
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.

THE Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Memorial Hall, on Tuesday, May 8th. Tea was served in the Library, and at the outset of the meeting the Rev. A. G. Matthews was elected to the chair. After prayer, the minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed. The Secretary apologised for the absence of the Editor, Dr. Peel, who was in America, and referred to the loss sustained by the Society in the deaths of two of its officers, the President and Treasurer. On the motion of the Chairman, by a standing vote, the Secretary was instructed to convey to Mrs. Nightingale and to Mrs. Muddiman the sympathy of the Society in their bereavements.

The following officers were elected: President, Rev. Wm. Pierce, M.A.; Treasurer, Mr. R. H. Muddiman; Editor, Dr. Peel; Secretary, Rev. R. G. Martin, M.A. Mr. Muddiman, whom the Society was glad to welcome as Treasurer in the room of his father, was unable to be present, but sent the statement of accounts, which was adopted as satisfactory. This statement is printed below.

At the conclusion of business, Mr. David Chamberlin, Literary Superintendent of the L.M.S., read an instructive paper on "Boston and 'The Great Migration,'" which was of peculiar interest in view of the *Celtic* "Pilgrimage." Members will be glad to have this paper in the present number of THE TRANSACTIONS.

There was a fair attendance of members and visitors, and six new members were enrolled.

* * * *

The October meeting of the Society will be held in the Junior Schoolroom of Salem Chapel, Leeds, on Tuesday, October 9th, at 4.30, when the Rev. E. J. Price, M.A., B.D., of the United College, Bradford, will speak on "The Yorkshire Academies and the United College." Nobody is better qualified to speak on this subject than Professor Price, and we hope there will be a good attendance of members and friends to hear him.

* * * *

When a writer starts out with appreciation of scholars like Alexander Gordon and Lyon Turner, we know he has the

spirit of sound scholarship. Dr. Thomas Richards, the Librarian of the University College, Bangor, has already made solid contributions to the history of religion in Wales in *The History of the Puritan Movement in Wales from* 1639–1653, and *Religious Developments in Wales* (1654–62). He now follows them up by *Wales under the Indulgence*, 1672–5 (National Eisteddfod Association, 7*s.* 6*d.*). Dr. Richards is an able research student, and his special local knowledge enables him at times to correct even Lyon Turner. Altogether his work cannot be neglected by students of Puritanism in Wales.

CONGREGATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.
SUMMARIZED A/C OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS, 1927.

Receipts.	£	s.	d.	*Expenditure.*	£	s.	d.
To Balance forward 1/1/27 from 1926	53	2	0	Printing *Transactions*	44	0	9
				Postages & Receipts	2	5	0
Subscriptions 1927	29	16	0	Hire of Hall for Annual Meeting ...	1	1	0
Arrears	10	1	0				
Subs. in advance ...	2	15	0	Circular to Churches	1	5	6
Sale of *Transactions* ...	6	8	9	Donation to Friends' Historical Society		5	0
				Balance in Hand, 31/12/27	53	5	6
	£102	2	9		£102	2	9

Audited and found correct,
CYRIL LEE DAVIS,
16th April, 1928. *Hon. Auditor.*

Boston and "The Great Migration."

THE Bostonian who is reported to have said after reading Shakespeare: "Well, that's fine. I reckon there aren't more'n ten men in Boston who can write like that," has done us good service. He helps us to remember in a pleasant way that Bostonians think well of one another and of Boston.

They have every right to think well of their history and their great men, for Boston has seen the making of more history in three centuries than many a city "half as old as Time."

The great migration began in 1628 and ended in 1640. Between those years twenty thousand of England's best, driven out by a miserable combination of civil and religious terrorism, settled on the shores of Massachusetts Bay, and also settled the fate of America.

The Pilgrim Fathers had gone out in 1620. Nothing can rob them of the honour and romance which will for ever be linked with New Plymouth. But the Plymouth Colony was very small. After ten years it did not number more than 300; "insufficient," says Fiske, "to raise in New England a power which could overcome Indians, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen and assert its will in opposition to the Crown." The Virginia colonists were a mixed lot of adventurers with no appetite for hard work and none of the cohesion shown by the Bostonians.

Here, then, was a migration which was destined to produce results of world wide importance. (1) It settled the point that America was to be peopled by speakers of the English tongue. (2) It planted—without quite intending it—the democratic State in the New World. (3) It made a home for that Independency which later on separated the United States from Britain.

This is the order of events:

In 1620, while the *Mayflower* was tossing on the Atlantic outward bound, King James set up a somewhat theatrical concern called "The Council established at Plymouth in the County of Devon for the planting ruling ordering and governing of New England in America."

The patentees were forty in number, including thirteen

peers, among whom were Lord Lennox, the Earls of Arundel, Pembroke, and Warwick, the Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Carlisle, and Lord Sheffield. They proposed to send out from the city (they were afraid of over-population even then) poor children and youths from parishes not tainted with any villainy or misdemeanour to be sent to New England and bound apprentice to such as shall have occasion and means to use them." There was to be a tax on fisheries, at that time busy supplying Catholic Europe with its Friday fare.

The Council had tremendous powers on paper. It was to make laws, exercise military rule, monopolise trade—indeed, carry on all the functions of a state under James I. in a territory which extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

It was to be a governing body—the Duke of Buckingham had no intention of engaging in team work with the untainted parish youths. Unfortunately, there was nobody to govern, so various grants—often overlapping and confused—were made to companies which really did the work.

The Council of New England, however, did one thing which in the light of subsequent history may be regarded as important.

On the 19th of March, 1628, it sold to a company of knights and gentlemen about Dorchester a tract of land consisting of all the territory included between the Rivers Merrimac and Charles in one direction and between the Atlantic and the Pacific in the other.

The Dorchester company consisted of Sir Henry Roswell, Sir John Young, Thos. Southcoat, John Humphrey, John Endicott, and Simon Whetcomb. These men knew all about the prospects of trade in New England, for Dorchester had already sent fishing vessels yearly to the coast, and they felt that the time had come for a larger effort which would gather up the small scattered settlements into a properly ordered single company.

John White, Puritan Rector of Dorchester, had some hand in the affair, and probably his letters sent about England were the means of turning this trading adventure into a great Puritan State. It happened at a time when serious people in England were in distress not only because of religious persecution but also because of the gloomy outlook for men who loved liberty. They saw the first signs of impending disaster to England, and their eyes were turned towards the new land whither the Separatists had already gone.

The Dorchester gentlemen deputed John Endicott to lead

their first contingent; and he left Weymouth in the *Abigail* on June 20th, 1628. At any rate the Bill of Lading was dated June 20th, and in all probability the ship actually set sail on that day, carrying sixty or more settlers, the first of the great migration.

The ship arrived at Naumkeag, subsequently called Salem, on September 6th.

It is true that the Charter signed by Charles I. was not completed till March, 1629, but since so many of the King's friends were members of the New England Council it may be assumed that the signing of the Charter was a foregone conclusion. The Dorchester gentlemen at any rate took the Charter for granted. They had bought the land, equipped the first expedition, and Endicott sailed to take charge of the new territory in the name of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay, the new owners and the sponsors for the migration.

In the minutes of the Massachusetts Bay Company the first page is filled with a list of arms and furnishings, evidently the equipment of the vanguard, and on the second page there appears the first dated record, which tells of the payment of £100 for the passage and diet of Endicott and his wife by the ship which left Weymouth on June 20th. So it is evident that the sailing of the *Abigail* was regarded as the first transaction of the Massachusetts Bay Co.

Delegates and visitors from England to the United States have usually taken the Pilgrim Fathers as the theme of their speeches. The wreaths placed upon the memorials of the Pilgrims are politely accepted by Americans as tokens covering all succeeding immigrants. But American historians have always placed great emphasis upon the coming of the Massachusetts Bay Company, and quite recently important books have issued from the press on the other side which recall the stern glories of the creative days of 1628–1640.

Consider for a minute who the emigrants were.

John Endicott was a Dorchester man with strong Puritan convictions. Most of us first heard his name as "dark and haughty Endicott," in the Quaker poem "Cassandra Southwich," but he deserves more and better fame than that. His letters to Bradford of the Plymouth Colony show him to be a cultured man, with a strong brotherly sympathy and a fair mind.

American historians tell us that his harshness to the Quakers and his suppression of the Maypole at Merry Mount were

justified by the disturbing and lawless conduct of the people whom he punished. As first Governor under the Company he ruled well, submitted himself to the law when his own conduct was in question, and so set an example of respect for the institution he helped to set going.

The Massachusetts Bay Company did not take long to declare its religious purpose. In April, 1629, they wrote to Endicott saying: "In that the propagation of the Gospel is a thing we do profess above all to be our aim in settling this plantation, we have been careful to make provision of godly ministers, by whose faithful preaching, godly conversation, and exemplary life we trust not only those of our own nation will be built up in the knowledge of God, but also the Indians may in God's appointed time be reduced to the obedience of the Gospel of Christ." The seal of the Company contained the figure of an Indian saying: "Come over and help us." They were not the kind of men who would have put it there in jest.

The three ministers first sent out were Samuel Skelton, a Lincolnshire minister, from whose teaching Endicott had received help, Francis Higginson of Leicester, and Francis Bright of Rayleigh, Essex. These three were commended to the care of Governor Endicott, who was to provide them with homes and see that they received due honour.

Among the people of social standing were John Winthrop, gentleman, of Groton, Suffolk, who spent his whole estate, his bodily strength and life in the service of the colony, and died its lamented Governor; Isaac Johnson, of Clipsham, Rutland, who had married Lady Arabella, sister of the Earl of Lincoln; John Humphrey, Kent, who had married another sister; Matthew Cradock, a wealthy London merchant, who was one of the largest contributors to the Company, and was in after years a member of the Long Parliament; and Sir Richard Saltonstall of Halifax, nephew of another of the same name who had been Lord Mayor of London in 1597.

The settlers came from every county in England, though more than half came from East Anglia. Cambridge University sent in all ninety scholars to New England.

A group of famous ministers succeeded the first contingent. Their names are held in perpetual memory because of the part they played in building the new community.

John Cotton, Vicar of Boston, Lincolnshire, was a man of great gravity and sanctity of life. His grace, learning, and eloquence made him universally respected except by the Bishops, who found him Non-conforming, so he left.

Richard Mather, clergyman of Liverpool, suspended also for Nonconformity—he would not wear the surplice—became the first of three Mathers whose names are famous.

Richard himself was great on all points of Church government and order. According to the New English Dictionary he was the first to use the word *Congregational* as applied to a particular form of Church. He wrote that in 1639.

Richard Mather's son, Increase Mather, born in 1639, was a preacher and leader in Boston for sixty-six years. He is said to have written and published over 400 books and pamphlets. One interesting fact about him is that he was the first person to take an American D.D. In his case it was a peculiar and distinct dignity, for Harvard's power of granting degrees was suspended for a time immediately after dubbing him, and for many years Increase was the only holder of the Doctorate.

Cotton Mather, son of Increase, was born in 1663, graduated at Harvard when he was fifteen. He produced 383 publications, was three times married, introduced inoculation for smallpox into the Colony, and believed in a personal devil who appeared in witches and Indians. He was brought up on Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, which may have given him the habit of seeing things vividly. Devils, angels, flames, and spiritual hand-to-hand fighting, accompany the whole of his perturbed life. He was a brave man, though, and deserves our thanks for his tremendous book recording the history of his times. It was no joke introducing vaccination to Boston. One fiery opponent threw a bomb into Mather's house; it fell to pieces without exploding. There was a message tied to it which said: "Cotton Mather, you dog, dam you, I'll inoculate you with this."

Cotton Mather is generally linked with the terrible witchcraft panic which, having swept over Europe, gave its last kick in New England in 1692. Some people well known to have lived pious lives were hanged on hysterical evidence. Nathaniel Hawthorne pictures Cotton Mather riding his horse through the doubting crowds about the gallows, assuring them that everything had been done in accordance with God's laws. Although Mather was the public apologist for the executions, he had spent himself by prayer and fasting in many cases of recovery from possession.

Three things helped to stop the panic. Geo. Burroughs, Congregational minister, repeated the Lord's Prayer just before he was turned off the ladder. It was believed that devil-

possessed people could not repeat that prayer correctly, so doubts arose about his guilt. Then some genius spread the rumour that the panic was the work of Satan, who had chosen this way of getting rid of the Lord's people. Finally Governor Phipps's wife was denounced as a witch. Phipps knew better and intervened to stop the reign of terror.

Cotton Mather did everything with a profusion and an intensity of feeling and manner which will always make him an interesting character, but the spirit of the colony is better represented by its great Governor, John Winthrop. He was a man of generous heart. A busybody reported to him that a colonist of the meaner sort was stealing the Governor's firewood one cold winter. Winthrop said: "Send the man to me; I'll cure him of stealing." When the miscreant appeared the Governor said: "It is a severe winter and I apprehend you are ill provided with firing. I would have you supply your need from my wood pile till the hard weather be over."

