
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.

WE are glad to note that the Baptist Historical Society has shown its warm appreciation of the long and distinguished services of its Editor, Dr. W. T. Whitley. Dr. Whitley's devotion to historical study has long been an inspiration, and not to Baptists only. We trust he will long be able to draw upon his stores to the enlightenment and profit of many students. This recognition coincides with the publication by our sister Society of a facsimile reprint of Thomas Helwys's *Mistery of Iniquity*.

* * * *

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held on 15 May, under the chairmanship of the President, Dr. Grieve, who received the hearty congratulations of the Society on his election to the Chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. The officers were re-elected, with thanks for their services, and members then settled down to a discussion of the future policy of the Society. The Rev. A. G. Matthews outlined a scheme whereby the Society should sponsor and guide research, the results of which should be communicated at Meetings and, where feasible, in the *Transactions*. He pointed out that it was difficult to obtain a representative attendance of members and others during the crowded weeks of the Annual and Autumnal Meetings of the Congregational Union, and that it was embarrassing when a speaker from without was confronted by a meagre audience. He suggested that at least one meeting a year should have for its main purpose the receiving from members of the Society of the fruits of their researches. It was generally felt that this suggestion was wise and timely, and Mr. Matthews agreed to act as "Research Organizer." Members who desire to co-operate in research should communicate directly with him at Farmcote, Oxted, Surrey, or with the Editor. Meanwhile Mr. Matthews suggests that a start might be made at the next meeting of the Society by discussing "Dr. Johnson and Nonconformity"—what he said about Nonconformity and what Nonconformists said

about him. Any contributions on this subject will be welcome.

It may be possible to develop this policy by arranging groups for co-operative research in different localities or on special periods or subjects. Mr. Matthews will have his own suggestions for a group; there is a possibility of work in Oxford on Nonconformity in Oxford (communicate with Mr. G. F. Nuttall, B.A., Mansfield College, Oxford); and the Editor has many side-lines connected with the history of the Colleges which went to constitute Hackney and New College, London.

* * * *

It has been decided to hold the next meeting of the Society, not at Brighton during the Union Meetings, but in the Students' Room at the Memorial Hall, London, on November 20th at 4.15 p.m., when many members from the Provinces have to be in London.

* * * *

With increased activity in research must go strenuous efforts to extend the Society's list of members. Other denominational Societies have larger memberships and, sometimes, denominational grants. The Balance Sheet (see p. 288) discloses the fact that our Balance in Hand is now exhausted. The only alternative to an increased income is to reduce the number of issues of the *Transactions* to one a year. which we should be very loth to do.

* * * *

It is encouraging to note that historians of local churches have been particularly busy. Among histories that have reached us are Mr. N. Willett Bocock's *The Abbey Lane Congregational Church, Saffron Walden*, 1665–1833, Mr. W. J. Brain's *Broad St. Chapel, Reading*, 1662–1912, the Rev. H. Cunliffe-Jones's *The History of Witney Congregational Church*, 1662–1935, and Dr. John Stevens's *Chronicles of Claylands Congregational Church*, 1835–1935. Work is in progress on the records of Lion Walk, Colchester, and Sherwell, Plymouth. We should be glad to receive copies of all local church histories as they are published. Where they are not printed we commend the example of Mr. F. G. Davies, of Reigate, who has had his very full account of the history of the Reigate church (1662–1932) typed and bound and deposited in the Congregational Library.

A history of Congregationalism in Sussex is also in preparation. Material should be sent to the Rev. W. C. Chisholm and the Rev. W. Silver.

The Lollard Movement after 1384: its characteristics and continuity.

THE Lollard Movement is one of which it is surprisingly difficult to obtain a convincing grasp. After the death of Wyclif in 1384 the Lollards had no scholar or theological leader amongst them; Hereford recanted, as did Purvey, who, like the Wycliffite party which trickled on at Oxford,[1] seems to have shown no fresh initiative, once his translator's work was done. So also, after the death of Oldcastle in 1417, no nobleman or political leader appears to support the movement. It tends to become vague and intangible, and

effugit imago
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno.

Something of the characteristics of the movement, however, one may certainly recover, and my object in this paper is first to suggest the nature of these characteristics, and then to consider some of the evidence for the continuity of the movement through the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.

It is a historical as well as a philosophical judgement that an ever-recurring fundamental ground of division between the Roman Catholic Church and heretical sects has been the question of the seat of authority in religion. In Christianity as a whole the question may be answered in one of three ways; authority may be found in the Church, the Bible, or the self. Each of these may be subdivided: the Church may be the Church as represented by the local priest, by tradition, by the Pope, or by a General Council; the Bible may be taken as a whole, or especial authority may be found in parts of it, or in the words of Jesus alone; the authority of the self may be thought of as dependent on the supernatural enlightening of the self by the Holy Spirit, on the universal but still God-given gift of reason, or finally on reason in itself, as the possession of man in his own right. The attitude which we adopt towards the Reformation and towards the history of Protestantism

[1] See A. B. Emden, *An Oxford Hall in Mediæval Times*, c. 5.

depends very much on the side we support in this controversy of authority; according to our decision we shall condemn the Reformation as mistaken or arrogant, praise it as the Golden Age in Christianity, or regard it as but the beginning of a movement towards freedom, a freedom which, through the clinging power of tradition, it could not itself immediately attain. Whatever be our attitude, however, the fact would seem to be that at the Reformation, the authority of the Church (as then constituted) was denied, the authority of the Bible asserted, and the authority of the self, in experience and in reasoning, foreshadowed. What of the Lollards?

The outstanding characteristic of the Lollards is their attitude to the Bible. Of this practically everything else in their movement may be said to be an outcome. It is useless to look among them for any direct foreshadowing of the authority of the self, even as directly inspired by God, unless it be in the implications of Wyclif's doctrine of dominion by grace, which, in any case, his followers never worked out. The Lollards provide no parallel to the Strassburg Anabaptist who asked, "*meinst du dass mein Geist sich nach dem Maas des Paulus einschränken müsse?*"[1] The Lollards would have been at one with the orthodox in condemning any such humanist arrogance; to them the part played by the human spirit in selecting and interpreting Biblical passages was not apparent. Reginald Pecock alone dared to exalt "the doom of human reason" as the final authority, and he, though he suffered bitterly for the heresy of it, had intended it as an argument *against* the Bibliolatry of the Lollards. For bibliolaters they were in the full later sense. Just as to the Puritans Rome is the "daughter of Babylon," "the great whore sitting upon many waters," and the Pope is discovered to have the number of the Beast, in that the letters of the words *Dux Cleri*, when considered as Roman numerals (DCLXVI),[2] add up to 666. In fact the Lollards even advanced to a Biblical casuistry, which allowed them to answer the question *In ecclesiam credis?* in the affirmative, on the ground that they believed in themselves, whose bodies were the temples of God.[3]

Yet, without intending it, they did lay foundations for the later claims of reason. The Lollards, like the Apostles,

[1] Adam, *Evangelische Kirchengeschichte der Stadt Strassburg*, p. 1171, as cited by Courvoisier, *La Notion d'Eglise chez Bucer*, p. 6, n. 4.

[2] Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe.*

[3] Clark, *Lincoln Dio. Documents* (E.E.T.S.).

were unlearned and ignorant men ; as Trevelyan points out, this was less their own fault than that of their persecutors, who made it a crime to read or possess Lollard books or to have a Lollard school. This meant the complete detachment of some of the most alive religious people in the country from the orthodox scholastic tradition. Instead of the learned and ideal arguments advanced by Wyclif, with their basis in academic tradition, a rough horse-sense appeared in the forefront of apologetic, not sufficiently self-conscious or articulate to defend reason *per se* and *suo jure*, yet none the less dependent on the reasonings of common sense. To bury the corpse of a dead person in consecrated ground does the soul of the dead person no more good than if the corpse had been thrust into a bog, they would say, and a priest has no more power to make the body of Christ than has a wheatstalk or Jack Hare. Such language, together with the earnest and straightforward positive language of their own Biblical preaching, of which unfortunately we have no account, but which must have been their mainstay, and which perhaps (like the preaching of the Friars) included illustrations from homely incidents, would work quietly but efficiently in reconnecting religion with the *realities* of everyday secular life, and thereby implicitly in heightening self-respect in the religion of the individual. Their Bible-religion and their common sense combined in condemning much of the current religion as mistaken in theory and worthless in practice : for transubstantiation they found no defence in the Bible (and it should be noted that this in itself demands the application of the use of reason to the categorical saying *Hoc est corpus meum*) ; confession to one another they found commanded, rather than confession to a priest, while of pilgrimages and devotion to images they very naturally found no trace. It needs a little historical imagination to appreciate the contemptuous zeal with which they condemned these last, and the mental revolution this implied in a society in which the place of such things in religion was so large and so assured ; it is only at the Reformation, in the reports of the commissioners for the dissolution of the monasteries, that their importance, their ridiculousness, and their choking power become blindingly apparent.

A further result of the Lollards' devotion to the Bible was a growth of the use of the vernacular in religion. It is as the translators and users and distributors of the Bible that the

Lollards are usually thought of, and perhaps indirectly by this means as assisting in the nationalistic break-up of the Middle Ages. Too much should not be made of this. The English Bible was no doubt distributed far and wide, and Wyclif's *Wicket* seems to have been much and continuously read; but the constant confiscation and burning of Lollard books must have lessened the extent of their influence, and in any case the Lollards were in this but the children of their age, rather than initiators. Rolle's glossed English psalter remained "the only biblical book which the laity might use without license"; but the Carthusian Nicholas Love's *Mirrour of the Blessed Lyf of Iesu Crist*, first licensed by Arundel in 1410, was "probably more popular than any other single book in the fifteenth century," and it was not the only English gospel harmony. Further, "there was a contemporary movement in favour of vernacular literature . . . in Germany, France, Spain and Italy," as well as in England.[1]

Their ethical views, though not unimportant, the Lollards shared with the Waldenses and other medieval heretics. It is not surprising that men who understood the Bible literally and who were sufficiently emancipated from convention to assert that an unspoken prayer was as good as a spoken prayer, and a prayer in a field as good as a prayer in a church, should also assert that oaths and war were unChristian (the use of reason being, again, implied in the selection of texts), and that the combination of church offices and state offices was hurtful to both. Wyclif had put the pacifist principle far more clearly than it was put by the Reformers: "He who says his Paternoster cannot go to war."[2]

With ethics politics and industry may be associated, and a word must be said about the relation of the Lollards to these, the more since, until recently, they have been supposed to have had a large share in such economic discontent as came to a head in the Peasants' Revolt. M. Reville[3] has shown, after detailed research, that

> *leur révolte, selon toute vraisemblance, n'eut aucun caractère religieux . . .*
> *aucun des chroniqueurs n'accuse de lollardisme les insurgés de ces comtés,*

[1] See M. Deanesly, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xv. 349—358.

[2] These are not Wyclif's actual words, but his sermon on the gospel for the fifth Sunday after Easter makes this simple principle evident.

[3] *Le Soulèvement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre en* 1381.

and much more to the same effect. Oman[1] also discharges the Lollards of all responsibility for the revolt. Moreover, one of the twelve Lollard conclusions presented to Parliament in 1395 reveals an almost quietistic attitude to industry in general.

> ye multitude of craftis nout nedful usid in our chiche norschith michil synne in wast, curiosite and disgysing. . . . us thinketh that goldsmethis and armoreris and all manere craftis nout nedeful to man aftir ye apostle schulde ben distroyd for ye encres of vertu.[2]

So also Trevelyan has been able to find "between the years 1381 and 1520, only one case of a Lollard accused of holding communistic theories," and "not a single case of a Lollard charged with stirring up the peasantry to right their social wrongs." Wyclif's doctrine of dominion by grace did not bear the economic fruit one might have expected.

