

will help to build bridges between the W.C.C. and the Lausanne/Pattaya approach, and between Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox.

It was a privilege to attend such a gathering, to meet such a wide range of Christian experience from all over the world, and to be the recipient of so much first-class theological thinking. I do recommend, particularly, if readers can get hold of it, Bishop John V. Taylor's address on "The Church witnesses to the Kingdom" and also Kosuke Koyama's address on "The Crucified Christ challenges Human Power" — these were undoubtedly the two finest pieces of thinking put before the conference. Raymond Fung's address "Good News to the Poor — the case for a missionary movement" is also very good value. Extracts from these addresses, together with other reports of the conference can be found in the latest issue of the *International Review of Mission*, Vol. LXIX (275) July 1980. Issues of *I.R.M.* from about mid-1978 onwards give further background to the Melbourne conference.

I returned home from Melbourne with a deepened awareness of the richness and variety of the people of God, and with a renewed confidence in the power and relevance of the gospel.

P. CLEMENTS-JEWERY,
Minister, Wigan Baptist Church.

The Tangled Careers of Two Stuart Radicals: Henry and Robert Danvers

IN the decades after the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660, most Baptists adjusted themselves to the new regime by practising quiescent obedience in political matters and worshipping as best they could in conventicles. Sometimes this entailed persecution through fines or imprisonment, as manifested in the career of John Bunyan and fellow members of the Bedford church. For most Baptists the holy war was no longer to be fought in physical terms but in the world of the spirit, as Bunyan's classic, *The Holy War*, revealed.¹ There were, however, a minority of Baptists who adhered strictly to the Good Old Cause and repeatedly endeavoured to overthrow the Stuart monarchy by renewed revolution. Of these the most prominent Baptist leader was Henry Danvers, but in seeking to pursue his surreptitious activities in the 1660s and 1670s the historian must disentangle him from his near namesake, Robert Danvers, also a revolutionary and perhaps a Baptist.

Henry Danvers was a Staffordshire gentleman who possessed an estate worth some £300 p.a. He may have studied at Trinity College, Oxford, for the title-page of the Congregational Library copy of his 1663 tract, *The Mystery of Magistracy Unveiled*, contains an annotation suggesting as

much. As a young man of approximately twenty when the Civil War erupted, he supported the parliamentary cause and ultimately became a colonel in its forces. With future associates such as Thomas Harrison and Hugh Courtney, he engaged in discussions of the "Agreement of the People", the proposed Leveller constitution, in 1647-48. His position in the shire and commitment to the parliamentary cause were responsible for his service on the Staffordshire County Committee from 1647 to 1652, and he was also a justice of the peace, in which capacity he was "well beloved among the people, being noted for one who would not take bribes". Four times in 1649, 1650, and 1652 he was appointed a commissioner in Leicestershire for the general assessment, which raised funds to support the troops in England and Ireland. On 15th and 16th June 1649 the Council of State directed Major Danvers to make plans for the demolition of Belvoir Castle to prevent its use by Royalists. It was perhaps in this connexion that the Council commissioned him as a major in the Leicestershire militia on 5th March 1650, although two months later, on 14th May, he also received a commission as colonel in the Staffordshire militia. (While serving as Governor of Stafford (1650-51) he became concerned for the town's security, hence he sent a proposal for its improvement to the Council of State in 1651, and in response received £100 from the Ordnance Committee for the garrison.²

It was during his tenure as Governor of Stafford that Danvers embraced Baptist views, having formerly been an Independent, and joined the General Baptist congregation associated with Henry Haggar. He had already written in favour of religious toleration in *Certain Quaeries Concerning Liberty of Conscience* (1649). His religious convictions were further manifested in 1652 when he signed a petition to the Rump opposing the Independents' scheme for a national ministry. This was Roger Williams' *The Fourth Paper, Presented by Major Butler, to the Honourable Committee of Parliament, for the Propagating the Gospel*.³

