

Continental Anabaptists and Early English Baptists.

WE are attaining a much clearer view of the sixteenth century Anabaptists, who were long slandered and were much misunderstood. Justice has been done to them by such historians as A. H. Newman and T. M. Lindsay.

One question about them is of peculiar interest to Baptists: What is our own relation to them? It was assumed by Rippon that in substance they and we are one; in this he simply adopted the view of those who opposed them and us alike. He was followed by many other Baptists, such as Orchard in 1838, Armitage in 1887, Carey Pike in 1904. On the other hand modern Pædobaptists are most cautious in alluding to any connection, and Richard Heath even speaks of the fall of Anabaptism in 1536, which seems an error of another kind. It seems well, therefore, that the question should be examined by itself. The case for distinction is stated here, and the case for a certain indebtedness is presented separately.

I. THE ANABAPTISTS OUTSIDE ENGLAND.

It is well known that during the sixteenth century people called by their enemies "Anabaptists" were well known in Saxony, all along the Rhine, at Augsburg, in Tirol, Austria, north Italy, Moravia, Bohemia, Poland. Also that some of them took refuge in England and won a few converts, two of whom published books on their views. Lindsay's map in his second volume on the history of the Reformation illustrates the distribution.

It is equally well known that some of them obtained power at Münster, where they were attacked and exterminated. It is less notorious, but well established, that in the very next year a congress was held near Bockholt, in Westphalia, when reorganization began. There soon emerged a leader, Menno Simons, whose influence was great from Wisby in Gothland to Flanders, and perhaps as far south as Strasburg. Though his disciplinary methods were repudiated elsewhere, yet his name

was gradually adopted by all, and the "Anabaptists" of the sixteenth century are continuous with the later "Mennonites." But there was fierce and steady persecution, which exterminated all in Italy, and most in south Germany and the Austrian dominions. The Moravian section had most vitality, and, because of their communism, they have received close attention from modern Socialists. Most of these who escaped or did not conform, took refuge in South Russia. And the emigration to America, which began as early as 1650, has been greatly quickened in the last fifty years, so that more than half the whole are now in the United States and Canada. Full accounts are given by themselves in the new *Schaff-Herzog* and in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*; while the United States Census Bureau has issued modern reports dealing with their history, and touching even on their condition in Europe, where they exist in Switzerland, Germany, Holland and Russia.

It is agreed that there are no Mennonites in England to-day. The question is as to the relation in the sixteenth and Magistracie, Ministerie, Church, Scripture, and Baptisme.

II. THE ANABAPTISTS IN ENGLAND.

Allusions to these begin with 1528, and have been gathered together by Baptist historians; they may be seen conveniently in Crosby, I, 38, and in Evans, *Early English Baptists*, volume I. At first we read of "all Dutch, certain Dutchmen, nineteen Hollanders, born in Holland, &c"; but in 1539 King Henry spoke of such foreigners having "seduced many simple persons of the King's subjects," and next year the French ambassador implied that twelve London citizens had adopted the opinions of the Flemish Anabaptists. Bishop Ridley soon enquired of his clergy whether Anabaptists were holding conventicles, and he was actively concerned in the death of Joan of Kent, a Colchester woman, condemned for a characteristic Anabaptist doctrine. Fox refers often to the "Anabaptists lately springing up in Kent," with many details. Doctor Some, in 1589, declared that some persons of these sentiments had been bred at our universities, the Anabaptistical absurdities having been specified by him in 1588 as touching Magistracie, Ministerie, Church, Scripture, and Baptisme.

When we find also that the new Articles of Religion take express notice of Anabaptist doctrines, it is clear that the continental immigrants had won English adherents, that there were now English Anabaptists. In 1562 Elizabeth ordered "the Anabaptists. . . from the parts beyond the seas . . . [who] had spread the poison of their sects in England, to depart the realm within twenty days, whether they were natural-

born people of the land or foreigners." But the persecution by Alva sent more and more over, so that in 1575 there was a capture of a whole Flemish congregation.

The question, then, is whether these English Anabaptists won by the continental immigrants have any continuity with the English Baptists. There may be continuity of external organization, quite compatible with remarkable changes, even of doctrine; an extreme case is the technical legal continuity of the Church of England despite the changes at the Reformation. Whoever would assert this as between the English Anabaptists and the English Baptists, must produce evidence. There is remarkable dearth of evidence after 1577, and as yet there is nothing to show that the English Anabaptists had any formal organization.