Politically, it cannot be questioned that they showed more activity than they did economically, but here also the activity was incidental rather than an expression of a distinguishing purpose. The affair of St. Giles' Fields of 1414, which is hardly to be found in modern history books,[3] was a real scare, and was still remembered a hundred years later—"*annales nostri testantur*,"[4] writes Tunstall to Erasmus of it—but here again Trevelyan finds "no evidence . . . of any other motive save religion." Oldcastle was their leader, Oldcastle was in danger, and the Lollards had not sufficiently assimilated their anti-militarist doctrine to see that they might not rightly fight on his behalf. In 1431 Jack Sharpe headed an abortive agitation by leaflets for the disendowment of the church, which we have seen was a Lollard aim; in 1447 there was a rebellion in Somerset, where Lollardy was strong, perhaps through the tenants of Oldcastle's stepson-in-law, who held land in the county,[5] and the priest was expelled and the bishop's officers beaten; but such sporadic riotings hardly disturbed the public peace, and cannot be said to show a distinctly political Lollard aim as apart from the occasional bubbling over of Lollard principles into politics.

---

[1] *The Great Revolt of 1381.*

[2] *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xxii. 29.

[3] But see J. H. Wylie, *Henry V.*, I. c. 17.

[4] *Erasmi Epp.* (ed. P. S. Allen), 1367.

[5] Waugh & Wylie, *Henry V.* III. 88.

What they do, however, help to show—1414, 1431, 1447—is the continuity of the movement. Reginald Lane Poole, perhaps with less than his usual caution, lays it down that the "Wycliffite tradition" which continued

> without a break until the time of the Protestant Reformation . . . was so slight and attenuated that it exercised no appreciable influence upon our later religious history,[1]

and many other writers are of the same opinion. That there is a close parallel between the Lollard and the Reforming movements in their negative attitude to the Church and in their positive attitude to the Bible, and that the Lollards further laid the way for the coming of the claims of reason, we have now seen; it remains to consider how far the continuity of the Lollard movement and its merging in the Reformation may be accepted. It was necessarily such an underground movement that its traces must be *sought*, and there seems to be no one who has co-ordinated the discoveries of local research. That the movement was wide-spread in Oldcastle's time is evident from the appointment of commissioners in as many as twenty counties to try those suspected of Lollardry.[2] At the other end of the period, in 1511, we have Ammonio writing to Erasmus that the price of wood was going up, the heretics were taking so much of it for burning, and that his servant's brother, *stipes verius quam homo*, had himself started a *secta* and had disciples.[3] What of the hundred years in between?

We can naturally list here only a few pieces of evidence. Miss Graham declares that "throughout the fifteenth century Lollard beliefs held ground among the artisans of Bristol,"[4] and we find the same Bristol smith named twice as giving Lollard books to a man tried in 1447 and to another tried in 1462. In Northamptonshire, where John Fox, the Mayor of Northampton in 1392, though attacked for his Lollardry in that year, was again Mayor in 1399 and 1400, there were places where the movement prevailed during the fifteenth century, and the places were those which in the two succeeding centuries were permeated with Puritanism. The number

---

[1] *Wycliffe & Movements for Reform*, pp. 118 f. .

[2] J. H. Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[3] *Ep.* 239.

[4] *Vict. County Hist. of Glos.*, II. 22.

and the vehemence of Pecock's books in the middle of the fifteenth century are, again, evidence of the power of the movement the bishop hoped to quash. In 1457 there was a congregation at Chesterton, Cambridgeshire, possessing three teachers, who, as usual, denied transubstantiation, the necessity of confession, extreme unction, fasting, and so forth. In the same year two brothers of Somersham, Huntingdonshire, acknowledged to the bishop of Lincoln that they had sworn, in a large Lollard meeting, to bring as many as possible into the movement and not to reveal the existence of the movement or the names of its adherents, until there were sufficient of them to destroy Antichrist. At or in the neighbourhood of Amersham, Buckinghamshire, Lollards were tried, imprisoned for life or put to death in 1414, 1428, and 1462 ; and at the trial of Thomas Man in 1518 evidence was brought that among the congregations which he had instructed was one at Amersham, " a godly and great company, which had continued in that doctrine and teaching twenty-three years." At Newbury also Man had found " a glorious and sweet society of faithful favourers, who had continued the space of fifteen years together " ; London, Chelmsford, Henley, Norfolk and Suffolk had also known his ministry ; and he claimed to have turned seven hundred persons to his religion.[1]

Such evidence as this, and more could probably be collected,[2] surely makes it apparent that the underground workings of the Lollard Movement had more influence in preparing the way for the Reformation in England than Lane Poole allows. To measure the extent of the movement by the number of prosecutions, and so, because in the middle of the fifteenth century the number of prosecutions was small, to suppose that in those years the movement was dead, is at best a superficial method. There was no new leader, no new doctrine, to give any other name but Lollard to those who, in increasing numbers, suffered for heresy in the years either side of 1500 ; and, when no living leader was claimed, the increasing numbers themselves demand the moral support of continuity with the past. Further, in his letter to Erasmus, already quoted, Tunstall says in so many words :

[1] Foxe.

[2] The *Transactions* of local archæological societies need combing, as well as episcopal registers.

Neque enim una aut altera perniciosa novitas ingeritur, sed ad ingentem Vvicleficarum[1] *haeresum catervam nova accedunt arma.*

The numbers were at last, with the help of European movements, becoming strong enough to destroy Antichrist.

The merging of the Lollard Movement in the Reformation may be seen working out in different ways in Colet and Latimer. Colet was the son of a Lord Mayor of London and of a Buckinghamshire family, and Erasmus writes of him :

> *Nullus erat liber tam haereticus quem ille non attente evolveret, dicens se plus aliquotiens ex illis capere fructus quam ex horum libris qui sic omnia definiunt ut frequenter adulentur coryphaeis, non nunquam et sibi ipsis.*[2]

To Colet's sermons on the *Epistles*, with their fresh commonsense approach, the Lollards are said to have flocked, and at the trial of the Lollard John Butler evidence was brought that he had been persuaded to attend Colet's sermons. Colet himself was attacked for essentially Lollard heresies by his bishop, Fitzjames ; yet, like Erasmus, he had too much of the quiet scholar in him to care to make a stand, and in 1511 he was actually appointed one of the judges in a trial of Lollards by Archbishop Warham.

Latimer is popularly thought of as the forward-looking man, with faith in the future through the blood of the martyrs, but without an undue stretch of the imagination he may equally be considered the last of the Lollards. He came from the county of Leicestershire ; his homely outspoken sermons to Henry and Edward alike had their patterns in the sermons of Wyclif's " poor priests " and their successors, though Latimer also introduced economic teaching ; and the candle he lit at Oxford in 1555, in the enduring light of which he had such confidence, was a candle which had caught fire from a Lollard tinder-box. Ignorant, mistaken, fanatical the Lollards must often have been ; but in their devotion to the Bible which they made their own, and in the sincere common sense with which they attacked the accumulations of tradition, they hold an important place in the evolution of English Church History.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

---

[1] *Cf.* the interlocutor's remark of Pullus (*i.e.* Colet) in Erasmus' *Peregrinatio Religionis Ergo* : " *Viclefita quispiam, ut opinor.*" *Cf.* also the late use of the term Lollard as given in *O.E.D.*—till 1625 in an oath, according to Summers, *Our Lollard Ancestors*, p. 67.

[2] *Ep.* 1211.

The Huguenot Dispersion.

THROUGHOUT the Reformed Churches of France the 27th October is to be observed as a day of solemn remembrance of the 250th anniversary of the Revocation by Louis XIV. of the Edict of Nantes—a Royal act which had far-reaching and abiding results not only in France itself but many other lands.

Granted by Henry IV. in April, 1598, the Edict of Nantes, says Lord Acton,

> forms an epoch in the progress of toleration—that is, in the history of liberty. It pacified France and afforded to the minority sufficient strength and safety, not on the basis of religious equality but in the shape of circumscribed and definite privilege. The Edict involved no declaration of new principles and no surrender of ancient claims. The power of the Protestants was acknowledged—not the prerogative of conscience. The Protestants enjoyed the faculty of self-government, and their great writers and scholars were free to influence opinion by their writings.

Specifically, the Edict accorded to the Huguenots freedom of conscience, civil equality, limited liberty of worship, guarantees for the administration of justice, and a State subsidy for the maintenance of Huguenot pastors and troops.

The Edict was avowedly to be permanent, but in the reign of Louis XIV. the rights of the Huguenots were gradually taken away until, in October, 1685, the King deliberately revoked the Edict, with the intention of wiping out Protestantism altogether wherever his writ ran. Louis's action was very largely due to the Church in France, which had not only never been in favour of the Edict but ever since its enactment had passionately desired and worked for its withdrawal.

The Jesuits were especially elated by the Revocation, which had been brought about largely by their intrigues. It enabled them to fill their schools and nunneries with the children of Protestants, who were compelled by law to pay for their education by Jesuit priests. To furnish the necessary

accommodation, nearly the whole of the Protestant temples which had not already been pulled down were made over to the Jesuits to be converted into monastic schools and nunneries.

The King had solemnly sworn, at the beginning of his reign, to maintain the Edict, but he came to look upon himself as really the sole proprietor of all the territory in his kingdom, the sole legislator, the supreme judge, the living epitome of the whole State. At length he came to think that minds as well as bodies were beneath his sway, and he treated as high treason all conscientious objections to his sovereign pleasure. So it came to pass that

> the King congratulated himself on his power and his piety; the Bishops wrote panegyrics of him; the Jesuits made the pulpits resound with his praises.

The aged Chancellor of France, Le Tellier, on affixing the great seal of France to the deed of revocation, was so overjoyed that he exclaimed, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace: for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." The Chancellor believed, as did the King, that the Edict would bring all to an end; really it was but the beginning.

What did the Revocation mean? One writer puts it in this way:

> Protestants could neither be born, nor live, nor die, without State and priestly interference. Protestant midwives were not permitted to exercise their functions; Protestant doctors were prohibited from practising; Protestant surgeons and apothecaries were suppressed; Protestant advocates and lawyers were interdicted; all Protestant schools, public and private, were put down. Protestants were no longer employed by the Government—not even as labourers on the public roads. Even Protestant grocers were forbidden to exercise their calling. There must be no Protestant libraries, booksellers, or printers. All Bibles, Testaments, and books of religious instruction were collected and publicly burned; there were bonfires in almost every town. Protestant grooms were forbidden to give riding lessons. Artisans—shoemakers, tailors, masons, carpenters—were forbidden to work without certificates that their religion was Catholic. Protestant barbers were forbidden to cut hair. Protestant washerwomen were excluded from their washing-places on the rivers. In fact, there was scarcely a degradation that could be invented or an insult that could be perpetrated that was not practised upon those who refused to be of "the King's religion."

This is by far from being the whole of the story. At no time in France had it been an easy matter to be a Protestant; after the Revocation, it became almost impossible. The consequences of the King's action were by no means limited to the religious sphere. "In almost every branch of industry," writes R. L. Poole, in his *History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion*, "the Protestants surpassed the Catholics"; and when they left their native land rather than forswear their faith, they naturally took with them their habits of application and of industry.

It is thought that more than a quarter of a million became exiles for conscience' sake. Large numbers settled in Holland, in Germany, in England, and in Switzerland, but others went to Scotland, to Ireland, to Boston, New York, South Carolina, Maryland, and Virginia.

