not know of the rebuff he had dealt certain Independents who came to him at the outset of his Kidderminster ministry and begged him to take their way. Presuming, therefore, on a change in his friend which had not taken place, he might well say to Cromwell, on the one hand, "Mr. Baxter is your man"; and, on the other, might well urge upon Baxter the call of the troop and the open door it offered for effective service in the great cause they both had at heart. He might well add, too, how it seemed to offer a providential means of renewing old ties. And I can hardly imagine that he had any fear of a refusal. But the refusal came. Though Berry's plea was sustained by the subscribed names of the whole troop, including Cromwell's, Baxter refused and even reproved them sharply for their Separatist "attempt." This is about the earliest extant specimen of an offensive didacticism which was to cost him dear. In the present case, I think it cost him the finest opportunity of his life. For one thing, it produced an estrangement on Berry's part which time failed to heal. For another and worse thing, it alienated Cromwell. Accordingly when Baxter, after Naseby (June, 1645), saw fit to join the army and hoped to repair his mistake, he had to realise that the door was shut. Berry avoided him, and Cromwell, after a few curt sentences of satirical greeting, left him alone. Moreover, he discovered that what he might have been able to do in 1643 was utterly beyond him in 1645. If he had taken spiritual charge of the troop in 1643 he might at least have checked the growth of its Separatist tendencies, but in 1645 they had spread, more or less, through all the camp and seemed ineradicable. As he says plaintively, what had been but a spark had grown to a conflagration, and he felt himself helpless. His consequent self blame was acute, though it implied no change of mind as to the *reason* of his refusal. He only regretted that he had been too hasty in acting upon it. He should have taken counsel of prudence. He should have gone to the troop with suspended judgment, judged the situation on the spot, and been guided in what he did by what he saw. In 1645 it was too late. He did his best for two years, but his best was futile; and he never

had a chance of getting intimate with Cromwell. In the light of history I am inclined to regard this fact as tragical. Suppose the two had been brought together daily on a footing of friendship. There would, of course, have been many a difference of opinion and many a debate, and probably no small heat of temper, but might there not have grown up, also, a state of mutual understanding? Knowing, as we do now, the genuine honesty of the two men, this seems more than possible. And then one cannot help going on to imagine how such a mutual understanding might have influenced the course of events. For if these two could have learned to trust each other—despite differences of opinion and the deeper difference of temperament—their combined effort to find and keep that middle way in which they both believed might have so rallied the moderate forces of opinion in religion and politics as to have rendered them paramount.

Baxter, we must remember, became as much the real leader of the "sober," *i.e.*, the so-called Presbyterian party, as Cromwell of the Independents. There were extremists among the former no less than among the latter, but the moderates made up the great majority in both cases, and stood much nearer together than many supposed. It was always Baxter's hope and aim to make this clear from the Presbyterian side, as it was always Cromwell's hope and aim to make it clear from the side of the Independents. Neither, *e.g.*, wanted to destroy or even dethrone the King; neither wanted to subvert the old constitution of Church and State; neither wanted unbridled liberty in the one or the other. No doubt it was Cromwell's temptation to go too fast, and Baxter's to go too slow. But Cromwell was capable of very cautious self-restraint as Baxter was capable of very adventurous enthusiasms, and each, if they had been friends, might have applied on occasion the brake, or the spur. Baxter tells us that it was the "sober" clergy, with their adherents, who finally overthrew Cromwell; and this was no vain boast. What, then, would have happened, if, under Baxter's leadership, they had joined up with Cromwell, and so saved him from things which (to use his own words) only "necessity" justified? Would the tragedy of Whitehall have happened, or the tragi-comedy of 1660? One cannot say. But this is certain, at any rate, that if Baxter had been enabled to find, through friendship, the key to Cromwell's character, he would not have missed the true light in which to judge his conduct. As it was, however, he judged his conduct in the light of an inveterate prejudice—planted perhaps in 1643, strengthened (with the added sting of some wounded pride) in 1645, and confirmed by "appearances" (which there was no first-hand knowledge to correct) during every successive phase of Cromwell's life. This prejudice fixed him in an attitude of sheer distrust. Whatever Cromwell did, therefore, Baxter suspected of an evil motive; and whatever evil he was said to have done, or to intend,

his suspicion disposed him to credit. His own words, as will be seen, illustrate his attitude at every turn.

I. Thus, the creation of the New Model (he says) was chiefly the work of Cromwell in conjunction with Sir Henry Vane, Junr. —the one in the Army, the other in the House of Commons; and if their common purpose was to consolidate the Sectaries, Cromwell's special purpose was to make himself great. Hence the Self-denying Ordinance, which cleared the way by disqualifying M.P's. from serving in the Army, was so managed that Cromwell could evade it —though at first, just to quiet the simple, he let himself be put out. He veiled his policy, indeed, by contriving (with Vane) the selection of Sir Thomas Fairfax—"one that Cromwell could make use of at his pleasure"—as Lord General, but "when *he* was chosen for General, Cromwell's men must not be without *him*. So valiant a man must not be laid by. . . . Cromwell only and no other member of either House must be excepted."

II. The New Model proved its mettle at Naseby, and Baxter allows credit to Cromwell—but not unmixed: "His sudden and seasonable coming, with the great name he had got by the applause of his own soldiers, made a sudden joy in the Army (thinking he had brought them more help than he did) so that all cried *a Cromwell, a Cromwell*, and so went on."

III. Baxter's visit to the Army opened his eyes to its sectarian plague, and, as he thought, to Cromwell's responsibility for it: "A few proud, self-conceited, hot-headed Sectaries had got into the highest places, and were Cromwell's chief favourites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the rest." These were the men who '*Per fas aut nefas*' . . . were resolved to take down not only Bishops and Liturgy and Ceremonies, but all that did withstand their way. They were far from thinking of a moderate Episcopacy, or of any healing way between the Episcopal and Presbyterians. They most honoured the Separatists, Anabaptists, and Antinomians; but Cromwell and his council took on them to join themselves to no Party, but to try for the liberty of all."

IV. His two years in the Army supplied his prejudice with much to feed upon. Thus he found food for it in the £100 granted to Major Bethel, after the rout of Goring's army (July, 1645), instead of to Captain Evanson "because *he* was no sectary, and Bethel only had all the glory and applause by Cromwell and that party." He found it, too, in the substitution of Col. Rainsborow for Col. Whalley at the siege of Worcester just before its surrender (July, 1646). Whalley, indeed, was Cromwell's kinsman, but "he was called a Presbyterian," while Rainsborow was known to be a Sectary. Hence the latter must "have the honour of taking the city" in order "that he might be governor there" and "gratify the Sectaries and settle the City and County in their way."

