

Charles-Marie de Veil.

(Continued from page 129).

De Veil had now revised his previous work, and even commented further. His next publication was on *Ecclesiastes*, which he dedicated to Sancroft. It came out in 1681 with a flourish of trumpets, containing both the certificate of the six dignitaries, and a separate testimonial from Lloyd. Charles-Marie seems to have understood well the art of advertising. And yet it is curious that no publisher ever handled a second book; the market for Latin commentaries in England cannot have been large, though the language ensured a sale in Europe. Of making many books there was for a space a distinct end; and though de Veil was not chiefly a Preacher, he may have agreed that so far as promotion went, Vanity of vanities, all was Vanity. He was still "omnium egenus." Yet his fame had reached Rome, where Bartoloccio in preparing his *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, during 1683, was inserting notes about the work of himself and his brother: Part III. n. 847, folio 843.

Towards the end of the year, he had the opportunity of renewing his friendship with Henri Justel, who was appointed Librarian to Charles II. He also met again the Maimbourgs, and we may be sure that he was present when Théodore followed his example, and before the bishop of London abjured his faith and was admitted into the Church of England. When Simon at Belleville heard of this, he wrote to Justel that some one had told him de Veil's conversion to Protestantism was due to Madame Maimbourg.⁴⁹

De Veil was a habitué of Fulham, whence indeed he had dated his letter to Simon. The controversy on Tradition was seen to be important, and Compton urged him to keep au fait with all developments. And his commentaries caused both English clergy and reformed churches abroad to ask him to continue such work.⁵⁰ Now for both these tasks, he needed access to a library. And in those days London was far inferior to Oxford and Cambridge in this respect. The only old college was Gresham, and this was not rich in divinity. On London Wall, at a new Sion college, a library was accumulating round the nucleus of John Simson, with accommodation for students; but it was

⁴⁹ Letter of Richard Simon, 20 March 1682: edition Rotterdam 1702, I, 77-78.

⁵⁰ Crosby: IV, 256. But is this only a generalization from Claude?

intended for the incumbents of city parishes, and de Veil had no right to use it. In some of his works he apologises that he has no access to originals, and has to quote from translations only. It was therefore a great boon to have the run of the episcopal library at Fulham.

In 1682 there came out an English version of Simon's suppressed history, without leave of the author; and thus curiously England had the start of all countries in facing problems of the higher criticism. De Veil might naturally have followed it up, being well qualified and directly concerned; but except for an English version next year of his letter to Boyle, he kept to his chosen path of Biblical commenting. This controversy was taken up rather by Jean Leclerc, who this year was preaching at the Walloon church and the Savoy chapel.

Of scriptural exposition there was no glut. Beza's New Testament with notes was often reprinted; the *Revelation* had attracted three students lately, and *Daniel* had been expounded; Owen's *Hebrews* had just been finished, and *Esther* had found a commentator. Otherwise the field lay open. The question would arise, On what books could his Talmudic knowledge bear? What books raised points in issue between Papist and Protestant? What would sell readily? On the whole, the *Acts* seemed suitable. Nobody had paid special attention to it lately; there were just the relevant pages in Grotius, Diodati and Calvin from abroad, Trapp, the Assembly, the *Critici Sacri* and Poole's synopsis of the same. And not one of these knew Hebrew customs at first-hand. It would be a natural sequel to his commentary on *Matthew and Mark*. There were many places where points could be made against Rome. So to *Acts* he settled down, with the conviction that "there is scarce any book that treateth of the Christian religion, which so clearly explains the doctrine of truth by examples that cannot be spoke against, and truth of history attending it; and truly there is no other book, save the apostolic epistles, that intermingles these two."