As an example of the way in which the refugees were treated, the case of Holland may be glanced at. As the people of the Netherlands themselves had suffered for their Protestant faith, it is no matter for surprise that the exiles' treatment there was so friendly. The Estates of Friesland resolved to grant to all foreign families whom stress of religious opposition had forced to leave their homes every right enjoyed by citizens of the country. In other provinces collections were taken to meet the needs of the newcomers; master-workers were free to practise their crafts without fee; advances of money were made for trade purposes; pastors were given a State allowance and allotted to the places where the refugees had settled in the greatest numbers. In one town alone—Middelburg—in the eight years from 1685 to 1693, 532 newcomers were naturalized. At Dordrecht the burghers welcomed the exiles into their houses, cared for them as for their own children, and put them in the way of earning their bread honestly. Rotterdam seems to have been the chief resort of the poorer emigrants. Within one month of the Revocation 5,000 (chiefly from Normandy) had arrived. In Amsterdam the French grew from 2,000 in 1684 to 15,000 by the end of the century. Six weeks from the Revocation 180 Huguenot ministers were in Holland. In 1684 free passage was offered to any Huguenots who were willing to apply themselves to husbandry or handicraft in the Cape Colony. About 80 families went out and were established at Drakenstein, about 40 miles north of the Cape.

The English seaports all the way from the Severn on the

west to the Thames on the east were thronged with fugitives. Churches were formed at Bristol, Barnstaple, Bideford, Plymouth, Dartmouth, and Exeter. In addition, Winchelsea, Rye, Dover, Sandwich, Faversham, and Yarmouth received refugees who mostly were on their way to Norwich and Canterbury. There are records of calico-workers at Bromley; cotton-spinners at Bideford; lace-makers at Buckingham, Newport Pagnell, and Stony Stratford; furriers and hat-makers at Wandsworth; tapestry-workers at Exeter; wool-carders at Taunton; linen-makers and sailcloth-makers at Ipswich; weavers at Smithfield, Hoxton, Stepney, Bow, and Canterbury; silk-workers at Spitalfields; paper-makers at Maidstone, Laverstock, and Glasgow; kersey-workers at Norwich; cambric-workers at Edinburgh.

There was, indeed, scarcely a branch of trade in Great Britain but at once felt the beneficent effects of the large influx of experienced workmen from France. Besides improving those manufactures which had already been established, they introduced many entirely new branches of industry; and by their skill, their intelligence, their laboriousness, they richly repaid the land which had welcomed them for the asylum and the hospitality which had been so generously accorded to them in their time of need.

The Huguenots did not a little to bring to a head the agitation which led to the offer of the throne of England to William of Orange. There is little reason to doubt that the flower of the little army with which William landed at Torbay in November, 1688, consisted of Huguenot soldiers trained under Schomberg, Turenne, and Condé. There were three regiments of French infantry and a complete squadron of French cavalry. Nearly all of these were veteran troops. Moreover, many of William's ablest and most trusted officers were Huguenots.

Louis XIV. lived for nearly thirty years after his rash and cruel act. He declared that he would extinguish heresy in his dominions even at the cost of his right hand. The persecution of the Protestants went on not only to the end of his own reign but throughout the reign of his successor, Louis XV. Under the severest penalties every man, woman and child was required to conform to the religion professed by the monarch.

Nevertheless, in the very year of Louis XIV.'s death there was held the first of the historic "Synods of the Desert." This period of the "Synods of the Desert" marks a truly

heroic chapter in the story of the Huguenots. It reminds one of the Covenanters in Scotland. It is the history of a Church which refused to die. By 1756 there were 48 pastors; in 1763 there were 62. In 1789 the States-General voted for complete religious liberty, and in 1802 the Protestant religion was not simply tolerated but subsidized by the State. The 809 pastors and 751 churches in 1626 had been reduced in 1802 to 121 pastors and 171 churches. State support continued until December, 1905, and for the last 30 years, save in Alsace and Lorraine, Protestantism has had to maintain itself by its own efforts.

The loss to France by the act of Louis XIV. was, of course, altogether beyond computation; but that loss was very largely the gain of the countries to which the exiles fled for refuge. As one authority writes:

> Correctly viewed, the history of the Huguenots is in no sense the history of a lost cause. The emigration of the Huguenots must be viewed in the larger relations of world-history, wherein the advantages accruing to the Netherlands, to Switzerland, to Germany, to England, to the United States, and to other countries, far more than offset the damage received by the land which the fugitives forsook. The principles for which the Huguenots battled are imperishable.

One striking illustration of the way in which things work out is the fact that no less than 80 of the German staff in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 were descendants of Protestant families driven from France by the Revocation.

Professor A. J. Grant declares:

> Among modern historians, the act of Louis XIV. has found no defenders. French historians are not one whit less vehement than English or American in condemning the motives and the consequences of the King's act. None can refuse their admiration to the patience and endurance of the Huguenots, or their condemnation to the policy that turned admirable men and citizens into exiles and outcasts.

HENRY J. COWELL.

Anabaptism in England during the 16th and 17th Centuries.[1]

ANABAPTISM in England during the 16th and 17th centuries is a subject which has not received the attention it merits. Beyond a few scanty references history books give it little notice and although some articles have been written on the subject they are concerned more with Anabaptism in general in Europe, and even where they deal with England the writers have stopped their record shortly after the middle of the 16th century.

There are four probable reasons for this general neglect:

(1) The difficulty of tracing the Anabaptists as such. The Münster sect had roused such alarm among the authorities that Anabaptists were hounded down and ruthlessly persecuted by Catholics and Protestants alike in every country in Europe. In consequence after the fall of Münster in 1535 the Anabaptists tried to keep themselves as inconspicuous as possible. Indeed, their history is chiefly to be traced through the contemporary writings of those who opposed them and in State Papers.

(2) The authorities themselves are not too clear in the way they use the term "Anabaptist." This was due to the number of divisions that existed among the Anabaptists themselves, but the authorities often designate anyone who differed from the State religion as an "Anabaptist."

---

[1] In every case the writer has gone back for his facts to the original documents. These consist chiefly of letters, books, and documents written by various contemporary writers during the period. Most of these are in the British Museum, although a few are to be found in various other London Libraries and in the National Library, Edinburgh. The State Papers, the other great source of our facts, have been examined in the Museum, or in the Public Record Office, and the writer is also indebted to the Dutch Church at Austin Friars for their courtesy in allowing him to examine their unique collection of records and documents.

The chief "sources" of the materials consulted may be grouped as follows:

(1) Records of the *Baptist Historical Society Transactions.*
(2) Records and Papers in the Public Record Office.
(3) Contemporary documents, pamphlets, letters, and books in the British Museum.
(4) The Publications of the Hanserd Knollys Society.
(5) Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae.*
(6) The *Acts of the Privy Council.*
(7) *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic* (Henry VIII).
(8) *Calendar State Papers.* (*a*) Edward VI, (*b*) Mary, (*c*) Elizabeth, (*d*) James I, (*e*) Charles I (Cromwell), (*f*) Charles II.
(9) The Records of the Dutch Church in Austin Friars, London.
(10) The Publications of the Parker Society.

(3) The focus of interest to-day has moved away from Anabaptism in England, although the student of the original records will find that the subject was of " burning " interest during the 16th and 17th centuries.

(4) Modern research along this line has been done chiefly by Baptist scholars, and English Baptists rightly repudiate connexion with the Münster sect, although in the 16th and 17th centuries they were frequently confused with it.[1] Indeed English Baptists during those centuries embarked on a long and vigorous campaign to show the distinction between themselves and the Anabaptists of Münster. This campaign has had its effect and the term " Baptist " has now no association with the events that culminated at Münster in 1535, but the very vigour of that campaign gives evidence that the Anabaptist history on the continent was alive in the memory of England during those years.

We may divide the history of Anabaptism in England into two stages. The first roughly covers the 16th century. During this period frequent refugees from Holland and Germany introduced into different localities in England the doctrines of the Continental Anabaptists. This stage, however, never developed into a national movement, and throughout it was subjected to a persistent campaign of " extermination."

The second stage is really the growth of the English Baptists as such, more properly named the " General Baptist Movement." It begins with John Smyth, a Cambridge scholar,[2] and this movement, unlike the former, has gone on developing.

It is not our purpose to trace the history of the English Baptists as such.[3] The aim of this article is to show that Anabaptist doctrines and history were known in England in the 16th and 17th centuries.[4]

---

[1] In using the term " Anabaptist " partisan writers of the period classify Baptists generally with the social disorder and fantastic prophecy (if not profligacy) of Münster. This shows a lack of knowledge of the history of English Baptists as such.

[2] Smyth entered Cambridge University in 1586.

[3] This has already been brilliantly done by Dr. W. T. Whitley in his *History of British Baptists*. See also his *Works of John Smyth*.

[4] Even in the case of Smyth we come up against Anabaptism, for his writings show that he accepted without question the slanders current about the Anabaptists, such as that they were Anarchists. (Whitley, *Works of John Smyth*, I. 165):

> Anarchie : which is want of Magistrates, whence issueth disorder and confusion that every man may do what him listeth . . . for it is a thing that the divell would wish principally that Magistracie were abolished, and therefore hee hath inspired that divellish doctrine into the confused heads of the Anabaptists, who take away all rule and authoritie and all superioritie among men.

It is difficult to fix the date when Anabaptism first appeared in England. We catch a glimpse of something like it in 1511 at Bishop Warham's Court at Knoll,[1] when proceedings were instituted against persons who were teaching that the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation were not necessary or profitable to a man's soul.[2] There is no positive evidence to show that these were really Anabaptists; they were more probably descendants of Lollardy. In any case Warham succeeded in terrifying them into a renunciation of their "errors" and compelled them to

> wear the badge of a faggot in flames on their clothing during the rest of their lives or until they were dispensed with for it.

In 1530 Bishop Warham issued an address in which he warned the authorities that Anabaptist refugees from the Continent had already begun to seek refuge in England, and that their heresies were spreading.

> Many books in the English tongue containing many detestable errors and damnable opinions are printed in countries beyond the seas to be brought into divers towns and sundry of this realm in England, and sown abroad in the same, to the great decay of our faith and the perilous corruption of the people, unless speedy remedy is provided.

On 24 May, 1530, the State itself became alarmed. A Commission appointed by Henry VIII consisting of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Durham, and others found that "divers heretical erroneous opinions" were rife in the country.[3]

The word "Anabaptist" does not appear in State docu-

---

[1] Modern spelling "Knole."

[2] This year several in the diocese of Canterbury abjured for heresy before Archbishop Warham at his manor of Knoll. Thus Christopher Grebel:

> I, Christopher Grebel, layman of the diocese of Canterbury, of my pure heart and free-will, confess and knowledge, that I in times past have believed, said, affirmed, holden and taught . . . specially . . . these errors and heresies . . . that in the sacrament of the altar is not the body of Christ, but material bread; also that the sacrament of baptism and confirmation is not necessary (*Regist. Warham*, fol. 144. 173).