"Have I not stopped his stealing?" said Winthrop to the informant.

Winthrop spent his life and fortune for the new State, not because he was a merchant venturer, but because be believed in the experiment. He was an earnest Puritan, sage in counsel, kindly in ways, a strong, patient ruler who gave stability to Massachusetts at a time when it was most needed.

We do not really know much about Thomas Hooker, but whenever we catch a glimpse of him he is seen throwing off sage maxims about government and popular rights which have been repeated again and again by representative men right down to President Coolidge.

Here are three of his sayings:

"The foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people."

"Those who appoint their governors have the right to set bounds to their powers."

When Governor Winthrop defended a restricted franchise Hooker replied:

"In matters which concern the common good, a general council chosen by all, to transact business which concerns all, I conceive most suitable to rule and most safe for the relief of the whole."

When the *Mayflower* men signed their historic compact they began by recording their allegiance to their most dread sovereign, the King, but Hooker went a step beyond that when he drew up the constitution of Connecticut. He left out

the bit about the dread sovereign, indeed he took no notice of anyone outside Connecticut: in later years when the constitution of the United States was being drafted the men who did it were anxiously approached by outsiders who had heard rumours of a proposed monarch. Their answer was: "We never once thought of a king." In that respect and in many others they followed the model of Connecticut, which under Hooker's guidance had produced the first example in history of a written constitution deriving no authority from any ruler.

Thus it came about that Hooker was called "the father of the American Constitution." He had other claims to fame too. He was one of three New England Congregational ministers invited to come over to the Westminster Assembly. The voyage was not a holiday trip in the seventeenth century brigs. They often took three months to do it, and most of them must have been supremely uncomfortable, since there was no room to stand upright below deck if one happened to be anything over five feet six inches. Neither Hooker nor the other two came to the Assembly. They stayed at their work. It was not because of the discomfort, but the time.

I like Hooker's remark when he came to die. An admirer said to him:

"So you are going to receive the reward of your labours."

He answered:

"Brother, I am going to receive mercy."

The best known figure among the pioneers of Massachusetts Bay was the apostle to the Indians, John Eliot. The son of an Essex farmer, he was brought up at Nazeing, graduated B.A. at Cambridge in 1622, and was next heard of as assistant in a small school at Little Baddow, where he and Thomas Hooker had retreated before the attentions of Laud. Both Eliot and Hooker joined the Puritan migration. Eliot became minister at Roxbury, where he lived nearly sixty years, faithful to his flock, an example of industry, prayer, and faith to the whole colony. He added to his pastoral work the immense task of translating the Bible into the language of the Massachusetts Indians. It was the first translation made for missionary purposes, and confers upon Eliot the undoubted right to be called the father of Modern Missions. He settled his Indian converts in a model town at Natick, encouraged them in simple arts and scholarship, founded schools, taught the teachers, and had the joy of seeing thousands of Red men trying to walk in the new way. It was not his fault that the Indian wars swept away his scholars

and disciples. His example is undying—the record of his gallant attempt lay before William Carey when the latter set about the formation of the Baptist Missionary Society, and it is no diminution of Carey's fame to remember that the first missionary of the Protestant Churches was a Congregational minister who was supported by a Society established in London[1] a century and a half before Carey.

It is impossible to read Dexter's pages on the early New Englanders without the conviction that the days and the men were creative. Lowell says they went out to rebuild Zion and all the while it was not Zion but America they were building. That is terse and true, but, though we should be careful to agree that America is no small thing to produce, they did to a large degree carry forward the building of Zion, the city which all men seek, still seek, and will perhaps for long seek in both hemispheres.

What was it that the great migration aimed at? Had the emigrants or any large proportion of them a conscious common object before them? We must take their declaration that they went to plant the Gospel in New England, literally.

Every expedition or plantation under Royal warrant from the days of Columbus had professed an interest in religion and the conversion of the Indians. Many of them had brought that profession into derision, but the New Englanders were different. Cotton Mather, writing after the first generation of settlers had passed away, and with a copious knowledge of affairs, said that while the propagation of the faith had been one of the declared aims of other plantations it was the main object of the Massachusetts Colony. The history of the colony justified the distinction. The settlers had of course to build homes, to labour prodigiously for food, to fish, build ships, organise commerce, settle their relations with the Indians, and keep a watchful eye for new dangers to their freedom arising from English politics.

But the great subject which engaged the Massachusetts Bay Company was the setting up of a State agreeable to the Word of God. This was the test applied to every practice or institution—was it agreeable to the Word? The Bible was their final court of appeal, agreed to be so by all and loyally held to even when it was imperfectly understood.

It was testing England by the Bible which gave the Puritans

[1] The New England Company, which still exists.

courage to stand out and march out. In doctrine there was not much quarrel between the Elizabethan Church and the Puritans. Everything turned upon order and discipline, and even in those matters a large measure of agreement might have been reached if it had not been for excommunication. The bowings and kneelings, the vestments and prayer book, were not all of them anathema to every Puritan. But to be excommunicated for refusal was another matter. It was this that united the Puritans, who found a larger freedom in the Scriptures than the Church was willing to give them. They suffered heavily, as we know. The tale of terror need not be told again. God offered a new land for them in the West, and there they tried their great experiment.

The Massachusetts immigrants were not Separatists like the Pilgrim Fathers, who had already formed themselves into an Independent Church. They sought rather to carry the Reformation a stage farther by omitting those ceremonies and practices of the Church of England which savoured of Rome and seemed corrupt. They were perfectly clear in their declarations on this point when they left England. They loved their Church and asked for its prayers. The things they did not love about the Church were quickly dropped. Even on the voyage out in 1628 prayers were offered which did not come from the Prayer Book. Soon after the arrival of the *Abigail* at Salem, Endicott sent to New Plymouth for medical help because his party had scurvy and other disorders. Fuller, a surgeon and a deacon, came over from Plymouth to Salem, helped to put the sick ones on their legs, and had some converse with Endicott about the new way of Church life adopted by the Pilgrim Fathers. The result was that Endicott found nothing to alarm and much to attract him in the Separatists. One after another the marks of Episcopacy faded out like a dissolving view and what appeared in its place was Congregationalism.

They adopted a Church covenant substantially the same as that of Scrooby, established Churches which were independent of one another, elected their own officers, called their own ministers, "without tarrying for any," whether King, Bishop, or Presbytery.

It was the settlement of the relations between these Churches and the fixing of a common practice among them which gave the Colony its chief task. It may be said that these were only matters of order and not of doctrine, but the discussion of them produced a set of principles which had enormous

importance in after years. They had to settle the source of authority, the distribution of power, the needful limitations of liberty, and the ordering of daily life in accordance with what they believed to be the Will of God. These are fundamental things in which everyone is interested. Nowhere will they be found more thoroughly handled than in the discussions among the Massachusetts leaders.

It is a mistake to suppose that universal toleration was an object with them. The settlers had before them a very definite plan—they had purchased a territory in which to try their plan. They were agreed, in the main, that they should be a gathered Church, as contrasted with the old parish idea in which every citizen was supposed to be a saint—here only saints were to be citizens. They had no idea of admitting disturbers to their Zion for the sake of civil freedom.

This explains their conduct in regard to heretics of all sorts. Singularly enough, the first to suffer were Episcopalians. Two men wanted the Prayer Book back again—they missed the old forms and ceremonies. They were sent back to England by Endicott because to give them liberty to do what they wanted would have endangered the liberty of the rest—and there might be a Bishop and King in the background or at the thick end of the wedge, to mix the metaphor.

It is easy to charge the Puritans with continuing in New England the methods of persecution which had thrust them out of the old. But their idea was at least intelligible. If they found no warrant for the introduction of new practices in their Bibles these practices were forbidden. In some things their reading of the Bible led them into error. Witches were to be put to death. Women were to keep silence in the Churches—they did not even vote.[2]

Slavery was allowed. The laws of Moses were taken equally with the commands of the new dispensation, and this led the Bay people into some places whence they had to retrace their steps. Yet the laws they made were a great advance on those of Britain, and if narrowness and bigotry seem to us to have been their characteristics, we must remember that they provided the best antidote when (long in advance of us) they established Free Schools and pledged their land, houses, and furniture for the support of them.

After all, the ideal of a Church-State or a State introducing

[2] There was one case where the members, reduced in numbers by death, consisted only of women. When new members had to be voted in, they sent for some men of surrounding churches to do the voting.

the rule of Christ is a noble one. After every great war, tyranny, or revolution, whenever the existing order seems to collapse and the fountains of the deep are broken up, men turn their minds anew to the question, "Are we governed aright?", and Christians dimly seek a way to bring the nations under the Kingdom of Christ. It is well for us that again and again the thought of a Christian Commonwealth arises and claims adventurous spirits. Not Fifth Monarchy madness only, but often grave and promising attempts have failed to bring in the Kingdom, and still there is division, some looking for a cataclysm, others for slowly evolving perfection. Perhaps the clue to a solution is in that saying of Dr. Simon:

"Men will not reach the ideal state until all reach it together."

With the Atlantic rolling between them and the Bishops the New England Churches arrived at some decisions about forms of worship strangely un-Episcopal. It was decided that a Church exists before and independently of its officers or minister; that ministers cease to be ministers if and when they have no pastoral charge; dumb reading of the Bible—reading without running comment—was not tolerated. There were two preaching services on Sunday, the first about 9 a.m. and the second at 2 p.m. Sermons and prayers were long. The Chapels were unheated—the frozen bread rattled in the plates during a winter Communion. Sternhold and Hopkins's metrical Psalms (afterwards replaced by the Bay Psalter) were lined off and sung—not too melodiously, without any musical instruments. Christmas was not observed, being thought a festival of paganism. Marriages and burials were at first civil affairs with no help from the Church. Palfrey found no instance of a prayer at a funeral before the year 1685, nor a minister at a wedding before 1686. Church buildings were severely simple structures of wood and thatch, to which people were summoned by the beating of a drum, the blowing of a horn, or the raising of a flag. When the congregation entered, having passed the stocks and pillory outside, they were careful to occupy seats in accordance with their social status. It was called "dignifying the Church."

The deacons had seats of honour, usually facing the congregation; the specially elect had the best seats in the area, while inferior seats were allotted to servants, a far corner of the gallery being set apart for slaves. It meant something that they were admitted at all: a century later there were

other colonies in which Churches displayed the notice: "Negroes and dogs not admitted."

The fact that the Churches levied a public tax for their support is sometimes spoken of as Establishment. But since everybody was within the Church it was simply self-assessment for the maintenance of religion and not quite the same as the endowment of a specific Establishment at the expense of unbelievers. The day came when it had to be altered because all were not of the Church, but at its commencement the custom was reasonable.

The people so meeting and worshipping were engaged through their chosen representatives for many years in settling a Church practice which should be common to all. Great discussions centred round the power of the elders, particularly the point, "How should the will of the elders be made to prevail in cases where the Church Meeting opposed that will?" All sorts of devices were proposed, many of them bearing a strong family likeness to those advocated in our own adjustment between Lords and Commons.

It is a fine education in Churchmanship to read Dexter on these discussions. The Will of Christ, the Head of the Church, was to rule—that will being assumed to reveal itself to the elders more than to the members. Thus for a time they had what one writer called "*a speaking aristocracy in the face of a silent democracy.*"

And yet it was a sincere effort to secure a just balance between excessive liberty for the uninstructed and excessive autocracy in the leaders. The Will of the Master had to be sought by all, and when the elders thought they discerned it they had to convince the members of the fact—quite a good thing for the elders.

Cotton Mather's description of John Eliot's Congregationalism is as good as any account of what they found in their chosen order:

"He was fully persuaded that the Church State which our Lord Christ hath instituted in the New Testament is: In a congregation or society of professed believers agreeing and assembling together among themselves with officers of Divine appointment.

"He perceived in the Congregational way a sweet sort of temperament, between rigid Presbyterianism and levelling Brownism. So that on the one side the liberties of the people are not oppressed and overlaid; on the other side the authority

of the Elders is not rendered insignificant, but a due balance is herein kept upon them both."

It was while hammering away at these questions that the Puritans arrived at a level of opinion and conviction which taught them how to be a democratic State, and in due time how to stand up against the distant monarchy.

Lord Acton—with no sort of bias towards the Independents, and a historian beyond doubt—said of this process:

"The idea that religious liberty is the generating principle of civil, and that civil liberty is the necessary condition of religious, was a discovery reserved for the seventeenth century. That great political idea has been the soul of what is great and good in the progress of the last two hundred years."

Those who know the early history of Boston will probably agree that its importance is second to that of no town in modern history.