In the Fulham Palace library there was abundance of books. But whereas Metz had given him Hebrew thought, and Angers had introduced him to all Western and some Eastern thinkers, London was strong on post-Reformation works. And browsing along the shelves, he might find a few English books with a fresh tinge. An ex-clergyman, Henry Jessey, had been deeply concerned with the re-admission of Jews to England. Thomas Delaune had lately collaborated in a huge folio on the metaphors of scripture. Another ex-clergyman, Francis Bampfield, was convinced like the Talmudists that all learning whatever was implicit in the Bible. Yet another ex-clergyman, John Tombes, had given attention to Romanism. And one more, Hanserd

Knollys, was an expositor, especially of *Revelation*, a Hebrew scholar, and much concerned with the second coming of Messiah. An ex-Huguenot, Peter Chamberlen, was interested in the Sons of the East. For one reason or another, every one of these authors might attract a passing glance; and it might dawn upon him that they all had one singular point in common—the very point to which Simon had called his attention—these men had quitted the Church of England, because they rejected infant baptism. If he caught sight of the *Conference touchant le pedobaptisme, tenue à Paris entre le sieur Jean Mestrezat et Théodore Naudin*, he would hardly resist reading it, for Mestrezat was one of the Charenton pastors; he would be struck with the fact that it had occurred in the very year he had had the conference with Bossuet that had led to his first change of view. The works of Tombes would give him ample food for thought.

Then while Tombes had died lately, there were others of this band of scholars still living, Hanserd Knollys, Bampffield and Delaune. The two latter were thrown into Newgate in a spasm of persecution against dissenters, but Knollys seems to have been left at liberty, perhaps because he had business abroad and could travel at the worst time, perhaps because he had friends at court.

Then came in a touch of romance.⁵¹ There was a house-maid at Fulham, who may have waited on the ungainly foreign scholar, and may have seen him reading some of these books. She did learn something of his new line of thought, and let him know that she was a Baptist, acquainted with Hanserd Knollys, who frequently visited at the house of a nobleman near Fulham. An interview was arranged, and de Veil began to give serious thought to the topic of baptism, which cropped up so often in the *Acts*, and to which Simon had called his attention.

It has been said that he found yet another man, like himself a domestic chaplain to a peer, John Gosnold. He was a Cambridge graduate, and had once held some post in the Established Church; but had gathered a Baptist congregation which met at Moorfields. It has been said that de Veil was so taken with his learning and conversation that he soon became a member of Gosnold's congregation.⁵² But though Crosby printed this statement from the M.S. of his brother-in-law Stinton, the latter was mistaken. Gosnold died in 1678, the year that de Veil reached England, and before he heard of Baptists.⁵³

⁵¹ Crosby IV, 256. The 1702 editor of Simon's letters added a note that de Veil married the daughter of a Baptist; and it has been assumed that this was the housemaid.

⁵² Crosby: IV, 257.

⁵³ Crosby: III, 63, citing Calamy, who printed the inscription on Gosnold's tombstone in Bunhill Fields.

Whatever gave the final touch, it is certain that de Veil came to agree with Naudin, that the baptism of infants was a matter only of church tradition, and that scripture interpreted with unprejudiced scholarship, such as he had urged on Simon, pointed to the baptism of believers, as indeed Simon retorted on him. He was committed to a commentary on *Acts*, and this view could not possibly be dismissed as unimportant. How long the mental conflict lasted, we cannot tell. In March 1682 Simon knew him still as an Anglican; even in 1683 it would seem that the English version of the letter to Boyle was put out without any sentence alluding to this corollary. Certainly by Easter 1684 the die was cast. The advertisements that term told of three new books: a conference between Bossuet and Claude; a scientific treatise on human blood by Robert Boyle; an *Explicatio Actorum Apostolorum* by Charles-Marie de Veil. All three curiously were from the same publisher, a man of some sharp practice, for he advertised de Veil as S.T.D. and professor emeritus, being canny enough to lay a false scent describing him also as Metensis.

BAPTIST.