V. So it was always. Cromwell's "Designs were manifest and I saw him continually acting his part." Fairfax, his nominal head, was clay in his hands. "When any Troop or Company was to be disposed of, or any considerable officer's place was void, he was sure to put a Sectary in the place; and when the brunt of the war was over, he looked not so much at their valour as their opinions." It was twenty to one against the promotion of any merely godly man—nay, if any of that sort "had a mind to leave the army he (Cromwell) would secretly and openly further it."

VI. At last, therefore, and mainly because "Cromwell had lately put so many of 'the active Sectaries' into superior commands, and their industry was so much greater than others that they were like to have their will," Baxter felt driven to give up in despair.

VII. After recovery from an almost fatal illness, he resettled in Kidderminster (June, 1647), and observed events from afar. Those connected with the Army and its relation to Parliament and the King were all (it seemed to him) of a piece with the design of Vane and Cromwell—especially of Cromwell—to ruin the King and break the authority of Parliament. The second Civil War sprang out of this, for "all that were loyal and sober-minded abhorred these traitorous proceedings of Cromwell and the sectarian Army." "But God's time was not yet." Cromwell came forth more powerful than ever. True, the House of Commons—with its Presbyterian element enlarged by a return of some members who had been frightened away in the preceding autumn—"voted that the King's concessions" (made at Newport, Sep., 1648) "were a sufficient ground for a Personal Treaty with him and had suddenly sent a concluding answer and sent for him up." Cromwell's answer to this, however, was to purge the House of its unmanageable members (Dec. 6), and so to reduce it to the bare Rump of a Parliament. The proceedings of the Rump, which swiftly brought on the death of the King, "all had Cromwell behind them and worked on his will." His next move was to declare for a Commonwealth, and get the Rump to draw up a form of engagement, binding all men to be true and faithful to it. But he had no intention of being true and faithful to it himself, save so long as there were impediments to his laying hands on the Crown. That was his glittering goal. And what were his impediments? Partly, the numerous Cavaliers, still ready for new enterprises against him; partly, the Scots, still resolved to stick to the Covenant and the King; partly, the Army, still insufficiently taught to act on his principles; but mainly the ministers and the great mass of sober people who regarded them. All these he overcame more or less thoroughly—all except the last. The "ministers and sober people withstood him" calmly and prudently, with invincible weapons; and, though they were quiet, had power enough, allied to the other three, whose "spark of life" they

revived, to accomplish the downfall of his work, if not of himself, and to recover substantially all that had been lost. Such was the miserable issue of his insolence. But, meanwhile, God's time seemed long in coming. Cromwell's accession to the Lord Generalship, when Fairfax "would have no more of the honour of being his instrument and mask," inaugurated his most decisive victories—at Dunbar and Worcester. Then, "having thus far seemed to be a servant of the Parliament and [to] work for his Masters the Rump or Commonwealth, he doth next begin to shew whom he served" in fact. Hence, on April 21, 1653, he suddenly appeared in the House with soldiers at his heels and "cast out the Rump as disdainfully as men do excrements." Whereupon followed the "nominated" Parliament—contemptuously called the "Little"—really Cromwell's expedient to discredit democracy, and make the necessity of his personal government undeniable. Accordingly, he encouraged the House to throw all interests into a panic by one upsetting Act after another—especially the ministers and Universities, by its proposal to vote them down. He did so that the people, in their dismay and disgust, might turn to him. Whatever else he did proceeded from the same motive—to take him for their Protector from otherwise overwhelming evils. Nay, he even conjured up some terrible apparition of evils which did not exist, that "people might fly to him for refuge." And it took all the sagacity of the "sober" party to see through him, and keep their heads. Baxter claims that they succeeded (pp. 67-9). No doubt they did to their own satisfaction, and thought themselves very wise men. Cromwell was no enigma to *them*, whereas the simple sort (poor fools) believed that he designed nothing of all that came to pass, but that God's providence brought about all, without his contrivance or expectation! Not for the first time were the simple sort nearest the truth.

VIII. With his installation as Lord Protector in Dec., 1653, Cromwell (we are asked to believe) readjusted his tactics. For his own firmer establishment, he made himself active in doing good. Hence, *e.g.*, his institution of the Triers, which effected so much good that "many thousands of souls thanked God for the faithful ministers whom they let in, and grieved when the Prelatists cast them out again." This was his positive way of attracting the good opinion of the godly; and, in a negative way, he hoped to conciliate the ministers by not requiring from them any oath of fidelity like "the engagement." He found that he had more to gain by moderation, so he became moderate. Moderation meant putting down extremists such as the Anabaptists, whom he had formerly favoured. He had not changed his mind about them, whatever it was, but he designed by their suppression "to settle himself in the People's favour." A dramatic illustration was afforded by his treatment of "his old friend Harrison." Having

connived at him "while he made himself the head of the Anabaptists and Fanatics," as soon as he "saw it would be an applauded acceptable thing to the nation to suppress him," "he doth it easily in a trice, and maketh him contemptible who but yesterday thought himself not much below him."

In fine, Cromwell was never straightforward, except in the sense that he had a single eye to his own aggrandisement; and was always on the look out for means to that end.

