

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

Was John Canne a Baptist?

A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY EVIDENCE.

A.

IT was my unexpected good fortune several months ago to come across five holograph documents by John Canne. Four of these were letters and the fifth was closely related to the other four. Of very few of the early Separatists is such a collection of original letters still extant, and on the whole they give us a most interesting view of the man and of the opinions by which he was moved; as well as preserve for us a few apparently new facts concerning himself and his family. Indeed, this discovery has re-aroused my interest in Canne and stimulated a further investigation into his case than I had formerly contemplated.

We may commence our study by examining the early portion of the so-called "Records of a Church of Christ meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, 1640-1687," London, 1847, as edited for the Hanserd Knollys Society by Edward Bean Underhill. Hitherto this work seems to have been generally regarded, as Dr. Underhill incorrectly¹ describes it on the title-page, namely, as a volume of the Records of that church. To be sure, he mentions in his "Introductory Notice" the following significant facts, which point in an entirely different direction, yet apparently without adequately recognising the full import of what he there says:

¹ Dr. Underhill, however, in describing the book thus, merely makes use of the title given to the manuscript by Mr. Terrill.

“FOR the singularly interesting and unique picture of the formation, growth, and persecutions of the church of Christ, now, and for nearly two centuries past, meeting in Broadmead, Bristol, we are indebted to one of its ruling elders, Mr. Edward Terrill. . . .”²

“But Mr. Terrill’s deep interest in the welfare of the church, and the prosperity of Christ’s kingdom, also appears in the preparation of the narrative of its varied history during the times of the Commonwealth and the Restoration, and now, for the first time, printed.³ From the incidental reference on page 47, it would appear that he commenced the record about the year 1672. This he continued from time to time, carefully collecting and arranging his materials, till in 1678 his handwriting disappears from the manuscript. It was doubtless at his suggestion that the brethren Bodenham and Davis, were, in 1675, desired every Monday to collect and record the ‘affronts and abuses’ of the preceding week; which record, it is probable, is the ‘Waste Book’ referred to by the unknown continuator of Mr. Terrill’s narrative, who takes up the history on page 420, and which was afterwards continued from the same ‘Waste Book’ by Mr. Bernard Fosket, from page 426 to the end, with the exception of a few pages at the close. It must be matter for regret that this original document is lost, since it contained a fuller account of the persecutions which, even in its abridged form, is of deep and thrilling interest. From several slight indications we deem it most likely that much of it was written by Mr. Terrill.”⁴

“. . . There are many references in the margin of the original [manuscript] to the contents of the

2 P. xci.

3 A more exact edition of this work was published by Haycroft in 1865 as Vol. xiv. of the Bunyan Library.

4 P. xciv.

text, in the handwriting of the late Dr. [John] Ryland, an example of which may be seen in the lithographed passage [inserted between pages 18 and 19] relating to Mr. John Canne; . . .”⁵

In other words, we are not dealing here directly with the “Records” of this church, but with a kind of history of the church compiled from memoranda or minutes. Furthermore, it appears from internal evidence noted by Dr. Underhill that the work was not commenced by Mr. Terrill until 1672, thirty-two years after the recorded visit of John Canne to Bristol in 1640. Accordingly, we at least have before us in this narrative not only statements of solid fact derived from minutes noted at the time when any particular event occurred, but also the interpretation of such statements of fact or memoranda by Mr. Terrill in 1672, etc. Before that date, we are concerned, therefore, with what might truly be termed a form of historical compilation.

One’s suspicions on this point are quickly aroused in examining the description of John Canne there presented, since we have the best of evidence for believing that in 1640 at least he was still a Brownist or Separatist and Pastor of the Ancient [Separatist] Church in Amsterdam. But when we come to these so-called “Records” we are amazed to find him calmly represented in that year as “a Baptized man”, or Baptist. Now are the “Records” correct in this description? It would appear not, and if we look further into Mr. Terrill’s narrative, we shall notice a good many points, and especially those relating to the matter of baptism, in dealing with which his historical accuracy must be called in question. In fact, we shall soon see that some of the very same defects are there present of which the Higher Critics complain in their investigation of the

early books of the Bible, and especially of the Hexateuch, and of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

For specific evidence as to the character of the "Records" we shall need to turn to Dr. Underhill's volume. Here we first note that before pages 10-11 the Broadmead congregation was not separatist, but only Puritan, in spirit. On page 10 one member, Mrs. Kelly, is mentioned as "very famous for piety and reformation", who "would not observe their invented times and feasts, called holy days" in the Church of England, and who "would keep open her shop on the time they called Christmas day, and sit sewing in her shop, as a witness for God in the midst of the city, in the face of the sun, and in the sight of all men; even in those very days of darkness, when, as it were, all sorts of people had a reverence of that particular day above all others." This Mrs. Kelly, apparently at a somewhat later date under her new name of Mrs. Hazzard, "was the first woman in this city of Bristol that practised that truth of the Lord, which was then hated and odious, namely, separation."

And yet on pages 11-15 this company of people of whom Mrs. Kelly or Mrs. Hazzard was one, are again represented as Puritans who met together for prayer, etc., and attended a parish church! Also on pages 15-18 we find the following passage:

"Then it pleased the Lord to stir up some few of the professors of this city [Bristol], to begin to lead the way out of Babylon—the corrupt worship, and to separate from them, and not so much as come near any of their superstitions—viz. five persons began to go further, and scrupled to hear common prayer; . . . giving up themselves to him to walk before him all the days of their lives in his ways, and joining together, in the fear of the Lord, to separate from the worship of the times.

“ANNO 1640.

“. . . So that in the year . . . one thousand six hundred and forty, those five persons . . . met together, and came to a holy resolution to separate from the worship of the world and times they lived in, and that they would go no more to it. And with godly purpose of heart [they] joined themselves together in the Lord; only thus covenanting, That they would, in the strength and assistance of the Lord, come forth of the world, and worship the Lord more purely, persevering therein to their end.”

Mr. Terrill evidently interpreted this declaration as truly separatist in tone, but the very next paragraph⁶ shows that he was manifestly mistaken. Those who thus covenanted were only Puritans:

“Thus they having engaged themselves to the Lord, and one to the other, to walk before him according to his word, they would go to hear common prayer no more; *but after the common prayer was over in the morning, when the psalm was singing, they would go in to hear Mr. [Matthew] Hazzard preach.*⁷ Thus they did on the mornings of the Lord’s day, but in the afternoons they met by themselves, and so built up one another. . . .”

Then follows the interesting description of John Canne’s visit to Bristol and its neighbourhood, which we will reserve for use in a later portion of this paper.

Passing over several pages of the “Records” we now come across the following paragraph which seems to indicate that before 1643 those who had covenanted had really advanced to a genuinely separatist position, but even of this it is difficult to be perfectly certain.