During the years when Charles was governing England without a Parliament twenty thousand of the most earnest and active of his subjects were compactly settled in Massachusetts working out a new idea. The Indians on the West prevented the settlers spreading out as others had done. Their choice of commerce and shipbuilding also kept them together until their tradition took firm shape and became secure. When the War of Independence came it was Boston which provided the men and the Independent spirit. Time after time efforts were made from the old country to clip the wings of this bird of freedom, but by God's Providence no weapon formed against her prospered, and Boston was preserved to put to the test her great plan of a State seeking to walk in harmony with what it believed to be God's laws—and held together by stern loyalty to their agreed interpretation of those laws.

DAVID CHAMBERLIN.

A Congregational Church's First Year, 1804-5.

Being the Account of the Formation and Early History of the Church now worshipping in Clapton Park Chapel, London.

THIS account is taken from the first minute book of the church, which dates from the formation of the church in 1804 to the end of Dr. Pye Smith's ministry in 1849. The book is entirely in Dr. Pye Smith's handwriting, the last entry reading:

On the Lord's day morning, December 30th, 1849, John Pye Smith preached his last pastoral discourse, and resigned the office in which the Lord's wondrous mercy and grace, amidst all his infirmities and deficiencies for which he desires ever to be deeply humbled, have upheld him for nearly forty-six years. To his rejoicing and to the praise of divine love, he sees the increasing happiness of his beloved friends under the ministry of his dear brother who is now the sole pastor, the Reverend John Davies."

The Covenant was apparently signed by those admitted to membership. There are 226 names, a few of them being apparently the pencilled names of those whose signatures were not obtained. After many of the names are brief notes, giving dates of death, of dismissal to other churches, or other particulars. Those for the period covered by the minutes now printed are :—

JOHN PYE SMITH
JOSEPH ALDERSEY
GEORGE PARKER
THOMAS NORTON, Dismissed to Kingsland, Aug. 20, 1805. Church Missionary in Travancore.
THOMAS AUSTIN, March 3, 1808, withdrew.
MARY SMITH, Died, Nov. 23, 1832.
ELIZABETH ALDERSEY, Died in the Lord, Apr. 1, 1822.
MARY MADGWICK, Died in the faith and patience of Jesus, Jan^{y} 2, 1810, æt. 54.
SAMUEL GOULD UNDERHILL
GEORGE HALL, Died in the Lord, Jan. 5, 1807.

The occasional members mentioned in the minutes do not seem to have signed the Covenant. Quite a number of those who sign in later years make an exception of "the clause relative to the baptism of infants."

Register of the proceedings of the Church of Jesus Christ, formed March 6, 1804; and assembling for the enjoyment of Gospel Ordinances in the Academy at Homerton.

"Send now prosperity, O Lord!"

March 6, 1804.

After repeated mutual conversations, and humbly imploring Divine direction, the following persons met together for the purpose of solemnly uniting as a Church of the Faith and Order usually stiled Congregational.

Joseph Aldersey,—Elizabeth Aldersey,—John Pye Smith,—Mary Smith,—Thomas Austin,—George Parker,—and Thomas Norton.

The cxxxii psalm, L. M., of Dr. Watts's Paraphrase was sung.

Mr. Aldersey prayed.

All testified their mutual approbation of each other as brethren and sisters in the Lord, by lifting up the right hand.

The Declarations of faith and hope of each individual, and the Dismissals of two from other Churches, were read. These papers are preserved in a portfolio for the purpose.

The Church Covenant was read, all standing up in token of explicit acceptance; and it was then signed: as it stands in the beginning of this book.

Covenant

of the
Church of Christ meeting at Homerton in Middlesex constituted March 6, 1804.

"Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord, in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten."

Jer. L. 5.

We, whose names are voluntarily subscribed to this Solemn Covenant, do make the same in professed subjection to the will, and for the advancement of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Before the allseeing God we penitentially confess our guilty, helpless and deservedly wretched state as sinners in the native disposition of our hearts and the habitual course of our lives; acknowledging the aggravated malignity, the inexcusable baseness, the infinite evil, and the eternally dreadful desert of sin.

We own the righteousness and excellency of the Divine Law, its glorious perfection and purity, its unalienable claim on our

obedience, and the justice of its condemnatory sentence against us as guilty transgressors.

Renouncing all dependence on our own powers or merits, we lie down in our shame before a Holy and Sovereign God, and we profess that all our hopes flow from the free and everlasting love of the Father, through the obedience and the sacrifice of the Son manifested in the flesh, and by the effectual grace of the Holy Spirit, the Three Divine Persons whom we adore as the Ever Blessed Trinity in One, Eternal and Unchangeable Godhead.

This glorious Being we humbly take as our God, our Father, and our Portion; for ever renouncing all other objects as competitors for the homage of our hearts.

We acknowledge the Lord Jesus as the only King and Head of His Church: and we receive His sovereign will revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the perfect rule of our faith, and as having absolute authority on our consciences and lives.

As a Church of Jesus Christ constituted according to the principles of His word, we declare our mutual submission to the pure and godly discipline which His word appoints, our sincere purpose to watch over and encourage each other in all the duties of gospel fellowship, and our resolution to cherish the holy influence of unfeigned and tender love, and that we will bear each other on our hearts in our approaches to the throne of grace.

We profess ourselves bound by every obligation to honour God in our families and before the world, by worshipping Him with our households every morning and evening, by dispensing Scriptural instruction to our children and servants, by our authority and influence, and by the holy consistency of a good conversation in Christ.

We gratefully admire the condescension of Jesus in His appointment of the ordinance of Baptism for believers and their infant seed: and we acknowledge the children whom our God has given or may give to any of us, as one with us in a peculiar covenant relation, and as especially entitled to our united prayers, our affectionate care, and every encouragement in our power to lead them in the good ways of the Lord.

We also bless the love and wisdom of our Great Redeemer, for His institution of that ordinance by which His death as the atonement for our souls is shewed forth: and we consider those alone as entitled to participate in that sacred ordinance, who make a serious profession of faith in Christ and act in correspondence with that holy profession.

We acknowledge the Divine institution of public worship and the preaching of the gospel; and, for the enjoyment of those ordinances, we recognize the privilege and duty of our punctually

meeting together on each Lord's day, except in cases of justifiable hindrance.

This Solemn Covenant we make with the Lord our God, and with each other, not in our own strength, but in an humble reliance on the power and grace of Christ, applied according to our constant necessities by the Holy Spirit. To this grace we look for strength to perform every duty, and for humiliation, repentance and pardon in every instance of failure.

Thus, building up each other on our most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost; keeping ourselves in the love of God, and looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, we resign ourselves, and all that is ours, to Him Who is able to keep us from falling and to present us faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy.

Amen.

The brethren and sisters then gave to each other the right hand of fellowship.

Prayer and thanksgiving was offered to the God of Zion.

After some pertinent remarks from Mr. Aldersey, John Pye Smith was desired to withdraw.

In a little time he was called in, and presented with a Call to the pastoral office in this Church of Christ. To this he returned an answer of acquiescence. Both are preserved in the portfolio.

A short address to the Church was then delivered by the chosen pastor.

It was determined to request several ministers, whose names will appear hereafter, to take a part in the public ordination of the pastor; and Mr. Aldersey and J. P. S. were requested to convey those requests and to make the requisite arrangements.

The same two brethren were desired to draw up and present to the King's Head Society a memorandum expressing the gratitude of this Church to the Society for permitting the use of the Hall in the Academy at Homerton as a place of public worship; most explicitly renouncing any claim or right whatever, either now or at any future period, to such use of the Hall; and declaring that such a privilege will be desired no longer than the continuance of it will be quite agreeable to the Society.—N.B. It is also a further condition of this grant that the church renew its request *annually;* viz., at the Church Meeting preceding the Society's general meeting in December.

Mr. Aldersey was unanimously desired to take upon himself the care of the temporal concerns of the Church.

This solemn meeting concluded with singing Ps. cxxxii (C.M. v. 4–8 in Dr. Watts,) and prayer.

Wednesday,[1] April 11, 1804.

This was the day appointed for the solemn ordination of the poor and sinful creature on whom this Church of Christ had fixed its regards as its Pastor and Overseer in the Lord. The Church, with many valued ministers and messengers of other Churches and a numerous body of spectators, assembled in the Rev[d]. Mr. Gaffee's meeting house in New Broad Street, London, at eleven o'clock. This meeting had been kindly offered by that respected minister and the deacons of his Church, for this purpose.

Hymn x. Book i. in Dr. Watts, was sung.

The Rev[d]. Benjamin Gaffee prayed, and read Psalm cxxxii., I. Thess. v. 12–24, Heb. xiii. 7–21, Eph. iv. 1–16.

Ps. cxxxii. L.M., v. 2–5.

The Rev[d]. John Humphreys delivered an Introductory Discourse on the Nature, Constitution and Rights of a Scriptural Church, and on the Divine Institution and Importance of a Gospel Ministry.

He then requested the Church to give some account of the steps which it had taken and the reasons of its inviting sister Churches to witness its faith and order on this occasion.

To this request Mr. Aldersey replied in the name of the Church, by concisely stating that the members of this small Church were generally such as had attended on the ministry of that faithful servant of Jesus Christ, the late Rev. John Eyre; that, after his death, they had joined with a small number of friends and neighbours to assemble for public worship in the hall of the Academy at Homerton; that they trust they had found the ministry beneficial to their souls; that, after serious deliberation and humble prayer, they had united in Gospel fellowship, adopting the Solemn Covenant contained in this book, which Mr. Aldersey read; and that they had then invited one of their brethren to be their pastor, who had accepted of the weighty charge. Both the call and the answer were read.

Mr. Humphreys then proposed several important questions

[1] Thursday crossed out, Wednesday substituted in pencil.

to the chosen pastor, and received his answers and his Confession of Faith.

Mr. Humphreys having finished his part of the service by kindly desiring all spiritual blessings for us,—the Ordination Prayer was offered up to the throne of Infinite Mercy by the Rev. George Burder, in a manner uncommonly fervent, affectionate and impressive. This was accompanied with the scriptural usage of laying on the hands of the presbytery.

Singing Hy. lxxxii. in Dr. Doddridge, v. 3–6.

The Rev^{d}. Joseph Barber delivered the charge to the pastor, from Col. i. 28: "Whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." This venerable and excellent minister united faithfulness and affection to a great degree in his judicious and important address.

Singing Hy. cxxviii. B. 1, v. 1, 2, 4.

The Rev^{d}. John Goode offered the General and Intercessory prayer, in a very solemn, devout and edifying manner.

Singing Psalm cxxxiii. C.M., v. 1, 2, 4.

The Sermon to the Church was preached by the Rev^{d}. John Clayton, from I. Cor. xvi. 10. "Now if Timotheus come, see that he may be with you without fear: for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do." Our very excellent and valuable friend on this occasion spoke with that judicious fidelity and knowledge of the dispositions, duties and trials of men for which he is so deservedly esteemed.

Singing Ps. cxxxii. C.M., v. 4, 5, 6.

The Rev^{d}. James Knight offered the concluding prayer with his accustomed spirituality and seriousness.

April 12. Thursday.[2]

At the Church Meeting held this evening, Mary Madgwick was received into full communion with us, by dismission from the Rev^{d}. John Goode's Church, White Row.

April 15, Lord's day afternoon,

was our *first* administration of the holy ordinance of the Lord's Supper. J. P. S. preached in the previous service from Exod. xii. 26, 27, on the Nature and Design of this sacred observance.

[2] Thursday is later edition in pencil.

May 3.

At the Church Meeting held this evening, James Auld and Andrew Ritchie, members of the Church of Christ at Glasgow under the pastoral care of the Rev[d]. Greville Ewing, signified their sincere concurrence in the obligations and the design of our Solemn Covenant, and were received as occasional members with us.

August 30.

At the Church-Meeting held this evening, Samuel Gould Underhill was unanimously received into communion with us as a Church of Christ.

Nov. 29.

At the Church Meeting held this evening, John Small, a member of the Church of Christ at Dundee under the care of the Rev. William Innes, signified his concurrence in our Solemn Covenant, and was received as an occasional member with us.

Occasional membership, thus entered upon, we consider as bringing the person so received into the possession of all the duties and privileges, in discipline and government, belonging to the Church.

1805 Jan. 10.

This evening Daniel Dewar, a member of the Church of Christ at Glasgow under Mr. Ewing's care, signified his concurrence in our solemn Covenant, and was admitted to occasional membership with us.

1805 Feb. 28.

At the Church Meeting held this evening, George Hall was unanimously received into communion with us as a Church of Christ.

This concludes the minutes of the Church during the first year of its existence.

ALBERT PEEL.

The Rev. Richard Baxter's Relation to Oliver Cromwell

(*Continued from page* 144).