Probably more interest would be felt in a resemblance of doctrine or methods. There is a remarkable opening of communications to-day between the Church of England and the Orthodox Churches of the East, of which one after another is declaring that there is no bar to inter-communion; and possible relations with the Church of Sweden are being explored. Though no one would assert any external bonds for centuries, inner resemblances are being tested. So it is quite reasonable to examine what the English Anabaptists held.

The last three Articles of Religion suggest that their enemies were struck with their communism, their objection to oaths, weapons and war. More important are two of their works, which have been printed in our *Transactions*, iv., 91, and vii., 71, showing views in 1557 and 1575. The earlier work is a lengthy criticism of Calvinism, especially the doctrines of reprobation and final perseverance. The later is a discussion whether it is lawful to revenge wrongs, by invoking the law or by using force; it widens out to object to judicial oaths, to acknowledge kings and magistrates, and incidentally grants authority to the Old Testament, in so far as it is not "abolished by the newe."

These two works are not complete expositions of Anabaptist tenets, but they probably show what were the points that chiefly excited attention. To them we may add the view of Hoffmann imbibed by Joan of Kent, that our Lord's flesh was created in the body of Mary, and owed nothing physically to her. Then we have all the leading ideas that were held by the English Anabaptists, and they are all directly due to the continental Anabaptists or Mennonites.

How long these views persisted in English circles it is not easy to say. They certainly were not widely spread, for Bishop Jewell in his *Apology* of 1567 said that England did not know the Anabaptists. But when the Separatist Church of 1586

largely migrated to Holland, where contact with the Mennonites was easy, we find that some of the English presently adopted Anabaptist views, and after a while were excommunicated. In 1597 John Payne published at Haarlem a warning as to eight views held by the English and Dutch Anabaptists in Holland:—Christ did not take his pure flesh of the Virgin Mary; The Godhead was subject to passions and to death; The infants of the faithful ought not to be baptized; Souls sleep till the resurrection; Magistrates ought not to put malefactors to death; Wars are condemned; Predestination and the Lord's day are condemned; Free will and the merit of works are held.

This is good evidence that there were English Anabaptists in Holland at this time. Though the account of their tenets is from a hostile witness, we are able to compare with the confession drawn up by Hans de Ries in order to explain himself to another group of English, eleven years later. The emphasis is very different, but Payne's account is not incompatible.

The points here mentioned are none of them characteristic of English Baptists: only in a single respect is there coincidence, the refusal of baptism to infants. As to the other points, on some of them Baptists were divided in opinion, on others they held the exact opposite. This comes out well in the familiar story of the intercourse of Smyth, Helwys and Murton with the Mennonites.

III. THE FIRST ENGLISH BAPTIST CHURCH.

In the year 1608 or 1609, John Smyth baptized himself and most of the people who had come with him from England, then they formed themselves into a church. They were speedily asked why they had not sought baptism at the hands of the Mennonites; and as they were actually living in premises belonging to a Mennonite, communications were opened. They compared opinions, and it is quite instructive to see how utterly independent they were of one another at first. Smyth stated his views in twenty articles, Ries edited his confession anew into thirty-eight. On comparison, with a view to union, the English split into three groups. The first, says Richard Clifton, separated from the others "holding the error about the incarnation of Christ." The second, and largest, headed by Smyth, saw no obstacle to union, and asked for it; but the Mennonites hesitated and shelved the matter, till after the death of Smyth (whose self-baptism was a difficulty to them), the application was renewed, and the English were recognized as a church in communion with the Mennonites. The third, headed by Helwys, revised the confession of Smyth, and declined fellowship with the Mennonites.

Of the first group, further information is wanting. The second group remained as an English Mennonite church in full communion with the Dutch Mennonites; a generation later, when the members had learned Dutch, there was a union of three churches including this, into the one strong church still worshipping on the Singel.

The third group, under Helwys, returned to England, the first English Baptist church on English soil. The story of its intercourse with the second group was told in 1862 by Benjamin Evans from documents still to be seen at the Singel. Though the translation was poor, and the arrangement mistaken, there is nothing wrong as to the main point, that the English Baptists, now increased to five churches, differed from the Dutch and English Mennonites on several points:—As to Christ assuming his substance from Mary, the lawfulness of an oath, the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, the administration of the sacraments, the fulfilling magistracies, and the bearing of arms.