6 P. 18.

7 The italics are mine. Mr. Hazard was minister of the parishes of St. Ewens, Bristol, and of St. Mary, Redcliff (J. R. Boyle: *Memoirs of Master John Shawe*, Hull, 1882, p. 202).

"These few being thus joined, confirmed, and separated, they began very much to increase; . . . But divers that were grave, sincere, and godly people, that had gone all along with them step by step until this, would not enter into church fellowship at that time, standing off for many years. Now, notwithstanding some good people had not light in that duty, so to separate from the Church of England, as they called it, and did not come in, . . ." ⁸

On page 30, three pages later, a Mr. [Walter] Cradock from Wales is mentioned as administering the Lord's supper to the congregation, and the statement occurs that "although they had separated about two years from the world, yet were [they] not in a settled way with a pastor over them". Mr. Cradock of course was not an Anabaptist.⁹ In 1643, after the fall of Bristol, the members of the church journeyed to London, and were now composed partly of Welsh fugitives, as well as of those from Bristol. We are told that in London they "did commonly meet at Great Allhallows for the most part", and then comes the unexpected remark: "only those professors that were baptized before they went up, they did sit down with Mr. Kiffin and his church in London, being likewise baptized."

This last statement seems to be fictitious. It evidently was not contained in any minutes, and did not even form a part of Terrill's "Records" as he originally wrote them. Compare Haycroft's edition of the "Records" in the Bunyan Library (p. 26).

After September 10, 1645, the most of the members returned to Bristol, and on page 32 the narrative proceeds: "Thus having taken the names of such that again gave up themselves to the duties and privileges of such

⁸ P. 27.

⁹ See p. 31, note 5.

that were called to be saints, they entered into a covenant that was very briefly written in a paper, and read unto them, to this effect—‘That they would, in the strength of Christ, keep close to the holy scriptures, the word of God; and [to] the plain truths and ordinances of the gospel, of church fellowship, breaking bread, and prayers [baptism, it will be noticed, is not mentioned]; and to [be] subject to one another, according to the discipline and admonition [commanded] by the rules of Christ, in the New Testament, or the scriptures.’

“And so having now by a new embodying of themselves again, and, as it were, renewing their covenant with God, and [with] one another, they went on in the ways of the Lord, meeting usually every Lord’s day, in the afternoons in Lewin’s Mead, at a brewer’s house, . . . and [on] Lord’s days, in the mornings, they usually heard Mr. [Dr. Nathanael] Ingello, at the parish or public meeting house, called All Saints, . . .”
 “Having no pastor, they chose Mr. Ingello afore-said, otherwise called Doctor Angello, to be their teacher, and sat under his ministry [? in the parish church]¹⁰ about four or five years. They also desired him to break bread unto them, which accordingly he did during the said time; and so the church walked together and increased.”¹¹

“Thus the Lord carried on his work in this church, in Mr. Ingello’s time of being with them.

“But at last, divers of the members of the congregation began to be offended with Mr. Ingello’s conversation; as first, with his flaunting apparel, for he, being a thin, spare, slender person, did go very neat, in a costly trim, and in some time began to exceed in some garments not becoming the gospel; much less

¹⁰ It will readily be seen that it is not easy to trace the exact development of the Broadmead church from the very hazy account given by Mr. Terrill.

¹¹ Pp. 34-5.

a minister of Christ; together with his being given so much to music, not only at his own house, but at houses of entertainment out of town; sometimes with some of his relations, and [sometimes with the] gentry of the city of his acquaintance; he would be at his music. Of which, when some of the members heard, they were much troubled and offended; and dealing with him for it by way of admonition and entreaty, they could not work upon him to leave his music, nor his so frequent nor public use thereof. For he told them,—take away his music, take away his life;¹² which offended and stumbled them more, that is, the lively and most serious, watchful members in those times; [so] that their affections began to alienate from him, and to hearken after another."¹³

From this citation it is evident that as yet the Broadmead Church had not become Anabaptist, nor even thoroughly separatist, and from what is said on pages 38 and 39 it would almost appear as if this church, even in 1651, was a parish church in Bristol, for the new minister, Mr. Thomas Ewins, who, by the way, was invited to Bristol by the mayor, divers aldermen, "commissioners for the maintenance of ministers for the city" preached in "several of [the] other parishes . . . in the afternoons: at [St.] Thomas's . . . and frequently to [St.] Phillips's, . . . Thus he continued divers years, to the comfort, peace, and increase of the church.

"And in those halcyon days of prosperity, liberty, and peace, it pleased the Lord to break forth more

¹² In other words, Mr. Ingello was far from being an unmusical separatist or Anabaptist of the Commonwealth period. In certain quarters in the past Dr. Ingello has apparently been regarded as a Baptist, no doubt because he appears in the so-called Broadmead Records as the pastor of a church which until now has been supposed to have been, in his time, a Baptist church. Dr. Ingello, of course, never had any Baptist affiliations of any kind. A brief account of his life will be found in "The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College Cambridge", as edited by James Crossley, Esq., for the Chetham Society, Vol. I., 1847, p. 36, note 1.

¹³ P. 36.

primitive light and purity in reformation of worship, to bring the church to a more exact keeping to the holy scripture; so that some of the members began to question what rule they had for sprinkling of children; and upon examination, finding no bottom for it, but men's inventions and tradition. . . ."¹⁴

Again under the dates 1652 — 1653 we are suddenly introduced to a somewhat different and more advanced situation as regards the baptismal question:

“ANNO 1652.

“. . . and, accordingly, the Lord awakened some of this church to consider [that] there was no ground for baptizing children, much less for sprinkling them; and, therefore, [that] they had not been rightly baptized, according to the scripture. Whereupon, one of the members, namely, Thomas Munday, being convinced in the year of our Lord, 1652, he desired leave of the congregation to go and join himself to the other¹⁵ church in Bristol that were all baptized, having one Henry Hynam for their teacher. And when, after divers reasonings with the said brother Munday, they could not prevail with him to abide in his former understanding as to that point,¹⁶ they gave him liberty to depart, and join himself to the other¹⁷ church aforesaid [*i.e.*, about June, 1653]. Thus, of several that were enlightened in the truth, some had strength to practise it.

“ANNO 1653.

“And the next year, 1653, another member, namely, Timothy Cattle, being convinced of the ordinance of baptism, that none ought to be partakers

¹⁴ P. 39.

¹⁵ This word “other” I believe may be Mr. Terrill's.

¹⁶ In other words, the Broadmead congregation was not yet an Anabaptist church!