"When he lay at *Cambridge*, long before,[21] with that famous Troop which he began his army with, his Officers purposed to make their Troop a gathered Church, and they all subscribed an Invitation to me to be their Pastor, and sent it to me to *Coventry*. I sent them a Denial, reproving their Attempt, and told them wherein my judgment was against the Lawfulness and convenience of their way, and so I heard no more from them, and, afterwards, meeting *Cromwell* at *Leicester*, he expostulated with me for denying them. These very men that then invited me to be their Pastor, were the men that afterwards headed much of the Army, and some of them were the forwardest in all our Changes—which made me wish that I had gone among them, however it had been interpreted: for then all the Fire was in one Spark."

It was in consequence of this self-blame that, later in the same year —1645—he consented[22] to become Chaplain to Colonel *Whalley's* Regiment. Whalley, though "engaged by kindred and interest to *Cromwell*" was orthodox. Cromwell, too, was orthodox, but not quite in the same sense. So his pleasure at Baxter's coming was qualified.

§ 76. "As soon as I came to the Army, *Oliver Cromwell* coldly bid me welcome, and never spake one word to me more while I was there; nor once all that time vouchsafed me an opportunity to come to Headquarters where the Councils and Meetings of the Officers were, so that most of my design was thereby frustrated. And his Secretary gave out that there was a Reformer come to the Army to undeceive them, and to save Church and State, with some such other jeers, by which I perceived that all that I had said but the night before to the committee, was come to *Cromwell* before me. (I believe by Col. *Purefoy's* means).[23] But Col. *Whalley* welcomed

[21] Early in 1643. In January "he obtained leave of absence for himself and his troop, and went down into the Eastern counties to raise such men as had the fear of God before them and made some conscience of what they did." (Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 85).

[22] His going was not entirely *sua sponte*: "An assembly of Divines (twice met) at Coventree (of whom two doctors and some others are yet living) first sent me into the Army to hazard my life (after Nasby fight) against the course which we then first perceived to be designed against the King and Kingdom. . . ." *R. B.*, III. 151 (dated London, Feb. 10, 1673).

[23] On the night before his departure from Coventry he met the Town Committee, to whom he had to state his reasons for so sudden and (to the Garrison especially)

me ; and was the worse thought of for it by the rest of the Cabal."

In his capacity of Chaplain, when the Army "marched speedily down into the West," Baxter went with it. The main object was to crush Lord *Goring's* Army—the only one left intact to the King—before "the Fugitives of *Naseby*-fight" could rally to it. Baxter's narative here is vivid :

§ 78. "They came quickly down to *Somerton* when *Goring* was at *Langport*,[24] which, lying upon the River, *Massey* was sent to keep him in on the farther side, while *Fairfax* attended him on this side with his Army. One day they faced each other, and did nothing.[25] The next day they came to their Ground again. Betwixt the two Armies was a narrow Lane which went between some meadows in a bottom,[26] and a small Brook, crossing the Lane, with a narrow Bridge.[27] *Goring* planted two or three small Pieces at the Head of the Lane to keep the Passage, and there placed his best Horse, so that none could come to them but over that narrow Bridge, and up that steep Lane upon the mouth of those Pieces. After many hours facing each other—*Fairfax's* greater Ordinance[28] affrighting (more than hurting) *Goring's* men, and some Musqueters[29] being sent to drive their's from under the Hedges—at last *Cromwell* bid *Whalley* send Major *Bethel*, Capt. *Evanson*, and Capt. *Grove* to charge. Major *Desborough* with another Troop or two came after. They could go but one or two abreast over the Bridge. By that time *Bethel* and *Evanson* with their Troops were got up in the top of the Lane, they met with a select Party of *Goring's* best Horse,[30] and charged them at Sword's-point whilst you would count three or four hundred, and then put them to Retreat. In the flight they pursued them too far to the main Body : for the Dust was so

---

so displeasing a step. This he did in the presence (unwittingly) of Colonel William Purefoy, a Parliament man, and a confidant of Cromwell's, who, resenting Baxter's charges against the Army, burst out, as soon as he had done—"Let me hear no more of that. If Nol. Cromwell should hear any soldier speak such a word he would cleave his crown. You do them wrong ; it is not so."

[24] "At the news of his" (Fairfax's) "approach, Goring raised the blockade of Taunton and took up his position about ten miles from Bridgwater, with his front covered by the rivers Yeo and Parret. The two armies came into collision near Langport on July 10." (Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 130.)

[25] "There was some skirmishing in the evening" of the 9th. (Gardiner, *op. cit.*, II. 238.)

[26] Pisbury Bottom.

[27] Gardiner (*id.*, 238) says Ford, not Bridge ; and thinks Baxter's evidence of no account on the point as he "did not write till after the Restoration."

[28] "Langport was one of the few battles of the Civil War in which field artillery played an important part. Fairfax began by overwhelming Goring's two guns with the fire of his own, and forcing the cavalry to move farther back and leave their musketeers unsupported." (Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 130.)

[29] 1500, to wit. "Finally, under Cromwell's direction, six troops of horse (all drawn from Cromwell's own regiment) dashed through the ford, and up the lane at Goring's Cavalry." (*id.*, 130, 131.)

[30] "More than three times his own number." (Gardiner, *id.*, II., 240.)

extream great (being in the very hottest time of summer) that they that were in it could scarce see each other; but I (that stood over them upon the brow of the Hill) saw all. When they saw themselves upon the face of *Goring's* Army, they fled back in haste, and, by that time they came to the Lane again, Capt. *Grove's* Troop was ready to stop them, and relieve them, and *Desborough* behind him. Whereupon they rallied again, and the five or six Troops together marcht towards all *Goring's* Army. But, before they came to the Front, I could discern the Rere begin to run[31]; and so beginning in the Rere they all fled before they endured any Charge, nor was there a blow struck that day, but by *Bethel's* and *Evanson's* Troop (on that side), and a few musquetiers in the Hedges. *Goring's* Army fled to *Bridgwater*; and very few of them were either killed or taken in the fight or the pursuit. I happened to be next to Major *Harrison* as soon as the flight began, and heard him with a loud Voice break forth into the Praises of God with fluent expressions, as if he had been in a Rapture. Upon this *Goring* fled further Westward (to *Exeter*) with his Army.[32] But *Fairfax* stayed to besiege *Bridgwater*[33]; and, after two days, it was taken by storm, in which Col. *Hammond's* Service was much magnified. Mr. *Peters* being come to the Army from *London* but a day before, went presently back with the News of *Goring's* Rout; and an Hundred pounds Reward was voted to himself for bringing the News, and to Major *Bethel* for his Service, but none to Capt. *Evanson*[34], because he was no Sectary; and *Bethel* only had all the Glory and Applause by Cromwell and that Party.

From *Bridgwater* they went back towards *Bristol*, where Prince *Rupert* was, taking *Nunny* Castle and *Bath*[35] in the way. At *Bristol* they continued the Siege about a month. After the first three days I fell sick of a Fever (the Plague being round about my Quarters). As soon as I felt my Disease I rode six or seven miles back into the country, and the next morning (with much ado) to Bath: where Dr. *Venner* was my careful Physician; and when I was near to death (far from all my Acquaintance) it pleased God to restore me . . . I came back to *Bristol* Siege three or four days before the City was taken. The Foot which was to storm the Works,

[31] "Two miles farther back the royalist cavalry made another stand, but one charge proved sufficient, and they were sent flying towards Bridgwater." (Firth, *Cromwell*, p. 131.)

[32] "his Army, as an army capable of waging war, ceased to exist." (Gardiner, *id.*, p. 240.)

[33] "the part of the town on the east bank of the Parret was taken by escalade on July 21, and the other half surrendered after a short bombardment" on the 22nd. (Firth, *id.*, p. 131).

[34] Bethel, as Major, was Captain Evanson's commanding officer, and naturally received the gift. (Gardiner, *id.*, p. 239, note.)

[35] Bath was captured (by a mere detachment of Cavalry) on July 30. (Gardiner, *id.*, p. 277.) Bristol fell on Sept. 11.

would not go on unless the Horse went with them (who had no Service to do) : so *Whalley's* Regiment was fain to go on to encourage the Foot and to stand to be shot at before the Ordinance (but in the Night) while the Foot did storm the Forts : where Major *Bethel* (who in the last Fight had but his Thumb shot) had a shot in his Thigh of which he died, and was much lamented. The Outworks being taken, Prince *Rupert* yielded up the City, upon Terms that he might march away with his Soldiers, leaving their Ordinance and Arms.

Upon this the Army marcht to *Sherborn* Castle[36] (the Earl of *Bristol's* House[37]), which after a Fortnights Siege, they took by storm and that on a side which one would think could never have been that way taken.

While they were there, the country-men called *Clubmen*[38], rose near *Shaftsbury* and got upon the top of a hill. A Party was sent out against them, who marcht up the hill upon them, and routed them, though some of the valientest men were slain in the Front.

When *Sherborn* Castle was taken, part of the Army went back, and took in a small Garrison by *Salisbury*, called *Longford-House*[39], and so marcht to *Winchester* castle, and took that by Composition after a weeks Siege, or little more. From thence *Cromwell* went with a good Party to Besiege *Basing-house* (the Marquess of *Winchester's*) which had frustrated great Sieges heretofore. Here Col. *Hammond* was taken Prisoner into the House[40], and afterward the House was

---

[36] Fairfax, taking Bath on his way, made directly from Bridgwater to Sherborne; opened the siege of its Castle on August 2, and took it on the 15; thence he set out on the 18th for Bristol, which was besieged from the 23rd to its fall on September 11th. Baxter has confused his dates.

[37] Its Governor was Sir Lewis Dyves, the Earl's stepson.

[38] "In the West and South of England the country people began to form associations in order to keep all armed men of either party out of their districts and to put an end to free quarter and the plunder of their cattle." (Firth, *Cromwell*, pp. 135-6.)

"They were armed with country weapons, mere bludgeons, if no other could be had." Cromwell went against them on Aug. 4th, from Sherburn, and by his, and Fairfax's, wise handling they were made to disperse contentedly. The resistance on the top of Hambledon Hill, near Shaftesbury, cost Cromwell about two men and four horses; and the Clubmen some 12 killed, with many wounded and about 300 prisoners. Letters found on Sir Lewis Dives (after the capture of Sherburn) proved the movement to have been a deeply Royalist scheme. (See Carlyle's *Cromwell*, Part II, Letter 30.)

[39] Longford House surrendered on October 17, 1645, *Winchester* on Sept. 28, and the Castle on October 5, Basing-house (after a 10 days siege) on Oct. 14.

Baxter's little inaccuracies may be ascribed to the fact that he was not, at the time, with Cromwell, having gone with Fairfax and the rest of the army in pursuit of Goring. Cromwell separated from Fairfax at Devizes on Sept. 26, his task being to reduce the garrisons of Hampshire. On Oct. 24, he rejoined Fairfax at Crediton for the siege of Exeter.

[40] The Marquis owed his life to the courtesy and kindness with which he had formerly treated the Colonel, who was his prisoner for a few days. (Gardiner, *id.*, p. 396.)

taken by storm, and he saved the Marquess and others ; and much Riches were taken away by the Soldiers. In the meantime the rest of the Army marched down again towards the Lord *Goring*, and *Cromwell* came after them.

§ 79. When we followed the Lord *Goring* westward, we found that above all other Armies of the King, his Soldiers were most hated by the People, for their incredible Prophaneness and their unmerciful Plundering (many of them being Forreigners). A sober Gentleman that I quartered with at *South Pederton* in *Somersetshire* averred to me, that with him a Company of them pricked their Fingers, and let the Blood run into the Cup, and drank a Health to the Devil in it. And no place could I come into but their horrid Impiety and Outrages made them odious.[41] The Army marched down by *Hunnington* to *Exeter*, where I continued near three weeks among them[42] at the Siege, and then *Whalley's* Regiment—with the General's, *Fleetwood's* and others—being sent back, I returned with them and left the Siege which continued till the City was taken; and then[43] the Army following *Goring* into *Cornwall*, there forced him to yield to lay down Arms, his men going away beyond Sea or elsewhere without their Arms.

And at last *Pendennis* Castle[44], and all the Garrisons there were taken. In the meantime *Whalley* was to Command the Party of Horse back, to keep in the Garrison of *Oxford* till the Army could come to besiege it ; and so, in the extreme Winter, he quartered about six weeks in *Buckinghamshire*[45] ; and then was sent to lay siege to *Banbury* Castle, where Sir *William Compton* was Governor, who had wearied out one long siege before[46]. There I was with

---

[41] "The Royalist forces in Cornwall and Devon numbered not less than 12,000 men, besides the Garrisons ; but, as Clarendon confesses, they were a 'dissolute, undisciplined, wicked, beaten army,' more formidable to their friends than to their foes." (Firth, *id.*, p. 137 : *cf.* Gardiner, *id.*, p. 320.)

[42] Fleetwood and Whalley were despatched towards Oxford to watch the motions of the King's Cavalry on December 25. So this date marks the limit of Baxter's time in the West, and Exeter marks the limit of place.