This last change shifted de Veil yet once again into a new environment, socially and mentally if not physically. He lost his position as domestic chaplain, he lost the friendship of all the Church dignitaries, he lost the patronage of the Secretary and the Lord Chancellor. Stinton indeed said that he did retain the friendship of Tillotson, but it was Louis-Compiègne who remained in favour, not Charles-Marie.⁵⁴

De Veil would now find himself singularly isolated. On the social side there was no one of the rank of gentleman; the best that could be produced were perhaps Mordecai Abbot, an iron-master operating in Ireland, and Thomas Hollis from Rotherham, in the same line of business at London; with Gale, rich enough to send his son to Leyden. Indeed the penal legislation debarred Baptists from all public employ, and almost limited them to commerce and medicine. Moreover de Veil would be bewildered by the absence of any such Order of ministers as he had been accustomed to. Rabbis, priors, priests, presbyters of the Anglican church, were set apart from other men; Baptists were rather emphatic on there being no distinction, and believing in the priesthood of all believers. They indeed had ministers of a sort, but outwardly they were not to be distinguished from ordinary tradesmen. Even as tradesmen only two were at all

⁵⁴ Birch's Life, edition 1753, page 75.

prominent; William Kiffin was a wealthy merchant, trading with Holland, and had led into the same business the ex-clergyman, Hanserd Knollys. Most of the others were too obscure for their occupations to be noticed; but besides a coat-seller in Leadenhall, a haberdasher in the Park, a rope-maker in Lambeth, Jennings was a cheese-monger, Barret a meal-man, Lamb a shoe-maker, Jones a tailor who kept a coffee-house, Keach a book-seller with a side-line in sugar-plumbs for worms, and a tincture for the bloody flux.⁵⁵

Medicine indeed was not a closed profession as yet, and there were plenty of quack medicines and family secrets. Peter Chamberlen had just died in retirement as squire of Woodham Mortimer, where he had literally buried his secret implement, the midwifery forceps. But William Russell had become Chymist in Ordinary to his majesty, and was about to put upon the market his Powder, whose recipe was to be divulged by a rival in 1693. And Edward Stennett down at Wallingford was so flourishing in his practice that he had taken a lease of an old royal palace, and was just sending to London his son Joseph, equipped with a good education, and destined to marry a Huguenot refugee, Susanne Guill. Another man, rather older, was William Collins, whose father had given him the Grand Tour, from which he returned with a theological education to become joint pastor at the Baptist church in Petty France. His colleague was Nehemiah Cox, who strutted the streets in his periwig, flaunting a gold-headed cane, as though in the front rank of doctors. He had picked up somewhere an M.D., and was an honorary Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians. With Cox, de Veil did strike up a friendship, and this may account for a brief excursion that he too made into the medical field, with whatever memory he had of his charitable uncle's practice. He once benefited greatly Mr. Sharp, then rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and later on arch-bishop of York.⁵⁶

Yet Cox, however fashionable and decently educated, had begun life as a shoe-maker in Bedford, and as a minister had been of lower rank than the pastor there, a brazier or tinker. John Bunyan indeed had since won a crowd of readers for his religious novels, and occasionally visited London, preaching in a large hall leased by Hollis on Broad street; but however great his fame, de Veil could have next to nothing in common with him.

And indeed Baptists were rather at a loss what to do with the unexpected recruit to their ranks. They had no sinecures, no chaplaincies, no colleges, no libraries, and they were not

⁵⁵ Crosby: III, 147.

⁵⁶ Crosby: III, 109, xxxix.

accustomed to pay their pastors. It is to their credit that they rose to the situation, and "on consideration of his abilities, on his dismissal from his place, raised him a salary, which he enjoyed till his death."⁵⁷ In return, he joined the fraternity of Keach, Russell and Cox.

