

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tbhs_01.php

Dr. Peter Chamberlen.

PASTOR, PROPAGANDIST, AND PATENTEE.

IN Transactions Vol. II., there was given, in the first place a biographical sketch of "Dr. Peter Chamberlen, Physician to Stuart Kings and Baptist Pastor" (1601-1683), and in the second place a *précis* of the original records of a London congregation over which for a time the same Dr. Peter Chamberlen presided. In the former article the Pastor was presented as a Sabbatarian who was ready to debate his distinctive convictions before a scornful world; in the latter, as if by contrast, it was shown that the church of which he was pastor held its meetings on Sundays like the generality of Baptist folk of the time and since! From these divergent outlines certain questions emerge, and with those it is proposed at present to deal.

In the first place, it is obvious that the Records—"A Book for the Accounts" and "Acts of the Church"¹—present a picture of First Day worship, though by no means ideal in some of its incidents. There appears to be no instance, in the entire document, of a meeting held on the Saturday. Largely in the handwriting of Dr. Peter Chamberlen himself, the Records describe meetings as having been held on such a day of the month and the year, with the additional peculiarity that the days of the week are expressed by the use of familiar astronomical signs, whether the day be Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, or Friday. The philomath—the physician-astrologer of the seventeenth century—would naturally affect such a method of narration. Moreover, from a survey of the material as a whole, we gather that, at the time covered by the Records, there was no controversy on the Sabbath question among the people who "walked with Dr. Chamberlen"; indeed, a prominent member of the church, Dr. Naudin, who had a deplorable share in the "lamentable breach and division" which fell among the community, spoke quite naturally of Sunday gatherings: he refers to "the next following Lords day" and

¹ "Transactions," Vol. II., pp. 129-160.

"the last Lords day of my meeting with you."² Unquestionably the church was one of the First Day order.

In the second place, it is important to observe that while the biographical sketch "A Sabbatarian Pioneer," covered the entire career of Dr. Chamberlen, the Records represent only a brief period, being, in fact, limited to the years 1652-4. Within a short period after that, the Doctor expressed himself on the subject of the Sabbath in vigorous terms. In 1657, moreover, his friend John Spittlehouse (with W. Sellers, otherwise Saller) wrote on the Seventh Day Sabbath, and his admirer Thomas Tillam did the same; while in 1658 a series of disputations took place in "Stone-Chappel by Pauls, London," between Chamberlen, Tillam, and Coppinger on the one part, and Jeremiah Ives on the other part, some account of which was published by the last-named with the title "Saturday no Sabbath." Needless to say, however, the fact that the church whose Records have been summarised was made up of First Day worshippers tells nothing against the statement that the Pastor was at that time a Sabbath keeper in his personal practice. Joseph Stennett, the second, served the (First Day) Little Wild Street Church, though himself a consistent Sabbatarian; and there have been many other cases of a like accommodating order.³ With the light furnished by the Records, however, as given to the world by Mr. Champlin Burrage, we are enabled to "round-off" our conceptions of the man, and to estimate more definitely (and more accurately) the varied influences which bore upon his life.

In Trying Circumstances.

Our interest in the Doctor begins in 1648, when he was baptized as a Christian believer. He had been among the Independents; but when the Anabaptist label was put among him, he was increasingly the butt of derision. All the time he was of a progressive tendency; educated abroad, he had seen and heard things which entered deeply into his life. If impulsive in action, he was deliberate in matters of profession, and accordingly he did not hurry before the public with the convictions which in due time came to dominate his mind. Hence though, as the inscription on his tombstone informs us, he began to "keep ye 7th day for ye saboth" in 1651, it was not until some years later that he faced the world as a Sabbatarian. Enough for him to declare one thing at a time; and it was when intro-

² "Transactions," Vol. II., p. 155.

³ See "Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America: Historical Papers" (1910), Vol. I., pp. 100, 103.

ducing "the imposition of hands" to the community in Lothbury, of which his church was the head and centre, that he sowed the seeds of that disruption which the Records describe with such tragic informality.