On 15th June 1653, some two weeks before the opening of the Nominated Assembly (or Barebones Parliament) on 4th July, the Council of State ordered lodgings for Danvers in London. In that Assembly he sat for Leicester and served on committees dealing with tithes, Scottish affairs, and prisons and poor prisoners. In the Assembly's debates he distinguished himself by speaking out in favour of religious toleration, hence a list published in 1654 properly recognized him as an opponent of a national ministry. As a trustee for the use of sequestered tithes during the Commonwealth (1649-50), Danvers brought some expertise to the committee on tithes, which included such other prominent radicals as Harrison, Courtney, and Arthur Squibb. These men were adherents of the Fifth Monarchy movement, a group Danvers himself joined while in London. He became a joint-elder of Edmund Chillenden's General Baptist Congregation, which first met at Aldgate and then St Paul's. Despite the efforts of Danvers and his colleagues, the committee reported on 2nd December that the majority favoured a retention of the tithing system. Although the radicals forced a debate, they narrowly lost by two votes, with Danvers serving as teller. The day after the vote the moderates caucused and determined to resign their authority to Oliver Cromwell

early the following day, an action to which Cromwell acquiesced.⁴

In the years after the dissolution of the Nominated Parliament Danvers' disaffection with the government intensified. Late in 1655 he pressed for the churches to protest against the Protectorate, but Edmund Chillenden, a fellow General Baptist and influential Fifth Monarchist who had a congregation at St Paul's, opposed such action. Nevertheless the following March Danvers urged the saints to rise in rebellion, and the same year he entered into negotiations with the Commonwealthsmen to pursue this aim. He did not, however, join in the planning of Thomas Venner for a rising to topple Cromwell and establish a divine kingdom governed by a sanhedrin of saints with scripturally-sanctioned laws. Harrison knew of these plans but refused participation, and may have informed and influenced Danvers. In any case Danvers, Harrison, Courtney, the Commonwealthsman John Lawson, Colonel John Okey, and Nathaniel Rich were arrested in April and briefly imprisoned for suspected complicity.⁵

In the midst of these events Danvers became involved in a schism in the congregation of John Simpson at Allhallows the Great, Thames Street. Simpson retracted his Fifth Monarchy views no later than February 1656, prompting the Fifth Monarchists in his congregation to mount a campaign to restore him to their ideology. That summer they enlisted the assistance of Danvers, Clement Ireton, Arthur Squibb, and others for a debate, but Simpson refused them entry. The following year the Fifth Monarchists in the congregation sought and received the permission of Danvers, Squibb, and others to separate from Simpson's church.⁶

Danvers presumably rejoiced with other Fifth Monarchists in April 1659 when Richard Cromwell dissolved his Parliament under pressure from Charles Fleetwood, Harrison, and others. Demands, however, by some Fifth Monarchists for a new version of something akin to the Nominated Parliament were shunted aside in favour of the restoration of the Rump, which the Fifth Monarchists had been happy enough to see terminated in 1653. With the change in fortunes Danvers was instructed to attend the Committee of Safety in July 1659. He was appointed a Militia Commissioner (with such prominent radicals as Sir Arthur Haselrig, Colonel William Purefoy, and Sir John Hartopp) for Leicestershire and Staffordshire, and a member of the Staffordshire County Committee (1659-60). In company with such men as Courtney, Clement Ireton, and Henry Jessey he signed *An Essay towards Settlement upon a Sure Foundation* in September 1659, in which they called for religious and legal reforms and the ousting from office of all who had supported the detested Protectorate. In January 1660 he was appointed a commissioner for the assessment for the county of Middlesex. Briefly, then, at the end of the 1650s Danvers returned to the sort of local political prominence he had enjoyed almost a decade earlier, but it lasted only until General George Monck successfully engineered the restoration of the Stuart monarchy.⁷

At the Restoration Danvers lost his positions but not his militancy. He did take the precaution of placing his estate in the hands of trustees, hoping to ensure its security, though apparently without the success he sought. In 1661 he was reported to be living in the village of Stoke Newington outside London and allegedly planning a rising with such disaffected

radicals as Clement Ireton and John Okey. That year and the next a series of tracts was published under the general title *Mirabilis Annus*, justifying the cause of the saints and hammering home the ultimate inevitability of divine retribution against their oppressors. Published at least partly by the Fifth Monarchist printer Livewell Chapman, the tracts were thought by the government to have been written by Danvers, Jessey, and the Independent minister George Cokayne. Although Danvers was in hiding, the authorities questioned Jessey in December 1661, but he admitted only to knowing Danvers and having an interest in the material in the inflammatory tracts. According to government agents Colonel Danvers was involved in 1662 in the Tong Plot to restore the republic, assassinate Charles II and the Dukes of York and Albermarle, and establish liberty of conscience. This, however, was almost certainly Robert Danvers, as will be seen.⁸