Baxter had this in mind when he preached before Cromwell in Westminster Abbey (25 Dec., 1654); he chose a text (I. Cor. i. 10) which led him to dwell on the iniquity of rulers who maintain divisions in Church and State because it suits them "to fish in troubled waters." He *intended* to be personal, and was felt to be so. His fixed idea of Cromwell's dissimulation commanded him to speak out, and silenced in him the call for good manners. In fact, the fixed idea became a beam in his eye when he turned it on Cromwell. If there was a point on which friends and foes alike were generally agreed it was Cromwell's sincere advocacy of toleration. Baxter admitted the advocacy but questioned the sincerity. For did he not, on the one hand, profess to back up the work of the ministers by the aid of the magistrates, while, on the other, he "himself, and such others, commonly gave out that they could not understand what the magistrate had to do in matters of religion, and . . . that all men should be left to their own consciences and that the Magistrate could not interpose but he should be ensnared in the guilt of persecution." Hot and cold, it seems, in the same breath. To us the explanation is clear enough—that Cromwell drew a sharp line between supporting the ministers in their fight against gross forms of social vice, on the one hand, and, on the other, forcibly imposing their doctrinal beliefs or Church Practices on those who (with a good conscience and decent behaviour) disliked and declined them. The former was his duty, the latter was not. Baxter, of course, saw the distinction and largely approved of it. He did not want the imposition of any elaborate or new-fangled creed, any more than Cromwell; but he did want the imposition of such a creed as summed up the essentials of Christianity and the forcible suppression of those who openly refused it: not perceiving that if the State allowed the plea of conscience in the matter of creed, it lost the logical right to impose any creed. Much was made by Baxter and other Puritans of the two tables of the Law, the one concerned with duty towards God, the other with duty towards man—the one religion, the other morality; and the relative importance of the first. Hence, atheism and blasphemy were treason against God, and a worse crime than treason against man. No Christian King, therefore, could let himself ignore the former. He might not feel bound to kill the Atheist or blasphemer—Baxter drew back from this—though texts were for it. But coercive

and punitive measures of an effectual kind must be taken, and, for a ruler not to take them was to show himself guilty of misprision of treason, at least. No doubt Baxter argued along this line in that discussion of the subject which he had with Cromwell a few days after his sermon, when the Protector proved to be a match for him in lengthy talk. He and two of his companions (Baxter reports) spun out four or five hours in mere ignorant speeches. Baxter was reduced to saying that he had a paper by him which set forth his mind and would send it for Cromwell to read. After the meeting he sent it by a friend, but found reason to doubt if Cromwell gave any heed to it, or even read it. So Baxter still held by his prejudice that Cromwell's zeal for liberty of conscience was pretended.

Clearly his impression of Cromwell's duplicity was invincible. But the duplicity, he thinks, was of gradual growth, and not at first deliberate. It became consciously deliberate after he had reached the decision that the King must die. To carry out such a decision, wariness, subtle scheming, tergiversation, had to be practised at every turn. But, in the process, and afterwards, events so favoured him that Providence, or the light of God's countenance, seemed clearly to shine upon him. This set a divine seal on his plans and justified his ambition. At length "having thus forced his conscience to justify all his cause . . . he thinketh that, the end being good and necessary, the necessary means cannot be bad . . . he thought secrecy a virtue and dissimulation no vice, and simulation, *i.e.*, in plain English a lie, or perfidiousness, to be a tolerable fault in a case of necessity."

That Baxter, once convinced of Cromwell's insincerity, should recoil from him was perfectly natural. For it was a fault more deeply alien to his own nature than any other. His own transparency was at once his charm and his snare. He spoke what he held for truth unreservedly on all occasions, and to all sorts of men, without a thought of consequences. Least of all did he ever plan any course of speech or action with a view to his own advancement. Intellectually he was far from simple, but morally he had the simplicity of a child. One may fairly say that, this being so, he was sure to find it hard to understand a complex nature like Cromwell's. For Cromwell was not simple. "His great soul was a chaos of seething thoughts, impulses and half-formed ideals, with some one immediate issue always emerging into glaring light and concentrating all its great powers on itself." (Picton's *Life of Cromwell*, p. 144.) Accordingly, seen from the outside—as Baxter was fated to see him—he could not fail to seem often a schemer. We know—on the evidence, for example, of the Clarke Papers—the real sincerity of Cromwell through those months of 1646 and 1647 when he was mediating between Army and Parliament, negotiating with the King, and counteracting the Presbyterians. We know, also, that

there was more than sufficient reason for his final decision to break, once for all, with King and Presbyterians, and go the way of the Army. But his swift changes of front, and then the final change from apparent indecision to swift unswerving action, might well startle and scandalize the uninitiated. "There is nothing surprising," says Gardiner (*Great Civil War*, IV. 149), "in the readiness of men, on the evidence before them, to come to the conclusion that Cromwell, in the sudden changes of front which he had undoubtedly made, had been actuated simply by regard to his personal interests. The only way in which he could meet the charge was to tell the whole truth, and to explain publicly the effect which his discovery of the Presbyterians' intrigue with the Scots had had on his course of action. It was the last thing that Cromwell was likely to do. . . . It is possible, too, that, on this occasion, Cromwell's silence is, to some extent, accounted for by a reluctance to irritate the Scots and the French by revealing their intrigues."

So, also, with regard to those weeks of suspense which followed the offer of the Crown. To many besides Baxter, including not a few of his warm admirers, Cromwell appeared to be just balancing the scales between his own ambition and expediency. Nor can one, even now, read his speeches without an uneasy feeling that the speaker did lack some integrity of purpose. More than one motive, certainly, was at work in his mind, and it would be absurd to suppose him incapable of being stirred by the thought of honour to himself or to his family. But there is no good reason to dispute his reiterated assertion of a pure desire to do what was best for the Commonwealth. In fact, the last thing which can be fairly charged against Cromwell is that he ever deliberately preferred, or sought, his own aggrandisement at the cost of the general welfare. That hoary lie has become less and less credible in the searching light of fuller knowledge. On the whole, we are far nearer the truth if we believe that the course of his life and conduct had its root in a conviction which came to him at an early date, and grew ever more strong, that God had raised him up to serve Him in the deliverance of England—of the "saints" first of all—from great actual and prospective evils; and that he must subordinate everything else to this high calling. What this calling might involve for him he could not foresee, nor at first did he regard himself as more of a deliverer than any other of the "godly"; but events led him on and shed light as they passed. To him, as to the Hebrew prophets, "events" were the language in which God spoke most unmistakeably. He did not lay out a far-reaching scheme of action, and then strive to make events conform to it. On the contrary, with a settled purpose to do the will of God, with a firm persuasion of what may be described as the general direction of that will—its "universal aims"—he waited and watched until the next step, or next few steps, grew clear; and then, going forward with all his might, the event declared