These matters were discussed at considerable length, and in the end both sides agreed that the differences were too serious to permit of intercommunion. The correspondence ceased, and was never renewed. One or two single persons, such as Murton's widow, crossed to Holland, and were received into the English Mennonite church there, in one case expressly on the strength of the baptism in 1609: but there was no transfer from church to church. After 1640 there was an absolute cessation of all intercourse.

More than that: the idea of Succession arose at a most early stage, and Helwys declared that it was "Antichrist's chief hold." Not merely did these churches disclaim succession as a fact, they objected to it as unnecessary, and insistence on it as distracting.

Each party has developed independently. Professor Kühler says that his fellow-believers in Europe to-day no longer abide by their original tenets as to ecclesiastical discipline, bearing of arms, or civil office; that their opinions are unchanged as to baptism and oath-taking; that most are liberal, while the more conservative profess a biblical orthodoxy. In America Professor Horsch gives a lengthy description of the six groups into which they are divided: all are very quaint in their practices, most retain feet-washing, anointing of the sick, the kiss of charity: they oppose oaths, lawsuits, war.

In many towns of Russia, Germany, Holland, America, there are Mennonite churches and Baptist churches. They have no more intercourse with one another than Methodists with Presbyterians.

IV. ENGLISH REPUDIATION OF THE TERM "ANABAPTIST."

Not only did the English churches of 1611-1630 break off intercourse with the Mennonites, they were at pains to dissociate themselves in English eyes from the Anabaptists. In 1615 they signed an epistle as "His Majesty's faithful Subjects, commonly (but most falsely) called Ana-baptists." They presented a supplication to the King in 1620 as "loyal subjects, unjustly called Ana-baptists." Even a generation later the confession of 1660 was "set out by many of us who are (falsely) called Ana-Baptists."

They were not indulging in any etymological argument, but were repudiating connection with the well-known people called in England "Anabaptists," though abroad they were equally known as "Mennonites." The doctrines of these men were fairly well known, and the English disclaimed them. Busher was at pains to uphold royal authority, within due limits. In 1615 the followers of Helwys reiterated, "We do unfeignedly acknowledge the authority of earthly magistrates, God's blessed ordinance, and that all earthly authority and command appertains to them." "For all other things we hold, as the lawfulness of magistracy, God's blessed ordinance, of Christ our Saviour taking his flesh of the Virgin Mary by the wonderful work of the Holy Ghost, &c., you may see them in our Confession in print, published four years ago." To the rejoinder, many that be called Anabaptists hold the contrary, and many other strange things, they reply, "We cannot but lament for it." To the further point, you will yet be called Anabaptists, because you deny baptism to infants, they reply, "So were Christians before us called Sects; and so they may call John Baptist, Jesus Christ himself, and his apostles, Anabaptists; for we profess and practise no otherwise herein than they, namely, the baptizing of such as confess with the mouth the belief of the heart. And if they be Anabaptists that deny baptism where God hath appointed it, they, and not we, are Anabaptists." Here the similarity of view on the one point is admitted, and dismissed as clouding the issue; the gist of the argument is that connexion is denied with the well-known men who had strange ideas as to oaths, magistracy, the flesh of Jesus.

In 1644, when civil war was breaking out, another association of the word was recalled, that the Anabaptists of Münster had dared to fight, and Doctor Featley tried to scare men with the thought that English Baptists would behave as at Münster. Therefore, the English Calvinistic Baptists, with whom he was in actual contact, took up the challenge, and they, too, said

three or four times that they were "commonly (but unjustly) called Anabaptists." They, too, spoke of their views on magistracy and private property, and quite plainly dissociated themselves from "some unruly men formerly in Germany, called Anabaptists."

It is therefore submitted that English Baptists have no kind of continuity with English Anabaptists or with foreign Anabaptists, whether formally or by kindred doctrine. The latter have no cause to be ashamed of their history, and they tell it plainly; we have no cause to be ashamed of it, but they are as independent of us as are Unitarians and Congregationalists.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Relation between English Baptists and the Anabaptists of the Continent.