While in hiding Henry Danvers wrote his tract, *The Mystery of Magistracy Unveiled* (1663), in which he set forth his political views. Although acknowledging that an act of God was behind the restored monarchy, he insisted that Christians should openly or secretly resist it as providence provided. The imposition of antichristian sovereigns such as Charles II was a curse on the subjects, yet the saints were exhorted to pray for such rulers.⁹ Perhaps such views were expressed by Danvers in the conventicles he illegally held in 1663. It was probably this Danvers who went into exile in Holland prior to 6th November of that year, and there laid plans with the rebel Colonel Gilby Carr for an insurrection in England. According to informers Danvers had agents in Leicestershire for this purpose (which clearly points to Henry Danvers), possibly men he had worked with in the early 1650s in that county. Certainly Henry Danvers was associated with Sir John Hartopp of Freeby, Leics., and his wife Elizabeth, the daughter of Charles Fleetwood. Conventicles frequently met at their home at Stoke Newington, where Danvers himself lived after the Restoration. Among those known to have attended these conventicles were Danvers, Jessey, and Nathaniel Strange, another Calvinistic Baptist, Fifth Monarchist, and former army officer. On 30th December 1663 the government issued a warrant for the arrest of Colonel Danvers, Strange, and the Fifth Monarchist John Skinner. Because Strange and Danvers were associated through Hartopp, the warrant surely refers to Henry Danvers.¹⁰

In January 1664 Colonel Danvers was alleged to be involved in a plot to enlist in forces to be raised in the spring of 1664 to fight the Turks and then turn those forces against the English government. Because Robert Danvers was in the Tower at this time, the information must relate to Henry Danvers. The authorities still had not been able to get their hands on him in April, and in June he was reported conniving with rebels in London and preaching in Leicestershire. Allegedly his new plot aimed at the overthrow of the Stuarts in late July. His wife subsequently went to London to convey news of the latest schemes to Lady Frances Vane, who seems to have been a key contact with revolutionaries in the City.¹¹

Although Danvers was finally apprehended in August 1665, he was rescued in Cheapside by a friendly crowd which presumably included numerous Baptists and Fifth Monarchists. On the 30th he was charged

with high treason and summoned by proclamation to stand trial. The Sheriff of Leicestershire was ordered to secure Danvers' estate in that county pending the outcome of the trial. The plot in which he was now alleged to be involved — usually known as the Rathbone Plot — was supposed to go into action on 3rd September 1665, when Charles would be assassinated, the Tower seized, London put to the torch, a republic established, and property redistributed. A number of schemers, including Colonel John Rathbone, were apprehended and eight executed, though Danvers again eluded his pursuers. On 9th September one of his servants at Maddersall, Staffs., claimed not to know his whereabouts, though he admitted he received money from his master in recent months and books from his brother, Charles, a London merchant and Fifth Monarchist. On 22nd October the state was informed that Danvers was still "about" but very wary since his near escape.¹²

Danvers appears to have fled to Ireland, where Colonel Gilby Carr and Colonel Thomas Blood allegedly were plotting to seize Limerick in February 1666. Whether Danvers was present and part of such plans is impossible to know, but he was linked to a subsequent plot that August involving Blood, the Congregationalist minister Thomas Palmer, and others. The English government also received a report that Danvers was meeting with agents from Holland, who were also in contact with Edmund Ludlow, to plan an invasion of England. Perhaps Danvers went with Carr and Blood to Scotland that autumn and took part in the rising of the Covenanters, and was still with Blood when the latter met with Baptists in Westmorland the following spring. In any case a warrant was issued on 2nd March 1667 for Danvers' apprehension, instructing that he be brought before either Secretary Arlington if found in London or Westminster, or a justice of the peace.¹³