While the members in general accepted the Doctor's practice in regard to the Fourth Principle, one member, Dr. Naudin, objected that the teaching should have been supported from the Book of the Revelation by the quotation of passages to which he himself gave an entirely different meaning; and he "admonished" the Doctor thrice for what he had said about the Star, the Angels, the White Horse, and Babylon, as these are named in the Apocalyptic visions. The consequences were far-reaching; and the impatience of the Doctor under foolish criticism told sadly against his influence in the church.

Yet we must observe that the Records do not place the Doctor in a dishonourable light. The same cannot be said, however, of his brethren, Theodore Naudin, John Light, and John More, neither of whom would seem to have had a strong backing among the general membership, though the Doctor more than once carried the support of the church as a whole. That the pastor was strenuous is beyond question: he was, in fact, charged with "anger." This, however, was thrown back upon Naudin with indignation:

How are you blameles, who are blamed [?] by all? & blameworthy by your Contention Turbulency. Anger. being in Law with your own Father. At distance with your wife (as by her Letters appear) at Continual difference with your mayd (as by her too frequent Complaints)

The brethren were grieved by the pastor's long discourse—"by the Hower"; but it hardly appears as if others in the fellowship were competent to teach. Yet the Doctor seems herein to have shown a remarkable consideration toward his brethren, for after speaking in meetings for worship it was his custom to ask whether others had anything to say. Moreover, it appears that he could concede with grace, and he knew how to ask forgiveness.

The Imposition of Hands.

The charges just mentioned were preferred in January 1653-4. There is ample evidence to show, outside the Records, that precisely at that time the Imposition of Hands was being keenly debated in the Baptist fraternity. On the first page of "A Discourse between Cap. Kiffin and Dr. Chamberlain about Imposition of Hands," printed in London in 1654, we read:

Dr. Chamberlain and the Brethren at Mr. Mores in Lothbury was invited by Mr. Willis and others on the first day (being 6. Novemb. 1653) to be the fift day following (being Thursday 10. Novem.) at the Glasse-house, to assist a Dispute between some of the Congregation meeting with Capt. Kiffin and himself, about Imposition of hands.⁴

In this encounter it would seem that three churches were actively concerned—(1) that of Chamberlen-More, (2) that of Kiffin, (3) that of Willis, which met in Glaziers' Hall. On that occasion, in the course of his argument, the Doctor uttered words which suggest that he already held Sabbatarian views. He said, (for instance, of the Apostles, that "their Examples, Doctrins and practices were binding commands, yea the very example of all Saints and churches in good and lawfull, of commendable Things."⁵

It will be remembered that it was in the "sweet society" of his "most heavenly brother Doctor Chamberlen" that Thomas Tillam, of Hexham, Northumberland, "obeyed Xt in ye 4th principle"—the laying on of hands—in reporting which to his North-country friends, he wrote:

Brethren, be earnest wth God that I may walk worthy of his mercie bestowed upon me, and that I may have a prosperous and speedy returne to you; and God is my witness, how greatly I long after you all in ye bowels of Jesus Xt. I thank and heartily salute you all. Oh that you could embrace it as ye mind of Xt to greete one another with a holy kisse. Oh how amiable it is in ye churches where it is practised.⁶

Was the "holy kisse" another of the observations which afforded Tillam so much satisfaction while in London? Almost certainly it would find expression, in some measure, at the "love-feast" which he attended in connection with Chamberlen's

⁴ It would appear to have been in the course of a meeting preliminary to the "Dispute," in fact "at Bro. Mores," that the words were spoken which gave such mortal offence to Dr. Naudin (see "Transactions," Vol. II., pp. 140, 1 top).

⁵ It may be remarked that it has all along been a point with the Seventh Day Baptists, not only to rest on Saturday but also to work on Sunday—following the terms of the Fourth Commandment as to the six days as well as the seventh. Hence it is significant that, as early as 1650, an anonymous pamphleteer, Philalethes (not Philoletes, as given in Aveling's book, and reproduced in "Transactions" II., pp. 24 and 112), in an attack on the Doctor, called upon him to consider "whether your misemploying so many for the spreading your pamphlets on the Sabbath day [meaning, as in Presbyterian usage, Sunday] be according to the rule of Gods word." Already the Doctor was setting aside the Puritan claims for the sanctity of Sunday.