Strictly speaking, a licence from a bishop was needful for practising physic. This would have been easy for Charles-Marie to obtain, as he was under the patronage of four bishops. The profession seemed immune from religious persecution; in the height of the 1683 troubles when Richard Baxter was literally being dragged from his bed to jail, he met Cox, who as a doctor went to a justice to certify that this endangered Baxter's life⁵⁸—yet Cox himself was guilty of Baxter's offence, preaching. On the other hand, Hanserd Knollys, with all his acquaintances in the West End, was thrown into Newgate in the spring of 1684.

It was in these troubles that Charles-Marie sent a copy of his *Acts* to William Bates, as before. Another went to Henri Claude, who acknowledged it handsomely on 15 April 1684, saying that the public would be much obliged if he would continue to make it such presents: the letter was very warm in its expressions of personal esteem and friendship. De Veil was encouraged to revise, while his publisher sought a translator so that an appeal might be made to the English public. For the best English that Charles-Marie could write is seen in the inscription "To the Reverend Doctor William Bates. The author humbly presents this such as it is his commentary as a small token of his respect and gratefulness." No time was lost, and by November Malthus advertised this version, to which he added a translation of an essay on "Baptism for the Dead," by Friedrich Spanheim junior, professor primarius at Leyden.

Meantime the Latin original had been seen by Simon, who seems to have been taken aback on discovering that his question about Tradition and Infant Baptism, which he regarded as a *reductio ad absurdum*, had sent de Veil further away from tradition to the scriptures alone. He said that his letter of 1678 had never been printed by him, but had been sent in manuscript to his Protestant correspondent. He was passing through the press at Rotterdam a reprint of his suppressed book, and to this he now appended a reprint of de Veil's letter, and his letter.⁵⁹ Strange to say, he did not comment on the fact that de Veil had become a Baptist.

⁵⁷ Crosby: IV, 259.

⁵⁸ Neal: *History of the Puritans* (Dublin 1755): IV 419.

⁵⁹ Bayle: *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, article XI, pages 517, 1029.

Now the Baptists had cause for abundant gratitude. Never had such a scholar been in their ranks; never had such a work appeared from a Baptist which so calmly presented their case as a part of a fine piece of scholarship. The commentary promptly took its place as standard; and as late as 1818, when Thomas Hartwell Horne in his massive *Introduction*, which ran to eight editions, was recommending the best books he listed no other commentary on *Acts* emanating from England. It is not surprising that the Hanserd Knollys Society reprinted it in 1851.



The Reverend Doctor
William Bates

The Author humbly presents
this such as it is his Commentary
As a small Token of his Respect
and Gratitude.

AUTOGRAPH OF DE VEIL.

Reproduced by the courtesy of Doctor Williams' Library.

Efforts were made to find or create a congenial post for de Veil; but here a grave difficulty presented itself. He was essentially a scholar, and Baptists thought in terms of preachers, or occasionally general superintendents; that he had been Prior of a house of preachers might even suggest that he was fit to

preach, in English. So strong as been the tradition of preaching as the only occupation of a minister, that even to-day if another man shares that duty he is styled a Lay Preacher, and on the other hand a minister who does not habitually preach is hardly regarded as in the Regular Ministry. The churches of Rome and of England have statesmen, governors, professors, lecturers and others who are all fulfilling their regular ministries, according to the variety that the apostle Paul commended. Baptists look almost exclusively for pastor-preachers. And de Veil did not know enough English even to translate his own book. How could he preach in English, or where could a French congregation be found?

In 1646 the second edition of the London Baptist Confession was subscribed on behalf of a French congregation by Denis le Barbier and Cristoph le Duret. How long that congregation held together is uncertain; it is improbable that it existed thirty years later. Dionysius le Barber, born in the parts beyond the seas, had been denizenated 27 July 1624; there is no evidence to connect him with Edward Barber the General Baptist. The Huguenot Society has no information as to these men.