IT will be well to make it plain at the outset that it is not the purpose of this paper to maintain a connection between the early English Baptists and the Continental Anabaptists. It is frankly admitted that in the present state of our knowledge—or perhaps we should rather say, ignorance—the evidence to establish such a position is not forthcoming. Perhaps it never will be forthcoming. Neither, on the other hand, are we at present in a position to deny the connection. That, at least, is the modest contention of this paper.

The word "relation" in the title is deliberately chosen. It is of course a very wide and vague term. Relation may indeed be negative as well as positive. If positive, it may vary indefinitely in the degree of its nearness; and it may be direct or indirect. Two bodies are directly related when it can be shown that one is originated by, or avowedly continues, the other. In the present case, there can be no question of affirming such a direct relation. It has, on the contrary, been definitely disproved. On this point I have nothing to except or to add to what has been adduced by Dr. Whitley, or by Mr. Champlin Burrage in his *Early Dissenters*. The English Baptist movement was not founded by Anabaptists from the Continent, nor by Englishmen who had been baptised or ordained by such Anabaptists, nor did the English Baptists profess to reproduce the principles of the latter.

But was there an *indirect* relation between the two bodies? Were the founders of English Baptism in any degree influenced by Anabaptist propaganda, whether in the shape of oral teaching or written apology? Unfortunately evidence on this subject is so far lacking. We have no statements from them showing consciousness of a debt to Anabaptism. On the contrary we know that the early English Baptists were concerned to affirm their distinctness from the Anabaptists. As to the significance of this fact something will be said later on. In the absence of express testimony from the persons themselves, we have to fall back upon inference from points of seeming similarity between the two bodies. Here, in the nature of the case, there may easily be considerable difference in the conclusions favoured by different judges. It is a familiar phenomenon that where evidence is fragmentary or ambiguous, the decisive factor in the conclusion is apt to be the judge's personal prepossession, and the same evidence which seems to one man to warrant a certain conclusion, seems to his opponent equally or more consistent with the opposite conclusion. To take a familiar instance, the Catholic has no difficulty in discovering his own conception of episcopacy in the earliest Christian literature, canonical and extracanonical.

Now, on the question before us, different investigators have arrived at opposite conclusions. For the positive view we may cite Professor McGlothlin, who in his article on the Anabaptists in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* says, "It is possible, and indeed probable, that there is some connexion between them and the Independents, English Baptists and Quakers, all of whom show some of the peculiarities of the Anabaptists." For the negative view it is sufficient to quote Dr. Whitley. In his *Baptist History* just published, he says, "Baptists are to be sharply distinguished from the Anabaptists of the Continent, some of whom took refuge in England as early as 1530, but had won only two known English adherents in 40 years" (p. 17). I must be allowed to call attention to the word "known" in this sentence. "Two *known* adherents in 40 years." Yes: they happen to be known because they uttered their views in tracts which are still (more or less) extant. But is it sound to infer from this fact that English Anabaptists were very few? It is the argument from silence, which is always precarious. Is it not a much more probable inference that there were silent members greatly more numerous than those who found a voice on paper?

On the next page (p. 18) Dr. Whitley says, "It is inexcusable to-day to confound the continental Anabaptists of the sixteenth century with the English Baptists of the seventeenth century." If he means to repudiate any debt of the

latter to the former, "inexcusable" seems rather a strong word. Why this apparent warmth of feeling? When one sees English Baptists like Dr. Whitley and Dr. Shakespeare so eager to deny all connection between Baptists and Anabaptists, one is tempted to wonder whether they are—of course, unconsciously—influenced by any bias against the Anabaptists. That a strong prejudice against the latter determined until quite recently the accounts given of them by Lutheran and Reformed Church historians, we all know. This prejudice was based on certain peculiarities, troublesome to constituted authority exhibited by various Anabaptist sects, and especially on the lamentable extravagances perpetrated by a small section of the Anabaptists when, frenzied by savage persecutions, they got the upper hand for a brief season in Münster. Is it possible that the recollection of the said eccentricities has anything to do with the apparent reluctance of some English Baptists to recognise any debt to a body, the vast majority of whose members are now recognised by impartial historians to have lived quiet lives of conspicuous piety and morality?