⁶ "David Douglas; History of Baptist Churches in the North of England" (1846), p. 58.

church. It is known to have prevailed among certain sections of believers in Germany, and the Doctor may have seen it there or in the Netherlands.

That which caused trouble in the London Church led to nothing better at Hexham. First, there was correspondence between Thomas Goare (or Gower) of Newcastle, and the church in Coleman Street, London, over which Hanserd Knollys presided—"great storms and commotions"; and then there was a disowning of Tillam and all who were with him in the practice of laying on of hands. One of the Hexham people, Stephen Anderton by name, "having endeavoured a schism" on the point, and failed, took another course:

He opened his mouth in blaspheming against Mr. Tillam's doctrine, and plunged himself into other gross evils. For which he was by the elders, with the joint approbation of the church, delivered unto Satan, with Thomas Ogle.⁷

These men were among the first-fruits of Tillam's work in the North. They partook of his enthusiasm, but do not seem to have had the resource which time and again stood him in good stead.

John More and the Doctor.

John More, whose name figures prominently in the Records, was for a time a particular friend of Dr. Chamberlen, afterwards an open opponent. It would almost appear that the Doctor was his father in Christ, and was looked upon by him as a teacher and champion in whom it was worth while to boast. The connection caused annoyance to More's employer, one William Webb, who organised a "dispute" with the design of showing that such laymen as the Doctor and his convert had no right to teach and preach. The record remains in a little book, issued in 1652, entitled: "The Dispute between Mr. Cranford and Dr. Chamberlen. At the house of Mr. William Webb, at the end of Bartholomew Lane, by the old Exchange: on March 1, 1652, and April 1, 6, 13." The primary subject of debate was "Whether or no a private person may Preach without Ordination"; and, further, "Whether or no the Presbyterian Ministers be not the true Ministers of the Gospel"⁸

⁷ "Records of the Churches of Christ"—1644-1720 (Hanserd Knollys Library, 1854), p. 295.

⁸ The book was issued on June 8, 1652, which, as appears from the note of urgency in the preliminary correspondence, was with all speed after the "Dispute." Hence, if the April meetings were held in 1652 (O. S.) which is beyond question, the March meeting must be assigned to 1651-2. In the course of the correspondence it is said that More "was lately baptized"—"was Baptized the first of February one thousand six hundred fifty two"—clearly a mistake for 1651-2, for the Dispute was

In the course of the proceedings, the Doctor took strong ground against everything emanating from Rome. He said:

I beseech you in the Lord, consider what a miserable Ordination that must be which is squeezed out of an ulcerous Church (as you confess it), and to believe that the most Holy God with such sacrifices can be well pleased.

Things went "fast and furious" for several days, and at the end the Doctor "was scarce able to speak for hoarsnesse."

Not only in the matter of the dispute did More "ingage" the Doctor: he publicly announced himself as one of his admirers. This was in "A Generall Exhortation to the World, by a late Convert from the World," a book issued in 1652. Therein the national churches of the day were admonished to a speedy "repentance for all their idolatrous and abominable practises in their pretended worship of God according to his Word, as in relation to their Ministerie, Maintenance, Membership, &c." This work is cast in a tone of severe rebuke of will-worship, and the argument for Believer's Baptism is presented with characteristic incisiveness. The writer alludes to "mungril assemblies" and speaks of "the ridiculousness of infants Membership":—"Can they put on Christ by Baptism, Gal 3. 27. before they know how to put on their own clothes?" The author could follow Dr. Chamberlen in the style of trenchant onslaught. In a Postscript, on p. 78, we find that which is to our purpose:

The Author is in Church Fellowship with Doctor Chamberlain, at whose House every Wednesday precisely from the hour of two in the afternoon untill four, you may either receive fuller satisfaction, as to what is here delivered as also to any other Scruple that you shall please to propound in relation to the profession of a true Disciple of Jesus Christ, by way of dispute or otherwise, unto which you are all hereby invited, whether pretended Ministers, or their (yet deluded) Parishioners.