¹⁷ See note 15.

thereof but such as profess faith in our Lord Jesus Christ: and when he had declared his desires of enjoying that ordinance of the Lord, as it was delivered to us, and the scripture grounds for it to the church, they agreed that if any were convinced of that ordinance, they might practise it: desiring that such persons so convinced, and practising that ordinance of baptism in that scriptural manner, would keep their places in the church, and not leave their communion notwithstanding. Agreeable to which agreement and desire, the church advised brother Cattle to be baptized in London,¹⁸ he having some occasions to go there about his private occasions. In order thereunto, the church gave him a letter to one Mr. Henry Jessey, a gracious, holy, baptized minister, in London, desiring him to baptize their said member, Timothy Cattle, which, according to their desire, he did. After this, divers others of the church were baptized, according to scripture example, in a river.”¹⁹

Under the year 1654 the following further stage in the evolution of the Broadmead church is described:²⁰ “First, the pastor, or teacher, Mr. Ewins, and the ruling elder that then was, namely, brother Robert Purnell—who, before that apostacy [of some of the members to the Quakers], he [*sic*] was a deacon, but after was chosen an elder, and brother Moone chosen a deacon—I say, those two were pressed in their spirits to take up the ordinance of baptism, of which they were before enlightened; especially brother Purnell, for several years, had been convinced of his

18 It is interesting to notice that the church would not entrust his baptism to the strict Anabaptist congregation in Bristol, nor to William Kiffin in London!

19 Pp. 41-2. This paragraph indicates that before 1653 no rebaptized persons had been allowed to be members of the congregation,—an additional argument against the tradition that Canne preached Baptist doctrines to the church in 1640!

20 P. 51. This passage shows that Mr. Ewins only became an Anabaptist after coming to Bristol. With his rebaptism in 1654 the Broadmead congregation probably began its history as an Anabaptist church.

duty therein, but omitted the practice thereof. Thus, they being now stirred up to their duty, to glorify God in their day, in owning his commands in the gospel, and [in] laying aside the traditions of man in worship, these two, namely Mr. Ewins and Mr. Purnell, went to London, and took up the ordinance of baptism. And they were accordingly baptized by brother Mr. Henry Jessey, after which they came down, and proceeded in the church and work of the Lord."

In this same year, 1654, one Dennis Hollister and "about eighteen or nineteen members more . . . rent away from the church" and became Quakers, leaving less than sixty persons in the congregation. On page 52 the narrative is thus continued:

"Thus there seemed to be hinted why the great breach [rent] was made, because . . . they had not kept close to the holy scriptures for the rule of worship, and to . . . the example or path of the primitive saints, recorded in holy writ; and [they] blamed themselves [in that] they had not rejected all notions of men whatsoever for matters of worship, . . .

". . . Therefore the ordinance of baptism must be always so administered or done, as at first it was done by the apostles, both as to the subjects to whom they did it, which was to believers, that is, [to] them that had given them a profession of their faith; and the manner how they did it, which was by dipping them in rivers, not sprinkling them."

Thus at last we may consider that we have traced the gradual evolution of the Broadmead congregation from Puritanism in the Church of England to the almost fully developed Anabaptist position. The process was a slow one, requiring a period of fourteen years after the traditional visit of the Baptist John Canne in 1640 for the advance from the teaching of separatism to the partial adoption of Anabaptist im-

mersion. At the same time we have made it evident that Mr. Terrill's narrative contains unconscious repetitions, contradictions, etc., which make it untrustworthy either as history or as "Records". A comparison of Mr. Haycroft's edition of the "Records" with that of Dr. Underhill's has confirmed my view that Mr. Terrill is specially untrustworthy in his treatment of the Broadmead Church as a Baptist congregation from Canne's traditional visit of 1640, and also in styling him a Baptist at that time. Thus we have freed Canne from the embarrassment of holding views in 1640 in which he certainly did not then believe, and enable him to appear before us as a more truly historical character.

B.

The way has now been largely prepared for an independent study of John Canne's life. First, however, we must mention the lives of Canne written respectively by the Rev. Charles Stovel for the Hanserd Knollys Society, and by Mr. W. E. A. Axon for the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Mr. Stovel's account comprises a part of Section I of the Introductory Notice to his edition of Canne's *Necessity of Separation from the Church of England*, published at London in 1849. Herein a good many points of interest have been brought together, but unfortunately in the interpretation of some of them several rather disastrous mistakes have been made. Mr. Axon's account is a truly able and trustworthy piece of work, thanks partly, no doubt, to Mr. Stovel's pioneer studies. He makes few mistakes, but at times he seems to avoid the discussion of difficult points, and now even his view appears to need correction as well as amplification.

I am inclined to agree with Mr. Stovel that Canne was probably born about 1590, or perhaps somewhat earlier. At any rate, he speaks of himself in 1657

as already an old man. We do not yet know the place of his birth, nor the names of his parents. We know nothing of their position in life, and nothing of his childhood, youth, or education. It seems to me probable that he was not an University graduate, although even in this respect his case is not perfectly clear. Any connection of his, other than an extremely remote one, with the family of Sir Thomas Canne of Bristol appears to me exceedingly improbable.

We first hear of Canne in London, in or about 1630, before his departure for Holland. We next have evidence that he was in Amsterdam in 1633, and apparently in 1632.²¹ It is also practically certain that the final reunion of the two Brownist congregations there by 1645, reported by Robert Baillie,²² was due to his efforts and presence. His edition of the Bible published in 1647 makes it probable that up to that time he had made his home in Amsterdam. In October, 1647, as we know from one of his letters, he was in London once more, and the fact that he had several tracts published at London in 1649,²³ reinforced by other evidence which we possess, points to his being in that city during that year. In 1650 we find him at Hull "as chaplain to the governor, Colonel Robert Overton, whose curious book, 'Man's Mortalitie,' he had printed at Amsterdam in²⁴ 1644." From 1650 until 1656 he appears to me to have resided at Hull, though he evidently was not there without interruption. His sojourn in that city, in fact, seems to have been very stormy, but he was apparently not driven out of Hull until 1656. Here his chief opponent was the Puritan preacher, John Shawe, who must have been indirectly concerned, if not directly, in Canne's final overthrow there. From certain words used by Canne

²¹ *Early English Dissenters*, vol. i., pp. 178-79, and C. Stovel's edition of John Canne's *A Necessity of Separation*, (Hanserd Knollys Society), p. xx.

²² See "A Dissvasive", London, 1645, p. 77.

²³ See the account of Canne in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, first ed., vol. viii., p. 412.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

after his banishment from Hull, one is made to wonder if that city might not have been his birthplace and early home. On April 1, 1658, we find him preaching to the Fifth Monarchy congregation in Swan Alley, in Coleman Street, London, and in August, 1659, he is reported as residing in a house in London "without Bishopsgate".²⁵ He seems to have remained in England until 1661,²⁶ and probably until early in 1664, when, in order to escape the rigor of the new law promulgated in that year against Nonconformists, he very likely returned to Amsterdam. He certainly revisited Holland and died there.²⁷ The place of his death is reported to have been Amsterdam, and the year 1667,²⁸—a report which cannot be far from the truth.

Into this rough framework of John Canne's life it is now my purpose to insert the recently-discovered documents written by him, as well as two or three pen pictures of him at different times in his career. From these, it is hoped, we may obtain a vivid, concrete, and accurate idea of the man. Canne's visit to Bristol I am now inclined to date in 1648. From the account of it given by Mr. Terrill I have removed all reference to the Anabaptists as unhistorical.