[3] Wilkins, III., 727–37. Special sections in the report are devoted to the "heresies and errours" in various Anabaptist publications: (1) In the booke of *The Wicked Mammon*, (2) the booke called *The obedience of a christen man*, (3) the booke of *The revelation of anticriste—The Sum of Scripture, etc.*

ments in England before 1534. In that year[1] Henry VIII was declared by Parliament to be Supreme Head of the Church, and as such he issued the following Proclamation :

> Forasmuch as divers and sundray strangers of the sect and false opinion of the Anabaptists and Sacramentarians been lately come into this realm, where they lurke secretely in divers corners and places minding craftely and subtilly to provoke and stir the King's loving subjects to their errors and opinions, whereof part of them by the great travail and diligence of the King's highness and his councill be apprehended and taken ; the King's most royal majestie declareth and notifyeth to all his loving subjects, that his highness . . . abhorreth and detesteth the same sects . . . and intendeth to proceed against such of them as be already apprehended. . . . And also that wheresoever any such be known, they shall be detected and with all convenient diligence as may be, informe his majesty or some of his councill, to the intent that they may be punished according to their defects, and the maintainers, abettors, or printers of the same opinions with an utter abjection of all books, out of which any such lewd opinions might be gathered.

---

[1] The *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic* afford us some interesting glimpses of Europe in that eventful year :

II. No. 317 contains a letter from Hackett to Cromwell dated from Basle 12th March, 1534, and refers to the Anabaptists of the Low Countries. " Divers places are infected with this nyew seghttes of rebaptissement."

A further letter dated 31 March, 1534 in VII. No. 397 states :

> More than 60,000 [Anabaptists] are assembled in Monster, Frisland and Westfalle. The princes know not whom to trust, for men will not take wages to fight against those who intend to set the world at liberty.

There is an interesting letter in VII. No. 447 dated 7 April, 1534, from Ferdinand, King of the Romans, to Antonio Leyva, the Captain General of the League :

> The King of France and the King of England are assisting the Anabaptists in Munster, the latter by sending them money. The King of England does all in his power to create disturbances in Germany.

(This letter is based on a wild report that Henry was seeking revenge for the Pope's refusing his divorce.)

That affairs in Europe were in a state of religious excitement is evident in another letter, VII. No. 394, written from Antwerp, 31 March, 1534, from John Coke to Cromwell :

> In Holland there is great meeting among the people, who are of sundry sects, principally of the same sect as the inhabitants of Mynstre, who are besieged by their bishop and his friends. Many villages are now deserted, the inhabitants having left their cattle and their goods and fled. Fourteen ships full of women and children, lately baptized again, have gone towards Mynstre. Two ships with similar cargoes have also left Amsterdam, and four more would have departed but the borowmasters and skepyns prevented them . . .
>
> On March 26th, about noon, men with naked swords in their hands ran through the town crying. You people of Amsterdam, amend your lives ; the ire of God cometh upon you.
>
> On the 28th a man in Dordrecht cried in like manner and was taken . . . The gates of Amsterdam, Legh [Leyden ?] and Harlam are kept shut, to prevent many of the rich burgesses, who are of the same sect, from departing. These people number more than 20,000.

> And over this his majesty straightly chargeth and commandeth all other strangers of the same Anabaptists and Sacramentarians erroneous sects not being apprehended or known, that they within 8 or 10 days after this present proclamation with all celeritie shall depart out of this realme . . . upon pain of loss of their lives.[1]

The records of the following year show that the proclamation was soon put into effect. On 5 June, 1535, Chapuys wrote from London to Charles V[2]:

> About a score of Dutch Anabaptists have been taken here, of whom 13 have been condemned to the fire, and will be burnt in different parts of the kingdom, as the King and Cromwell have informed me. The others, who have been reconciled to the Church, will be sent into Flanders to the Queen to be dealt with as seems right.

A contemporary chronicler, Stow,[3] gives us a glimpse of the actual details.

> The 25 day of May—were in St. Paul's Church, London—examined, 19 men and 6 women born in Holland . . . fowertene of them were condemned . . . a Man and a Woman of them were brent in Smithfield ; the other 12 were sent to other Towns, there to be brent.

That Anabaptists were to be found, and that the Münster doctrines and history were known in England and regarded as sufficiently strong to require official action, we can see from the steps taken to stamp them out. Had Anabaptism in England only been a feeble thing of small account, the King, Cromwell, the Council, and people in high position would not have considered it worth more than passing notice, and would never have bestirred themselves as they actually did, as we will show from the official documents of the time.

Among the State Papers we find references such as the

---

[1] Wilkins, III. 776–8.

[2] *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII*, III. No. 826. (The above extract is taken from a long letter.)

[3] *Chronicle of England*, 1004. The opinions of these Anabaptists were: (1) That Christ is not two natures God and man ; (2) that Christ took neither flesh nor blood of the Virgin Mary ; (3) that children born of infidels may be saved ; (4) that baptism of children is of none effect ; (5) that the sacrament of Christ's body is but bread only ; (6) that he who after baptism sinneth wittingly sinneth deadly and cannot be saved.

following:[1] Will Lok to Cromwell, dated from Barrow,[2] 11 February, 1534:

> My lord of Barow is made high commissioner of all this country touching the Anabaptists who have come hither out of Holland.

In the same collection of that year is a list of memoranda[3] headed, "Remembrances" (partly written in Cromwell's hand). The *first* item is, "What will the King do with the Anabaptists?"

There is also a letter[4] written from Amiens on 8 June, 1535, by the Bishop of Faenza to M. Ambrogio:

> They have also taken in England about 25 Anabaptists with whom Cranmer and others of the Court disputed . . . several of them have been already executed, and it appears that the King intends to persecute this sect as much as he can, *as it already has a firm footing in England.*

Here is another extract from a letter[5] dated from Antwerp, 4 July, 1535 from Walter Mersche to Cromwell. It shows the very aim of this article, *viz.*, that Anabaptist history was known to Englishmen:

> The bearer, Thomas Johnston, is an Englishman living at Amsterdam, *and can show you how Mynster was taken, and the behaviour of the people.* . . . It is reported that they are fleeing from the country and *many of them to England.*

The year 1536 was an eventful one in England. It saw the abolition of the smaller monasteries, and the "Pilgrimage of Grace." This rising had three definite aims. The first (generally omitted by historians) is noteworthy, the destruction of heresy; secondly, the overthrow of Cromwell; thirdly, the restoration of the monasteries. As was natural, the clerical element pervaded the rising. A letter to the Queen Regent at Brussels states that there were 10,000 priests among the rebels,[6] "who never ceased to stir them on to their work."

Against the reformed doctrines and in particular against the Anabaptists, the "Pilgrims" showed the fiercest hatred. The first proposition in the list of grievances[7] they presented to Henry was,

---

[1] VIII. No. 198. [2] Bergen-op-Zoom. [3] VIII. No. 475. [4] VIII. No. 846.
[5] VIII. No. 982.

[6] Rebels is too strong a word. The people who took part in the "Pilgrimage" did not regard themselves as such.

[7] The whole of this remarkable document is in manuscript in the Rolls House.

> Touching our faith . . . such other heresies of Anabaptists clearly within this realm are to be annihilated and destroyed.

With this fierce statement the Convocation which met in that year agreed. In its "Articles of Religion," published by the King's authority,[1] it set out,

> Item, that they ought to repute, and take all the Anabaptists . . . opinions contrary to the premisses, and every other man's opinion agreeable unto the said Anabaptists . . . for detestable heresies, utterly to be condemned.

That this was no idle statement we know from the fact that fourteen Anabaptists were burned during this year. It is a remarkable tribute to their courage that despite these proclamations and penalties, the Anabaptists in England sent deputies to a gathering of all sections of Anabaptists held at Buckholt in Westphalia in 1536, *the year after the Fall of Münster*. We know that Jan Mathias of Middleburg, *who was afterwards burnt in London*, was one.[2]

Among the State Papers[3] is a copy of a letter from Petrus Taschius to Georgius in which he comforts him in the persecutions to which their sect [the Anabaptists] is exposed :

> In England the truth silently but widely is propagated and powerfully increases : God knows for how long !

At this time the Protestant princes of Germany were seeking an alliance with England ; accordingly when Peter Tasch was arrested and incriminating documents found in his possession, Frederick, Duke of Saxony, and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, seized the opportunity to further their aims. On 25 September, 1538, they wrote to Henry.[4] They mention it as a friendly office among those who govern that they should warn each other of dangers, especially touching religion. They have found lately certain letters in the hands of an Anabaptist [Peter Tasch] in which mention is made of England, showing that the errors of that sect daily spread abroad. They describe Anabaptist practices in Germany and also the measures taken to suppress them.

---

[1] Wilkins, III. 818.

[2] Barclay, *Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, 77–78 *n*.

[3] XIII., II., No. 265.

[4] XIII. II. No. 427.

Henry did not require much stimulus. On 1 October, 1538, he granted a Commission[1] to

> Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, John, Bp. of London, Richard, Bp. of Chichester and others . . . to enquire after, and be informed summarily of all manner of Persons within this kingdom of the damnable, erroneous and heretical Sect of the Anabaptists . . . to receive back into the Church such as renounce their error, hand over those who persist in it to the secular arm for punishment, and destroy all books of that detestable sect.

On 22 November a fresh Proclamation[2] was issued by the King

> as Supreme head in earth under God of the Church of England, ordering all strangers who have lately rebaptized themselves . . . and hold and teach other pestilent heresies, to leave the realm in 12 days, whether they have recanted or not, on pain of death. Persons belonging to those sects are forbidden to hold such heresies, and all persons are ordered to assist in arresting the guilty.

Four Anabaptists were seized and paid the penalty for their faith. The details are to be found in a letter[3] from John Husee to Lord Lisle, dated from London 23 November, 1538 :

> Yesterday, the 22nd Lambert, alias John Nycolson was burnt in Smithfield, and the same day two Flemings and one of their wives, were adjudged to death. A third man abjured. These were Anabaptists.

A further proclamation[4] in 1539 attempted to stamp out the importing or printing of unlicensed books and ordered the burning of Anabaptist or Sacramentarian publications :

> Item, that those that be in any errors, as Sacramentarians, Anabaptists, or any other, or any that sell books, having such opinions in them, being once known, both the books, and such persons shall be detected and disclosed immediately unto the King's majesty, or one of his privy council, to the intent to have it punished without favour, even with the extremity of the law.

Violent measures proving ineffective, it occurred to Henry on 26 February, 1539, to issue a " Proclamation of Grace,"[5] declaring the King's pardon

---

[1] " Commissio regia archiepiscopo Cantuar et aliis contra Anabaptistas "—signed by Thomas Crumwell (*Wilkins*, III. 836–837); also in *Letters and Papers*, XIII. II. No. 498.

[2] XIII. II. No. 890. [3] XIII. II. No. 899. [4] Wilkins, III. 847. [5] XIV. I. 374.

to all persons, either his own subjects or others who have been seduced by Anabaptists and Sacramentarians coming from outward parts into this realm through divers and many perverse and crafty means and who now be sorry for their offences and minding fully to return again to the Catholic Church. The King's highness like a most loving parent much moved with pity, tendering the winning of them again to Christ's flock, and much lamenting also their simplicity, so by devilish craft circumscribed . . . of his inestimable goodness, pity and clemency, is content to remit, pardon and forgive . . . all and singular such persons. . . . Yet if any in future fall to any such detestable and damnable opinions the laws will be mercilessly enforced against them.

During the next seven years (until Henry's death), the persecution of the Anabaptists continued. Many suffered death. Latimer, referring to those executions says[1]:

The Anabaptists that were burnt here in divers towns in England, as I heard of credible men—I saw them not myself—went to their Death, even intrepide, as ye will say, without any Fear in the World, chearfully; well let them go.

It is evident from the records that there were many Anabaptists (chiefly refugees) in several parts of England. Marillac, writing to Montgomery from London, on 19 March, 1540, says[2]:

Milord of St. John and some officers of justice went a week ago to Calais to proceed against some Anabaptists who have made a stir there.