[43] Exeter surrendered on April 9, 1646, and Baxter is wrong in saying that *then* the Army followed Goring into Cornwall. The advance took place while the siege was going on. On Jan. 9, 1646, Cromwell surprised Lord Wentworth's brigade at Bovey Tracey ; on Feb. 16, he shared in the battle of Torrington ; on March 14, the Royalist cavalry capitulated. Then Fairfax marched back to Exeter. After April 9, Cromwell went to London, but rejoined Fairfax before Oxford in time to assist in the negotiations for its surrender on June 24.

[44] Pendennis Castle surrendered on Aug. 17, 1646. It was the last capture of the campaign.

[45] The headquarters were at Agmondesham (*R.B.I.*, p. 56), and here or at Chesham Baxter had a famous encounter with sectaries in the church—he taking the reading pew and they the gallery, the congregation crowding the rest of the building. He held his own against them "from morning till almost night," when they "rose and went away" tired out, if not defeated.

[46] For Compton—described by Cromwell as "the sober young man and the godly cavalier"—see *D. N. B.* In the first siege, which lasted 13 weeks, from July 19,

them above two Months till the Castle was taken ; and then *he* [*i.e.*, Whalley] was sent to lay siege to *Worcester*, with the help of the *Northampton* and *Warwick* and *Newport-Pannel* Soldiers, who had assisted him at *Banbury*. At *Worcester* he lay in siege eleven weeks; and, at the same time, the Army, being come up from the West, lay in siege at Oxford. By this time Col. *Whalley*, though *Cromwell's* Kinsman[47] and Commander of the *Trusted* Regiment, grew odious, among the Sectarian Commanders at the Head-quarters for my sake ; and he was called a *Presbyterian*, though neither he nor I were of that Judgment in several Points. And Major *Salloway*[48] not omitting to use his industry in the matter to that end—when he (Whalley) had brought the City to a necessity of present yielding—two or three days before it yielded—Col. *Rainsborough*[49] was sent from *Oxford* (which was yielded) with some Regiments of Foot, to Command in Chief, partly that he might have the honour of taking the City and partly that he might be Governor there (and not Whalley) when the City was Surrendered.

And so when it was yielded, *Rainsborough* was Governour to head and gratifie the Sectaries, and settle the City and Country in their

---

1644, he countermined the enemy eleven times and never went to bed. At the second siege he was still Governor and yielded the town to Whalley on honourable terms.

[47] Whalley's mother, Frances, daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell of Hinchinbrook, was Cromwell's aunt. Baxter can hardly have followed with satisfaction his Colonel's later career, leading up to regicide (see *D. N. B.*, article by Firth). But Whalley remained strictly orthodox, at any rate. He was extremely zealous, *e.g.*, against the Quakers and James Nayler.

[48] For Salloway, see references in Index of Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ed. by Firth.

[49] Oxford surrendered on June 23, 1646, and Worcester on July 23. Rainsborough was sent from Oxford on July 8, a fortnight at least before the end, and on the day of surrender was made Governor by Fairfax, who had recommended him to Parliament for the post. The inwardness of the situation (apparently unknown to Baxter) is revealed by the following extract from *The Diary of Henry Townshend of Elmley Covett* (1640-1663).

10 July " Col. Raynsborough wrote a civil letter to the Governor " (Wishington) " acquainting him that he was come thither by order from Sir Thomas Fairfax . . . that he understood he had several of their soldiers prisoners . . . (and) desired that either they may be exchanged or that he might have liberty to send them provisions : (and) that he shall continue all civilities and be his servant. To which the Governor returned a very civil answer, as being glad to deal with a gentleman who knew how to return civilities. As for Col. Whalley, he could have none from him. This Col. Rainsborough [is] a very active man, and we . . . must expect alarms every day, or night, from him. . . Yet all glad Col. Whalley is gone, though he have never attempted any alarm."

In another place (pp. 122, 3) there is a curious account of a debate held outside the city " at the foot of Roger's Hill," between Dr. Warmstry (Bishop Prideaux's Chaplain and Dean of Worcester after 1660) on the one hand, and " the Chaplain of their Regiment, Mr. Baxter," on the other. The debate took place on June 17. Before this, at the same place, the officers of both sides spent " two hours in familiar discourse, drinking of wine which each side brought." We can understand the diarist's remark that Whalley attempted no " alarm," and one reason for his supersession by Rainsborough.

way. But the Committee of the County were for *Whalley*, and lived in distaste with *Rainsborough*, and the Sectaries prospered them no further than *Worcester* City itself (a place which deserved such a Judgment); but all the Country was free from their Infection."

Baxter's suspicion of Cromwell grew strong in him during these two years of his army-life.

§ 82. "All this while, though I came not near *Cromwell*, his Designs were visible, and I saw him continually acting his part. The Lord General suffered him to govern and do all, and to choose almost all the Officers of the Army. He first made *Ireton* Commissary General; and 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 lookt not so much at their Valour as their Opinions[50]: so that by degrees he had headed the greatest part of the Army with *Anabaptists, Antinomians, Seekers, or Separatists* at best; and all these he tied together by the point of Liberty of Conscience, which was the Common Interest in which they did unite. Yet all the Sober Party were carried on by his Profession that he only promoted the Universal Interest of the Godly, without any distinction or partiality at all. But still when a place fell void, it was Twenty to one a Sectary had it, and if a Godly Man of any other Mind or temper had a mind to leave the Army, he would secretly or openly further it.

Yet did he not openly profess what Opinion he was of himself; but the most that he said for any was for *Anabaptism* and *Antinomianism*, which he usually seemed to own. And *Harrison* (who was then great with him) was for the same Opinions. He (*i.e.*, Cromwell) would not Dispute (with me) at all, but he would in good Discourse, very fluently pour out himself, in the Extolling of *Free grace*, which was savoury to those that had right Principles, though he had some misunderstandings of *Free grace* himself. He was a Man of excellent Natural Parts for Affection and Oratory; but was not well seen in the Principles of his Religion: of a Sanguine Complexion, naturally of such a vivacity, hilarity and alacrity as another Man hath when he hath drunken a Cup too much; but naturally also so far from humble Thoughts of himself that it was his ruine."

It was *Cromwell's* influence, so Baxter thought, that alienated from him at least one "old bosom friend."

§ 83. "All these two Years that I was in the Army, even my old bosom Friend, that had lived in my House, and been dearest to me,

---

[50] This seems to be a complete inversion of the fact. To Cromwell a man's opinions did not matter, if only he had the religious spirit which inspired valour.

James Berry[51] (then Captain, and after Colonel and Major General and Lord of the Upper House) who had formerly invited me to *Cromwell's* old Troop, did never once invite me to the Army at first, nor invite me to his Quarters after, nor never once came to visit me, nor saw me save twice or thrice that we met accidentally: so potent is the Interest of ourselves and our Opinions with us, against all other Bonds whatever. He that forsaketh himself in forsaking his own Opinions, may well be expected to forsake his Friend, who adhereth to the way which he forsaketh; and that Change which maketh him think he was himself an ignorant, misguided Man before, must needs make him think his Friend to be still ignorant and misguided, and value him accordingly. He was a Man, I verily think, of great Sincerity before the Wars, and of very good Natural Parts, especially Mathematical and Mechanical; and affectionate in Religion, and while conversant with humbling Providences, Doctrines and Company, he carried himself as a very great Enemy to Pride. But when *Cromwell* made him his Favourite, and his

---

[51]Berry, after 1638, when he wrote to Baxter from Shrewsbury, appears to have served as a clerk at some iron-works in the neighbourhood of Dudley (Foley's ?). He may have joined up with Cromwell on the latter's way, with his troop of 60 horse under Essex, from Northampton to encounter the King, and so may have fought at Edghill. He became one of Cromwell's most trusted Lieutenants; and his election to be President of the Council of Adjustors (1647) indicates popularity with the soldiers. In the winter of 1655 he was appointed Major-General for Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Shropshire, and Wales. He was nominated a member of Cromwell's House of Lords (1657); is said to have favoured the Protector's acceptance of the Crown, yet was active in overthrowing Richard Cromwell. He helped to set up military rule, and was one of the committee of safety established by the army (26 Oct., 1659), but could not prevent his own regiment—when he led it to blockade Portsmouth—from deserting in large numbers to the partizanry of the Parliament. His imprisonment at Scarborough, at first very close, is said to have been relaxed on his wife's petition in April, 1663, but whether he was released and lived by gardening (as Baxter says) or died in prison, we do not know.

In 1656 Baxter and Berry met at Worcester. Berry had come there, as Major-General, to hear the Quaker case against Edward Young, Mayor of Evesham, and other J.P.'s, who had treated the Quakers harshly. He came under orders from Cromwell to do justice, and appears to have done it. For he ordered "Friends to have their liberty"—though warning them not again to "disturb the national worshippers in their worship." But the interesting point is that Baxter was in the same room with Berry and his interviewers. It seems as if he were there before they entered and remained after they were gone. Had the two come together on purpose to have a private talk ? If so, not a hint of their conversation remains; and, as to the Quakers, not a word did he speak while they were in the room. He "only stood by the fire-side with the hat over his eyes." Edward Bourne, who reports this, might have hoped for a sign of sympathy, or at least interest, from "the Priest of Kidderminster," but he found none. (*The First Publishers of Truth*, pp. 283-5, ed. by Norman Penney, 1907.)

The eloquent letter of 30 pages which Baxter prefixed as "epistle Dedicatory" to Berry before his *Treatise of Self-denyall* (Sept. 14, 1659) breathes strong affection but equally strong suspicion. He wrote it to warn his friend of what he believed to be his imminent moral dangers—"not knowing whether I shall any more converse with you in the flesh." It is probable that he never did.

extraordinary Valour was crowned with extraordinary Success, and when he had been a while most conversant with those that in Religion thought the old Puritan Ministers were dull, self-conceited Men of a lower form, and that new Light had declared I know not what, to be a higher attainment, his Mind, his Aim, his Talk and all was altered accordingly. And as Ministers of the old way were lower, and Sectaries much higher in his esteem than formerly, so he was much higher in his own Esteem when he thought he had attained much higher than he was before, when he sat with his Fellows in the Common Form. Being never well Studied in the Body of Divinity or controversie, but taking his Light among the Sectaries—before the Light which longer and Patient Studies of Divinity should have prepossest him with—he lived after as honestly as could be expected in one that taketh Error for Truth, and Evil to be Good. After this he was President of the Agitators, and after that Major General and Lord as aforesaid, and after that a principal Person in the Changes, and the principal Executioner in pulling down *Richard Cromwell*, and then was one of the Governing Council of State. And all this was promoted by the misunderstanding of Providence, while he verily thought that God, by their Victories, had so called them to look after the Government of the Land, and so entrusted them with the welfare of all his People here, that they were responsible for it, and might not in Conscience stand still while anything was done which they thought was against that Interest which they judged to be the Interest of the People of God. And as he was the Chief in pulling down, he was one of the first that fell. For Sir *Arthur Haselrigg* taking *Portsmouth* . . . his (*i.e.*, Berry's) Regiment of Horse, sent to block it up, went most of them into Sir *Arthur Haselrigg*. And when the Army was melted to nothing, and the King ready to come in, the Council of State imprisoned him, because he would not promise to live peaceably ; and afterwards he (being one of the four whom General *Monk* had the worst thoughts of) was closely confined in *Scarborough Castle*. But being released he became a Gardiner, and lived in a safer state than in all his Greatness."

§ 84. " When Worcester Siege was over " Baxter had a mind to leave the Army and return to his " old Flock," at Kidderminster, whom he had lately seen again " with joy " ; and by whom his settlement in Peace among them was ardently desired. He, therefore, went to Coventry, and, having called together the ministers who had " voted " him " into the Army," gave them his reasons for wishing to retire. The chief of them was this, that his work, though as successful as could be expected in the narrow Sphere of his Capacity, " signified little " to the Army as a whole—because " Cromwell had lately put so many of " the Active Sectaries " into Superior Command and their Industry was so much greater than others that they were like to have their Will." In fact, " whatever

obedience they pretended" he "doubted not but they would put down all that stood in their way, in State and Church, both King, Parliament and Ministers, and set up themselves."

The Ministers, however, all voted for him to go on, and he acquiesced. But an attack of illness which threatened his life forced him to give up.

§ 84. "My purpose was to have done my best to take off that Regiment which I was with, and then (with Capt. *Lawrence*) to have tried upon the General's (in which two was *Cromwell's* chief Confidents), and then have joyned with others of the same mind (for the other Regiments were much less Corrupted). But the Determination of God against it" (*i.e.*, this sudden illness) "was most observable: For the very time that I was bleeding, the Council of War sat at *Nottingham*,[52] where (as I have credibly heard) they first began to open their Purposes and act their Part; and presently after they entered into their Engagement at *Triploe-Heath*. And as I perceived it was the Will of God to permit them to go on, so I afterward found that this great Affliction was a Mercy to myself: for they were so strong and active that I had been likely to have had small Success in the Attempt but to have lost my Life among them in their Fury. And thus I was finally separated from the Army."