Nothing more is heard of Henry Danvers until 28th May 1670, when a new warrant was issued ordering that he be taken into custody. Dr B. S. Capp has suggested that this may have been due to Danvers' participation in Blood's daring attempt to kidnap and hang the Duke of Ormonde while he was host to William of Orange, but that escapade did not occur until December 1670. The state remained frustrated in its endeavours to apprehend Danvers, and a chagrined Earl of Arran seemed surprised to discover in May 1671 that there were two Colonel Danvers, "both dangerous fellows".¹⁴ Henry Danvers did not take advantage of the Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 to apply for a licence to preach, undoubtedly because of his fugitive status. Once again, however, he used his period of hiding to produce another tract, the millenarian *Theopolis, or the City of God* (1672). In it he set forth the postmillennialist view that Christ would not reappear until the conclusion of the thousand years, which would be a time of bliss and health for the saints. In the millennium there would be no church, no ministry, and no ordinances (baptism and the Lord's supper), for Christians would worship by prayer and thanksgiving alone. In company with various other thinkers Danvers anticipated the conversion and return of the Jews to the Holy Land as the prelude to the millennium, but unlike many millenarians he refrained from making guesses about exact dates.¹⁵

Still in hiding, Danvers next turned his attention to the subject of

baptism in his *Treatise of Baptism* (1673; 2nd ed., 1673; 3rd ed., 1675). It is particularly interesting because it was part of a broad and heated controversy over the nature of baptism and whether or not it was essential for church membership and communion. John Bunyan argued that it was not in *A Confession of My Faith* (1672), to which Thomas Paul (*Some Serious Reflections*, 1673) and John Denne (*Truth Outweighing Error*, 1673) issued rebuttals. Bunyan counterattacked in his *Differences in Judgment about Water-baptism, No Bar to Communion* (1673), to which Danvers responded in "A Postscript" to his *Treatise*. Bunyan retorted in his *Peacable Principles and True* (1674). Danvers was primarily interested in his *Treatise* in stating the case for believers' (adult) baptism, hence the paedobaptists attacked him in such works as Richard Blinman's *An Essay Tending to Issue the Controversie* (1674), Obadiah Wills' *Infant-baptisme Asserted* (1674), and Richard Baxter's *More Proofs* (1675), reiterating the views expressed in his *Plain Scripture Proof of Infants Church-membership and Baptism* (1651). Danvers defended his position against Wills and Blinman in *Innocencie and Truth Vindicated* (1675), to which Wills responded in his *Vindiciae vindiciarum* (1675). As the controversy dragged on Danvers stuck to his argument in *A Rejoynder to Mr Wills His Vindiciae* (1675), *A Second Reply* (1675), and *A Third Reply* (1676). While much of the argument is very tedious, the "Postscript" against Bunyan, presenting the case for closed membership and communion, is interesting. There Danvers cogently argues that "if it be preposterous and wicked for a Man and Woman to cohabite together, and to enjoy the Priviledges of a Marriage-state, without the passing of that publick Solemnity: So it is no less disorderly upon a Spiritual account, for any to claim the Priviledges of a Church, or be admitted to the same till the passing of this Solemnity by them." In the midst of this controversy over baptism Danvers wrote *A Treatise of Laying on of Hands* (1674), in which that traditional practice was repudiated as unscriptural.¹⁶

When the government next noticed Danvers on 27th November 1675, there was some surprise that "a person of his quality and estate" was preaching on foot throughout the country. At last the authorities apprehended him as he was leaving a conventicle near Aldgate, where he was a joint-elder; a warrant of 16th January 1676 directed that he be committed to the Tower for treason. He was there only briefly when his health deteriorated sufficiently for a warrant to be issued for his discharge on 28th April 1676, on payment of £1000 security. He was confined to his house. Apparently undaunted Danvers was believed the following year to be involved in a fresh plot to assassinate Charles, his brother, and William of Orange, and possibly bring back Richard Cromwell as titular head of state. In addition to Danvers this plot was alleged to involve William Smith, a crony of Blood (who was now acting as an informant), and the son of the Baptist regicide Daniel Axtel.¹⁷

No later than 1679 Danvers moved closer to the Whig mainstream and even managed the parliamentary election of Algernon Sidney that year. As the government's attention was increasingly devoted to the exclusion controversy, Danvers grew bolder in his pulpit appearances. In December 1681 he was reported ministering to a London Conventicle, and by the