We begin with the year 1640 when Canne was apparently in Amsterdam.

I.

Canne's First Letter to William Sykes.

To his louing

Freind M^r williamSykes Marchant²⁹

Endeared Freind, & beloued in christ Iesus.

It hath been and stil is, a great sadnesse of spirit

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 413.

²⁶ See my article on "The Fifth Monarchy Insurrections" (*English Historical Review*, vol. xxv., p. 745).

²⁷ *Early English Dissenters*, vol. ii., p. 307.

²⁸ *Dictionary of National Biography*, first ed., vol. viii., p. 413.

²⁹ Add. MS. 4275, fol. 143-44, in the British Museum. This heading is from the verso of fol. 144.

vnto me, that I haue not receiued any letter from you since I came home. now the truth is but that I strue to set my eyes bejond the creature. otherwise my greife would be much greater then it is. I haue much desired a long time, to vnderstand how the kingdome of our God and Sauour is aduanced in the parts w[h]ere you are and what a blessing of increase the Lord giues to the endeauours of his seruants there. I make no question but you are one still of the Lords warriours, & fight the hard fight of faith against the euils and errours of the time. I am a wittnes ... thus farr for you, that you haue put your hand to the plow and are greatlie ingaged in the cause of Christ. I beseech you therfore for the same Christ his sake: take not back, but hold fast your own, yeeld not a whit but goe forward as a valient man in the seruice and worke of your God. you know whome you serue: it is one (& marke it) that hath no intent to be serued by any man for nought: he hath no worke to doe, but he hath his reward, & that a gracious and liberal reward for it. you are now in a place where occasions will be daylie offered you to declare your loue & zeale towards the building vp of Sion. oh let the Lords house & his ordinances be still deare to your soule: doe Gods worke in his own way. and wherein you se others to differ from the truth therein doe you differ from them. Deare Freind I know the eyes of many there are greatlie vpon you. so that your walking is exemplarie & so tends either to a general good or harme. be carefull therefore to walke with an vpright & euen foot in the gospel: & in so dooing you shall haue much peace of conscience beside Christ for this thing will honour you in the day of his Father: I take the more boldnes to write this vnto you because there lies a charge vpon me from your selfe, to consider you in the lord, & to prouoke you to good workes. moreouer I I [*sic*] mind the times are perilous, &

the depths [?] of Satan verie great & manie. and in this regard, it stands us [?] vpon, that we goe still armed, that so beeing set vpon, we may be able (by the good hand of God assisting us/ both to stand fast and ouercome. I would haue written more largely to you: but I knew not of the goeing away of the ship til it was almost to [*sic*] late to begin to write I doe exceedingly long to heare from you. surelie it is the worke of Satan that hath interrupted the sweet & comfortable passages that was between us in writing: For I speake it in the word of truth, that I saw so much of God in your letters: as I was often occasiond [?] to blesse the Lord, to see so much of his grace and spirit in you: But I cannot in regard of time write more now to you. onelie I purpose (if God will) to take euery oppertunitie hereafter: for it grieues [me] in truth that I haue not sent to you as often as I should haue don.

About the reckonings and accounts betwixt is [us], I question not but we [?] shall bring them to a good period: For I doe desire to walke honestlie & to doe vnto others as I would be don unto you [*sic*]. & thus with my kind & louing remembrece to your selfe & wife I committ you both to the Lords gracious keeping & doe rest

your euer sincere Freind & brother

Amsterdam may 20th in Christ Iesus.
1640. Io. Canne.

II.

Canne's Promissory Note to William Sykes.

In Amsterdame 21.th Decemb. 1640⁸⁰

These are to testifie that I Iohn Cann minister of the Gospel doe acknowledge that I haue by the order of m^r William Sykes marchant in Rotterdame re-

30 *Ibid.*, fol. 145 recto. At the top of this paper some one has written in a contemporary hand the words, "John Canne the Separatist." There is no reference to Anabaptism here.

ceiued of m^r. P. Brendan [?] the summe of _____
 1559. *gulden*. And of m^r witherel_____ 500—
gulden. As also a peece of Cloth at 57 *gulden*. —
 10 *stivers*. Now touching this summe of 2106—*gulden*
 & 10. *stivers* I doe confesse my selfe to be a deptor
 to the aforsaid m^r Sykes, & doe promise here vnder
 my hand that by the helpe & assistance of Iesus Christ
 I will in some reasonable & short time pay back the
 sayd summe [?] of 2106.—10 to him or his assignes:
 & for the truth of it, & the better performance of
 the thing I haue set my hand to this writing in the
 day & yeare aboue written.

John Canne.

III.

Canne's Second Letter to William Sykes.

My deare christian Freind.³¹

The searcher of all hearts doth know, with what vp-
 rightnes of spirit I loue you in the lord Iesus, & my
 prayer to God daylie is that by his good hand of
 prouidence, a way were once opened for me, that I
 might more reallie shew, in what presious esteeme I
 haue you. *sir* I haue heard of your late troubles. now
 I must confesse that after some sadnesse of spirit, my
 soule was abundentlie refreshed, to consider that the
 lord hath as it were in especial manner fitted and
 framed you to suffer for his name. the truth is, euerie
 man hath not the gyft. & therefore our blessed God
 is wise to proportion euerie ones condition & state
 according as he qualifies his children for the same.
 our time here is not long, and therefore while we haue
 a little oppertunitie, lett us serue Iesus Christ in the
 best manner we can, & further the lords worke what
 we are able. I haue minded it as a great prouidency
 that the Lord hath drawn out our hearts so affection-
 atelie each to other & to make use of such poore

31 Add. MS. 4275, fol. 147-48, in the British Museum.

instruments as we are, for the setting foreward of his glorious kingdome. we need not to repent of our former worke & labour this way. For I dare call God to wittnes both in your behalfe & my owne. that his glorie hath been sought after both first and last. and indeed for my own part I speake it in the word of the truth, that I neuer saw more of G[od] in any thing in my life. For this I am certaine of, that the lord hath vsed us as instruments to bringe the [kno]wledge of his [?wa]ies & will, unto [the] ignorant [one or two illegible words] parts of th[e?] [one or two illegible words]. the which [three or four words torn off] joy to take [?n]otise of.