At all events, it is the object of this paper to plead for the maintenance of an open mind on the question of relationship, and by showing an *à priori* probability that Baptists were influenced by Anabaptists, to give an impulse, if possible, to a search for further evidence on the subject, and to its favourable consideration if (or when) producible.

It is not contested that from about 1530 Anabaptist refugees from persecution found their way into England, that they carried on propaganda here, and met with a certain or rather, an uncertain, amount of success. Were the founders of English Baptism influenced in some degree by that propaganda? We have seen above that the main evidence on this point at present available must be derived from a comparison of the known tenets and practices of the two bodies. But here at once we are confronted by serious difficulty. Take practice first. We are largely ignorant of the forms of organization and worship adopted by the Anabaptists. We do know that they laid very little stress on outward forms, whether of practice or belief. Principal Lindsay remarks (Reformation II, p. 422), "What characterised them all [he is describing mystics and Antitrinitarians as well as Anabaptists], was that they had little sense of historic continuity, cared nothing for it . . . that they all possessed a strong sense of individuality, believing the human soul to be imprisoned when it accepted the confinement of a common creed, institution or form of service, unless of the very simplest kind." They found the mark of the true church rather in the presence of a certain spirit and life—those, namely, which were characteristic of New Testament

Christianity, as they understood and sought to reproduce it. Hence it is not remarkable that we hear little of their observances, and that what we do hear shows wide divergence between different sections of the Anabaptist group. Mr. Bax notes that some of them refused even the ceremonies of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Of their tenets, it is true that we know a good deal more. Nevertheless, the method of comparison can hardly be applied so immediately as Dr. Whitley applies it. The reason is that here again there is an extreme divergence between the tenets of the various sects of Anabaptists. Lindsay tells us that "some [Anabaptists] maintained the distinctive doctrines of the medieval church (the special conceptions of a priestly hierarchy, and of the Sacraments being always excluded), others were Lutherans, Calvinists or Zwinglians; some were Unitarians, and denied the usual doctrine of the person of Christ; a few must be classed among the Pantheists" (ib. p. 424). It is in fact extremely difficult to name positions that were held by all, or even by the majority of the Anabaptist sects. Sebastian Franck, a contemporary and not unkindly observer, declares that no two sects agree in all points. Lindsay mentions repudiation of the State Church as "perhaps the one conception on which all parties among them were in absolute accord" (ib. 443). Elsewhere he says, "It is simply impossible to give any account of opinions and practices which were *universally* prevalent among them. Even the most widely spread usages, adult baptism and the 'breaking of bread,' were not adopted in all the divisions of the Anabaptists" (ib. p. 446).

To begin with the tenet alluded to in the nickname Anabaptist—while all Anabaptists rejected baptism of infants, and held that only conscious believers belonged to Christ's Church, not all practised the baptism (or rebaptism, as their opponents said) of the believers who joined them. As to ceremonies in general, we have already noted that Anabaptists attached little weight to them; but, whereas most rejected those of the State Church, some, on the principle that all forms are matters of indifference, allowed themselves to show outward conformity. There were Anabaptists who wandered about preaching their views, and Anabaptists who discountenanced preaching. Anabaptists who observed Sunday as a feast, and others who refused to do so. The view that Christ did not derive his human flesh from Mary was by no means characteristic of Anabaptists in general; nor, apparently, was the notion that the dead sleep, in a sort of intermediate state, until the Judgment Day. Communism, for the support of the members of the society, was by no means universal among Anabaptists; perhaps the greater number inculcated a Christian stewardship

of his possessions on the part of the individual. Almost all maintained "passive resistance," i.e. they acknowledged the duty of obedience to the civil magistrates, except in matters of religion, and held that for disobedience in these matters they were to suffer persecution without resistance or retaliation. But some, not all, denied that a man could be a magistrate and a Christian. War and capital punishment were contrary to the principles of Anabaptists in general; but there was a section which taught that one day the faithful would be used as the Lord's instruments for the violent overthrow and execution of the ungodly authorities of this world. This view, however, was no more typical for the generality of Anabaptists than was the "millenarianism" of the followers of Melchior Hoffmann. On the taking of an oath, and the use of law courts, there was probably no less diversity of view. Not to multiply further these points of difference, we will merely add that while the majority of Anabaptists were honourably distinguished by the austere purity of their morals, there were apparently some who were antinomian in teaching or practice.