following year he was said to have a congregation of some seven hundred in the City. Against the background of the revelations of the Popish Plot, Titus and Samuel Oates visited Danvers at Stoke Newington in January 1682. Danvers made known to them his conviction that those who lost lands at the Restoration must have them restored. Throughout the year he plotted incessantly with this in mind, scheming with members of the Green Ribbon Club, former associates of Blood, and the Fifth Monarchist Walter Thimbleton. In August he seemed to be working with Titus Oates and two shadowy radicals, Raddon (associated with Blood in 1666) and Spurraway, and the following month there was a report that Francis Smith, the Baptist bookseller, was part of this group. They contemplated kidnapping and possibly executing the King, the Duke of York, and Privy Councillors, thereby stirring the Duke of Monmouth and the Earl of Shaftesbury to topple the ruling order. These meetings continued in the fall and spring, and at some point in this period may have merged with the schemes of the Rye House plotters. In any case Danvers was suspected of complicity in that plot, which was uncovered on 12th June 1683. Two weeks later Danvers was reportedly associating with the Baptist bookseller John Darby, and at the end of July there were fears that he, Spurraway, and a man named Alexander were conniving to have Shaftesbury or Monmouth kidnap the King and force him to sign an Exclusion Bill.¹⁸

On 16th September 1684 the Privy Council decided it wanted to interrogate Danvers, but when they learned the following day that his whereabouts were unknown they decided not to press the search. They did discover, however, that Danvers had been seen at Algernon Sidney's house. They must have regretted not pursuing the search when they read Danvers' latest piece in December, *Murther Will Out*, in which he excitedly charged that the imprisoned Earl of Essex did not commit suicide but was murdered. Viewing this as seditious libel, the government issued a warrant for his arrest on 30th December for allegedly treasonous activity and a reward of £100 was posted. Additional warrants were issued on 20th and 26th January, 8th February, and 4th July, in which he was still listed as residing at Stoke Newington.¹⁹

The culmination of Danvers' career of scheming and plotting came in 1685. When it became apparent that the Duke of York would succeed Charles II, Danvers planned an insurrection in London on the day of the coronation, relying on some five hundred men from Essex and Hertfordshire who could enter the City under the guise of celebrating the event. These plans, however, were set aside when he was informed of the Duke of Monmouth's intention to raise England. Although warned by Captain Robert Perrott, a Fifth Monarchist, that Danvers could not be trusted, the Duke resolved to leave the city in the care of the colonel and Thimbleton. In many respects conditions were propitious for Danvers, particularly since many of the troops loyal to James had already marched westward. Yet with several thousand men ready to rise in the City, Danvers refused to act. According to the famous explanation of Thomas B. Macaulay, "the craven Danvers at first excused his inaction by saying that he would not take up arms till Monmouth was proclaimed King, and when proclaimed King, turned round and declared that good republicans

were absolved from all engagements to a leader who had so shamefully broken faith". Macaulay, however, based his judgment on sources strongly biased against Danvers, and it is now reasonably clear that Danvers refused to move until he was certain that Monmouth could break through the King's western defences and that Cheshire would rise. After the rebellion was suppressed the government on 27th July gave Danvers twenty days to surrender, but he escaped to Holland. For Danvers and probably most of those who rose in 1685, this was the last blow struck on behalf of the Good Old Cause. Three years hence the Glorious Revolution was largely cut of another cloth.²⁰

In Holland Danvers must have spent his last years in consternation about the Jacobean government, but he also had economic interests abroad. He was a major investor in a scheme to employ exiles, many of whom were west country folk experienced in cloth manufacture. With Monmouth's associate Joseph Hilliard and others he was responsible for establishing an English centre for the manufacturing of cloth at Leewarden in Friesland, and a comparable effort got underway at Luneberg. Danvers did not live to see the Glorious Revolution, which in any case would have been too conservative for him to sanction. He probably died late in 1687 or early in 1688, for on 2nd March 1688 it was noted that he had "died lately" at Utrecht, still outlawed for treason.²¹

Macaulay's assessment that Henry Danvers was "hotheaded, but faint-hearted, constantly urged to the brink of danger by enthusiasm, and constantly stopped on that brink by cowardice", a demagogue and a vile species of human nature,²² is surely too extreme. Danvers was a man captured by his millenarian vision and convinced that the long-awaited thousand years would come only when the saints ushered them in by establishing a godly society. Essentially he was a republican in his political ideology, though he seems to have been willing to tolerate a godly figure-head as a token monarch. His reluctance to raise London for Monmouth may have been due not only to fears that the Duke could not break through the King's western defences and that Cheshire would not rise, but also to correct suspicions that Monmouth had no intention of governing as a mere puppet of religious sectaries. Monmouth could never have accepted Danvers' concept of a state governed in accordance with the principles of Mosaic law, with magistrates selected by lot. Danvers did not stop on the brink because of cowardice, but because realism ultimately interjected, making it evident that effective action to implement his radical ideology was in the realm of wild fantasy. Yet he schemed on. At most Danvers and the men like him who hatched such schemes as the Rathbone and Rye House Plots might have succeeded in assassinating Charles II, the Duke of York, and other notables, but they could never have acquired the political power for the Good Old Cause that perished forever in 1659. In his better moments Danvers worked with the Exclusionists in an endeavour that at least had some hope of success as well as aims to which many Englishmen could subscribe. Henry Danvers is historically significant in providing a clear contact between Algernon Sidney and the Green Ribbon Club on the one hand and the shadowy world of radical revolutionaries on the other. The government's repeated inability to lay its hand on him and his