If Bishop Latimer was not misinformed[3], there were above 500 in one town,

who spake against the order of Magistrates and Doctrine of Subjection to them, and who would have no Magistrates nor Judges in the Earth.

During Edward VI's minority Cranmer prevailed on a number of leading Continental Protestant theologians to take up their abode in England and assist in shaping the policy of the English Church. Heinrich Bullinger was one. He was Zwingli's successor at Zürich and had taken a foremost part in the exclusion of the Anabaptists from Switzerland. By his

[1] *Sermons*, V. 151. [2] XV. No. 370. [3] *Sermons*, V. Sermon IV.

writings[1] he added fuel to the flame against the Anabaptists in England.

In the spring of 1549 a report was laid before the Council charging the Anabaptists with the usual errors of the sect. An Ecclesiastical Commission consisting (note the personnel) of Cranmer, the Bishops of Ely, London, Lincoln, Sir John Cheke, Latimer, Coverdale, Dr. Parker, and divines of a lower order, with various distinguished laymen (among others we find the names of Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith) was appointed in 1550 to seek out, examine and punish the Anabaptists, " that now begin to spring up apace and show themselves more openly."[2]

The errors of the Anabaptists in England are described in the writings of Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester.[3] Contemporary writers such as Becon,[4] Bradford,[5] Coverdale,[6] Ridley,[7] and Whitgift,[8] also describe and condemn them. Latimer[9] says the opinions of the Anabaptists in England are " pernicious." Hooper[10] goes a step further and says, " very pernicious and damnable."

Many other references from contemporary literature could be quoted, but these chiefly deal with the opinions and theology of the Anabaptists. Although an interesting volume of references to Anabaptist doctrines could be compiled, that lies outside our aim, except in so far as they show that Anabaptism was so alive in England that men of the highest rank in the Church took steps to crush it, and furnish evidence of its strength by the fierce way they fought it.

The county of Kent was especially " infected " with Ana-

---

[1] *An Holsome Antidotus or counter-poyson against the pestylent heresye and secte of Anabaptistes* (1548); *A treatise or Sermon... concernynge Magistrates and obedience of subiects* (1549); *A most necessary and frutefull Dialogue betwene ye seditious Libertin or rebel Anabaptist, and the true obedient christian* (1551); *A moste sure and strong defence... against ye pestiferous secte of the Anabaptystes* (1551); *Fiftie godlie and learned sermons* ... (1577). These sermons contain numerous references to the Anabaptists. Convocation in 1586 ordered them to be studied by young ministers, and examination to be made of their written notes before every Michaelmas.

[2] Strype, *Sir Thomas Smith*, 37; *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, II. i. 385; *Parker*, I. 55; Coverdale, *Remains*, II. xiii. (The edition of Strype's *Works* used is that of 1822.)

[3] *Zurich Letters* III. 65. [4] Becon, *Works*, II. 207, 215, 226. [5] Bradford, *Writings*, II. 382, 383. [6] Coverdale, *Writings*, I. 51. [7] Ridley, *Works*, 120. [8] Whitgift, *Works*, III. 552–554. [9] Latimer, *Works*, I. 106. [10] Hooper, *Later Writings*, 121.

baptism. Take the famous case of Joan Boucher.[1] Her name first appears in an official letter[2] written in 1543, by John Milles to Cranmer :

> Pleaseth Your Grace, most of the vulgar people think the foundation of these errors in these parts cometh by the fault of heresies not punished set forth by Joan Baron, sometime called Joan Bucher of Westgate, she being a prisoner detect of heresies.

Joan was more popularly known as Joan of Kent, and it is evident from this title that she was well known as a power in that county. That she was no ordinary prisoner we deduce from the fact that she was imprisoned in the Lord Chancellor's house, where no less people than Cranmer and Ridley interrogated her frequently on her beliefs.[3]

Anabaptism in Kent and Essex so troubled the authorities that in 1547 an Ecclesiastical Commission with Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley at its head was set up[4]

> for the examination of the Anabaptists and Arians that now begin to spring up apace and show themselves more openly.

If they proved obstinate the Commission was empowered to excommunicate and imprison them, and deliver them over to the secular arm to be proceeded further against.

After the rebellion of 1549[5] Parliament passed an act of grace and general pardon, but expressly excepted those who held.

> that infants were not to be baptised ; and if they were baptised they ought to be rebaptised when they came to lawful age, also

---

[1] Joan is first heard of at Colchester before 1539 as Joan Baron, pleading a pardon by proclamation for those who had been seduced by Anabaptists. She moved to Canterbury, where apparently she married a butcher, and so became known as Joan Baron or Bocher. In 1542 she was at Calais, where a jury acquitted her of heresy, but the council held her to answer another charge at Canterbury. Next year, after confessing her doctrine, she pleaded the pardon afresh. Ultimately she was burned in Smithfield by order of Edward VI.

(*Baptist Trans.*, I. 108.) Evans cites a MS. in the archives of the Mennonite Church, Amsterdam calling her " Joan Knell, alias Butcher, often Joan Van Kent."

[2] XVIII. II. No. 546.

[3] In an account of the examination by the authorities of one, Philpot, who was martyred for his faith in 1555, we read :

> I [the Lord Chancellor] had myself Joan of Kent a fortnight in my house, after the writ was out for her to be burnt, when my Lord of Canterbury and Bishop Ridley resorted almost daily to her. But she was so high in the spirit, that they could do nothing with her for all their learning ; but she went wilfully unto the fire and was burnt. Philpot, *Works*, 55.

[4] Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, II. I. 385 ; also Vol. II. I. 107 ; *Sir Thomas Smith*, 37.

[5] Kett's Rising, provoked by the unjust enclosing of common land.

those who held it was not lawful for a Christian man to bear office or rule in the commonwealth.

The authorities continued their policy of extermination of the Anabaptists with unabated zeal. Among the list of "Articles to be inquired of" in the Diocese of London at Bishop Ridley's visitation in 1550, we find the query "Whether there be any of the Anabaptist sect?"

Kent continued to give much anxiety to the authorities on account of the continuance of Anabaptist activity. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, was taken severely to task for lukewarmness in extirpating heresy. In October, 1552, the Cranmer Commission was renewed, directing[1]

> the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London and other worshipful persons in Kent, to make inquiry after sundry heresies lately sprung up; and for the examination and punishment of erroneous opinions, as it seems of the Anabaptists and Arians of which sort some now, notwithstanding former severities, show their heads.

In consequence of this Joan Boucher was burned, also George van Pare, evidently a Dutch Anabaptist.[2] Bishop Ridley

---

[1] Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, II. II. 365.

[2] It is interesting to note that John Knox was highly recommended for the Bishopric of Rochester *and the reasons therefor*. Some of Knox's biographers suggest that the Council proposed to form a new bishopric at Newcastle, but in the *Cal. State Papers* (Ed. VI, Vol. XV.) is a letter from Northumberland to Sir William Cecil, dated 28 October, 1552, which makes it quite clear that Rochester was the place:

> I would to God it might please the King to appoint Mr. Knocks to the office of Rochester bishopric . . . he would not only be a whetstone to quicken and sharpen the Bishop of Canterbury, whereof he hath need, but also he would be a great confounder of the Anabaptists lately springing up in Kent.

The writer is indebted to Dr. Whitley for drawing his attention to an *English* Anabaptist of this period. Robert Cooche was not an immigrant refugee but an Englishman, who was converted by Anabaptist teaching and adopted Anabaptist beliefs. He was Keeper of the wine-cellar to the Queen-Dowager, Catherine Parr, and c. 1550 published a pamphlet maintaining that infants have no original sin and ought not to be baptized. William Turner, Prebendary of York, replied in 1551 with *A preservative, or triacle, agaynst the poyson of Pelagius, lately reneued and styrred up agayn by the furious secte of the Anabaptistes.*

In 1557 Cooche again appeared in print with a lengthy tract, *The Confutation of the Errors of the Careless by Necessity.* This was the first reasoned attack in English against the doctrines of Calvin, and the interest it aroused is evident from the fact that it drew a reply from Knox. Knox was at the Court of King Edward VI in 1552 and 1553, and had the opportunity then of meeting Cooche; his reply shows that he knew the author of *The Confutation* personally. It was published in 1560 under the title, *An answer to a great nomber of blasphemous cavillations written by an Anabaptist, and adversarie to God's Eternal Predestination and Confuted by John Knox, minister of Gods worde in Scotland.* (Reprinted in 1591.) The full text of *The Confutation* is given in the *Baptist Trans.*, IV.

was specially instructed to hunt up the Anabaptists and a congregation of sixty was surprised at worship and seized at Bocking.[1]

In estimating the extent of Anabaptism in England we must take into account the action of the authorities, as it furnishes strong evidence of the strength of the movement. For no insignificant sect would Ecclesiastical Commissions composed of the most influential churchmen in the realm, armed with special powers, have been set in motion. The authorities themselves try to belittle the movement by saying that its followers consisted only of " cowherds, clothiers, and such-like mean people." Why then did they take such special steps to repress it ?[2] They further followed this policy by casting opprobrium on the memory of Joan Boucher[3] after her death. Nevertheless, it is evident, as we have shown, that authority in England was sufficiently aware of the power of this movement in its midst to dread it. Hence the machinery set in motion. Yet they did not succeed in stamping it out, for nearly a century later we find Laud telling Charles I that the Kent variety of Anabaptist was so deeply rooted that it was impossible to pluck it out all of a sudden.

The sufferings of the " Reformers " during Mary's reign have bulked so large that historians have paid small heed to the " root and branch Reformers," the Anabaptists, whom these very " martyrs " of " Bloody Mary's " reign had themselves harried to death. All through Mary's reign the extermination of the Anabaptists continued, always requiring a repetition of " extermination " immediately thereafter.

---

[1] Strype (*Cranmer*, I. 337) records it thus :

In January 27th a number of persons, a sort of Anabaptists about 60, met in a house on a Sunday, in the parish of Bocking in Essex. . . . These were looked upon as dangerous to Church and State ; and two of the company were therefore committed to the Marshallsea, and orders were sent to apprehend the rest.

This case has often been quoted, and for that reason the writer has included it, but as a matter of fact this was not really an Anabaptist gathering. The congregation which was apprehended at Bocking consisted of people from Maidstone, Lenham, Pluckley and Ashford, and the records of the case in the Privy Council Register show that Anabaptist doctrines did not enter in at all. The main topic of discussion was " that the preaching of predestynacyon is a damnable doctrine." If Strype had used the Privy Council records he would not have made the mistake of calling these people " a sort of Anabaptists."

[2] In 1552 under Edward VI the " Forty Two Articles," largely drawn up by Cranmer, were agreed upon in Convocation and published by the King's Majesty. Articles 8 and 37 expressly contradict the Anabaptists, and many of the others are aimed against them.

[3] See Becke's rhyming pamphlet, *Jhone Bucher's Burning* (1550 ; published in Collins, *Illustrations of English Literature*, II).

Bishop Jewel bears witness in 1553 that "the Anabaptists held private conventicles in London and perverted many."[1] The *Zurich Letters*[2] and the contemporary writings of Becon[3] bear out this statement of the prevalence of Anabaptism in England. In that year the Queen issued a proclamation "for the driving out of the realm strangers and foreigners."[4] In 1554 Mary and Philip jointly wrote to the Bishop of London urging him "to go on in the persecution of the hereticks."[5] In 1555 the King and Queen issued a Commission "for repressing of heresies and false rumours" to the Bishop of Exeter and others.[6]

East Anglia was particularly strong in martyrs for their faith. On one occasion while Hopton, Bishop of Norwich, was engaged in the work of extirpation at Ipswich, Dunning, his chancellor, ran up to the ecclesiastical tribunal to announce to his lordship the glad tidings that a number of heretics had just arrived—many of them Anabaptists. Baxford and Lanham, and what Foxe[7] calls "the cloth country," had supplied this band. It was maddening to hear them, the chancellor declared.