Touching reckonings and accounts betwixt us. I doe desire beyond my power to beare the burden of expences and other . . . and I doe beleue when you shall see how farr my engagements haue been this way you will say it hath been the loue of Christ which hath constrained[?] us both. But the thing which I most desire is your enlargment & deliuerance & that I might once more see you in the face and as for other things, I make no doubt but we shall easilie & soonn [*sic*] compose them. I pray if it be possible let me heare from you, and how things are in your parts, I verelie beleue the worke of the lord goes on a pace, & that the beasts kingdome in our land is nere his last & final destruction and therefore let us hold vp our heads & be comforted, the busnes is almost over and how soeuer our present streights & durances are somewhat sharpe and greeuious yet let this sweetlie refresh us, that it is a great worke which the lord is now a dooing, and therefore. no maruaile tho the storme seeme long & be general it is to bring in a long and general reformation, to the ioy of all saints. And thus beseeching God to beare you up, in all your sufferings, & to vse you still as a worthie instrument in his hand for the glorie of his name in

the propagation of his gospel and kingdome I conclude for the present committing you to the safe protection of our alsuffecient God: in whome I rest

Amsterdame Aug: 20. Your deare & most affectionate
1643. new stile. freind & brother in the Gospel
Io. Canne.³²

IV.

Canne's Third Letter to William Sykes.

Sir³³

I had no time to answeere your letter in holland by reason I was then vpon a iournie but hauing now a better oppertunitie I thinke it verie fitt that I write some lines vnto you: first of all I doe perceiue that you exspect much monie from me, now I doe professe in the word of truth that my outward condition was neuer lower then at the present: I have ten children, nine of which are in house with me, and as yet haue not any thing from any man to giue for the monie which I had of you, the lord who is the searcher of all hearts doth know, that it was laid out for a publick good, that the glorious light of Christs wayes and truth might be known vnto the people of this nation. and therefore I neuer had scarce any thing for what was published, but cheiflie endeauored the spreading of what was don to the world: and for this purpose made vse of sundrie freinds up and down the kingdome to giue forth what was sent vnto them not mercenarie or for profitt, but that the glorious kingdome of Iesus Christ might be aduanced: so that besides what monies you have receiued, I neuer got penny by the work in my life. It is true I sent you a note vnder my hand, but you wel know it was of my own accord neuer by you desired, neither did I euer thinke that you would haue: [*sic*] made vse of it in such a way as I

³² On the back of this letter Mr. Sykes appears to have written: "recd 1th October 1643 John Cann 20 Aug: 1643".

³³ Add. MS. 4275, fol. 149, recto and verso, in the British Museum.

perceiue you doe: many were the letters which I had from you where you made christ the debtor and not me, and this publick busnesse should be put upon Christ score and his account, so that it hath added much affliction and sadnesse to my soule, that I should now be the man upon whose score and account such things must come, wherein I had noe profit, but spent my time and labour about: Besides I cannot but be verie senceable of the great dishonour and scandal which I lie under to haue that which was don in a secret way to be so openlie diuulged, as your son to demand so much as if it had bin monie lent for my proper vse, which the lord knowes it was neuer in my thought. I speake nothing here of Ioseph Collier who had his chamber studie, pack seller diet and other things with me about two yeares: I know not what I shall further say, onelie I wish I were in a condition to returne all the monie layd out in the publick seruice of Christ vnto you: truelie were I able I would be loth to make any apologie, but doe it willinglie, as knowing the worke should not be in vain But for my part as things stand with me at present, I liue by faith waiting what prouidence the lord will bring for me. and thus beseeching you in the bowels of Christ to consider how the case doth stand betwixt us, and how full of greife my spirit is, that there should any vnkindness[e] fal in betwixt us especially about these worldlie things and about a worke wherein we may see such good successe and fruit to follow, I commit you to th[e] gracious protection of the allmightie God and shall euer be while I am

yours most effectio[n]atelie
in what I am able to doe
Iohn Canne.³⁴

³⁴ This letter is undated by Canne, but Mr. Sykes has written on the verso in a very hasty hand the words: "Mr Can From London off the 12th [?] october 1647. Answered the 17th [?] october 1647."

I could name you 3. or 4 men
 in this land that had, neere
 200^l of the bookes which were
 printed for the common good
 of which there was neuer any
 returne of monie, but a
 spreading of them into all the
 parts of the land.

V.

Canne's Fourth Letter to William Sykes.

Deare *Sir*⁸⁵

your Answere to my last letter I haue receiued, and how much some passages therein doe sadden my spirit the lord knowes. you tax me as if I were vnmindfull and vnthankfull of your former kindnesse: now for this, my wittnesse is in heauen, & the searcher of all hearts doth know, had I any abilitie, I would not be wanting to answere your desire but is a matter of wonderfull greife vnto me, that beeing at the present neuer in a lower condition, & in no capacitie in the world, to doe the thing, that you should iust now prosecute the busnesse as you doe. But to come to some other particulars: first for the smal bibles you mention, *Sir*, I pray take notice I was meerelie deceiued by such as went on in the thing with me, and it is wel known to many in Holland that I suffered great losse by the vnfaithfulnes of such as I trusted in the thing. & so was meerelie indeed gulled: Now for Iosua Collier I doe protest that he neuer did any thing for me about the printerie in his life he did neuer learn any thing that way, nor would, but altogether followed his own busnes. and so much I can proue to you by many honest people who were all the while in my house & are here in london. And therefore good *Sir* doe not thinke that I had euer a farthing from him, either by his labour or

⁸⁵ Add. MS. 4275, fol. 150 recto, in the British Museum.

any other way in any consideration to this day: he was at most 3. yeares with me. he had his diet, his chamber & studie to him selfe a pack seller for his commodities. his washing starching, & besides all this I pasd my word for him to m^r Becham, & after he was gon paid 250: gulden which he promised to repay but neuer did: It is true he left in my hands some smal debts, but I neuer could get one promise. These things I neuer thought to haue spoken of, for I thought you would not have called the busnesse betwixt us in this manner to examination: you tel me that you are not willing that your son should fall upon me in an extreme way: I can say nothing to it so that Christ may not suffer I hope I shall submit to what sufferings he will put vpon me. But for your more christan & pious aduice that brethren should heare it, I like it maruealous wel, and am verie desireous to goe this way along with you: and shall produce in a meeke & humble way what I haue to say, & shall gladlie submitt to the determination of any godlie men, & will to the vttmost of my power satisfie you, in what shall appeare either in point of law or in point of conscience to be your due truelie it hath euer been my desire to pay my debts: I know nothing else at the present for this[:] about some freinds to examine the matter I shall leaue it to your own time, place and persons, onelie I desire here to handle the matter with your selfe and none else. And thus beseeching God to cast a fauourable countenance upon us both, & to helpe us in our present streight that the glorious name of Iesus may not be dishonoured by either of us, I committ to the lord & shalbe euermore

your sincere and most true

freind & brother. Iohn Canne.³⁶

³⁶ Internal evidence, it will have been noticed, shows that this letter was written in London. Its date appears to be late in 1647.

VI.

Canne's Visit to Bristol.

"Shortly after this [in 1648?], on a time called Easter, . . . the providence of God brought to this city [of Bristol] one Mr. Canne, . . . it was that Mr. Canne that made notes and references upon the bible. He was a man very eminent in his day for godliness, and for reformation in religion, having great understanding in the way of the Lord.