open preaching to hundreds in London in 1682 are a curious comment on the effectiveness of Stuart rule.

The second Colonel Danvers, who compounded the government's difficulties in the 1660s and early 1670s, was Robert Danvers (*alias* Villiers), the illegitimate son of Sir Edward Coke's daughter Frances. She was married to Sir John Villiers, Viscount Purbeck, but deserted him for Sir Robert Howard in 1621. Aged seventeen when the Civil War broke out, he joined the royalist forces and may have commanded a regiment of foot, though he denied this in 1659. He did fight at the battle of Gainsborough in 1643. By 1646 he had renounced the Catholic faith in which he had been raised, and he approached Parliament for permission to compound for his delinquency. The noted Puritan ministers Stephen Marshall, Herbert Palmer, and Obadiah Sedgwick lent their support to his petition on 4th May 1646, and on 7th July he was fined £1126, pardoned, and discharged. A change in political convictions also occurred, and he married Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Sir John Danvers, the regicide. He successfully compounded for that part of the late Earl of Danby's estate vested in him through his wife in December 1649, paying a fine of £265.²³

He was probably the Robert Villiers to whom a pass was issued on 14th October 1650 to go "beyond sea" and again on 12th January 1652 to travel to Flanders with his servants. The change of religion and political convictions apparently opened some doors to the inner circles of power, for in 1652 Robert Villiers, representing that faction in the Council of State hostile to Cromwell, was dispatched on a mission to Italy. Despite objections from Lady Danvers, he successfully petitioned Cromwell for a patent to assume the surname and arms of the Danvers family, thus dissociating himself from the unfavourable reputation of the Villiers. Although Lady Danvers got a hearing before the Court of Wards in January 1657, the patent stood.²⁴

In the elections to Richard Cromwell's Parliament in 1659 Danvers was chosen to sit for Westbury, Wilts. He had, however, political enemies who suspected the genuineness of his conversion from the royalist cause and Catholicism, and thus challenged his right to the seat. During the ensuing debate Colonel Touchett, who had served in Prince Rupert's regiment in the Civil War and had subsequently seen Danvers in Italy, testified that Danvers had commanded a regiment of foot in the royalist forces. The House thereupon disabled Danvers from sitting on 12th February, but rejected (112 to 145) a motion to commit him to the Tower. Danvers was elected for Malmesbury, Wilts., in the Convention Parliament, but opted to sit as Viscount Purbeck in the Lords, from which he was expelled in July. After offering to "surrender" his title in September, he and his wife petitioned Charles II in November for permission to assume the surname and crest of the Danvers family and the estate of the late Henry Lord Danvers. According to the petition Robert had received no estate from the Villiers family, but the estate of Lord Danvers was supposed to descend to Elizabeth and her sister Anne. The license they sought for the Danvers' surname was finally issued on 25th March 1662.²⁵

Danvers' rejection by the Lords and the government's apparent unwillingness to recognize even his claim to the Danvers' name and arms

deepened his radical inclinations. As early as December 1660 he was reported to be speaking disloyally of Charles II and admiring "his kinsman" John Lambert and Cromwell. According to his critics "he only sits in the present Parliament for formality's sake, and never goes, for he can do his country no good". The government was sufficiently concerned to incarcerate him with over forty other radicals that month for suspected complicity in a plot against the King. Under Thomas Venner the Fifth Monarchists did in fact rise in January 1661. The only evidence to link Danvers to the rising is a report that on the eve of the insurrection he predicted the Anabaptists would prevail and declared that he would adhere to his republican principles. This may suggest he was now a Baptist himself.²⁶