Again, a minute-book starts in 1652, December 15, with the entry, Eliazer Bar Ishai baptized at Ould Ford.⁶⁰ Next day he married widow Rebecka Hounsell, and one witness was Théodore Naudin, who was corresponding with Jean Mestrezat, pastor at Charenton, on infant baptism. Another prominent member was Peter Chamberlen, who after much trouble with the baptized Jew, notified the church on 29 January 1653/4 that Eleazar Bar-Ishai alias Paul had been baptized only in order to get married, that he had deserted the church, that he had taken his infant to be christened; therefore the church duly delivered him to Satan. In 1683 the second minute-book shows that Chamberlen had dropped out of touch, and that the church had become Seventh-day Baptist. De Veil does not seem to have heard of it.

Charles II had offered letters of denization to Huguenots in 1681, so that Soho and Spitalfields began to fill with Frenchmen. Clearly there was here a great opportunity; private sympathizers were subscribing thousands of pounds to help the refugees. Baptists might have risen to the occasion by hiring a hall from

⁶⁰ Rawlinson D.28 at the Bodleian. Printed in the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society*, II, 132. Eliazer was an interesting chameleon, having already served in Prince Rupert's horse. Under the name of Paul Isaiah, he was employed to write on "The Messiah of the Christians and the Jews," in the introduction to which he takes credit for having had his infant son baptized at one of the City Churches. More serious scandals against him are alleged in W. Prynne's "A short Demurrer to the Jewes." (London 1656) pp. 72-3.

some livery company, and placing it at de Veil's disposal. There were however several drawbacks: Huguenots as such were welcomed with open arms, but Baptist worship was illegal; the law was no dead-letter, and two London ministers had died in Newgate during 1683; Baptists had no leader with any vision and courage.

De Veil therefore had to drop into the English rut. There was a little church which had been meeting in a private house on Gracechurch street, under John Child. He flinched in the persecution, and joined the Church of England, but soon became ashamed, and committed suicide. That did not help the abandoned church, and it did seem as if de Veil might be grafted on to this stock, and that his nationality and his medical pretensions and his eminence might possibly make him immune. Certainly he did settle here as pastor, and had a regular position understood among Baptists.

He might ponder over his new surroundings. The Old Jewry a quarter of a mile west, was indeed but a name, as was also the Elizabethan Jewry off the Minories. But in 1657 the Sephardi Jews had built a new synagogue at the corner of Creechurch Lane and Bury Street, opposite the great gateway into the erstwhile priory of the Augustinian Friars; and this synagogue had been enlarged in 1674. Over on the west of the city was the splendid church of St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, once occupied by the Augustinian Canons, to whom he had belonged. And halfway thither was the cathedral where Compton had his throne, and others of his Anglican patrons held office. Just outside Bishop's Gate, Huguenots were settling in thousands. Hard by, William Kiffin's meeting-house was still confiscated. Hanserd Knollys was languishing in Newgate, and no one knows how his church fared at the Broken Wharf on the Thames. It needed some courage in 1685 for anyone to re-start Baptist worship in the City.

Yet de Veil was an anomalous person, and might possibly be left unmolested, or even win sympathy as a Huguenot refugee. He took pains to accentuate this, and when at Rotterdam there appeared Simon's book, with his letter to Boyle, and de Lisle's reply, he printed a second letter to Boyle, in September. This does not seem available in any library now, though Bayle mentioned it at the time in his *Nouvelles*.

Attention however was diverted by the formal revocation, on 17 October, of the Edict of Nantes. The Temple at Metz was rased next day. Claude was instantly escorted across the frontier into Holland, his colleague de l'Aigle to England, and their great Temple at Charenton was broken up; an Englishman present saw a vast assembly at the closing scenes, and sent graphic descriptions

of the partings, the numbers "devoted to banishment, slavery, and the most barbarous deaths."⁶¹ Every minister was sent into exile, while no others were permitted to leave. But in fact, thousands evaded the cordons, of whom many came to England. The popular sympathy was great, and equally great the rage against Romanists. James had to stop executing the penal laws against Baptists, and in practice they could meet in peace. We should have expected de Veil to ride on the crest of the wave.