§ 87. "When I was gone from the Army, the Parliament was most solicitous how to keep them from Tumults and Disobedience. But Sir *Henry Vane*, with his Party, secretly confederated with them, to weaken all others, and to strengthen the Sectaries. Whereupon they procured the House to Disband both Major General *Massey's* Brigade,[53] and all other Field Soldiers, and the honest County Forces and Garrisons of most Places, which among them had sober Men enow to have resisted them. This was the successfullest Act that was done for their Designs: for they had little fear of Opposition.

This Design of *Vane* and *Cromwell*[54] now was not only to keep

---

[52] "During this time" (July, 1646, onwards) Sir Thomas Fairfax himself lay at Nottingham." (*Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson*, p. 298 Bohn's ed.) But Nottingham most likely is Baxter's mistake for Newmarket. For the engagement into which the council of war is said to have entered "presently after" at Triploe (or Kentford) Heath, near Newmarket, took place on June 4 and 5, 1647.

[53] General (Sir Edward) Massey's brigade was disbanded at Devizes on October 20, 1646, "by order of both Houses" (*D. N. B.*); but Parliament at this time was under the Dominion of the Presbyterians (Firth, *id.*, p. 153), and Massey himself was a Presbyterian; so that this and the other disbandments cannot have been brought about by Sir Henry Vane's secret confederacy with Cromwell and the sectaries.

[54] Baxter is nowhere so much wrong as in what follows, and the best answer to him is a plain statement of the facts:—

[I take them mainly from Firth's *Cromwell*, cc. VIII and IX.]

(1) On May 12, 1647, the King sent a message to Parliament accepting its Proposals, but with such modifications as meant his ultimate return to full sovereignty.

(2) The Independents felt all the danger of such a one-sided compromise, but they were now in a hopeless minority in both Houses.

(3) At this point the majority decided upon a disbandment of the Army. There was to be a new Army with Fairfax as General and none but Presbyterian officers. 4,000 horse were to be retained for service in England; the rest of the Horse and the Infantry were to be employed for the reconquest of Ireland.

(4) But all but 2,300 of the soldiers refused to volunteer for Ireland, both because Parliament offered only a small fraction of the money due to them, and because they had no guarantee of the liberties for which they had fought.

(5) In April the Horse Regiments, and in May the Foot, elected representatives called Agitators, or Agents, to bring their case before Parliament, and maintain their rights. At this time they were in favour of coming to terms with the King.

(6) Up to now Cromwell had taken no part in the negotiations with the soldiers, much less in the movement amongst them against disbanding. He was intensely dissatisfied with the policy of the Parliament, but "there is no sign either in his words or actions that he contemplated resisting it" or thought of stirring up a military revolution. On this account he was bitterly assailed by some who had been among his warmest friends.

(7) Cromwell received, and deserved, the thanks of the Commons (May 21, 1647) for his conciliatory endeavours with the soldiers—endeavours largely successful until it became clear that the "Presbyterian leaders had made up their minds to resort to force to carry their policy through." A Scottish army was to be brought into England, the Prince of Wales was to be sent to Scotland to lead the projected invasion; the King was to be transferred to London, and the train of artillery from Oxford to the Tower. "Then, backed by the Scots and the city, they would force the soldiers to submit to their terms, and punish the officers who had taken their part. It meant a new civil war."

(8) Simultaneously, a general mutiny began. At the bidding of the Agitators the Army refused to disband. A party of Horse secured the Artillery train at Oxford, and seized the King at Holmby House on June 3. The same day Cromwell left London, resolved to throw in his lot with the Army.

(9) His influence, however, was all on the side of moderation. At the rendezvous of Kentford (or Triploe) Heath on the 4th and 5th of June, when "a bold statement of the grievances of the soldiers was presented, and all bound themselves by a solemn engagement not to disband, or divide, till their rights were secured," it was Cromwell who brought about the institution of a Council of officers and men, by which the functions of the Agitators were limited and they were induced to co-operate with their officers.

(10) When the Agitators, after a fortnight of negotiations, urged an immediate march on London and the enforcement of their demands, it was Cromwell and the higher officers who opposed. "Whatsoever we get by a treaty," argued Cromwell, "will be firm and durable. It will be conveyed over to posterity."

(11) During the march on London the army published its proposals "for clearing and securing the rights of the kingdom and settling a just and lasting peace." They were offered to the King for his acceptance, and (*inter alia*) "proclaimed complete religious liberty for all except the Roman Catholics . . . no proposal so wise and comprehensive had yet been made. It gave to Charles, as it gave to the Presbyterians, all that they could fairly ask."

If Ireton was the framer of these proposals, their chief inspirer was Cromwell, who, at this time, did all he possibly could to effect "a speedy agreement with the King," so as to ward off a second war. Thus he became an object of suspicion both to the Royalists and the soldiers. The former spread among the latter stories which suggested treachery and double dealing, or sheer personal ambition.

(12) The effect upon the Agitators, once ardent for agreement with the King, was to make them demand the immediate rupture of the negotiations with him; and, also, to educe (October 28, 1647) their "Agreement of the People for a firm and present Peace," which marked a complete divorce from kingship in favour of pure democracy.

up an Army of Sectaries, when the Sober Party was Disbanded, but also to force the Parliament to their mind, and moddel it so as that they should do their work—which I had foretold some Parliament

---

([13]) In a long and hot debate of the Council on this, Cromwell protested against so doctrinaire a scheme. He held it neither practicable, nor in view of the Army's engagements to the nation, honest. They were pledged, he thought, to monarchy for England by the spirit and temper of the people. In the abstract, he had no preference for any particular form of Government. That was best for people which they thought best. In England this was Monarchy.

([14]) But, however anxious he might be to retain the Monarchy, he had begun to doubt whether it was possible to retain the King. The distrust of Charles's sincerity had become general; and he was forced to share it. The King's intrigue with the Scottish Commissioners (before Dec., 1647) while negotiating with the Army was known to him. All the Army knew of it. In consequence, the Levellers, *i.e.*, the democratic section, clamoured for his punishment as well as his dethronement. On November 4, 1647 Colonel Harrison, in a committee of the Army Council, denounced the King as a man of blood whom they ought to bring to judgment. It was Cromwell who saved him. "I pray have a care of your guard," he wrote to his cousin, Colonel Whalley, "for if such a thing" (as the King's assassination) "should be done it would be accounted a most horrid act."

([15]) The same night, Nov. 11, the King escaped from Hampton Court, and found refuge at Carisbrooke Castle. There is no evidence in support of the theory that Cromwell frightened the King away, in order to forward his own ambitious designs. "In the long run, the King's flight was one of the causes of his dethronement and execution, and so of Cromwell's elevation to supreme power. At the moment, however, it increased his difficulties and added to the dangers which beset the Government."

([16]) The King's flight, after six months of trifling with Parliament and Army alike, had turned both against him. In answer to his request for a personal treaty at London, the former sent him an ultimatum consisting of four Bills (Dec. 14, 1647), to which his assent was required before any treaty should begin. The King's counterstroke was to enter into an "engagement" (Dec. 27) with the Scottish Commissioners who had now arrived at Carisbrooke, by which, for certain concessions—including the liberties of England—he won the promise of a Scottish army if Parliament continued obstinate. On Jan. 3, 1648, the House of Commons voted that they would make no further addresses to the King, and receive no more messages from him. Cromwell agreed. Events had driven him at last to be the foremost advocate of that policy of completely setting aside the King which he had long so stubbornly opposed. Yet, though convinced that the King could not be trusted, he was not prepared to abandon monarchy. There is evidence that during the spring of 1648 the Independent leaders discussed a scheme for deposing Charles, and placing the Prince of Wales or the Duke of York on the throne. But the unwillingness of the Prince and the escape of the Duke to France frustrated this plan. No wonder extremists failed to understand Cromwell, or that one of them, John Lilburne, should publicly accuse him of High Treason at the Bar of the House of Lords (Jan. 19, 1648). His apparent inconsistency was notorious. All eyes could see it, but only one here and there could see that unbending devotion to a supreme cause which was the key to it. Neither loss of popularity, misrepresentation, nor undeserved mistrust could diminish Cromwell's zeal for the cause.

"I find this only good," he wrote on his recovery from a dangerous illness in the spring of 1648, "to love the Lord and his poor despised people, to do for them and be ready to suffer with them, and he that is found worthy of this hath obtained great favour from the Lord."

Men of long before. One of the Principal engines in this Contrivance was to provoke the Parliament to pass such Votes as the Army would be most Displeased with, and then to stir up the Army to the deepest Resentment of it. Accordingly the Parliament voted that part of the Army should go to *Ireland*, and part be disbanded, and part continued. The Leaders in the Army incensed the Soldiers by persuading them that this was to deprive them of their Pay, and to divide them ; and, when they had them at home again, to ruine them as Sectaries : and this was the Reward of all their Services. Whereupon at *Triploe-Heath* they entered into an Engagement to stick together, &c., and were drawing up a Declaration of their Grievances (the aggravating of supposed Injuries being the way to raise Mutinies, and make use of Factions for Seditious Ends. Quarter-Master General *Fincher* acquainteth Sir *William Waller* with their Design (who, with others, was sent to the Army) ; and Col. *Edward Harley* (a member of the Parliament and of the Army) acquainteth the House with it.[54a] *Cromwell* being in the House doth with vehemency deny it ; and said it was a Slander, raised to discompose the Army by discontenting them ; and undertook that they should all lay down their Arms at the Parliament's Feet ; and for his own part, protesting his Submission and Obedience to them. And this he did when he was Confederate with them, and knew of the Paper which they were drawing up, and confesst it after when the copy of it was produced, and presently went among them, and headed them in their Rebellion. In short, he and his Cabal so heightned the Discontents, and carried on the New Confederate Army, that the Parliament was fain to Command all that were faithful to forsake them ; and (to) offer them their Pay to encourage them thereto. Commissary General *Fincher* and Major *Alsop* and Major *Huntington* and many more with a considerable number of Soldiers came off. But being not enow to make a Body to resist them, it proved a great Addition to their strength : for now all that were against them being gone, they filled up their Places with Men of their own Mind, and so were ever after the more unanimous.

Upon this *Cromwell* and his *Obedient Lambs* (as he called them) advanced in the Prosecution of their Design, and drew nearer *London* and drew up an Impeachment against Eleven Members of the Parliament, forsooth accusing them of Treason—*Viz* :—Sir *Philip Stapleton*, Sir *William Lewis*, Col. *Hollis*, Sir *John Maynard*, Mr. *Glyn* &c., and, among the rest, Col. *Edward Harley* (a sober and truly religious Man, the worthy Son of a most pious Father, Sir *Robert Harley*). And when thereby they had forced the House to exclude them as under Accusation, they let fall their Suit, and never prosecuted them, nor proved them Guilty. Thus began that Pride

[54a] For this see *Clarke Papers*, I. 2 ,6, 428; Ludlow, *Memoirs*, 149, 152; and Gardiner, *ad loc.*

to brake forth into Rebellion, which grew up from Successes in impotent minds, not able to conquer so great a Temptation as their Conquests.

When they had cast out these Members, they thought that the House would have done as they would have had them, and been awed into Obedience; but still they continued to cross them, and came not up to the Conformity expected. A while after the City seemed to take Courage, and would defend the Parliament against the Army; and, under Major General *Massey* and Major General *Pointz*, they would put themselves into a Military Posture. But the Army made haste, and were upon them before they were well resolved what to do; and the hearts of the Citizens failed them, and were divided; and they submitted to the Army; and let them enter the City in triumph (Aug. 6, 1647). Whereupon *Massey* and *Hollis* and others of the accused Members fled into *France*, of whom Sir *Philip Stapleton* died of the Plague near *Calice*. And now the Army promised themselves an obedient Parliament; but yet they were not to their mind."

Meanwhile, the King had betaken himself to the Scots (May 5, 1646); the Scots handed him over to Parliament (Jan., 1647) on conditions; the Parliament lodged him at Holmby House in Northamptonshire; and emissaries of the Army, with Cromwell's connivance,[55] carried him off (June 5, 1647) to Newmarket.

§ 89. "On the sudden, one Cornet *Joyce*, with a party of Soldiers, fetcht away the King, notwithstanding the Parliament's Order for his Security. And this was done as if it had been against *Cromwell's* Will, and without any order or Consent of theirs; but so far was he (Joyce) from losing his Head for such a Treason, that it proved the means of his Preferment. And so far was *Cromwell* and his Soldiers from returning the King in Safety, that they detained him among them, and kept him with them, till they came to *Hampton Court*, and there they lodged him under the Guard of Col. *Whalley*, the Army quartering all about him. While he was here the mutable Hypocrites first pretended an extraordinary Care of the King's Honour, Liberty, Safety and Conscience. They blamed the Austerity of the Parliament, who had denied him the Attendance of his own Chaplains and of his Friends in whom he took most pleasure. They gave Liberty for his Friends and Chaplains to come to him. They pretended that they would save him from the Incivilities of the Parliament of Presbyterians.