"When Mrs. Hazzard heard that he was come to town she went to the Dolphin Inn, and fetched him to her house, and entertained him all the time he stayed in the city; who helped them very much in the Lord, he being a man skilful in gospel order. Like unto Aquila, he taught them the way of the Lord more perfectly, and settled them in church order [according, of course, to the views of the Ainsworthian Separatists in Amsterdam], and showed them the difference betwixt the church of Christ and antichrist, and left with them a printed book treating of the same, and divers printed papers to that purpose. So that by this instrument, Mr. Canne, the Lord did confirm and settle them; showing them how they should join together, and take in members. And he exhorted them to wait upon God together, and to expect the presence of God with those gifts they had, and to depart from those ministers that did not come out of anti-christian worship [i.e., out of the Church of England]. And when he had stayed some time in the city he departed.

"And on a Lord's day following he preached at a place called Westerleigh, about seven miles from this city [Bristol] . . . where he had liberty to preach in the public place, called a church, in the morning, but in the afternoon could not have entrance. The obstruction was by a very godly great woman, that

dwelt in that place, who was somewhat severe in the profession of what she knew, . . .”³⁷

“But to return to our narrative of the Lord’s carrying on the truth of separation. This godly, honourable woman, perceiving that Mr. Canne was . . . not in her way [of Puritanism], but a step beyond her light [i.e., a Separatist], caused the public place [the parish church] to be made fast, whereby they were prevented to come in. Then he drew forth, with abundance of people, into a green thereby, and sent for Mr. [Richard] Fowler, the [parish] minister that lived there, to speak with him, . . . who, accordingly, came to Mr. Canne, in the green, where they debated the business of reformation, and the duty of separation from the worship of anti-christ, cleaving close to the doctrine of our Lord Jesus and his instituted worship. . . . Mr. Canne answered, . . . though they could not get a public place or such conveniences, they should hire a barn to meet in, keeping the worship and commands of the Lord as they were delivered to us. Thus Mr. Canne continued near two hours in the green, asserting and proving the duty of a people to the Lord in such a day; . . .

“But the business of preaching in a barn could hardly be received. The thing of relative holiness, and tincture of consecrated places, was not off the people; . . .”³⁸

“Then she [Mrs. Hazzard], with those few that had joined themselves together to worship the Lord more purely, as aforesaid, after Mr. Canne had thus instructed them, and showed them the order of God’s house, and the difference thereof from anti-christian worship; then they stepped further in separation, and

37 E. B. Underhill: *The Records of a Church of Christ*, London, 1847, pp. 18-9.

38 P. 22.

would not so much as hear any minister [of course, in the Church of England] that did read common prayer. . . ." ³⁹

VII.

Canne's Life in Hull.

Concerning Canne's life in Hull during the years 1650—1656 we have the following interesting, though perhaps somewhat prejudiced, description by his contemporary, Master John Shawe of that city:⁴⁰

"When colonel [Robert] Overton was governor of Hull, he was perswaded by some persons to entertain for his chaplain to the garrison one John Canne; (I do not know that he was either University man or minister, but) he broached many fond opinions and drew away the governor and his wife and some others; I had many contests with him. This John Canne was a person of very litle learning, and his natural parts were not very great, and therefore vented fond new opinions to draw a party after him, but his fury and passion (if not malice) were, (if I may use that phrase, Nah: 3: 9), infinite. He had (to use Erasmus his phrase) *plus fellis quam humerorum*; and needed no adversary, but his own unquiet mind, of whom (if he be dead, which I certainly know not, but think that he is⁴¹) I may say with the Poet:

Is John departed? is Canne dead and gone?
Farewell to both, to Canne and eke to John:
Yet being dead, take this advice from me,
Let them not both in one grave buried be;
But lay John here, and lay Canne thereabout,
For if they both should meet, they would fall out.

But peace, lest he hear, and then I am sure he wil chide.

³⁹ P. 23.

⁴⁰ See the "Memoirs of Master John Shawe, sometime Vicar of Rotherham, Minister of St. Mary's, Lecturer of Holy Trinity Church, and Master of the Charterhouse, at Kingston-upon-Hull. *Written by himself in the year 1663-4.* Edited by the Rev. J. R. Boyle", Hull, 1882, 88, pp. 42-5.

⁴¹ It appears to me that Mr. Shawe was not well informed on this point.

“ Collonel Overton the governor, and the officers did by a thicke wal (which is now puld downe again) part the chancell of Trinity church in Hull from the body of it, and brake a door into the chancel, and so Mr. Canne preached to the governor (collonel Overton), and the soldjers there, at the same time when I preached in the body of the church, and yet I had constantly above 3000 hearers, and their people in the chancell could not hear us (no, not when we sung a Psalm); sure I am we could not hear them sing *Psalms*, for they sung none. This Mr. Canne came to Hull out of Holland,⁴² whither formerly he had fled, and against whom pious and learned Mr. Ball hath writ a large and learned book (and therefore I need write nothing) in answer to him (and so have others also): he troubled both England and Holland. . . . But—I had many contests with him before *Oliver* the Protector, to whom he appealed, and elsewhere. At last, he printed a little pamphlet against me, where are some few truths, but most part lyes; I drew up an answer to it, but was over perswaded by divers discreet and learned men to let it alone and sleight it, seeing (said they) nobody regards it, but as a lying idle pamphlet, and few regard him; to answer it (said they) was too much to honor it, Prov. 26: 4, and would make it more regarded: contempt and silence are best answerers. And ere long he came to suffer enough (tho’ not by me), and I was unwilling to insult over him in calamity. Only when I had read the pamphlet, and saw how litle ill his great malice could say therein against me, I thanked God, . . . for if Can could have told any worse by me, I am sure he would not have spared me in the least.—But enough of this.”

A note by Mr. Boyle gives a few additional particulars of value in our present study:⁴³

⁴² This statement might seem to suggest that he came directly, and not after a visit to London, but I now believe he must have made his home in London between 1647 and 1650.

⁴³ “Memoirs of Master John Shawe”, Hull, 1882, pp. 43-4, note 71.

“ The following is the account of these transactions given by Abraham De la Pryme in his MS. History of Hull:—‘ In these times of trouble and confusion there was another hot-headed Preacher here, that came over from Amsterdam, whose name was Mr. Can, who being a mongrel Independent, preached openly to the Soldiers, both in the streets of the Town, and in the Garrison, and won himself so much into their favour that they called him their Preacher, and petitioned the Council of State to grant them the Chancel to meet in, and though that the Parishioners complained and petitioned against it, yet they got the grant of it in the year 1657 [probably 1651],⁴⁴ and walled up the arches between it and the Church, that the one might not disturb the other in their devotions,⁴⁵ pulled most of the Brasses up from the Gravestones, defaced the Monuments and Inscriptions, filled the same with Benches, and entered into the same by two doors through two old Chantries, the one on the North, the other on the South side thereof, and kept their filthy conventicle here, until the same was purged and they cast out by our good Josiah, King Charles the Second.’ In the first volume of the Parish Order-books preserved at Holy Trinity Church, on page 20, occurs the following entry, which refers to the removal of the pews or benches introduced into the chancel by Canne’s party:—

“ At the Trinity Church the sixth day of March 1659.