At this time, More had a high opinion of his pastor, whose teaching in regard to the laying on of hands he proceeded to support in a work entitled "A Lost Ordinance Restored: or Eight Questions in reference to that Principle of the Foundation

held IN CONSEQUENCE OF THAT BAPTISM. By an error that may easily be understood, on the one hand the baptism, and on the other hand the opening of the dispute, were both assigned to the year in which the book was printed and published. Having, as a fact, been baptized some weeks before the opening of the year 1652, More had been a Baptist over ten months when, on December 15, 1652 (as the Records show) he baptized Bar Ishaie at Old Ford ("Transactions," Vol. II., p. 134, note 3).

of the doctrine of Christ, termed Laying on of hands." This was issued in 1653; and therein, writing as "one of the least of all Saints," More dealt with certain queries propounded by non-observing ministers and churches. He concluded with "A General Exhortation to all Baptized Churches not yet under the practice, according to the rule of the word of God."

At length, however, as we find in the Records, More follows others who turn their backs upon the Doctor. Thus the laying on of hands had cost the pastor and the church more than could be foreseen. The break-up seems to have taken place in 1654, after the issuing of the document known as "A Declaration of several of the Churches of Christ and Godly People in and about the Citie of London; concerning the Kingly Interest of Christ and the present Suffrings of His Cause and Saints in England," for among the signatories to that document we find the names of John Light, John Spittlehouse, John Davis, Richard Ellis, Richard Smith, and Robert Feak, with that of the pastor, the same being bracketed as having signed "in the name of the whol Church that walks with Dr. Chamberlain." Indeed, the trouble was in progress at the very time, and the Doctor had already inscribed on the Records the sad words which appear under date of April 30: "Dr. Naudin & Mr. More falne away"!*

The Mill Yard Church.

With the break-up of his church, the Doctor entered upon a new chapter in his career; to use the terms of our own day, "he left the pulpit for the pew." It would seem that he lost no time in finding a congenial fellowship. His strength of character and self-reliance had carried him through many a difficulty; and wherever he might go he would command attention if not respect. For one thing, the Lothbury quarrel was not the affair of the Sabbatarian community out of which grew the historic Mill Yard Church, and it would seem that the Doctor was there accorded a welcome. To such a fellowship he would go, not under the shadow of a criticism like that passed by Arise Evans, who had "wholly forsaken the Faith," but rather as a pastor who (like many a worthy successor) had struggled with "a kind of Laodicean spirit"⁹ and found the work of exorcism beyond his power.

*As a fact, the Declaration was signed on "the 30 day of the sixth month, 1654"; and it would thus seem that More was by August among the signatories as "walking-with" another church.

9 "Transactions," Vol. II., p. 139, 146.

The Mill Yard community seems to have had its rise in the work of John Traske (or Trash) of whom Ephraim Pagitt speaks in the first edition of his "Heresiography," published in 1645, along with the Sabbatarians and other sects that vexed his soul. Pagitt speaks of Traske as one whom he knew well. In subsequent editions of this book—e.g. the sixth, dated 1661—there is given "A Relation written in the year 1635, and now published for an admonition to Quakers and Sabbatarians," also a letter addressed to Mrs. Traske (who was a woman of superior education) while lying in prison "for keeping Saturday for Sabbath and working on the Lords Day"—during an imprisonment which extended over sixteen years, or thereabouts, and only ended with the death of the victim. Some account is also given of John Traske, her husband—that he was "born in the County of Somerset, and a School-master there, being about four and thirty [other accounts say twenty-four] years of age, came to London about the year of our Lord 1617, where being zealously affected, and in the path of non conformity, he fell into divers points differing from the way of the Church."