The state learned in 1662 of a plot to assassinate the King and the Dukes of York and Albemarle, capture the Tower and Windsor Castle, and restore the republic. Allegedly conceived by Ensign Thomas Tong, a London distiller and tobacco merchant, it was supposed to have the support of numerous radicals, including Nathaniel Strange, Edmund Ludlow, and Colonel Danvers, though cases could be proved only against Tong and five rather insignificant compatriots. Henry Danvers was already in hiding because of suspected complicity in writing the *Mirabilis Annus* pamphlets and scheming with Ireton and Okey, but Robert Danvers was perhaps involved. A warrant to apprehend Danvers, William Prior, George Elton, and James Hill was issued on 17th February 1663 in connection with the Tong investigations. It must have been Henry Danvers who fled to Holland before 6th November, for Robert Danvers, a prisoner in the Tower on misprision of treason (perhaps because of the February warrant), was ordered sent to the Isle of Wight on 30th January 1664. While in the Tower he provided the authorities with information on plotters in London. After being moved to York Tower he escaped in late July, at which time he had an estate at Allerston, Yorks., and a proclamation was issued on the 27th for his arrest. Nothing is heard of him during the next three years.²⁷

In February 1667 the authorities were contemplating the release of one J. Bradshaw, who they hoped would provide them with information about plotters in London, especially "Col. Danvers and all Presbyterian [sectarian] designs". At that time Henry Danvers was still in hiding, though he had apparently returned from his meeting with Blood in Ireland. The government may, however, have been referring to Robert Danvers, for by September he was in prison on the Isle of Wight on suspicion of treason and seditious speech. The Earl of Arran's remark in May 1671 about two dangerous Colonel Danvers suggests Robert had been released or had escaped. It was probably the latter because he fled to the Continent, where he died and was buried at Calais in 1674. His widow returned to England that November and resumed the titles of Baroness of Stoke and Viscountess Purbeck. The House of Lords refused in 1678 to recognize the claim of their son, Robert, to the titles, and he too subsequently found himself in trouble with the state. In November 1683 he escaped from King's Bench prison and was reported hiding near the Savoy.²⁸

Like his more famous near-namesake, Robert Danvers was possibly a

Baptist.* There is, however, nothing to suggest he was a Fifth Monarchist. Unlike Henry Danvers his republican proclivities were not the result of conviction but anger at a government that refused to recognize his claims. Had Charles II acknowledged him as Viscount Purbeck, Robert Danvers would undoubtedly have become a supporter of the restored regime, but the aggravating slowness with which even his request for the Danvers' surname and arms was granted embittered him and turned his thoughts to insurrection. Unlike Henry Danvers he seems not to have had ties with the more important radicals who had designs against the Stuarts, perhaps because the distrust with which he was greeted in Richard Cromwell's Parliament never dissipated. To most radicals he must have remained an untrustworthy and perhaps unsavoury character. Henry Danvers was a radical by conviction, but Robert Danvers took that road because of the ramifications of his bastard birth. Yet to the government they were, as the Earl of Arran aptly observed, "both dangerous fellows".

*On the likelihood or otherwise of Robert Danvers being a Baptist, see also D. W. Bebbington, "Baptist M.P.s in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries", *Baptist Quarterly* Vol. XXVII (April 1980), pp. 247, 255. — Editor.