the truth, or otherwise, of his insight. "No man rises so high as he who knows not whither he is going," is a remark ascribed to him; and it is a flash of light upon his inward attitude. It points to a sort of sublime opportunism—the opportunism of one for whom God is a living reality who besets him behind and before and lays His hand upon him; and is no less able, through him as instrument, to mould the frame of things than He did through Moses or David. Thus, before the invasion of Scotland in the summer of 1650, he had become certain that the invasion was right, and that he must not refuse to take up the post of General-in-chief which Fairfax laid down. (See Carlyle, *Letters and Speeches of Cromwell.* Vol. III. p. 5 [People's ed.]) When, therefore, he found himself at Dunbar in a tight place he could write—"All shall work for good. Our spirits are comfortable, praised be the Lord, though our present condition be as it is, and indeed we have much hope in the Lord of whose mercy we have had large experience." Not that he is sure of victory, or even escape. He makes provision for the contrary. But when, by a tactical mistake, David Lesley, the Scottish General, "was pleased to bring down his men" from their safe position on the hills, he sees in that mistake a sign that the Lord had delivered them into his hands. He expressed that conviction in the cry with which he led the onset—"Let God arise and let His enemies be scattered"—and their total overthrow seemed to set the clearest possible seal to his faith. This was the outstanding fact which he stressed in his letters to the House of Commons; and the blindness of the Edinburgh ministers (Sep. 12) to so manifest a disclosure of God's judgment amazed him. "In answer to the witness of God upon our solemn appeal" (at Dunbar) "you say you have not so learned Christ as to hang the equity of your cause upon events. We, for our part, could wish blindness have not been upon your eyes to all those marvellous dispensations which God hath lately wrought in England. But did you not solemnly appeal and pray? Did not we do so too? Are not you and we to think, with fear and trembling, of the hand of the Great God in this mighty and strange appearance of His, instead of slightly calling it an 'event'! Were not both your and our expectations renewed from time to time, whilst we waited upon God, to see which way He would manifest Himself upon our appeals? And shall we, after all these our prayers, fastings, tears, expectations and solemn appeals, call these bare 'events'? The Lord pity you." [For a true and striking account of Cromwell's relation to the Covenanters see G. A. Smith's *Isaiah*, I. pp. 160-163. He speaks of Cromwell as "the best commentator Isaiah has ever had."]

There could be no clearer self-explanation than Cromwell gives in such words as these. He believed with all his heart what every Covenanter, every Puritan, also professed to believe, that events are controlled by God, enshrine the Presence of God, and utter

His living voice. History, therefore, which is made up of events, is a sacred book, and the present is as sacred as the past. "What are all our histories but God manifesting Himself," he said, and, as to our own history, "We are a people with the stamp of God upon us . . . whose appearances and providences among us were not to be outmatched by any story." Hence, the marvellous series of events which attended his own action—action directed by his faith in God: how could he refuse, how could anyone else refuse, to construe them as proof of God's approval? Of course, such a faith is close neighbour to fanaticism, though from this, on the whole, Cromwell was saved by his strong common sense. But the point is that it supplies a sufficient answer to Baxter's charge of insincerity. In view of the evidence—better known to us than to Baxter—that faith in an immediate divine arbitration by events was the prevailing motive of his life, the charge is seen to be absurd. At the same time, Baxter's mistake was natural. For it was due to just that way of interpreting Providence upon which both Baxter and Cromwell relied. Events do not interpret themselves. Their meaning is derived from the state of mind which is brought to them. And Baxter's state of mind (like that of the Scots) was very different from Cromwell's. Believing, as he did, that the ascendancy of the Army was a tyranny, that the execution of the King was a murder, that the Commonwealth was a usurpation, and that the Solemn League and Covenant could not be annulled, he was bound to condemn Cromwell's later conduct, and attribute his successes to the triumph of lawless force. He could not, and did not, deny that somehow God was in it all, but, if so, then He must be in it for chastisement of the nation's and the Church's sins. God must be scourging them, by the hand of a hypocrite, because they had refused to be guided by honest men. In other words, Baxter's view of Providence took its colour from his prejudices. It is always so, in a measure; and this is why the appeal to Providence is apt to be unconvincing. What is Providential is a question to which "events" give no satisfactory answer, because so many answers are forthcoming. Nevertheless, viewed on a wide scale and in the long run, events are not without a definite moral significance. They do disclose a tendency which makes for righteousness or the reverse. It is surely clear, for example, that the stream of events which accompanied the activities of Cromwell reflected a higher quality of temper and purpose than that which swept it aside in the Restoration. It is clear that the latter, as compared with the former, was a swift descent to lower levels. True piety and righteousness largely ceased to count. Yet the strange thing is that, in the "events" which led up to this change for the worse Baxter saw the hand of Providence more distinctly displayed than in anything that had happened through Cromwell. Here in the sudden crash of all that the usurper had built up, or tried to build—here,

indeed, was Providence! He is amazed when he considers the rush of change which reduced the Army to impotence, and confounded the fanatics, and brought in the King—and did all this by the agency of a spiritual Laodicean like General Monck.

"Let any man" (he says) "that hath the use of his understanding, judge whether this were not enough to prove that there is a God that governeth the world, and disposeth of the Powers of the World according to his Will! And let all men behold this Pillar of Salt, and standing Monument of Divine Revenge, and take heed of over-valuing Human Strength, and of ever being puffed up by Victories and Success, or of being infatuated by Spiritual Pride and Faction! And let all men take warning how they trample upon Government, rebel against it, or vilifie the Ministers and Ordinances of Christ, and proudly despise the warnings of their Brethren." But he can see no eminent Providence in the 'events' which raised a Huntingdon farmer to the summit of power, and cleared his way before him, and revolutionised the soul of a nation; nor, apparently, does it occur to him that what he calls a 'standing monument of Divine Revenge' might be really a monument of human blindness and folly, including his own. For if he had 'known the things that belong unto peace' in State and Church, how could he have chosen Charles II. instead of Cromwell?

"How dangerous a thing is it to have a mistaking judgment in practicals of greatest moment? How lamentably will it misguide their prayers, their speeches, and their Practices?

"And the greater is their zeal, the forwarder will they be to prosecute that evil which they take for good. It will cause them to misinterpret all God's providences, and misapply His Promises and Threatenings; and their hearts will rise with zealous indignation against all those that would recover them. Let us, therefore, beg of God that He would not leave us to a deluded mind, nor give us over to the error of our hearts."

Baxter wrote this in 1659, towards the end of his *Holy Commonwealth* (p. 504), and he had such as Cromwell in mind, nor did he come to see, until too late, that his words carried a warning, if not a reproach, to himself.

Richard Baxter on Oliver Cromwell.