Before tracing the main stream of Anabaptism in England in Elizabeth's reign, it would be well to examine an unexplored tributary of Anabaptist history.

In the precincts of Austin Friars, London, is a very old Dutch Church, whose records[8] must be among the most interesting in the country. A charter "granting the church of the Augustine Friars, London, to foreign Protestant refugees," was signed by Edward VI on 24 July, 1550.

It cannot be too strongly stated that these "refugees" who constituted this Church were not Anabaptists, but of the reformed Protestant faith. Indeed when the writer explained it was his purpose to look for Anabaptism among their records an immediate and rather indignant repudiation of such doctrines was at once given.[9] When it was pointed out that it

[1] *Works*, IV. 1241. [2] I. 92. [3] III. 6, 293, 401. [4] Wilkins, IV. 93. [5] *Ibid.*, IV. 102. [6] *Ibid.*, IV. 140. [7] *Book of Martyrs*, II. 545.

[8] The writer is indebted for the courtesy which allowed him to examine the documents.

They are stored in a specially built strong room in the church. It was a suggestion by Dr. Whitley that something *might* be found there that sent the writer on the search. The records have been indexed and transcribed by Professor Hessels.

[9] This denial was interesting, for it shows that a body who takes a legitimate pride in its history has still a recollection of Anabaptism. To how many Baptist churches would the term mean anything at all to-day?

was to look for such " heresy " as far back as the 16th and 17th centuries, it was admitted that then such " heresy " might be found.

Ten years after the receipt of their charter was a record of the very thing the writer sought, and in none other than Adriaan Haemstede, the *pastor* of the church. On 16 November, 1560, the Bishop of London excommunicated Adriaan for holding the erroneous doctrines of the Anabaptists ; that others among his flock were also " infect " is clear from further letters.[1]

Haemstede apparently returned as pastor in 1562, and the Bishop of London required him to sign a revocation of his former " heresy." This is also preserved. It is in Latin[2], but the English runs something as follows :

> 31 July, 1562. On account of certain assertions and tenets repugnant to the word of God which I entertained while I was minister in the London Dutch Church, I was deposed and excommunicated by a decree of the Bishop of London, but after a consideration of about eighteen months I think differently, acknowledge my guilt and am sorry to have given so much offence. These are my errors : I have acknowledged the Anabaptists, who deny that Christ is the true seed of woman. . . .

Haemstede again " fell away " and on 19 August, 1562, was deposed from his ministry, excommunicated, and ordered to quit the country.

Despite the action of the authorities Anabaptism again appears in the records of the Dutch Church in London. In a letter dated 17 November, 1570[3], from certain members to [Edwin Sandes], Bishop of London, repudiating unjust charges of false doctrine, they nevertheless admit that within their

---

[1] Letter 49 dated from London (Saturday) 19 April, 1561, deals with Haemstede's supporters, ordering them to confess publicly that Adriaan's Anabaptist doctrines . . . were false . . . and threatening obstinacy with excommunication. This case was " acted " (in the legal sense) before the Bishop of London with the consent of the ministers of the Flemish and French Churches, and in the presence and with the consent of the Bishop of Durham.

Actum decimo nono Aprilis 1561. *Coram Edmundo Episcopo Londinensi cum consensu ministrorum utriusque Ecclesiae peregrinorum Flandricae scilicet et Gallicae, presente etiam Domino Episcopo dunelmensi et consentienti.*

Letters 49*a* and 49*b* show that these " heretical brethren confessed and testified " in accordance with the dominant party.

[2] Letter 66, 31 July, 1562. A copy of this is in *Cal. S.P.D.*, 1547–1580—31 July, 1562.

[3] Letter 104.

fold are those "infected with errors." They give a long list of such errors and say they are due amongst other things to the doctrines and heretical pamphlets of divers sects as Arians, Anabaptists and Familists.[1]

Among the State Papers[2] there is under 3 April, 1575, a "Confession of Faith and appeal to the Queen's mercy of five Dutchmen condemned for Anabaptism." Two of these were burned on 22 July, 1575. There is a lot of correspondence on the matter in the archives at Austin Friars.

DUNCAN B. HERIOT.

---

[1] The Familists or Family of Love were akin to, if not a band of the Anabaptists. They believed in "visions and revelations." One of their leaders was Henry Nicolas (generally H.N.), an Anabaptist, who had been mixed up with the Münzer insurrection at Amsterdam and fled thence to Emden. He published several works the chief being *The Glass of Righteousness.*

Fuller (*Church History*, IX. 3. § 38) says that Nicolas came to England in the latter end of the reign of Edward VI, and joined himself to the Dutch congregation in London, where he seduced a number of artificers and silly women. . . . Martinus Micronius, writing to Bullinger, 20 May, 1550 (*Epistolæ Tigurinæ*, p. 365) expresses his satisfaction at the arrival of John à Lasco in England, because it is a matter of first importance that the Word of God should be *preached in London in the German language, "to guard against heresies which are introduced by our countrymen. . . ."*

On 3 October, 1580, a Proclamation was issued against the Sectaries of the Family of Love.

[2] *Cal. S.P.D.*, 1547–1580, 496.

(To be continued).

Henry Richard and Arbitration.

I. One of the most reasonable ideals in the realm of international politics is to place disputes between nations on the same footing as those which take place between individuals, and to seek their solution by referring them to impartial justice instead of encouraging their settlement by force. Not until the establishment of the Permanent International Court of Justice at the Hague, under the auspices of the League of Nations, was this ideal finally realized and given the sanction of the less uncivilized nations of the world. International co-operation in the legal sphere is, in this way, fairly recent as an officially recognized technique in dealing with international complications, and even yet there is no means of compelling nations to submit their cases to arbitration, though the signatories of the Covenant of the League of Nations have implicitly committed themselves to this mode of procedure. During the history of the movement towards the recognition of arbitration as a principle in international relations in the 19th century, the man who strove more than any of his contemporaries to bring home to people the futility and immorality of the use of force to settle disputes was Henry Richard, who has with justification been called the Apostle of Peace: it was he who, during his secretaryship of the Peace Society and the twenty years in which he was an M.P., brought to the notice of the Government and of the people of his own and of other countries the urgent need for a reconsideration of the principles of international law and of the question of armaments. For forty years he had been trying to persuade the governments of Europe both through public action and the activities of international peace conferences to abolish war as an instrument of international policy, and to adopt some plan for the reduction of armaments. If conferences and resolutions are of any value, which is to be doubted, Richard was responsible for enough of them to abolish war for ever from the political landscape of Europe.

A cursory glance at the pamphlet-literature published in the United States and in Great Britain during the fifty

years in which Richard was active is sufficient to show that the demand for arbitration and disarmament was not merely the outcome of the fear and uneasiness which followed the World War. Throughout this period statistics were collected and published which actually show that peaceful methods of dealing with international questions were more numerous than the instances of resort to arms. And yet, in spite of petitions, conferences, and semi-officially endorsed resolutions, during the years 1848–1886, the years of Richard's political activity, the occurrence of the Crimean, the Franco-Prussian, and other wars broke into these unofficial strivings to bring about a more peaceful atmosphere, even though some of the participators in these wars had shown their willingness on other occasions to recognize the need for arbitration. Gladstone's attitude towards proposals for overtures to foreign powers with a view to facilitating disarmament was also disappointing.

There were, it is true, in all, during the 19th century, 471 settlements of disputes by arbitration; and between 1816 and 1893 there were eighty important cases of arbitration, in thirty-three of which the United States took part, and Great Britain in eight. The most important cases of arbitration in Europe were: 1834, Belgium and Holland; 1835, France and Britain; 1867, France and Russia; Turkey and Greece; 1874, Italy and Switzerland; 1875, Great Britain and Portugal; 1885, Great Britain and Russia (Afghan boundary); Britain and Germany (over Fiji, award to Germany); 1887, Britain and Spain; 1889, France and Russia; 1890, Britain and Germany; Britain and France; 1891, Britain and France. All of these cases would not have provoked wars; yet if handled tactlessly many of them might have done so. The well-known *Alabama* case, in which the award was made against Britain, was the most sensational example of arbitration during the century: the incident leading up to it had certainly created an atmosphere in which an Anglo-American war was by no means remote.

Arbitration, then, was not a new thing even in 1848; what Henry Richard and the Peace Society did was to force upon the attention of Europe the compelling need for the solution of international difficulties without recourse to war. That was his chief mission. Yet a complete appreciation of his work is impossible without some knowledge of his achievements in the interests of Welsh nationalism; for he was not only a

leader of peace movements but a formidable antagonist of landlordism and of anti-Welsh Anglicanism in Wales ; he shares with Tom Ellis and Michael D. Jones the honour of having helped to produce in Wales a definite political self-consciousness. His international outlook was all the greater because he recognized the contributions of individual nationalities to world-culture.

II. Henry Richard was born on 3 April, 1812, at Tregaron, in South Wales. His father, Ebenezer Richard, a Calvinistic Methodist minister, sent Henry in 1826 to be employed as a draper's apprentice. Four years later Henry Richard decided to enter the ministry. He went to Highbury Congregational College, and in 1835 settled at Marlborough Chapel, London, where he had a very successful ministry. In May, 1848, he became secretary of the Peace Society, which had been founded in 1816, chiefly as a result of the activities of Clarkson and the Quakers. Richard said of the Society that " it has helped to create something like a Christian conscience in the nation on questions of peace and war," though Disraeli regarded it as one of the most sinister and pernicious organizations ever set on foot.[1] Soon after accepting the secretaryship of the Society Richard began to busy himself with the idea of international peace congresses, an idea which is said to have originated with the American, Elihu Burritt. He suggested to Joseph Sturge, a prominent member of the Society, that a conference might be held in Paris. Brussels, however, was decided upon, owing to the political excitement in France that year. The objects of the conference were three : arbitration, reduction of armaments, and the improvement of international communications. At the congress were 200 American and English delegates. It lasted three days, and Cobden wrote in his message to those present :

> Your congress will be the protest of a minority against a system repugnant alike to humanity and common sense.

The following year a congress was held in Paris. In the mean-

[1] Disraeli's exact words, as quoted by Richard in a paper read at a peace conference at Darlington 30 January, 1885, were as follows :

> Their deleterious doctrine haunts the people of this country in every form. It has done more mischief than anything I can recall that has been afloat in this country. It has occasioned more wars than the most ruthless conquerors ; it has destroyed the political equilibrium of the world, it has dimmed for the moment the majesty of England, and I call upon you to brand these opinions with the reprobation of the peers of England.

time many large subscriptions were sent to the Society, and its activities became more widely known. Richard visited the French Parliament in April, and was received by Lamartine. The congress opened on 22 April, the president being Victor Hugo. The American and British delegates numbered 700; Hugo made a rhetorical speech about the United States of America and the United States of Europe, and the conference, which brought satisfaction to the delegates, as is the habit with conferences, passed off pleasantly, though without any repercussions in the European capitals. On his return Richard was presented with a cheque for £1,000, Cobden and Bright being among the subscribers. In the summer of 1850, when he resigned from the ministry, Richard went with Burritt on a mission to Berlin, taking advantage of the opportunity to make a tour of central Germany. Travelling *via* Brussels and Cologne he visited Giessen (where he met the theologian Ferdinand Christian Baur), Marburg, Cassel, Eisenach, Gotha, Erfurt, Weimar, Leipzig, and Dresden. At Potsdam he had an interview with von Humboldt, then went to Hamburg, and returned eventually to Frankfurt.