“ Whereas the leads over the Chancell are in great decay it is thought fitt and accordingly ordered

⁴⁴ Mr. Boyle suggests here that the date intended was 1647, but he elsewhere gives evidence which shows that it was probably 1651.

⁴⁵ Mr. John Broadley in his edition of the *Memoirs of the Life of Master John Shawe*, Hull, 1824, p. 59, has a note in which he cites from Tickell the following significant point: “ thus did the church continue for some years divided between the presbyterians and independents, not perhaps to the satisfaction of either. . . . ”

by the parishoners present that the churchwardens for the tyme beeing doe presently putt the same leads in good & sufficient repayre. And whereas great damage and preiudice hath fallen to the sayd Trinity Church by setting up pewes in the body of the Chancell, It is ordered that all the pewes & seats within the body of the sayd Chancell excepting the pulpitt & the pewes thereto belonging be forthwith taken up and sett by,”

VIII.

Canne's Second Banishment.

In a Postscript at the close of “The Time of the End”, 1657, Canne makes this interesting reference to himself:⁴⁶

“UPON my Banishment from *Hull* (for what Cause I know not, there being nothing to this day made known to me.) I went a part (as *Elias* did) into the *Wildernesse*. And as I lay under hedges, & in holes, my Soul in bitterness breathed forth many sad complaints before the Lord. *It is enough O Lord take away my life, for I am not better than my Fathers*. Often and sore wrestlings I had with my God, to know His *Meaning* and *Teaching*, under this Dispensation; And what further work. (whether *Doing* or *Suffering*) he had for me, his *Poor old Se[r]vant*, being now againe Banished, after *17 years Banishment before*.”

IX.

Canne's Sufferings in London.

Finally, the following vivid description of one of Canne's experiences as a Fifth Monarchy man may be given:⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Pp. 265-6.

⁴⁷ From “A NARRATIVE; | Wherein is faithfully set forth the suffe- | rings of *John Canne*, . . .”, London, 1658, pp. 3-5

“ Upon the first day of the second moneth commonly called *April*, 1658. Many of the Lords People being Assembled together in *Swan Alley* in *Coleman street* (a publick place where Saints have met many years). As they were there waiting upon the Lord in Prayer and other holy duties, on a sudden the *Marshall of the City*, with severall other Officers, rushed in with great violence upon them. The which fight for the suddennesse and strangenesse of it, occasioned some amazement among the people; who were there peaceably worshipping God in spirit and Truth: having no other weapons but Faith and Prayer.

“ Old Brother *Cann* was then in the Pulpit, and had read a place of Scripture but spoken nothing to it, the Scripture was *Numb. 16. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 66*, Now he perceiving that they came in at both doores with their Halbets, Pikes, Staves, &c. and fearing least there might be some hurt done to the Lords poor and naked people: He desired the Brethren and Sisters to be all quiet, and to make no stir: for his part he feared them not, but was assured the Lord would eminently stand by them.

“ Whilst he was thus speaking to the people, exhorting them to patience, one of the Officers (breaking through the croud) came furiously upon him, and with great violence pluckt him out of the Pulpit, and when he had so done, hurled him over the Benches or Forms, in a very barbarous manner. Some Brethren being nigh endeavoured to have saved Brother *Cann* from falling, but the rage of the Officers was such, as they fell in upon him, although through mercy he had not much hurt by it.

“ Having thus a while pull'd and halled him, at last they brought him to the *Mayor of the City*, who was without the doore (with one of the Sheriffs on horse-back) waiting for the Brethren to be taken and brought to him. The Brother asked the Mayor, *What he had*

against him, telling him, withall, for his part, he desired no more favour at his hands, than was allowed to Thieves and Murtherers, that is, to know what they had to charge him with, and who were his accusers. To which the Mayor Answered Mr. Cann (saith he) *I have nothing against you, neither do I know any evill you have done; but think you are an honest man, onely you must appear before his Highnesse, and I will send you thither presently. No saith the sheriff, keep him till to morrow morning, and then send him.* And so the Mayor bid one of his Officers to carry our Brother to the Counter. Afterward they brought seven more to the *Mayor*, of which number, five had never spoken in that Meeting place, but came onely to hear: Now that which occasioned their apprehending and sending to prison, it was because they spake against the cruelty and inhumane dealing exercised upon Brother *Cann*, saying, aloud, *He is an old man and do not use him so barbarously.*

“Having brought eight of them to the *Counter* with Halberts, Staves: here presently begun a new trouble, for the Keeper having neither a Warrant for their Commitment, nor knowing who they were; comes to enquire for their Names, all refused to tell him their names except Brother *Cann* (whose name they knew before) whereupon they were all seven thrust into the *cold stinking hole*, and would not allow them any Beds to lie on, nor any other place in the prison, though they offered them any reasonable content. In this noisome place, they were kept all night, neither suffered the next day to come forth (though the rest of the Prisoners did) till they were all sent for by the *Mayor* to come before him, which was about 3, or 4. of the clock in the afternoon.

“When they came to the *Mayors* house, he sent for them one by one into a private room; some of the Brethren desired that they might be heard openly,

and that their freinds might be witnesses to what was spoke: But this would not be granted. The first that they called, was Brother *Cann*; The *Mayor* asked him, *What he thought of the present Government?* his Answer was: *For the present Government, I am not (saith he) satisfied with it. But this concerns not you: Neither shall I speak now any thing to you about it: but if you send me to the Protector, I shall tell him what I think concerning this Government. For I have a great deal to say to his face, if in such a way as this, I may be brought before him. But for you Sir, this is not our businesse now.* Many words passed too and fro, not worth the mentioning here: onely I shall note a little, concerning the *Marshall*. He had been a little before in *Coleman street*, and having heard Brother *Cann* exercise there, gave him thanks before the people, *for his good Sermon*: He being now with the *Mayor*, Brother *Cann* told him what he had said, his Answer was, *I confesse (saith he) it was a good Sermon, but I knew who you meant, even the Lord Protector*: thus he acknowledged the matter to be good, onely the meaning of the brother, that he presumed to know, and could tell how to apply it."

C.

Finally, we may briefly touch upon three problems in Canne's career which have thus far not been adequately treated.

The first of these relates to the period of his first exile, which, it will be remembered, covered seventeen years. Mr. Stovel imagined that this lasted from 1623 to 1640, while Mr. Axon* seems to avoid the question. My own belief is now that the period terminated in 1647, after the taking of that "blessed martyr" Charles I., and that it began in 1630.

The second problem concerns Canne's banishment from Hull in 1656. The cause of this, he says,

he does not know,—a strange remark, since we are now aware that for several years he had had enemies in Hull who had apparently done their utmost to undermine his influence. In this attempt they seem at first, however, to have been only partially successful, for early in 1656 his home was still at Hull. In July, 1656, he was unexpectedly banished.