[These extracts are from the folio *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ* published by Matthew Sylvester in 1696—five years after Baxter's death. The autobiography is in three parts, the first written in 1664, the second in 1665, and third between 1670 and 1684.]

BAXTER'S first reference to Cromwell is in connexion with the causes which brought about the fall of the Earl of Essex and the new modelling of the army (*R.B.*, Pt. I., § 69).

"The causes were all these in conjunction:

1. Though none could deny but the Earl was a Person of great

Honour, Valour, and Sincerity; yet did some Accuse the Soldiers under him of being too like the King's Soldiers in Profaneness, lewd and vicious Practices, and rudeness in their carriage towards the Country; and it was withal urged, that the Revolt of Sir *Faithful Fortescue*,[1] Sir *Richard Greenvile*,[2] Col. *Urry*[3] and some others, was a satisfying Evidence that the irreligious sort of men were not to be much trusted, but might easily by Money be hired to betray them.

2. And it was discovered that the Earl of *Essex's* Judgment (and the wisest men about him) was never for the ending the Wars by the Sword, but only to force a Pacificatory Treaty.[4] He thought

[1] Fortescue (1581?-1666). See *D.N.B.* "At the battle of Edgehill (October 23, 1642), when Prince Rupert charged the left wing of the Parliamentary Army, Fortescue, with his troop, drew off from the rest of Lord Wharton's Regiment, and rode over to the royal horse."

[2] Grenville (1600-1658). See *D.N.B.* "Grenville's adoption of the Parliamentary cause was merely a stratagem to obtain his pay. On March 8, 1644, he arrived at Oxford, bringing with him 36 of his troop, 600£ advanced to him to raise his regiment, and news of an intended plot to surprise Basing House. Parliament proclaimed him 'traitor,' 'rogue,' 'villain,' and 'skellum,' nailed their proclamation to a gibbet set up in Palace Yard, and promised to put him in the same place when they could catch him."

[3] Urry or Hurry (d. 1652). See *D.N.B.* "At the outset of the Civil War he took the side of Parliament and did valiantly at Edgehill and Brentford (November 12, 1642), but in June, 1643, on some personal pique, deserted to the Royalists to whom his information was of great service. He had a large share in the Royalist success of Chalgrove Field on June 18, and was knighted for his services on the same day."

[4] The Earl of Essex (1591-1646) was made general of the Parliamentary Army on July 9, 1642. Cromwell had already shown his own confidence in him by carrying a motion on November 6, 1641, that "the two houses should vote to the Earl of Essex power to command all the train bands south of the Trent." His rank, character, and military experiences pointed out the propriety, and seemed to pledge the efficiency, of his command. But though able and honest enough, he soon made it clear that he had no real will to beat the King.

[a] With an army of 20,000 against the King's much smaller one, he might have crushed it at once, and perhaps have ended the war. But instead he gave the King time to grow strong.

[b] At Edgehill, though urged by John Hampden to advance and drive the King from his position, Essex was disinclined to risk anything, and retreated to Warwick.

[c] In April, 1643, the Earl might have captured Oxford had he acted on the advice of Hampden, but delayed till June, by which time the King had been strongly reinforced; and after Hampden's death (at Chalgrove Field, 18 June) he fell back from Oxford, and remained inactive, permitting the King to effect a junction with the Royalists of the North and West.

[d] When the King made his escape from Oxford (May, 1644), with about 6,000 men, Essex, instead of pursuing and crushing the King's weak army, as he ought to have done, delegated the task to Waller; and set out himself to recover the south-western counties, and relieve Lyme.

[e] At Lostwithiel (on September 2, 1644), Skippon and the infantry of Essex's army were forced to capitulate and to lay down their arms. The Horse escaped by a night-march, through a gap in the royalist lines, while Essex himself and a few officers fled by sea.

[f] At the second battle of Newbury on October 27, 1644, Essex was not present, though the Earl of Manchester's army was strengthened by what remained of his troops. But Manchester lost the chance of a complete victory by following the same kind of compromising policy. (See Firth, *Cromwell*, pp. 79-113.)

that if the King should conquer, the Government of the Kingdom would be changed into Arbitrary, and the Subjects Propriety and Liberty lost; and he thought that if he himself should utterly conquer the King, the Parliament would be tempted to encroach upon the King's Prerogative, and the Privileges of the Lords, and put too much Power in the Gentries and the Peoples hands, and that they would not know how to settle the State of the Kingdom, or the Church, without injuring others, and running into Extreams and falling into Divisions among themselves. Therefore, he was not for a conquest of the King. But they saw the Delay gave the King advantage, and wearied out and ruined the Country, and therefore, they now began to say, that at *Edghill*, at *Newbury*, and at other times, he had never prosecuted any Victory, but stood still and seen the King's Army retreat, and never pursued them when it had been easier to have ended all the Wars.

3. But the chief Cause was, that Sir *H. Vane* by this time had increased Sectaries in the House, having drawn some members to his opinion; and *Cromwell*, who was the Earl of *Manchester's* Lieutenant-General, had gathered to him as many of the Religious Party, especially of the Sectaries, as he could get; and kept a correspondence with *Vane's* Party in the House; as if it were only to strengthen the Religious Party; and *Manchester's* Army, especially *Cromwell's* Party, had won a Victory near *Horncastle*[5] in *Lincolnshire*, and had done the main service of the day at the great fight at *York*[6]; and everywhere the Religious Party that were deepliest apprehensive of the Concernment of the War, had far better Success than the other sort of Common Soldiers.

These things put together, caused almost all the Religious sort of men in Parliament, Army, Garrison and Country, to be for the new modelling of the Army[7], and putting out the lower sort of men (especially officers) and putting Religious Men in their steads.

---

[5] Winceby Fight, October 11, 1643, six miles West of Horncastle. (See Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 99.)

[6] Marston Moor, July 2, 1644. (*id.*, pp. 104-110.)

[7] "The first suggestion of the new model came from Sir William Waller." (See *D.N.B.*, article "Cromwell.") Then, on November 23, 1644, the Commons ordered the committee of both Kingdoms to consider the reorganisation of the whole army.

On December 9, Cromwell, dropping his personal charges against Manchester, suggested to the House of Commons a self-denying ordinance.

On the 19th this was passed, and sent up to the Lords, who accepted it—much against their will—on February 15, 1645; and on April 3, with still more reluctance, a second self-denying ordinance, which, however, was much less stringent than the first. It simply ordained that all members of the two Houses holding Office should lay down their commissions within forty days of its passing, and said nothing to prevent their reappointment in the future if the two Houses thought fit. (See Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 118.)