Yet he sank absolutely out of sight. In 1759 a well-informed biographical notice stated that on joining the Baptists, he *épousa la fille d'un homme de cette secte*, and *mourut dans le cours de la même année*.⁶² This would account for the silence. In 1685 the Monmouth rebellion distracted attention, so that scarcely any Baptist data survive which could be expected to note his death. In 1689 he did not attend the meeting of Particular Baptists. In 1691 Keach quoted his authority as of a classic, not as of a living man.⁶³ And when Keach's son-in-law, Benjamin Stinton, began compiling short biographies of Baptist worthies, since incorporated in Crosby's History, he obtained very meagre information. Evidently in Baptist circles he lived not long enough to make any mark.

It is tempting to speculate what he would have done. Would he have got in touch with the Chamberlens, and through them with Thomas Tillam? the latter, a Continental, had become Catholic, Baptist, Seventh-day Baptist, and almost Jew. Tillam had promoted a great emigration of Seventh-day Baptists through Holland up the Rhine to the Palatinate. If de Veil had thrown in his lot with these, and come back close to Lorraine and Metz, then Pierre Bayle might well have said that he completed the tour of the zodiac.

As it is, we remain ignorant of the circumstances of his death and burial, and may attempt to sum up his career. With so many changes, it is no wonder that admiration of his talents was qualified by remarks as to his instability. Yet no one charged him in later life with mercenary motives; indeed he twice forfeited good positions and good prospects, when he gave up his Priory and became Huguenot, when he lost his episcopal patrons and became Baptist. It would seem that he was an honest student, and as each new point was put before him, he decided, and acted. Such a conception of him shows his career perfectly consistent.

His actual contributions to scholarship won great fame, and

⁶¹ Walter Wilson: *History of Dissenting Churches*: IV, 381.

⁶² Louis Moreri: *Grand Dictionnaire Historique*: X, 507.

⁶³ He "understood, as I am informed, all the Oriental Tongues." *Answer to Mr. Marlow's Appendix*, page 20.

it deserves attention that the principles on which they were based were somewhat novel, and they still hold the field. Attention to grammar, to the historical surroundings, are accounted as fundamental. His clash with Father Richard Simon shows that he might have taken a leading place also as a writer of Biblical Introduction.

EPILOGUE.

Louis-Compiègne was licensed on 30 November 1685 to teach letters in and around the city;⁶⁴ on 9 April 1687 he was denizenated.⁶⁵ He won favour with Tillotson, in whose correspondence he and his wife often figure, and in whose biography he is mentioned. In the field of Hebrew lore he continued to win fame. But he did not become—as has so often been stated—the official Librarian of Lambeth Palace.

Thomas de Veil was born in St. Paul's Churchyard 1684, and was taught by his father till 1700. In a biography published 1748, the father's name is given as Doctor Hans, but the details point to Louis-Compiègne, "a thorough master of Hebrew and of all the rabbinical literature," though there is some confusion with Charles-Marie. Thomas fought in Portugal, obtained a colonelcy of dragoons by the help of Ruvigny, opened a petition-office in Scotland Yard when placed on half-pay, became Justice of the Peace, took the lead in cleaning up London, showed great bravery in riots 1744, and was knighted. Hogarth depicted him as the drunken man in his "Night." By the first of his four wives he had a son, Hans.

This Hans graduated at Cambridge from Emmanuel College, published at Northampton in 1725 an *Essay on the Horizontal Moon*, dedicated to the ladies of that town; they responded in verse to his inimitable fine dedication. He became usher and vicar at Felstead in Essex, where in 1736 he translated *Les Amusemens de Spa*.

His son John, educated at Felstead, became vicar of Aldenham 1794-1804, also chaplain to the Marquis of Abercorn, and J.P. for Middlesex. In 1798 he preached a patriotic sermon at Edgware. Ten years later he died.