---

[55] On May 31, 1647, Cromwell ordered Cornet Joyce, an officer in Fairfax's lifeguard, to get together a party of horse and to prevent the King's removal from Holmby. When Joyce came on the scene Colonel Graves, an ardent Presbyterian who was in charge of Charles, took flight. "Cromwell had given no orders for the King's removal." He came away on June 4, willingly, and persisted in going on to Newmarket, the Army's headquarters, when Fairfax sent Whalley to meet him and convey him back to Holmby. (Firth, *id.*, pp. 165-6.)

Whether this were while they tried what Terms they could make with him for themselves, or while they acted any other part, it is certain that the King's old Adherents began to extol the Army, and to speak against the Presbyterians more distastfully than before. When the Parliament offered the King Propositions of Concord (which *Vane's* Faction made as high and unreasonable as they could, that they might come to nothing) the Army forsooth offer him Proposals of their own, which the King liked better; but which of them to treat with he did not know. At last on the sudden the Judgment of the Army changed, and they began to cry for *Justice* against the King, and, with vile Hypocrisie to publish their Repentance, and cry God Mercy for their Kindness to the King, and confess that they were under a Temptation. But in all this *Cromwell* and *Ireton*, and the rest of the Council of War appeared not. The Instrument of all this Work must be the Common Soldiers. Two of the most violent Sectaries in each Regiment are chosen by the Common Soldiers by the Name of Agitators, to represent the rest in these great Affairs. All these together made a Council of which Col. *James Berry* was the President, that they might be used, ruled and dissolved at pleasure. No man that knew them will doubt whether this was done by *Cromwell's* and *Ireton's* Direction. This Council of Agitators takes not only the Parliament's Work upon themselves, but much more. They draw up a Paper called the *Agreement* of the People, as the Model or Form of a New Commonwealth. They have their own Printer, and publish abundance of wild Pamphlets, as changeable as the Moon. The thing contrived was an Heretical Democracy. When *Cromwell* had awhile permitted them thus to play themselves, partly to please them and confirm them to him, and chiefly to use them in his demolishing work, at last he seemeth to be so much for Order and Government as to blame them for their Disorder, Presumption and Headiness—as if they had done it without his Consent. This emboldeneth the Parliament (not to Censure them as Rebels, but) to rebuke them and prohibit them and claim their own Superiority; and, while the Parliament and Agitators are contending, a letter is secretly sent to Col. *Whalley*, to intimate that the Agitators had a design suddenly to surprise and murder the King. Some think that this was sent from a real Friend; but most think that it was contrived by *Cromwell* to affright the King out of the Land, or into some desperate Course which might give them Advantage against him. Colonel *Whalley* sheweth the Letter to the King, which put him into much fear of such ill-governed Hands; so that he secretly got Horses and slipt (Nov. 11, 1647) away towards the Sea with two of his Confidents only, who, coming to the Sea near *Southampton*, found that they were disappointed of the Vessel expected to transport them, and so were fain to pass over into the Isle of *Wight*-and there to commit his Majesty to the Trust of Colonel *Robert*

Hammond[56] who was Governor of a Castle there. A Day or two all were amazed to think what was become of the King; and then a Letter from the King to the House acquainted them that he was fain to fly thither from the Cruelty of the Agitators, who, as he was informed, thought to murder him; and urging them to treat about the ending of all these Troubles. But here *Cromwell* had the King in a Pinfold, and was more secure of him than before."

§ 90. "The Parliament and the *Scots*, and all that were loyal and sober-minded, abhorred these traitorous Proceedings of *Cromwell* and the Sectarian Army; but saw it a Matter of great difficulty to resist them." Nevertheless "the conscience of their Oath of Allegiance and Covenant[57] told them they were bound to hazard their Lives in the attempt."

Hence arose the Second Civil War. "The three Commanders for the Parliament in *Pembrokeshire* raised an Army against them, viz., Major General *Langhorn*,[58] Collonel *Powel*,[58] and Collonel *Poyer*.[58] The *Scots* raised a great Army under the Command of the Duke of *Hamilton*.[59] The *Kentish* Men rose under the Command of Lord *Goring* and others; and the *Essex* Men under Sir *Charles Lucas*.

But God's time was not come, and the Spirit of Pride and Schism must be known to the World by its Effects. Duke *Hamilton's* Army was easily routed in *Lancashire*,[60] and he taken, and the scattered Parts pursued till they came to nothing. *Langhorn*, with the *Pembrokeshire* Men, was totally routed by Collonel *Horton*, and, all the chief Commanders being taken Prisoners, it fell to Collonel *Poyer's* Lot to be shot to Death.[61] The *Kentish* Men were driven out of *Kent* into *Essex*, being foiled at *Maidstone*.

[*To be continued.*]

---

[56] 1621-1654 (See *D.N.B.*, article by Firth). By his marriage with Mary, a daughter of John Hampden, he was related to Cromwell. The saintly Dr. Hammond, one of the King's Chaplains, was his uncle.

[57] Baxter assumes that the oath of allegiance and the covenant were absolutely binding on the Parliament "and the Scots" whatever the King might do.

[58] Both Poyer and Langhorne went over to the King's party in 1648. Their combined forces were routed near St. Fagans on May 8, 1648, by Colonel Thomas Horton (d. 1649) to whom also Tenby Castle, long held by Colonel Powell, surrendered on May 31. (See *D.N.B.*)

[59] On July 8, 1648, when Hamilton entered England, his army amounted to 10,000 or 11,000 men, but it reached 24,000 later. (Firth, *id.*, p. 197.)

[60] Cromwell broke its strength at Preston on Aug. 17th. On the 25th, Hamilton capitulated to Lambert at Uttoxeter.

[61] At the surrender of Pembroke and its Castle to Cromwell on July 11th, Poyer and Langhorne were excepted from pardon on account of their treachery to the Parliamentary cause. They and others were tried by court-martial in April, 1649, and condemned to death, but only one was to die—the one upon whom the lot fell. It fell upon Poyer, who was shot in Covent Garden on April 25.

The Earliest Sunday School.

IT is not generally known that a strong claim to have established the first Sunday school can be put forward by a Congregational Church—Dursley Tabernacle, Gloucestershire—which recently celebrated the 150th. Sunday school anniversary. In 1863 the secretary was asked to make full enquiries with a view to establishing the truth of the local tradition that the school was started in 1778 by William King, and that he gave the idea to Robert Raikes of Gloucester, who is usually acclaimed as the founder of Sunday schools. The secretary, Mr. Alfred Bloodworth (whose younger sister, Mrs. W. H. Allen, is still one of the most faithful and respected members of the Tabernacle), took great pains with his task, and carried it out efficiently. Bound in the front of an old book containing minutes of teachers' meetings from 1859 to 1883 are the results of his enquiry, comprising copies of his own letters, originals or copies of letters he received, and records of verbally given information, with some comments and conclusions of his own.

The best evidence he obtained was the written testimony of the relatives of William King. A letter from his daughter (Mrs. Oldland, then nearly ninety years of age) tells us:

"My Honoured Father Mr King . . . Beeing in business at painswick on a Satterday and was informed that there was 2 men to suffer Death at Glouster insted of returning home to Dursley his strong feelings for his felow suffers resolv'd him to go to Glouster to see if he could see and converse with them and intending to spend the night with them if permited but the keeper of the prison thought it not proper as they ware Desperate Charicters and he abode in Glouster and on the Sabbath morn called on Mr Reaks [Raikes] both walk'd together by the Hand whare was many boys at Different Sports My Father said wat a pity the Sabbath Should be so Desocrated Mr [Raikes] answered how is it to be altered Sir Open a Sunday School I have Opened one at Dursley with the help of a faithful jorneyman but the multitud of business prevents me from taking so much time in it as I could wish as I feel I want rest Mr Reaks replyed it will not Do for Diseenters as my Father blonged to the Tabbenacle and one of the Revd Georve Wilfeelds [Whitfield's] followers then my Father answered then why not the Church Do it Mr R nam'd this to a Clergiman the name of Stock who paid a person to teach a few in 3 weeks after Mr Reaks printed it in his

news paper . . . I believe that the same acount will be found in a book written some yers ago—the Original of Sunday Schools."

It would be of great interest to know whether such a book actually was written, and if a copy still exists. At the Centenary celebrations of the Dursley Sunday school, held in 1883 (since the " school sermons " did not begin until 1783), reference was naturally made to the above letter. According to the report in the *Dursley Gazette* for June 23rd, 1883, a Mr. Higgs, of Gloucester, one of the speakers, " proceeded to detail the success he had met with in searching for corroborative evidence to the story. He described how, in searching the sheriff's records and old numbers of Mr. Raikes' newspaper, he found that at that time there were two men executed at Gloucester, and it was the only period for many years at which two men were executed together at Gloucester: that was in March of 1781. Still further corroboration he found in their being described as 'desperate' and part of a gang which had long infested the county. The word 'desperate' corroborated the story of Mr. King's daughter and explained the reason why Mr. King was refused admission, the governor thinking it would be unsafe."

Mrs. Oldland's account was supported by her nephew, Edward Weight, who wrote:

" I have often heard [my brother] say he was with my grandfather [William King] when the conversation took place between Mr. King and Mr. Raikes respecting Sunday Schools; shortly after Mr. Raikes brought the subject forward in the Gloucester Journal of which he was the Editor. My grandfather with the assistance of Mr. Adrian Newth of your Town had previously opened one at Dursley but was not so successful as they could have wished."

Mr. Bloodworth also sought information from the descendants of this Adrian Newth, the " faithful journeyman " who helped his master in his pioneer work. A son (also named Adrian) sent this account, which probably had been received from his father:

" Wm. King, cardworker, formed a Sunday School before Robert Raikes did. Mr. Raikes' efforts resulted from advice given him by Wm. King. On the occasion when Mr. King accompanied Mr. Raikes to the suburbs of the city of Gloucester, and when Mr. King advised Mr. Raikes to commence a Sunday School, Mr. King gave to a woman, who was induced to agree to hold a Sunday School, a lesson book suitable for use in such a school."

Additional testimony to the early existence of a Sunday schoo

in Dursley, though not certainly previous to the one established by Raikes, comes from several old men interviewed by Mr. Bloodworth. One of them, Samuel Thurston, born about 1793, had known William King's family, and according to him they used to say : " Our father proposed, Mr. Raikes seconded, and Rev. Mr. Scott [Stock ?] carried it out." Samuel Attwood remembered being taken to the Sunday school when about four years old (in 1788 or near it). Joseph Edwards said he attended it in 1789, when Adrian Newth was superintendent, and he cherished the memory of a " Christmas anniversary treat " in the superintendent's house. Jehoida Morgan was a scholar from 1789 to 1796, and recalled Adrian Newth and other teachers.

In the absence of contemporary written records, we have no fully conclusive evidence for the priority of the Dursley school, but there seems to be no reason to doubt the good faith and good memory of those whose testimony has been brought forward. Whether it was in 1778, as tradition has it, or a year or two later, it is highly probable that William King began a school before Robert Raikes did, and long enough before to have had time to give the project a thorough trial. We may therefore accept Mr. Bloodworth's own conclusion : " Mr. Raikes deserves, I think, the name of Promoter of Sunday schools more than that of Originator." Then how are we to account for the fact that William King's claim has been ignored ? I have by me, for instance, a little book written by Mrs. H. B. Paull in connexion with the Centenary of Sunday Schools, celebrated in 1880. It is entitled *Robert Raikes, and his Scholars*, and contains no mention at all of William King. Why is this ?

The chief reason is, no doubt, that William King was a Dissenter, and Robert Raikes a Churchman. To Mr. Bloodworth, writing sixty years ago, this point was evident enough. He says :

> " Mr. Raikes does not, positively, so far as I have been able to see, say that no one suggested starting a Sunday School to him, although that seems to be implied, which may be sprung from a want of candour and a desire to make out a case as much as possible in favour of the Church of England, which is not very surprising seeing the tendency of Churchmen very often was and still is almost to ignore the existence of dissent."