"The name self-denying ordinance was never applied by contemporaries to the first ordinance." (Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War.*, Vol. II. p. 143, note 3. Library Edition.)

But in all this Work, the *Vanists* in the House, and *Cromwell* in the Army, joined together, out-witted and over-reached the rest, and carried on the interest of the Sectaries in special, while they drew the Religious Party along as for the interest of *Godliness* in the general. The two Designs of *Cromwell* to make himself great were:

1. To Cry up Liberty of Conscience, and be very tender of Men differing in judgment, by which he drew all the Separatists and Anabaptists to him, with many soberer men.

2. To set these self-esteeming Men on work to arrogate the Glory of all Successes to themselves, and cry up their own Actions, and depress the Honour of the Earl of *Manchester*, and all others; though men of as much Godliness at least as they: so that they did proclaim the Glory of their own Exploits, till they had got the fame of being the most valiant and Victorious Party. The truth is, they did much and they boasted of more than they did.

And these things made the new modelling of the Army to be resolved on. But all the Question was how to effect it without stirring up the forces against them which they intended to disband. And all this was notably dispatched at once, by one Vote, which was called the *self-denying Vote—viz.*—That because commands in the Army had much Pay, and Parliament Men should keep to the Service of the House, therefore, no Parliament Men should be Members of the Army. This pleased the Soldiers who looked to have the more pay to themselves, and at once it put out the two Generals, the Earl of *Essex*, and the Earl of *Manchester*, and also Sir *William Waller*, a godly valiant Major General of another Army; and also many Colonels in the Army, and in other parts of the land, and the Governour of *Coventry*, and of many other Garrisons. And to avoid all Suspicion *Cromwell* was put out himself. When this was done, the next Question was, Who should be Lord General, and what new Officers should be put in, or old ones continued? And here the *Policy* of *Vane* and *Cromwell* did its best. For General they chose Sir *Thomas Fairfax*[8], son to the Lord *Ferdinando Fairfax*, who had been in the Wars beyond Sea, and had fought valiantly in *Yorkshire* for the Parliament, though he was overpowered by the Earl of *Newcastle's* Numbers. This man was chosen because they supposed to find him a Man of no quickness of Parts, of no Elocution, of no suspicious plotting Wit, and therefore, One that *Cromwell* could make use of at his pleasure. And he was acceptable to sober Men, because he was Religious, Faithful,

[8]Cromwell was one of the tellers for the majority "which voted Fairfax General instead of Essex, and had urged that Fairfax should have full liberty in the choice of his officers. His own military career seemed over: for he could scarcely expect to retain his command when all other members lost theirs. If he had sought to keep it, he would have continued the prosecution of Manchester rather than striven to erect a legal barrier against his own employment." (Firth, *id.*, p. 119.)

Valiant, and of a grave, sober, resolved Disposition; very fit for Execution, and neither too Great nor too Cunning to be Commanded by the Parliament.

And when *he* was chosen for General, *Cromwell's* men must not be without *him*: so valiant a Man must not be laid by; the Self-denying Vote must be thus far only dispensed with; *Cromwell* only, and no other Member of either House, must be excepted. And so he is made Lieutenant General of the army,[9] and as many as they could get of their Mind and Party are put into Inferiour Places, and the best of the old Officers put into the rest. But all the *Scotch-men* (except only Adjutant *Grey*) are put out of the whole Army, or deserted it."

§ 71. "The *English* Army being thus new modelled, was really in the hand of *Oliver Cromwell*, though seemingly under the command of Sir *Thomas Fairfax* (who was shortly after Lord *Fairfax*, his Father dying).

Cromwell's old Regiment[10]—which had made itself famous for Religion and Valour,—being fourteen Troops, was divided; six Troops were made the Lord *Fairfax's* Regiment; and six Troops were Col *Whalley's* Regiment; and the other two were in Col. *Rich's* and Sir *Robert Pye's* Regiments. The confidents of *Cromwell* were especially Col. *Ireton*, and Major *Desborough* (his Brother-in-law) and Major *James Berry*, and Major *Harrison*, and Col. *Fleetwood*, and (as his kinsman) Col. *Whalley*, and divers others.

But now begins the change of the old cause. A shrewd Book came out not long before, called *Plain English*, preparatory hereto.

---

[9] The facts about this matter are these:—

[a] On March 3, 1645—before the second self-denying ordinance was passed and even introduced—the House of Commons ordered Cromwell to join Waller in the West (for the relief of Weymouth and Taunton) with his regiment.

[b] On April 20 a letter from the Committee of both kingdoms reached him at Windsor—the Army's Headquarters—where he had come the day before to take leave of Fairfax and lay down his commission. The latter despatched him at once with his brigade of Cavalry to Oxfordshire to prevent the King from joining Prince Rupert.

[c] On May 10, the Parliament prolonged his command for another 40 days.

[d] On May 28, when the King threatened the Eastern Counties, Cromwell was sent in hot haste to Ely to see to their defence.

[e] On June 4, London petitioned that he might have power to raise and command all the forces of the Association.

[f] Finally, on June 10, Fairfax and his council of war petitioned Parliament to appoint Cromwell Lieutenant-General. (Firth, *id.*, pp. 119, 123, 125, 126.)

His appointment was limited to three months, but it was afterwards again prolonged for terms of 4 and 6 months successively. (*D.N.B.*, Cromwell.)

As a summary set-off against Baxter's account that of Mrs. Hutchinson, no friend to Cromwell, may be cited. (Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 185-6, ed. Firth.).

[10] "Cromwell's old Regiment was made into two, one commanded by his cousin, Edward Whalley, the other by Sir Thomas Fairfax himself." (Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 122.)

And when the Lord Fairfax should have marched with his Army, he would not (as common Fame saith[11]) take his Commission, because it ran as all others before, for *Defence of the King's Person* : for it was intimated that this was but hypocrisie, to profess to defend the King when they marcht to fight against him ; and that Bullets could not distinguish between his Person and another Man's ; and therefore this Clause must be left out ; that they might be no Hypocrites. And so (he) had a Commission without that Clause—*for the King*. And this was the day that changed the Cause."