WILFRED S. SAMUEL.

⁶⁴ F. de Schickler, *op. cit.*, page 335.

⁶⁵ State Papers Domestic, James II, Entry Book, 67.

Pedigree of Charles-Marie de Veil.

MOSES ASHER THE LEVITE

[Roll of 1628. Revue des Etudes Juives, Tome xiii. page 116.]

JEQUEL JACOB THE LEVITE

[Roll of 1595, R.E.J., Tome L, page 116.]

Memorbuch:—President here for many years, behaved well, did much charity and many good works; house always open, maintained and aided young people who wished to study the Law.

ASHER

JEQUITIEL DAVID, son of David the Levite
Memorbuch:—Went early and late to synagogue; his descendants gave charity on his behalf; died and was buried 5439 [i.e. A.D. 1679.]

RABBI ASHER LÆMMLEIN (Dr. Lambert) [Roll of 1637, wife and child. R.E.J. Tome L, page 126] Memorbuch:—Son of Jequitiel David the Levite, magnate, faithful doctor. He did loving-kindness to all with his healings, and also bled many poor people free, besides other drugs and ointments and bandages and physic which he gave the poor free to heal their ailments. They also gave charity on his behalf to the congregational fund. Died and was buried 3 Tammuz 5410 [i.e. A.D. 1650.]

RABBI DAVID

[Roll of 1621, wife and four children. Roll of 1637, four children. R.E.J. Tome L, page 121.] Memorbuch:—Son of Jequitiel David the Levite, righteous and liberal Magnate, honoured. He acted as Mohel and also blew the ram's horn at the New Year for a long period. He also occupied himself in charitable works, buried the dead, fixed times for the study of the Law. He went early and late to Synagogue. His heirs gave charity on his behalf to the Congregational Fund. Died in a good name on the sixth night and the next day, the first day of Hanukah 5405 [i.e. A.D. 1645.]

⋮

Name? born 1630, christened at Metz 1654 CHARLES-MARIE DE VEIL baptized and married, London 1684 died, London 1685.

DANIEL, born 1637, christened at Compiègne, 1655 Louis-Compiègne de Veil, probably identical with Dr. Hans de Veil of St. Paul's Churchyard.

The Works of Charles-Marie de Veil.

- Tentative thesis [for S.T.B.?] not published as it stood.
- 1674 Thesis for S.T.D., not published as it stood.
- 1674 Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Mathæum et Marcum. Andegavi, In quarto. P.
- 1676 Commentarius in Joel prophetam. Parisiis. In duodecimo. AP.
- 1676 Commentarius in Canticum Canticorum. Parisiis. In duodecimo. P.
- 1678 Explicatio literalis Evangelii secundum Matthæum et Marcum. Londini. In octavo. CHOPSWY.
- 1678 Lettre à Mons. Boisle pour prouver contre l'auteur d'un livre intit. *Critique du Vieux Testament*, que la seule Ecriture est la règle de la foi. MO.
- 1679 Explicatio literalis Cantici Canticorum. Londini. CHOPSWY.
- 1680 Explicatio literalis duodecim prophetarum minorum. AcFHMPSW.
- 1681 Ecclesiastæ explicatio literalis. . . . Hebraeorum ritibus. MOSY.
- 1683 Letter to Robert Boyle (translation). MO.
- 1684 Acta Sanctorum Apostolorum ad litteram explicata. AOPW.
- 1685 A literal explanation of the Acts of the Holy Apostles (translation) ABCFHMOW.

Libraries where the above may be consulted.

- A Angus Library, for the time at New College, Hampstead.
- B Baptist College, Bristol.
- c Baptist College, Cardiff.
- C Cambridge University Library.
- F Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London.
- H Baptist Historical Library, Baptist College, Bristol.
- M British Museum.
- O Bodleian, Oxford.
- P Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- S Sion College, London.
- W Dr. Williams' Library, London.
- Y York Minster.