From the meagre details which are now at our disposal, is it possible to gain any further insight into Canne's difficulties in Hull? It is my belief that we can. It appears to me that they were really connected with a cause which made trouble for all of its prominent adherents, namely, the Fifth Monarchy Movement, which began to arouse apprehensions on the part of the authorities in London as early as 1653. In 1656 the movement was approaching its first crisis. The suspicions of the government had already been aroused. John Canne's sympathies were well known in Hull, and apparently as the movement advanced his enemies had new opportunities for bringing about his 'downfall.' Information against him was sent up to London, and on July 25, 1656, President Lawrence from Whitehall wrote to the Governor and the Mayor of Kingston-upon-Hull in behalf of the Protector and the Council expressing "fear that the peace and safety of the garrison and town of Hull may be endangered by Mr. Canne's residence", and giving instructions "to order him to remove forthwith out of the town, or you will cause him to be removed."⁴⁸ Thus was Canne's sojourn in Hull brought to a sudden and untimely close. As a result of the hardships which his family were now compelled to endure his wife and a daughter died.

The third problem pertains to the time when Canne became an Anabaptist, Baptized man, or Baptist. We

⁴⁸ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1656-7*, London, 1883, edited by Mary Anne Everett Green, p. 41.

have already seen that the so-called "Broadmead Records" cannot be relied on for information relating to the subject of baptism, and they, I believe, are alone responsible for the belief that he ever became one. John Ball speaks of Canne in 1642 as being the leader of the Brownist church in Amsterdam. Furthermore, even in 1645 it is probable that he still occupied the same position, while in 1649 at London he was apparently not an Anabaptist, but only a Separatist. From a note⁴⁹ in Mr. Boyle's edition of the *Memoirs of Master John Shawe*, Hull, 1882, as we have already seen, it is likewise evident that between 1650 and 1656 Canne was looked upon as an Independent. When then did he adopt Anabaptist views? Or is this story of his being a Baptized man a mere fiction? At present I am disposed to think that it is an unconscious fabrication of Mr. Terrill's brain. And this explanation appears the more likely to be true, after an examination of the 1662 and 1664 editions of Canne's Bible, in which I have been unable to discover any marginal references such as one might naturally expect to find, suggesting that he had at that period become an Anabaptist, or a rebaptized or immersed Fifth Monarchy man.

Furthermore, Steven's *History of the Scottish Church in Rotterdam*, pp. 270-71, as cited by Mr. Stovel,⁵⁰ certainly suggests that when Canne died he was once more the leader of the Brownist congregation at Amsterdam. If this was indeed the case, as there seems to be little reason for doubting, we need not have much hesitation in concluding that John Canne's connection with the English Anabaptists is absolutely unhistorical. At any rate, he can now be much more accurately described during all the years 1640-1664 as a prime promoter of the Fifth Monarchy Movement,—a fact which his newly discovered letters help to make

⁴⁹ Note 71 on pages 43-4.

⁵⁰ *A Necessity of Separation* (Hanserd Knollys Society), 1849, p. xxvii.

evident; and we may also feel perfectly certain that his sympathies throughout his long life were for the most part, if indeed not altogether, on the side of the Brownists and Independents, and not of the Anabaptists.

In closing, I would merely remind the reader of two points which perhaps have not yet been made quite clear in this paper. 1. In none of his many extant writings does John Canne claim, or speak of, any connection with the Anabaptists, nor so far as I remember, does he refer to rebaptism, "dipping", or other matters, such as he would have been certain to mention had he been an Anabaptist. Even his enemies never branded him with that name. 2. As to the way in which Canne came to be so mistakenly represented as a Baptist in the "Broadmead Records", fortunately we are not left entirely in the dark. We know that Mr. Terrill wrote the final copy of his work after 1672, and perhaps corrected it still later. He had evidently never known the Broadmead Church in any other light than as a Baptist congregation. From a comparison of the two editions of his manuscript published respectively by Dr. Underhill and by Mr. Haycroft, it seems that on looking over his work and finding certain supposed facts concerning baptism unaccountably wanting or lacking in emphasis, Mr. Terrill supplied in his final redaction such points as appeared to make the history more uniform and harmonious. Now Mr. Terrill had in his possession earlier papers relating to the history, as for instance the "Waste Book", and probably his first text differed from them as much as Dr. Underhill's edition does from Mr. Haycroft's. Terrill found Canne's name and some account of him in these papers, and without manifesting any more critical acumen than he has shown in the rest of his narrative seems, without further thought, to have added to this account and to have described him as

a "Baptized man". By this means a somewhat more harmonious description of the origin of the Broadmead church was produced, but at the same time an error was transmitted to credulous posterity, which has proved a great hindrance to clear historical thinking, and to the correction of which too large a proportion of the present paper has unfortunately had to be devoted.

CHAMPLIN BURRAGE.

Thomas Tillam of Colchester.

In "Transactions," Vol. III., No. 3, reference was made to a series of "disputations" on the Sabbath question between Peter Chamberlen, Thomas Tillam, and Matthew Coppinger on the one part, and Jeremiah Ives on the other part. From the fact that the account of the debate was issued by Ives in 1659, it is generally concluded that the "disputations" took place in that year, and so given in error on pp. 184, 188, of this volume; whereas they came off in 1658. The book in which Ives described the proceedings was addressed to "beleivers in Christ, especially they who are in bondage to the Jewish Sabbath, and more particularly to those in Colchester"—a thrust at Tillam, who had entered upon the pastorate there. In the same year Edm. Warren, "Minister of the Gospel in Colchester," answered Tillam in "The Jews' Sabbath Antiquated," in the preface of which he speaks of a treatise by Tillam, "by profession an Anabaptist," who had been pleased "to print and found a challenge and provoke me to the combat in answering of it," Pass on to 1678, in which year Thomas Grantham, "a Servant of Christ," also opposed Tillam, in "Christianismus Primitivus," speaking of him as "T. Tillam, of Colchester, an Apostate" (Book III., ch. 10, sec. 2, p. 56). Thus it would appear that Tillam was resident in Colchester for at least twenty years. Adverting to the Chamberlen story, I may correct an error (on p. 188). The "dwelling on Garlick Hill" was at "the lower end of Bowe Lane" (not *lowest*).

J. W. THIRTLÉ.

From a study of Tillam completed two years ago, based partly on the State Papers, may be added that on 13 June 1660 he was under restraint, on 1 September 1661 he was reported as having landed at Lowestoft having settled a hundred families in the Palatinate, on 3 December 1664 he was still on the same business, on 24 August 1665 he was with Colonel Blood in Ireland, on 14 December 1666 he was sending agents to the north to get more emigrants, and on 5 March 1668-9 full details are given of the remarkable community at the monastery, and the Jewish customs there observed.

EDITOR.