§ 72. "The Army being ready to march was partly the envy and partly the scorn of the nobility, and the Lord Lieutenants and the officers which had been put out by the Self-denying Vote.[12] But their actions quickly vindicated them from contempt. They first attempted no less than the Siege of *Oxford*[13] ; but, in the meantime, the King takes the field with a very numerous well-recruited Army, and marcheth into *Northamptonshire* into the Parliaments Quarters, and thence strait to *Leicester*, a Town poorly fortified but so advantageously situated for his use, as would have been an exceeding Loss to the Parliament if he could have kept it. It was taken by storm, and many slain in it.[14]

General *Fairfax* leaveth *Oxford*, and marcheth through *Northamptonshire* towards the King. The King having the *greater*[15] *number*, and the Parliaments Army being of a new contemned Model, he marcheth back to meet them, and in a Field near *Naseby*, a Village in *Northamptonshire*, they met. *Cromwell* had hasted a few days before into the associated Counties (which were their Treasury for Men and Money), and brought with him about 500 or 600 Men, and came into the Army just as they were drawn up, and going on to give Battel.[16] His sudden and seasonable coming, with the great Name he had got by the Applause of his own Soldiers, made a sudden joy in the Army (thinking he had brought them more help than he did), so that all cried, *a Cromwell, a Cromwell*, and so went on ; and after a short hot fight, the King's Army was totally

[11] See *Gardiner's History of the Great Civil War*, II., p. 144. The omission of the clause "to wage war for the preservation of the King's person" seems to have originated from the Commons *sua sponte*. The Lords objected, but had to yield.

[12] "Never did any army go forth to war who had less of the confidence of their own friends, or were more the objects of the contempt of their enemies." (Quoted by Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 127.)

[13] For a fortnight early in May, 1645.

[14] On May 31, Leicester was stormed and sacked by the King's army. (Firth, *id.*, p. 125.)

[15] "The King's army amounted at most to about 5,000 horse and 4,000 or 5,000 foot. Fairfax had 13,000 men, of whom 6,000 were horse." (Firth, *id.*, p. 127.)

[16] The date of the battle was June 14. "On June 13, Cromwell rode into Fairfax's camp with 600 horse from the Association, and was welcomed by the soldiers with a mighty shout. 'Ironsides,' they cried, 'is come to lead us,' calling him by the name which Rupert had given him after the battle of Marston Moor." (Firth, *id.*, p. 126.)

routed[17] and put to flight, and about 5,000 Prisoners taken, with all the Ordnance and Carriage, and abundance of his own letters to the Queen and others in his Cabinet (which the Parliament printed, as thinking such things were there contained as greatly disadvantaged the Reputation of his *Word* and *Cause*).

Major-General *Skippon* fighting valiantly was here dangerously wounded, but afterwards recovered. The King's Army was utterly lost by the taking of *Leicester*[18]; for by this means it was gone so far from his own Garrisons that his Flying Horse could have no place of Retreat, but was utterly scattered and brought to nothing. The King himself flew to *Lichfield* (and it is reported that he would have gone to *Shrewsbury*[19], his council having never suffered him to know that it was taken till now); and so he went to *Rayland* Castle in *Monmouthshire,* which was a strong hold, and the House of the Marquess of *Worcester*, a Papist (where his dispute with the Marquess was said to be, which Dr. *Bailey* published, and then turned Papist; and which Mr. *Chichester Cartwright* continued, defending the King). *Fairfax's* Army pursued to *Leicester*, where the wounded Men, and some others, stayed with the Garrison: in a day or two's time the Town was re-taken."

Two days after the battle Baxter went to the Army's Headquarters by way of Naseby; and received a shock.

§§ 73-4. "*Naseby* being not far from *Coventry* where I was, and the noise of the Victory being loud in our Ears, and I having two or three that of old had been my intimate Friends in *Cromwell's* Army, whom I had not seen of above two years, I was desirous to go see whether they were dead or alive, and so to Naseby Field I went two days after the fight, and thence by the Armies Quarters before

[17] "The pursuit lasted some 13 miles, nearly 5,000 prisoners, more than 100 colours, all of the King's baggage and artillery and his private papers, fell into the hands of the Victors." (Firth, *id.*, p. 130.)

[18] Leicester was retaken on June 18.

[19] Shrewsbury fell to the Parliament on February 22, 1645. The King's movements for the next few months are noted by Gardiner. (*Op. cit.*, Vol. II.)

June 19 Reached Hereford (captured by Parliament December 17 following) (p. 224).
July 1 Reached Abergavenney (p. 243).
Aug. 3 Reached Raglan Castle (p. 243).
Aug. 5 Set out from Cardiff (p. 260).
,, 15 Reached Welbeck (p. 260).
,, 18 Reached Doncaster (p. 260).
,, 24 Reached Huntingdon (p. 262).
,, 29 Reached Oxford (p. 276).
,, 30 Left to go Westwards (p. 276).
Sept. 1 At Worcester (p. 283).
,, 4 At Hereford (p. 283).
,, 18 Set out from Raglan Castle to Presteign (p. 283).
,, 22 Reached Chirk Castle (pp. 321-3).
,, 23 Rode into Chester, a day before the battle of Rowton Heath (pp. 321-3).
,, 25 Rode out of Chester with 2,400 horse to Denbigh (pp. 321-3).
Oct. 1 In Bridgnorth (pp. 321-3).
,, 4 Reached Newark (p. 346).

Leicester to seek my acquaintance. When I found them, I stayed with them a night, and I understood the state of the Army better than ever I had done before.

We that lived quietly in *Coventry* did keep in our old Principles, and thought all others had done so too, except a very few inconsiderate Persons. We were unfeignedly for King and Parliament. We believed that the War was only to save the Parliament and Kingdom from Papists and Delinquents, and to remove the Dividers, that the King might again return in the Parliament; and that no Changes might be made in Religion, but by the Laws that had his free consent. We took the true Happiness of King and People, Church and State, to be our end, and so we understood the Covenant, engaging both against Papists and Schismatics. And when the Court News-book told the world of the Swarms of Anabaptists in our Armies, we thought it had been a meer lye, because it was not so with us, nor in any of the Garrison or County-Forces about us. But when I came to the Army among *Cromwell's* Soldiers, I found a new face of things, which I never dreamt of. I heard the plotting Heads very hot upon that which intimated their Intention to subvert both Church and State. Independency and Anabaptistry were most prevalent. Antinomianism and Arminianism were equally distributed; and *Thomas Moor's* Followers (a weaver of *Wisbitch* and *Lyn*, of excellent Parts) had made some shifts to forge these two Extreams together.