Traske (or Trash) and his friends, we are told, "cried down all printed books except the Bible," and from them went forth preachers upon whom the leader had laid hands of consecration. In an anonymous book, entitled "Dissenters and Schismatics Exposed," issued in 1715, the Sabbatarians are likewise singled out for treatment, and it is there affirmed that "the congregation Trash left behind him spread his Errors, which are not extinct to this day." Among the followers of Traske was one Returne Hebdon, who wrote a book entitled "A Guide to the Godly." This was printed in 1648, and is described on the title page as follows: "The Dayly Meditations of Returne Hebdon, Gentleman, who for his conscience (through the tyranny of the Bishops) suffered many years imprisonment in the Kings-Bench, and there remained till death. Being very usefull for Instruction of all those who desire to walke in the paths of JESUS CHRIST. Left to Mrs Traske, who, not long since for the same judgment died in the Gate house, and published by a friend of hers." The "many years" of Hebdon's imprisonment may reasonably be supposed to take us into the first quarter of the century, and doubtless Mrs. Traske was at that time suffering for her convictions. It is generally believed that Mill Yard gave crystallised form to the work and influence of Traske; it is quite certain that, in 1660 the historic church was in the heyday of its power. To this fellowship, by whatever name it might be known at the time, the Doctor gave himself.

Accordingly we find, shortly afterwards, the name of Dr. Chamberlen in the Mill Yard Church Book, as the same is retained in the custody of Lieut.-Colonel T. W. Richardson, the present Pastor of the Church. In a good state of preservation, the ancient Minute Book opens about the year 1673, and was used for a full century from that date. As is well known, the Church lost some of its documents in a fire in 1790, but not (it is believed) the most important of them. In the book as we may now examine it, there appear the names of Dr. Chamberlen and Richard Smith, possibly others from the broken-up Lothbury fellowship. When did the Doctor join? We can only presume that it was about the year 1659 when he took part in the famous debate on the Sabbath against Jeremiah Ives. Among people of his own mind and judgment, he would be assured of spiritual comfort. Not for a permanency, however!

Free though he was from pastoral cares the Doctor was largely preoccupied during this time with political and other undertakings which kept him much under public observation. For instance, in 1659, utterly disappointed that the Commonwealth had not realised the Kingdom of God upon earth, he wrote: "A Scourge for a Denn of Thieves," a pamphlet of a vigorous type. Here are some early paragraphs:

Behold, I Peter Chamberlen, Doctor in Physick, do once more bear Witness, That if the Laws of God be set up, in the Name and Title of the Laws of God: And the corrupt Laws of our Heathen and Antichristian Forefathers, and of our more corrupt Lawyers and Courtiers be abolished; There shall be more equal Distribution of Justice, even concerning Meum & Tuum (besides other Matters) in one year than hath been done these 500 years by Kings, Parliaments, Councils, Armies, or People, by all the Laws of men; and all People shall rest satisfied.

But if men go on to prefer Man before God, and to prefer the Laws of Men before the Laws of God; I do hereby testifie, that my Soul is guiltless of the OATH that lies upon the whole Land, wherein both Parliament, Army, and People are engaged.

I said in Print, If Publick Goods and Lands were sold, the Parliament would remain in Debt: and the Souldiers unpaid, AND IT IS SO.

I said in writing, That God would chastise the Parliament, AND IT WAS SO; for this Men thought me Mad.

I lost four years Attendance on the Parliament for the Publick Good; yet I had many Friends amongst them. I lost

both Houses, Lands and Goods by Committees and Officers of Parliament and Protector: I lost the Rewards and Wages due to me from the late King; yet have done service unto all without Recompence. I ask none, but the fruit of mine own Labours, which is not yet granted. 'Twas GOD MADE ABRAHAM RICH. Gen. 14. 23 & 14. 1.

LET MY VOICE AT LAST BE HEARD.

The Doctor offered to come to the help of Parliament and to find £500,000, and more, to meet the needs of the time; and he also proposed an assemblage of "worthies" to discuss the situation; but nothing seems to have come of his proposals.

Inventions and Patent Rights.

Now again we find the Doctor devoting his attention to various inventions, or proposals of such an order. For several years he was engaged upon a scheme whereby carriages and ships should be propelled by wind—"navigating with all winds in a straight line"; and for this he obtained patents in France, Venice, and the United Netherlands, and at length the protection which he sought was granted him in his own country—to him and "his Heirs and Assigns for ever" (1668-9). Now also he promoted his "art or way of writing and printing true English whereby better to represent to the eye what the sound doth to the ear than what is now practised"; and for this also he obtained from the King a grant of sole benefit for fourteen years (1672).