It is this bewildering variety of tenet among Anabaptist sects which accounts for the extremely different estimates of the movement pronounced by modern historians. According as he attends primarily to this or that group of tenets, the historian may proclaim it "medieval" or "modern"—it may appear to him reactionary, or in the van of progress. Thus, according to Lindsay, the face of Anabaptism was toward the past. "The whole Anabaptist movement was medieval to the core; and like most of the medieval religious awakenings, produced an infinite variety of opinions and practices" (ib. p. 441). Contrast with this the finding of McGlothlin. "The Anabaptists were several centuries in advance of their age. Some of their tenets, then universally anathematized and persecuted, have been adopted by all civilized lands, e.g. universal religious toleration; and thus have been widely incorporated in the newer lands (America and Australia), and are making headway in the older societies, e.g. complete separation of Church and State; yet others are still objects of endeavour, only seen as far-off boons, as, for example, abolition of war. . . . It is remarkable that these people should have drawn from a fresh study of the Bible so many great ideas that still float before the race as high and distant ideals." (op. cit. 411-2.)

Enough has now been said to show the great difficulty in the way of an immediate comparison of Anabaptist tenets with those of the English Baptists. But while it is impossible to make a list of specific tenets common to Anabaptists in general, it is possible to distinguish a few fundamental ideas which underlie and give character to all their sects. There is the idea

of the individual soul's direct access to, and fellowship with God, independent of the meditation of church or priest. This, again, rests upon some doctrine of an "inner light"—a spark of the divine spirit in the individual, which, if heeded and obeyed, suffices to lead him in the ways of God. The true church consists not of persons mechanically included therein by accident of birth or performance on them of any ceremony, but of those who are actually saints—persons whose lives are under the control of the divine Spirit. All such are brethren, and belong to the fellowship of God's people. How He intends them to live, as individuals and as brothers, they are to learn from the New Testament Scriptures. As nearly as possible they are to reproduce the faith and life of the New Testament saints. In virtue of the divine spark within him, each individual has the ability to understand and interpret these scriptures for himself.

Now this broad type of a simple, practical Christianity, ruled by the individual's own devout study of the New Testament, reappears on English soil in the Baptists. If there were Anabaptists here, seeking, and with some success, to propagate their faith, as we know to have been the case, it is not a natural supposition that they may have exercised some influence on the first Baptists? That the Baptists drew widely different conclusions from the New Testament in many details, is a fact that presents no real obstacle to this supposition. We have seen that on the Continent Anabaptist sects arising in different regions and under varying conditions, adopted widely different views. It can be no marvel if on English soil the same germinal ideas gave rise again to a quite novel type.

There is, indeed, one serious objection to the hypothesis. As Dr. Whitley points out, the English Baptists themselves were careful to disavow any connection with the Continental Anabaptists. But the objection is not fatal. It was natural that the Baptists should wish to escape, if possible, the odium that everywhere attached to the Anabaptists, and the persecution which followed them. And the differences between themselves and the Anabaptists were so many and obvious that they might in all good conscience believe themselves quite distinct from them. But still this would not prevent the possibility of a certain indebtedness on their part. We are all apt to find encouragement and strengthening in our convictions when we see them exhibited also by those of a different party from ourselves, and are ready also to borrow or accept from them ideas that fit in with the general frame of our thinking. And this is likely to be much more decidedly true of a small, obscure sect, oppressed and universally denounced.

I venture, then, to suggest that there is sufficient likelihood of Anabaptist influence upon early English Baptists to

make it worth while to seek for further and more direct evidence on the subject. And I will end this paper by quoting in support the words of one whose opinion carries far more weight than mine. In *Baptist Historical Transactions*, VII, pp. 72-3, Dr. A. Peel recalls his statement elsewhere that in the century before that in which George Fox began his work, there were in many parts of the country bodies of worshippers—sometimes having much in common with the Anabaptists or the Family of Love—whose views were much akin to those of Fox's followers, and urges "as yet there has been no real and systematic research concerning Anabaptist congregations in London, Norwich and elsewhere. . . . There is a real opportunity for investigators in this field." I have only to add that the "elsewhere" should specially include those districts of Northern England whence came the first English Baptists of Amsterdam.

A. J. D. FARRER.