The Frankfurt Congress, the third Continental congress in two years, opened on 22 August. It was attended by French, German, Belgian, English, and American delegates. The resolution adopted was as follows:

> That the standing armaments with which the Governments of Europe menace one another impose intolerable burdens, and inflict grievous moral and social evils upon their respective communities. This Congress, therefore, cannot too earnestly call the attention of Governments to the necessity of entering upon a system of international disarmament without prejudice to such measures as may be considered necessary for the maintenance of the security of the citizens and of the internal tranquillity of the State.

An admirable resolution, similar to the innumerable ones passed during the last fifteen years, and equally futile. A German delegate, Bodenstedt, attempted to give practical expression to the purpose of the congress by proposing the setting up of a committee of inquiry or arbitration to solve the Schleswig-Holstein-Danish question.

III. For the next few years Henry Richard was concerned more with home than Continental affairs, and endeavoured to

intensify and increase the activities of the Peace Society in England. In July, 1851, a congress met in London, the overseas contingent including about sixty Americans. Both *The Times* and the *Morning Post* made fun of the " peace-mongers," who continued their congresses by arranging one in Manchester and another in Edinburgh. On the eve of the Crimean War Richard decided to appeal for the settlement of the dispute by arbitration, and with this in view he led a deputation of members of the Peace Society to Lord Palmerston, urging upon the Government

> the importance of proposing at the conference then sitting some system of international arbitration which may bring the great interests of the nations within the cognizance of certain fixed rules of justice and right.

Richard and Joseph Sturge even went over to Paris to see if their appeal could be of any avail. It was, obviously, a pity that this appeal was turned down, for it was thoroughly sensible, as was Richard's pamphlet on the Crimean War, in which he condemned the policy of Turkey and of the British public for supporting her.

In 1857 Richard was appointed editor of the *Star*. Seven years later he contributed his letters on the social and political condition of Wales, published later as a separate volume. In the general election of 1868 he was returned as Liberal for Merthyr Tydvil, with a majority of over 4,000 votes. He immediately proceeded to attack landlord coercion in Wales and co-operated in raising funds to relieve the two hundred tenants who had been evicted that year. During these years, too, he concerned himself with Welsh education and with the rights of Nonconformity in general. He took a prominent part in the debates on Forster's Education Bill in 1870.

IV. After Parliament rose in 1870 Richard again visited the Continent, passing through France, Holland, Prussia, Bavaria, and Austria, in the endeavour to induce governments to bring forward motions for disarmament. His success was not conspicuous, though he had grounds for believing that Faure and Simon were about to submit a resolution to the French Parliament in favour of disarmament, an intention the prosecution of which was made impossible by the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. On 8 July, 1873, Richard introduced a motion into the House of Commons urging that

an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to instruct her principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with Foreign Powers with a view to the further improvement of international law, and the establishment of a general and permanent system of arbitration.

During the course of his speech Richard dealt with the opprobrious term "peace at any price," which had been applied to his party by opponents:

> If what is charged against us be that we hate war too much and love peace too well, I must own that the accusation lies light enough on my conscience. . . . The only acknowledged solvent of international disputes in the last resort is the sword. The consequence is that Governments are driven, or imagine themselves driven, to that system of rivalry in armaments, which, in my opinion, is at this moment the greatest curse and calamity of Europe.

(How very recent these phrases sound!) Richard went on to mention the terrific expenditure and the increase in national debts incurred by heavy armaments:

> While spending so much time, thought, skill and money trying to organize war, is it not worth while to bestow some forethought and care in trying to organize peace, by making some provision beforehand for solving by peaceable means those difficulties and complications that arise to disturb the relations of States, instead of leaving them to the excited passions and hazardous accidents of the moment?

He emphasized the soundness of his contentions by referring to instances in which arbitration had proved successful. But although the motion was agreed to, little seems to have resulted from it. Yet Richard's courage and outspokenness were appreciated. Sumner sent him his congratulations from Washington, and messages were received by him from many European countries.

In September Richard went to Brussels, where he suggested the following resolution:

> This conference declares that it regards Arbitration as a means essentially just and reasonable, and even obligatory upon all nations, of terminating international differences which cannot be settled by negotiation. It abstains from affirming that in all cases, without exception, this mode of solution is applicable,

but it believes that exceptions are rare, and it is convinced that no difference ought to be considered insoluble until after a clear statement of complaints and reasonable delay, and the exhaustion of all pacific methods of accommodation.[1]

This was proposed again at a jurist convention, after he had paid a visit to Berlin, Dresden and Vienna. On returning to Vienna, he explored the possibilities of its effective discussion in the Reichsrat, but found that the difficulty of introducing it would be very great. Before leaving he received an address from Italy signed by Garibaldi, Crispi, some University professors, and Presidents of Chambers of Commerce. He proceeded to Rome, where he listened to a speech by the Italian Foreign Secretary, and in Florence received another address, this time from the women of Italy. Thereupon he returned to England, and after two years' preoccupation with domestic politics and Nonconformist affairs, he went to the Hague in August, 1875, where he once more spoke on arbitration, arguing that what was needed was not casual arbitration, but a tribunal established on a definite legal basis. Two years later he attended at Bremen a conference for the codification of International Law. He took an active part in the agitation against the Turkish atrocities in the Balkans, and while the Congress of Berlin was in progress in 1878 the committee of the Peace Society travelled to Berlin to advocate arbitration, submitting a memorial signed by the French Society of the Friends of Peace, Mancini (the Italian Minister of Justice) and others. Richard, who accompanied the committee, had long interviews with von Bülow and Count Corti, the Italian representative at the Congress. Two years later (June, 1880) he again brought forward a disarmament motion in the House of Commons, having been returned once more for Merthyr. Gladstone did not anticipate any beneficial results from making overtures to foreign powers on the subject of disarmament. Again Richard was far in advance of the Liberal opinion of his day, and it is a matter of regret that his efforts to secure the

---

[1] *Cf.* the *Covenant of the League*:

Article 12 (1) The Members of the League agree that, if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision, or the report by the Council.

Article 13 (1) The Members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject-matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

adoption of reasonable principles in the conduct of international affairs met with so little success. On the outbreak of the Egyptian revolt in 1882 the Peace Society protested against armed intervention, denouncing the bombardment of Alexandria, and Richard attacked what he called a " vote for blood-money " in the House of Commons.

Until the end of his life Richard was busy. After an Italian tour in 1884 he resigned the secretaryship of the Peace Society, but continued to take part in Parliamentary debates. In March, 1886, he made a speech against a declaration of war and the making of treaties without Parliamentary sanction, though his motion was defeated. He was returned by his old constituency in the elections of 1885 and 1886, and devoted much of his time to Welsh education, having been appointed in 1885 a member of the Royal Commission on education in Wales. He died in South Wales, on 20 August, 1888, the funeral service at Abney Park, London, being conducted by Edward White and R. W. Dale, who delivered the address.[1] Gladstone's reference to him, made at the National Eisteddfod at Wrexham in the following September may be quoted as an indication of his appreciation of his work and personality:

> I had the honour of knowing him for the last twenty years, if not more, and I have always been glad to take occasion of saying that I regarded him, in respect of conduct, character, and hopes of the people of Wales, as a teacher and a guide. I have owed to him much of what I have learned about Wales as my experience has enlarged, and I owe a debt to him on that account which I am ever glad to acknowledge. . . . I know his name will be long remembered, and ever be revered among you, and I am glad to have had the opportunity of paying to him this brief and imperfect, but hearty and sincere, tribute of admiration and respect.

V. Gladstone referred to Henry Richard's work as an exponent of Welsh national aspirations. As a protagonist of the rights of a small country he must be regarded as outspoken yet cautious in his refutation of the charges which had been made on an insufficient basis against Welsh morality and social life. Tom Ellis said of him:

> Mr. Henry Richard was the first real exponent in the House of Commons of the puritan and progressive life of Wales, and he expounded the principles which Nonconformity has breathed into the very life and heart of the Welsh people.

[1] In 1877 Richard was elected Chairman of the Congregational Union.

In this his work is of most interest to Welshmen, whereas his speeches on international affairs and his familiarity with European politics have a greater significance to those who are interested in the development of European peace movements, particularly as most of the things which are being fought for to-day were equally living issues in his own day. As a concluding estimate of his achievements an account should be given of two important speeches made at continental congresses: one on the "Recent Progress of International Arbitration" delivered at Cologne in 1881, before the "Association for the Revision and Codification of the Laws of Nations," the other in Milan in 1883.

In his Cologne speech[1] Richard dealt first with objections to arbitration, and then with the irrationality of warfare, which he rightly held to be incapable of solving difficulties which required justice:

> Each party loudly asseverates that it is drawing the sword only in defence of the right. But how are questions of right to be decided? Is it by an appeal to the appliances of brute force, or to reason and justice? . . . A bayonet has no aptitude for the discovery of truth; gunpowder has no quality of moral discrimination; a Krupp gun, or a torpedo, no particular relation to righteousness. A more conclusive proof of the utter impotence of war cannot be imagined than is afforded by the fact that it never does settle anything.

For settlement is the result of a treaty. In reply to the criticism that arbitration is impracticable, he points out that it has been practised.

> Our answer is that it is done. It has been done, it is being done, almost every year, and in my firm conviction, it will be done more and more, as mankind advances in enlightenment, civilization, and morality.

He then cites twelve cases of arbitration between 1873 and 1881, and comments on them:

> I do not wish to attach more importance to this recital than it deserves. But surely there is ground here for encouragement and hope. Here are about a dozen instances, within eight years, in which nations have had recourse to arbitration, and in every case so far as I know, with absolute success. It may be said,

[1] The speech was published in pamphlet form in 1882.

> for there is a curious propensity in a certain class of minds to minimize, or to reduce the significance of, these moral conquests for humanity, that, after all, the cases I have cited concern only minor matters in the relations of states. In the first place, that is not quite correct as a question of fact. Some of them were differences of a very grave character, which might have ripened into formidable quarrels. . . . Again, we may be told that isolated cases of arbitration are of little value. I say on the contrary, that they are of great value. Each case becomes *an example and a precedent*, and precedents have a tendency to settle into law.

Richard was a political prophet when he added, apropos of the support given by America to the arbitration movement:

> It is impossible to exaggerate the importance and value of the influence which the United States may exercise in this respect, over Europe and the world.

As a constructive proposal, he suggested that the U.S.A. should enter into treaties with the European powers, binding them beforehand to arbitration. This, he thought, might be taken as a basis for subsequent development into a Tribunal of Humanity.

In his Milan speech Richard continued his attack on war, which he described as

> an affront to reason, an outrage on justice, a scandal to civilization, and a bitter sarcasm on the professed Christianity of most of those nations by which it is sustained.

Referring, as was his custom, to the progress made by arbitration, he mentioned an agreement concluded between England and Italy, by which all future commercial disputes arising between the two nations should be settled by arbitration. Touching on disarmament, he condemned the increasing competition in armaments among European countries:

> They all protest, apparently with the accent of sincerity, that their policy is a policy of peace; yet they increase their armaments. They meet in council to seek a pacific solution for the problems that trouble Europe, and they may be said metaphorically to embrace each other with effusive signs of affection; but they continue to increase their armaments.