In saying this, Mr. Bloodworth may have had in mind a remark already quoted from the letter written by William King's

daughter, where Robert Raikes is reported to have said: "It will not Do for Diseenters." The attitude of which this is an example is displayed at its worst in the recorded memories of George Hill, one of the old men who were interviewed. His references require a brief explanation of the position of the church buildings. When the present Tabernacle was erected in 1808, the Parsonage alongside it, which is still in use, was boldly built just across the road from the old Rectory. That also is still occupied as a dwelling-house, but the Rector now lives in a larger building. Even more challenging, however, in the former days, was the fact that the Old Tabernacle, built in 1764 as a result of George Whitfield's influence, bounded the Rectory garden, and must have overshadowed the Rectory itself! Such proximity brought to a head the ancient feud between Church and Chapel. Here then is what George Hill had to say:

"I was born in 1783. My mother was a member, and my father a singer in the Old Tab. I have heard them speak of the tyranny of Madam Webster—the Archdeacon's wife—who lived in the Rectory near the Old Tab. Even a ladder wasn't allowed to be raised in the ground of the Rectory for repairs. She tried to injure the place by digging a trench close to the walls, the law however compelled the filling it up. She then planted trees near to the windows to keep the light out, these however all died with the exception of one, and that did but very little harm. She tried to interrupt a meeting held in front of the Tab. by getting a Farmer Hunt to run his dogs through and through the crowd—Madam Webster watching with high glee from a window of the Rectory. Hunt's having done so was a source of trouble to him on his death-bed."

George Hill also said: "Before I was breeched I went to the Church Sunday school then held in the Parish Church, Madam Webster superintending." Others confirmed the early formation of this school, and we can well believe that when it was in the hands of a bigot like Madam Webster the offensive Tabernacle school had a stern struggle for existence. The fact that George Hill was sent to the Church school suggests that economic or other pressure was brought to bear upon his—and other—Dissenting parents. A remark made by old Joseph Edmonds lends colour to this: "The Archdeacon's wife—Madam Webster—hated my mother because she was a meetinger and wouldn't go to Church." He also reminds us of the different status of Dissenters in those days. Speaking of the year 1788 or near it he said: "A Mr. Lewis was minister at the Tabernacle—

ministers were not so fine—didn't live in such fine houses—then as now."

A second likely reason for the passing over of William King in favour of Robert Raikes was the disgrace which overtook the Dissenter. Mr. Bloodworth wrote: "Mr. King towards the end of his life met with pecuniary difficulties." One of the secretary's aged informants, Samuel Thurston, told him:

"Though William was put in prison for debt he was honest. 'As honest as William King' was quite a saying. I have heard a woman in Bristol was the person who put him there—her hard-heartedness was spoken of with disgust, and some said, 'no one but a woman would have been hard-hearted enough for it.'"

Nevertheless the unfortunate event must have made it awkward for those who wished to press the claims of the Christian pioneer. Probably an added difficulty was the character of one of his sons, about whom Charles Champion (born in 1770) said to Mr. Bloodworth:

"His son William was a great poacher and drunkard. Old Lord Berkeley sent him to Gloucester gaol thirteen times for poaching—chiefly on Cam Peak [near Dursley]. His conduct was a great grief to his father."

We must add to these two reasons a third, the modesty of William King's own family, which checked the early advancement of his claim. For this we have the testimony of his grandson. Writing in 1864 he said: "I well remember my Brother was very anxious some fifty years ago to take the matter up, my father allways objected to his wishes."

Owing to the delay in making known the Dissenter's work, it had become, even by 1864, impossible to give perfectly convincing proof. We can sympathize with Edward Weight when he said in the letter last quoted: "I am sorry and regret much that the question was not taken in hand years ago, if it had, in my opinion, there would have been but little difficulty in proving my grandfather was the promoter of Sabbath Schools." This statement gains support from a tantalizing reference in a letter from the Rev. J. Stratford of Cirencester, which begins: "I regret that it is not in my power at present to give you more information about Mr. King. The gentleman of whom I could have obtained it died on the 2nd. inst." He was writing on the 10th. of February 1864. The information he had already given was printed by him in No. 13 of the *Gloucestershire Tracts*—a series of historical papers being published at

the time. Mr. Bloodworth copied the extract referring to William King, but this gives us no fresh evidence.

The correspondence reveals some interesting facts about the two chief personalities concerned. William King was born in 1730 of a family which had already given several bailiffs to Dursley. He himself became bailiff in 1778. After noting this, Mr. Bloodworth wrote :

" this shows he was a respectable well-to-do man—and I have heard he was at this time. He carried on business in Woodmancote . . . and kept on a number of hands. It was probably as early as this that he started his Sunday School. He had a large family, mostly daughters. Whether he had more than 2 sons I know not. Their names were William and John—the former wild, the latter steady. John was the first player of the first organ in the old Tabernacle—so I have heard."

The only family record Mr. Bloodworth could find in the old graveyard was the sad inscription :

" In memory of Ann the daughter of William and Anna King of this town who departed this life 5th Novr. 1773, aged 1 month."

A couple of years after this was born the daughter who became Mrs. Oldland. In the letter already quoted from she gave this quaint testimony :

" My Father was a most intiligent man and his Company was sought by them of hier [higher] Class and always very affectionate to children."

Mr. Bloodworth recorded :

" All or nearly all those who recollect Mr. King speak about his big head and particularly big nose, on each side of which was a little prominence, from which he got the name ' King with the three noses.' "

One who had known him referred to William King as " a benevolent, good man." His proverbial honesty and financial misfortune have already been mentioned. He died, at the age of 73, on December 8th., 1803, as a result of mortification due to the piercing of his hand by a " spil."

It appears that William King did not continue very long in connexion with the school he formed, but we are told that before giving up the work, he tried, helped by a Mr. Moore, to establish Sunday schools elsewhere. The superintendency of the Dursley school passed (probably in 1785) into the hands of Adrian Newth. When a young man he was a card-worker in the employment of William King, and (as we have learned) was

associated with him in the founding of the school, in which he became one of the most respected teachers. He was "subsequently a worthy deacon of the Tabernacle for several years." One of his pupils, Jehoida Morgan, who knew him up to his last days, spoke of him to Mr. Bloodworth as "an eminent Christian," and gave this interesting reminiscence:

"For years before his death he attended the weekly Church meetings[1] held in the old vestry. These meetings were very precious —were for conversation etc.—anyone feeling so inclined stating his or her Spiritual experience, which often tended much to the edification of the rest. They were for singing and prayer also. When about to separate Adrian would often give out with energy a hymn beginning with,

'Come on, my friends, let's mend our pace
For glory, glory, glory,
And you shall see Him face to face
In glory, glory, glory.'"

A brother of Adrian Newth, Samuel, also taught in the Dursley Sunday school. It seems that Adrian continued to superintend until near the close of the century, when the school for a time ceased to exist. Possibly he had to give up the work, and there was no one ready to take his place; or perhaps at the time the opposition of the Church school was too strong. In or near 1805 the school was re-established by the efforts of the Rev. James Taylor, with whom Mr. Bloodworth was able to correspond in 1864. In that year he learnt that "a nephew of old Adrian's" was Professor of Mathematics in New College, St. John's Wood, London.[2] William King's most loyal supporter died in 1820.

In concluding this account of the origin of the first Sunday school the comment of the founder's daughter may fittingly be quoted: "thus a Cloud have risen no biger than a man's hand but have spread far and wide." The metaphor is not so far-fetched after all! When Sunday schools began, the state of the children reminds us of the words in *Amos*: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord." William King in his day, like

[1] Only a few miles from Dursley is Rodborough Tabernacle, Stroud, where the Rev. C. E. Watson has built up a weekly Church meeting which is now the life of the Church. To attend it is a memorable experience. If this is a way forward for Congregationalism, it also appears to be a lesson from the past!

[2] Samuel Newth, 1821-1898; Prof. of Mathematics at New College, London, 1855-89; Principal of the College, 1872-89.

Elijah in a more distant age, was God's servant who was confident of the end of a devastating drought. The rapid growth of the Sunday school movement in the last century revealed how deep and wide-spread was the need it set out to satisfy. To-day the total enrolment of Sunday schools for the world is estimated at over thirty million teachers and scholars. When we honour the vision and courage of those who began this great work let us not forget him who is thus commemorated on a mural tablet in the present Dursley Tabernacle :

" William King was one of the First Members of the Old Tabernacle, erected on the spot where he now lies interred. He originated the first Sunday School in this Town and suggested to his friend Robert Raikes the establishment of Sunday Schools in Gloucester."

H. I. Frith.

Correspondence.

Ambrose Barnes and Richard Baxter.

Sir,

In the sprightly paper contributed to the last issue of the *Transactions* by Mr. R. S. Robson on Ambrose Barnes there is a statement about Baxter which calls for comment, viz. :

" He (Barnes) 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."

Of course this is based on the *Memoirs* of Barnes, edited (from a M.S. by M. R.) for the Surtees Society in 1867. The relevant passage is the following (pp. 151, 2 ; italics mine) :—

" He (Barnes) was in high esteem with the family of the Ashursts . . . one night, at *old* Alderman Ashurst's, he met with the Reverend Mr. Simeon Ash, and his wife, together with the famous Mr. Richard Baxter and *his wife* ; the alderman and his partner *Mr. Gregson* being Alderman Barnes his constant correspondents and most loyall friends. At supper, good old father Ash began to express what hopes he had from the King's *being nearly come in*, when Mr. Baxter took occasion to reflect upon Cromwell, and what giddy fannattical times the times of the late Commonwealth were. He

instanced in two men, whom he one day saw come into a church-porch where, *finding the minister in divine service, as the common Prayer is called,* fell to grumble—" Porridge yet! What the devil Porridge yet! "

This poor story Mr. Baxter could not be hindered from *printing afterwards over and over* Mr. Barnes, beginning to say something in reply, was prevented by the two gentlewomen who *bitterly* inveighed against the *old* man's pievishness and partiality.

Mrs. Ash said it was unreasonable and unjust to take the measures of a nation from the indiscretions of particular persons and basely ungratefull to reflect on the noble instruments of those revolutions for the sake of one or two sorry fellows. " I tell ye," said Mr. Baxter with his usuall acrimony, " I never liked the spirit of those times! " And " I tell ye," said his wife, Mrs. Baxter, " I as little like your spirit who I know *speak out of resentment* which *hardens* you to disparage that which *I am persuaded,* whatever frail and perfidious men might be guilty of in the part they acted in it, *was the work of God.*" The dialogue had *gone to a quarrell,* had not the two aldermen interposed and diverted the discourse."

Now we have here what can be shown to be just a tangle of errors :

1. Mr. Ashurst's partner (according to Baxter[1]) was not Mr. Gregson but Mr. Row, a draper.

2. The alleged date of the supper puts it before 1660—" the King's being nearly come in "—when the so-called *old* Alderman Ashurst was neither old nor an alderman. He was born in the same year as Baxter (1615)[2].

3. Margaret Charlton and Baxter were not betrothed till April 1662, and were married in September of that year, and Simeon Ash died before August 24th of the same year. How then could he have met Baxter and *his wife* in 1660 ?

4. After August 1645 it was illegal to use the Book of Common Prayer, and though the law was not always obeyed or strictly enforced it is very unlikely that Baxter ever saw two Puritans " in a church-porch listening to its public use and merely grumbling, " Porridge yet! What the devil, porridge yet! " They were far more likely to set the law at work.

5. I don't pretend to know all that Baxter wrote, but I am pretty familiar with most of his books and I have never yet come across a trace of " this poor story " which " Mr. Baxter could not be prevented from printing afterwards over and over."

6. Mrs. Baxter agreed with her husband in his attitude to the Commonwealth, and we have his assurance that they differed from each other in nothing material from first to last. Nor, even if she

[1] *Funeral sermon for Mr. Ashurst,* p. 38 (1680).

[2] *id.,* p. 59.

had differed from him ever so strongly, is it in the least degree credible that Mrs. Baxter, who was a lady, would have "bitterly inveighed against" him before others, and even compelled the two aldermen to intervene, so as to prevent a "quarrel."

Indeed the story is ridiculous, and not worth noticing except as a specimen of the many libels circulated about him by malice or prejudice. Mr. R., the unknown compiler of the *Memoirs*, was evidently one of the prejudiced, if not malicious. He appears to have been an Independent of the fanatical sort. Baxter's politics and Churchmanship, therefore, were distasteful. He had no personal knowledge of Baxter: for he wrote in 1716, twenty-five years after his death; and he snapped greedily at any bit of legend to his discredit which time floated down to him.[3]

We need not blame him, but we must not echo him as Mr. Robson seems to do when he speaks of "that irreconcilable Richard Baxter"; and it is a gratuitous aspersion to insinuate—as Mr. Robson does in the words "doubtless with more reasons than she could state"—that Mrs. Baxter found life with her husband too bad for words.

"These nineteen years," said he, after her death, "I know not that we ever had any breach in the point of love or point of interest, save only that she somewhat grudged that I had persuaded her, for my quietness, to surrender so much of her estate, to a disabling her from helping others so much as she earnestly desired."

No jarring note for 19 years, save one which passed as soon as she consented to claim less than her due for the sake of peace with her brother, though at the cost of leaving her with less to give away!

Can one picture a union more perfect?

Yours sincerely,

FRED. J. POWICKE.

[3] Cf. *Memoirs*, pp. 16, 19.