Abundance of the common Troopers, and many of the Officers, I found to be honest, sober, Orthodox Men, and others tractable ready to hear the Truth, and of upright Intentions. But a few proud, self-conceited, hot-headed Sectaries had got into the highest places, and were *Cromwell's* chief Favourites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the rest, or carried them along with them, and were the Soul of the Army, though much fewer in number than the rest (being indeed, not one to twenty throughout the Army; their strength being in the General's and *Whalley's* and *Rich's* Regiments of Horse, and in the new-placed Officers in many of the rest). I perceived that they took the King for a Tyrant and an Enemy, and really intended absolutely to master him, and to ruine him; and that they thought if they might fight against him, they might kill or conquer him; and if they might conquer, they were never more to trust him further than he was in their power; and that they thought it folly to irritate him either by Wars, or Contradictions in Parliament, if so be they must needs take him for their King, and trust him with their Lives when they had thus displeased him. They said, what were the Lords of *England* but *William* the Conqueror's Colonels? or the Barons but his Majors? or the Knights but his Captains? They plainly shewed me, that they thought God's Providence would cast the Trust of Religion and the Kingdom upon them as Conquerors. They made nothing of all the most wise

and godly in the Armies and Garrisons that were not of their way. *Per fas aut nefas*, by Law or without it, they were resolved to take down, not only Bishops, and Liturgy, and Ceremonies, but all that did withstand their way. They were far from thinking of a moderate Episcopacy, or of any healing way between the Episcopal and Presbyterians. They most honoured the Separatists, Anabaptists, and Antinomians; but *Cromwell* and his Council took on them to joyn themselves to no Party, but to be for the Liberty of all. Two sorts I perceived they did so commonly and bitterly speak against, that it was done in meer design to make them odious to the Soldiers, and to all the Land; and that was:—1. The *Scots*, and with them all Presbyterians, but especially the Ministers, whom they call *Priests* and *Priest-byters*, and *Dri-vines*, and the Dissembly-men and the like. 2. The Committees of the several Counties, and all the Soldiers that were under them that were not of their Mind and Way. Some orthodox Captains of the Army did partly acquaint me with all this, and I heard much of it from the Mouths of the leading Sectaries themselves. This struck me to the very Heart, and made me Fear that *England* was lost by those that it had taken for its Chiefest friends."

§ 74. "Upon this I began to blame both other Ministers and myself. I saw that it was the Ministers that had lost all, by forsaking the Army, and betaking themselves to an easier and quieter way of Life.

When the Earl of *Essex* went out first, each Regiment had an able Preacher, but at *Edg-hill* Fight almost all of them went home,[20]

[20] Cp. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, Pt. I. § 61: "There were with his Army, as chaplains to the several Regiments, abundance of famous excellent Divines," *e.g.*:

Mr. Stephen Marshall and Dr. Burgess to the Earl of Essex's Regiment.
Mr. Obadiah Sedgwick to Colonel Hollis's.
Dr. Calibute Downing to the Lord Roberts's.
Mr. John Sedgwick to the Earl of Stanford's.
Dr. Spurstow to Mr. Hampden's.
Mr. Perkins to Colonel Goodwin's.
Mr. Moor to the Lord Wharton's.
Mr. Adoniram Bifield to Sir Henry Cholmley's.
Mr. Nalton to Colonel Grantham's.
Mr. Simeon Ash to the Lord Brook's or the Earl of Manchester's (I remember not whether).
Mr. Morton of Newcastle to Sir Arthur Haselrigg's troop, with many more."

Why "almost all" should have gone back home at (or after) Edgehill fight is rather puzzling. Some may have imagined the war was as good as over; or on the other hand, that it was likely to lengthen out beyond the time they could spare from their congregations. But already, perhaps, ambition played a part—the ambition to share in the livings of ejected Royalists. This motive certainly came into action before long. Hence the increase of sectaries in the army became only one of the reasons or excuses for not joining up again. There were, it seems, but five other chaplains with the New Model besides Baxter during 1645-46, *viz.*, Bowles, Dell, Saltmarsh, William Sedgwick, and the famous Hugh Peters. Bowles did not remain long, and the rest were Independents of the most advanced type. (See Firth, *Cromwell's Army*, pp. 320-324.)

and as the Sectaries increased, they were the more averse to go into the Army. Its true that I believe now they had little Invitation, and its true that they must look for little welcome and great Contempt and Opposition, besides all other Difficulties and Dangers; but it is as true, that their Worth and Labour, in a patient self-denying way, had been like to have preserved most of the Army, and to have defeated the Contrivances of the Sectaries, and to have saved the King, the Parliament, and the Land. And if it had brought Reproach upon them from the Malicious (who called them *Military Levites*) the Good which they had done would have wiped off that blot, much better than the contrary course would do. And I reprehended myself also, who had before rejected an Invitation from *Cromwell*.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

DEAR SIR, Carrow Abbey, Norwich.

IN the last issue of the *Transactions* (p. 92), a letter was inserted from Louis Kossuth to my father, Jeremiah James Colman, then living at Stoke Holy Cross, near Norwich. I should like to correct an erroneous impression which may be gleaned from that letter, namely, that my father had suggested *letting* his seaside house at Lowestoft to the Hungarian Patriot. It is obvious that Kossuth at first mistook my father's intention, which was to *lend* him the house. This is made clear from letters in the possession of my sister and myself. One is from the Hungarian through whom my father made the offer to Kossuth respecting the house. Under date May 19, 1855, he writes: "in complyance (sic) with your generous suggestion I have ascertained that Governor Kossuth would not be disinclined to spend a few weeks in the country if invited by you to Lowestoft, and if nothing extraordinary should intervene." And in a letter from Kossuth himself to my father, dated July 6, 1855, the writer states: "I very much appreciate your kind offer and feel sincerely grateful for it." The suggested arrangement fell through, however, very possibly, as hinted in the same letter, because the house was not large enough for the purpose.

The "Madame Colman" referred to in the previous letter was my grandmother. When her husband's last illness began in 1854 he was taken to London where he underwent a system of massage, the treatment being carried out by a Hungarian exile, said to be of noble birth, who had taken part in the insurrection of 1848. It was through him my father was brought into contact with Kossuth.

Yours truly,

HELEN C. COLMAN.