The State Papers, wherein we find occasional mention of these things, also tell us of payments of money; e.g., in 1669 "out of the privy seal dormant," £100 for board-wages from 7 June to 20 Sept; and in 1670, "as the King's free gift" the sum of £200. It appears that from time to time the Doctor experienced difficulty in securing that approach to the Sovereign which he desired, and in 1677 he wrote to His Majesty:

I am unable to avail myself of the permission granted me to speak with your Majesty when I would, being prevented by new orders and new faces, who know not how necessary I am to the Royal Family, nor on what service I am at present engaged. I request the grant of a petition annexed, with some key, medal, ring, or other outward token, to make my access easy, for speedy promoting of my great affairs.

Annexing:

Petition of Dr. Peter Chamberlain, eldest physician in ordinary to the King, for a pass during life, that he

may go and come as often as he requires it; is often obliged to cross the seas, having to do with many kings, princes, and republics about his new art of navigation.¹⁰

We are unable to say whether this brought the petitioner anything. Equally without result do we search for any materialisation of the "new art of navigation." The incidents under this head, however, seem to raise the question whether, having regard to the times, it was likely that a man engaged in affairs at once so garish and out of the ordinary, could possibly continue in happy fellowship with Christians who had a critical way of "looking on the things of others"?

The Doctor Excluded from Mill Yard Church.

In those days of discipline on a scale which can hardly be realised in the twentieth century, the Doctor's public proceedings could not but excite suspicion and challenge investigation. Suffice it to say that there came an end—something happened. The Doctor was judged or misjudged; certainly he was excluded from the Mill Yard fellowship. No definite information has come down to us; but in a Minute, bearing date Jan. 18, 1675, there is a reference to "the matter of Dr. Chamberlain." We further read that "upon a Letter by Bro. Sall [Saller] to the Dr. he had declared his intention of being satisfied in Case Bro. Sall. would signify in publique wt he had done in his Letter, the wch Bro. Sall. declared his willingness to doe."¹¹

It would appear however that the matter was not straightened out, and that the Doctor had to go. Though no reason has come down to us, it is not difficult, having regard to the views and prejudices of the time, to find a serious objection against the Doctor and his public conduct. What right (it would be said) has Dr. Chamberlen to put forward inventions which are designed for the general good, and then to seek protection for them in the interest of his own pocket, indeed, for "his heirs and assigns for ever," as in the case of the "new art of navigation"? Here assuredly, was a ground of objection, when we consider the sentiment of the time. We are not, it is true, told that exclusion took place on this ground, but we may well believe that it was so, for just about the same time Matthew Caffin excommunicated one Richard Haines from the General Baptist Church at Horsham, on the simple ground that he was

¹⁰ Calendar of State Papers : Domestic Series.—Charles II., November 7, 1667.

¹¹ Mill Yard Church Book, p. 11. Bro. Saller [or Sellers] was pastor during several years, from 1670 onward.

a patentee, therefore "covetous" and a cause of "scandal" both to the Church and the world.¹²

Mrs. Chamberlen also Excluded.

The Doctor being excluded from the church, his wife absented herself from the meetings, and did so in a scornful manner. She kept at a distance, and gave no account of herself, excepting such as the circumstances suggested—sympathy with her husband, in whose skill as a physician and high standing in the world of thought and action she gloried. Such behaviour was not overlooked at Mill Yard; for in those days, particularly among Baptists, church membership was severely individual. Hence in due time "Mrs. Ann Chamberlin" was "withdrawn from" by the church. The record is given in the Church Book, on two pages, numbered xvi and xvii at the end. It is in the form of a memorandum, not exactly a Minute; and apparently in the same hand-writing as that of the Minute dealing with the Doctor in 1675. We may assume that the memorandum refers to an event of that year. It reads:

The matters & grounds for wch Mrs. Ann Chamberlin was wth Drawne frome by ye church :

i her Disorderly Leaveing the church & that against her owne Judgment & Contience.

2ly Secondly for her Justifieing her husband although Cast out for maneffest Sines—

3ly Thirdly in Condeming the church in Dealing wth him Contrary to the word of god.