He suggested that arbitration clauses should be inserted in all treaties, as a preliminary to a general recognition by all

governments that international law and not force should be the means of settling future disputes. A striking thing about Richard's speeches is the prophetic accuracy with which they describe the needs and conditions of the Europe of our own day. The League of Nations, the Court of International Justice at the Hague ; Locarno ; the Kellogg Pact ; conferences to discuss the limitations of armaments : all these things are the logical outcome of the ideals which inspired him, and in spite of them there are more men under arms in Europe than in 1914. Governments still profess that they have no aggressive intentions ; the principle of arbitration has been accepted and is binding on more than fifty nations ; yet the practical result is only a feeling of temporary and provisional security. The root of the matter has not yet been dealt with—the real limitation and ultimate reduction of armaments according to the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. There is still alive in our midst the temptation to discard whatever pacific methods of settling disputes there are at our disposal so long as force is available and ready organized. Only by the reduction of armaments to the minimum necessary for the preservation of internal peace can arbitration as an active principle in international politics be safeguarded. The world is still a long way from the end which Richard sought to realize by appealing to governments and peoples alike. The only thing which makes one hope that the work done by him and those who shared his ideals is not useless is the possibility that nations will eventually realize the folly and the futility of their ways.

GERAINT V. JONES.

Miscellaneous MSS. from New College, London.

[Thomas Wilson, 1764–1843. Thomas Wilson, often called "The Chancellor" and "The Chapel-builder," retired from business as a young man to give the whole of his time to the work of the Kingdom of God, going to Hoxton (afterwards Highbury) Academy, of which he was Treasurer for nearly 50 years. Wilson did the kind of work now done by College Principals, Moderators, and Chapel Building Societies. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society, the Religious Tract Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Congregational Union and the Congregational Library.

(See his son Joshua's *Memoir of Thomas Wilson*, 1846.)

Ebenezer Henderson, 1784–1858. After being Congregational minister and Bible Society representative in Denmark, Scandinavia, Russia and Iceland, was theological tutor at Hoxton and Highbury from 1826–1850. The misunderstanding with Wilson was evidently removed. Henderson gave the address at Wilson's funeral.

Henry Rogers, 1806 (?)–1877. Minister at Poole, 1829, afterwards Lecturer on Rhetoric and Logic at Highbury College. Professor of English Language and Literature, University College, London, and then Professor at Spring Hill, Birmingham. *Edinburgh Reviewer.* Author of *The Eclipse of Faith.* Wilson's reply to this letter may be gathered from the fact that it was in the following year that Rogers was appointed to Highbury.

Thomas Binney, 1798–1874. Minister of the Weigh House, London, 1829-69.]

I. Ebenezer Henderson to Thomas Wilson.

Cromer, Norfolk,
27th. Aug^{t}. 1835.

My dear Sir,

I sincerely thank you for the kind terms in which your communication of the 20$^{th.}$ is expressed, and duly appreciate the motive by which you were induced to institute the inquiries and encourage the spirit of criticism—the results of which you inclosed; but I cannot describe the pain it has given me to find that you have had recourse to any such measures.

I trust I am ever ready to receive advice from those competent to give it (and I can appeal to many of my Brethren, both in town and country, that I have made the College

exercises the subject of conversation with them, in order to elicit their opinion, and obtain practical hints, suggested by their own experience of ministerial work, that might be made to tell on the adaptation and efficiency of these exercises) but to set a student to find fault with the Lectures of his Tutor, or in other words to ask him to state wherein he considers them to be defective and how he conceives they might be improved, is, in my opinion, to engender a spirit than which I can conceive of none more calculated at once to destroy the usefulness of the Tutor, impede the progress of the students, and blast the prospects of the Institution. I cannot, therefore, consistently with the position I occupy at the College, for a moment listen to anything coming from such a quarter; but shall continue to prosecute my work in the fear of God and with a single eye to his glory. The plan of Theological tuition at present pursued is that which I believe to be best calculated to improve such young men as we generally receive, and to be the only one that the circumstances of the Institution will admit of. At all events it is not the likings or dislikings of students, but their real benefit that is to be consulted.

I remain,
My Dear Sir,
Yours ever faithfully,
E. Henderson.

II. Henry Rogers to Thomas Wilson.

MY DEAR SIR, Sept 1831

As you have always kindly interested yourself in my welfare, I take the earliest opportunity of asking your opinion and advice on a matter of great importance. I cannot now enter into details but hope to do so a week or two hence when I shall in all probability see you in town. Suffice it to say for the present, that my voice has of late exhibited such symptoms of weakness and huskiness, connected with extreme irritation and inflammation of the windpipe as to render it extremely doubtful whether I shall long be able to continue my public exercises. I have been necessitated to give up for a few Sabbaths at all events; and three medical gentlemen whom I have consulted since I came into the country —viz.—Dr. Martin of Chatham, my old friend Mr. Ray of Milton, and Dr. Smith, an eminent physician of Maidstone, all advise a speedy abandonment or at all events a very long suspension of the duties of the pulpit. Under such circum-

stances I have been advised to take a few pupils. Still, however, I cannot but hope that I shall be permitted at some future day, to become in some humble measure useful to the church, if not by the labours of the pulpit, yet in directing the studies of others for that great office. I am not I trust foolish enough to suppose myself competent for such an office now, but, as far as I can, I intend to direct my studies to theology & other kindred subjects, that if Providence should hereafter point out an opening, I may be able to embrace it. Should you think it advisable for me under present circumstances, to take a few pupils, may I request your kind recommendations should you have any opportunity of aiding me? If you can spare time to write a few lines in answer to this I shall feel greatly obliged. My address for the next fortnight will be—H. Rogers—at Mr. W. W. Bentham's, Chatham, Kent—With best respects to Mrs. Wilson and Mr. Joshua Wilson—believe me

My dear Sir,
Yours very respectfully,
Henry Rogers.

P.S. Will you present my thanks to Mr. Joshua Wilson for his pamphlet on the Dissenting Marriages? Will you be so kind as to tell him that I have felt much pleasure in looking over it, and that if he would write a similar tract on that odious *Tax*, the *Church rates*, he would be rendering most essential service to Dissenters?

III. Thos. Binney to Thos. Wilson.

40, Trinity Square,
Newington
June 24th. 1831.

My dear Sir,

Mr Hoy is a most respectable and worthy man, and his recommendation of any candidate for admission to Highbury may be securely depended on. He was a fellow student with me at Wymondley. If the name of the young man he recommends be *Watson* (which you have not mentioned) I have reason to think him very promising.

As I thus happen to be writing to you I will avail myself of the opportunity to say, that, last week, when at Manchester, at a breakfast with between 20 and 30 gentlemen, after which several toasts were given, *your* health was drunk as one of those benefactors of our age & "interest" who deserve to be remembered whenever dissenters meet together for any

good work. Your son, Mr. Joshua, was not with us, as he *ought* to have been, and was expected, and therefore *I*, as the only other person from London, was required to acknowledge the toast—and, permit me to say, that however imperfectly I did it, I felt it to be a happiness and an honour to return thanks on the behalf of one whom I have long privately regarded as one of the most nobly benevolent of men & of Xtians. I think it cannot be wrong, for one Xtian to speak thus of another, or *to* him either, when he really *thinks* it.

Yours dear Sir
very respectfully,
T. Binney.

IV. Thomas Binney to Joshua Wilson.

Kennington Common
Thursday Morning,
Nov^r. 1833

MY DEAR SIR,

I had hoped to have seen you today—but I have got a sore throat which confines me to the house.—I want, VERY PARTICULARLY to see that hand-bill about the "Devil being the first dissenter" which your father had sent to him, or an accurate copy thereof—I think I can make a capital use of it.—I think the times are now so important and critical that it becomes us all to be up and doing; and instead of whining and lamenting that nothing is done to set to work and do something—there is plenty room for individual exertion, in addition to combined movements, which, I hope, I shall always stand prepared to share in and accelerate.

Yours in haste
My dear Sir,
Very truly
T. Binney.

V. Thomas Binney to Joshua Wilson.

Kennington Common
March 8th., 1841

MY DEAR SIR,

I was led lately to look into the early history of the Weigh House Church. The Revd. S. Slater, who first founded it, preached, it appears, a farewell sermon on his ejectment, from which Wilson, in his Dissenting Churches, gives an extract. *Have you got that sermon?* or can you tell me where I could see it? Richard Kentish, Tho Kentish and John Knowles, who followed Mr. Slater, were ejected ministers.

Do you know if any of them preached farewell sermons ; and if I could find them, if they did ?

I want to make a calculation of what it *cost* our forefathers in fines, goods, liberty &c to maintain their religion. My impression is that if we had ten times the calls upon us from Societies in the present day beyond what we have, our religion would still be a cheaper thing to us than what it was to our progenitors. I think a good deal may be made of this as an argument & appeal to our churches to do the duty to which they are specially called in their day (viz giving money) liberally and without grudging, & I mean next Sunday, in preaching my own missionary services, to dilate upon it. Now—I find a great deal in Neal's Hist of the Puritans—but do you know any other source of knowledge on this subject—calculations of what was taken from the Dissenters from say, the year 1662 onwards ?

Can you direct me where I can find an account of the manner in which the money was got to build the Mansion House ?

I should like also to get together an estimate of what the Episcopalians suffered during the time of the long Parliament & Commonwealth—where is the best account of that by some *one of themselves* ?

Now, my dear sir, can you furnish me with any thing to suit my purpose ? I have Neal, Clarendon, Burnet, Vaughan, Wilson, A Hist of the Quakers &c but still you may know where I might get information condensed. I will take care of anything you let me have & return it immediately.

I shall be at Broad Street tomorrow at Dr. Fletcher's Lecture—if you were to be in town I could see you at the Library afterwards.

I must beg to congratulate you on your higher degree. I hope Mrs. Wilson & the young Prince & Princess are doing well. May this be a great & ever increasing source of pleasure to you both.

I am
My dear Sir
Yours very truly,
T. Binney.

VI. A Transfer of Membership.

The church of Christ meeting in York Street Walworth, to the Church of Christ under the pastoral care of the Rev^{d} Jn^{o}. Blackburn, Pentonville, sendeth greeting.

Our Sister, Mary Tilcock, having been called in the course of providential events, to fix her residence in your immediate vicinity, has expressed her desire to be transferred from our community to yours. We therefore commend her to your Christian esteem and fellowship, most willingly testifying, that, according to our knowledge and belief, her walk and conversation have been consistent with her holy profession.

With earnest prayers for your peace, increase and prosperity, we remain, on behalf of the Church, affectionately yours in the bonds of the Gospel.

Geo. Clayton ——— Pastor
P. T.[1] Maitland
John Bazley White } Deacons
William Dickinson
Jas Miller

Vestry, York St. Chapel
June 2d. 1837.

ALBERT PEEL.

[1] Query "T" or "J."

Congregational Historical Society Summary of Accounts, Jan.—Dec., 1934.

Receipts.	£	s.	d.	*Expenditure.*	£	s.	d.
To Balance forward 1933	10	5	0	By Printing *Transactions* (One issue only. See note across) ..	19	6	3
„ Subscriptions, 1934	35	19	11	„ Printing Notices and Circulars ..	5	12	6
„ „ Arrears	4	0	0	„ Postages and Receipts ..	7	16	0
„ „ Advance	4	3	5	„ Envelopes ..		18	0
„ Sale of *Transactions*		11	11	„ Letter Heading..		16	0
				„ Hire of Hall, Annual Meeting	1	1	0
				„ Editor's Postages		10	6
				„ Subscription to Friends' Historical Society ..		5	0
				„ Stamps on Cheques			6
				„ Balance in hand, 31-12-34 ..	18	14	6
	55	0	3		55	0	3

NOTE.—Printing bill outstanding 18 10 0

Examined and found correct,

28th March, 1935. C. LEE DAVIS, Hon. Auditor.