4thly Fourthly for maneffest pride & vaine Glory, Glorifying in her husbands learning, Agravatted by this Circumstance Shee saying she Could have a thousand such as wee are in Contempt.

5ly. for Despising the Church, Recconing her place in it to be no more than a wooden Stoole.

6ly. for her absenting her selfe from the Church & worship of god in it upon noe other pretence but her husbands Compulsion of her.

7ly in false accuseing ye Church yt they neglected Their Duty in ye [? word omitted] of her soule & further in Denieng matters witnessed against her.

¹² See particulars in "Minutes of General Assembly," edited by Dr. Whitley, for Baptist Historical Society. Vol. II., p. 12ff.

8ly her great Contempt of ye Churches messengers by scurulus Language in Calling Bro. Lawrance Shallow pate & that he spooke faningly be Cause hee did not use harsh words & afterwards Gloried in it to Mrs. Sarah.

This wife follows husband—and whither? Other departing members had been received into the sister church in Bell Lane, and there are grounds for concluding that the Doctor and Mrs. Chamberlen joined that body, then under the pastorate of Richard Parnham and John Belcher. Doubtless the “manifest sins” of the Doctor and the “vainglory” of the wife came under an entirely different construction in the new fellowship. It seems likely that the Doctor ended his days in this communion; for his will, made in 1681, two years before his death, was witnessed by Belcher and Parnham, the pastors.

At the end of the century Bell Lane church entered upon a process of disintegration, many of its members joining that which met in Pinners Hall. Mrs. Chamberlen, however, had a wish to go back to Mill Yard; and there she was given a welcome. Hence the Minute, dated Sept. 6, 1702:

Bro Soursbey [the pastor] acquainted the Church with Sister Chamberlains desire of sitting down with this Church, the Church being Broke with whome she Walked. A Letter also being Read signifeing her orderly Walk, which was subscribed by Bro. Brunt, Bro. Garvas, and Bro. Laborour.¹³

Time had wrought its changes. After upwards of a quarter of a century the circumstances of exclusion had been forgotten, and with happy results.

Conclusion.

In harmony with his travelling propensities the Doctor had a home-life that was somewhat “distributed.” In the palmy days of his practice as “the woman’s Doctor,” he acquired the Hall at Woodham Mortimer, in 1638; but he had a life in Town as well as in the country. Hence, in 1662 we find him at “my Cottage over against the Low Conduit by the Church in Coleman Street”; and in 1665 at “his dwelling on Garlick Hill, the lowest end of Bowe Lane, between the Cradle and Sugarloaf Court.”¹⁴ When in East Essex, he was not far from Colchester, where for some years following 1659, his friend Thomas Tillam exercised the pastorate, and whence he sent

¹³ Mill Yard Church Book, p. 131.

¹⁴ “The Chamberlens and the Midwifery Forceps,” by Aveling (1882) pp. 108–110.

forth controversial books which provoked replies from various quarters.

In his religious associations the Doctor would, no doubt, first command special consideration by reason of his eminence in the profession to which he belonged; but when, on some point of doctrine or practice, a "break" was reached, then he would not be quite an easy man to deal with. We have found him in at the death of one church and summarily excluded from another. Nevertheless, as the tombstone shows, he was unmoved in heart by these distracting experiences, being to the end "a Christian keeping ye Commandments of God & faith of Iesus." Though, moreover, he was the cause of much pain to others, yet a goodly measure of sorrow was given into his own cup, as would seem to be implied in his epitaph, in which he welcomed death as

The end of sorrow, labour and of care,
The end of trouble, sickness and of feare.

J. W. THIRTLE.¹⁵

¹⁵ In preparing this supplementary paper, I have been placed under great obligation, on points of detail, by Mr. Charles Henry Greene, of Battle Creek, Mich., U.S.A., a gentleman who has a marvellous acquaintance with the history of the Seventh Day Baptist body, and is uniformly courteous in communicating the results of his reading and research. I also acknowledge material indebtedness to Dr. Whitley for liberty granted me of going through his accumulation of information on the subject, also for timely criticism and suggestion on important points.