NOTES

- ¹ Richard L. Greaves, "John Bunyan's 'Holy War' and London Nonconformity," *Baptist Quarterly*, 26 (October 1975): 158-68. The only published overview of radical activity in the period from the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution is the sketchy treatment by Iris Morley, *A Thousand Lives* (1954). There is an excellent introductory article by W. C. Abbott, "English Conspiracy and Dissent," *American Historical Review*, 14 (1909): 503-28, 696-722. Some specialized studies are helpful, including Peter Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels* (1977), Maurice Ashley, *John Wildman* (1947), and W. C. Abbott, *Colonel Thomas Blood* (1911). There is a mine of pertinent information in B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (1972). Cf. also J. Walker, "Dissent and Republicanism after the Restoration," *Baptist Quarterly*, 8 (1937): 263-80; and his "The Yorkshire Plot, 1663", *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 31 (1934): 348-59.
- ² D.N.B., s.v.; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 248; Louise F. Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men* (1912), p. 22; *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (1911), 2:37, 301, 470, 667; C.S.P.D., *Comm.*, 1:187, 189-90; 2:211, 223, 505, 506, 580, 595; 3:114 *et passim*.
- ³ A. G. Matthews, *The Congregational Churches of Staffordshire* (1924), p. 34; Tai Lui, *Discord in Zion* (The Hague, 1973), p. 111.
- ⁴ C.S.P.D., *Comm.*, 5:412; *Acts and Ordinances*, ed. Firth and Rait, 2:143-44, 371; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 178; W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932-40), 3:146ff.; Liu, *Discord in Zion*, pp. 93, 168; *Commons' Journals*, 7:285-86, 361; H. A. Glass, *The Barebone Parliament* (1899), p. 74. As a tithes' commissioner he dispensed salaries and augmentations to preaching ministers as determined by Parliament.
- ⁵ John Thurloe, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. T. Birch (1742), 4:365, 629; C.S.P.D., *Comm.*, 10:351; *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. W. C. Abbott (Cambridge, Mass., 1937-47), 4:465; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 118; *The Clarke Papers*, ed. C. H. Firth, *Publications of the Royal Historical Society*, new ser., 61 (1899):106.
- ⁶ Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 276-78.
- ⁷ C.S.P.D., *Comm.*, 13:45; *Acts and Ordinances*, ed. Firth and Rait, 2:1327, 1331, 1373; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 124, 126.

- ⁸ Thomas Crosby, ed., *The History of the English Baptists (1738-40)*, 3:90ff.; *C.S.P.D. Chas. II*, 10:661; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 206, 209, 211; B. R. White, "Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion," *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent*, ed. R. Buick Knox (1977), p. 152.
- ⁹ Henry Danvers, *The Mystery of Magistracy Unveiled (1663)*, pp. 20-25, 37.
- ¹⁰ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 3:327-28, 393; G. Lyon Turner, "Williamson's Spy Book," *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, 5 (1912): 315.
- ¹¹ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 3:463, 565, 606, 638; 4:246.
- ¹² *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 6 (Berkeley, 1972): 184; *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 4:506, 542, 555; 5:24; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 211. Cf. *Lords' Journals*, 11:688. Danvers was not mentioned in the account of the plot provided by Sir Roger L'Estrange in *A Compendious History (1680)*, pp. 4-6, though he does comment on "those *Fifth Monarchy* bigots". Nor is Danvers mentioned in the documents in the *Middlesex County Records*, ed. J. C. Jeaffreson (1886-92), 3:376; 4:269-70.
- ¹³ Abbott, *Colonel Thomas Blood*; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 212; *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 6:64, 427, 463, 537, 545; 7:1-2.
- ¹⁴ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 10:239; 11:283; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 218.
- ¹⁵ Henry Danvers, *Theopolis, or the City of God (1672)*, pp. 39-46, 72-89. For the general context see Peter Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel* (Cambridge, 1970); and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (New York: Viking ed., 1973), pp. 70-78.
- ¹⁶ Henry Danvers, "A Postscript" to *A Treatise of Baptism (1673)*, pp. 52-53. Cf. Richard L. Greaves, *John Bunyan* (Abingdon, 1969), pp. 135-45.
- ¹⁷ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 17:419, 516; 18:90; 20:290-91, 299-300; *H.M.C. 19 Townshend*, pp. 43-44; *H.M.C. 25 LeFleming*, p. 124; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 218-19.
- ¹⁸ M. Dorothy George, "Elections and Electioneering, 1679-81," *English Historical Review*, 45 (1930):565; *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 22:613; 23:237, 358, 405, 495; 24:346; 25:216; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 82, 220-21.
- ¹⁹ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 27:145, 148, 268, 292; *C.S.P.D., Jas. II*, 1:5, 246; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs* (Oxford, 1857), 1:324.
- ²⁰ T. B. Macaulay, *The History of England* (New York, 1902), 1:422, 459; C. C. Tench, *The Western Rising (1669)*, pp. 88, 148; Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, p. 221; Luttrell, *A Brief Relation*, 1:355.
- ²¹ Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels*, pp. 157, 159; Luttrell, *A Brief Relation*, 1:432.
- ²² Macaulay, *History of England*, 1:408, 459.
- ²³ *D.N.B., s.v.; Commons' Journals*, 4:464, 508, 534, 605; *Calendar of the Committee for Compounding*, 3:1639.
- ²⁴ *C.S.P.D., Comm., 2:563; 4:548; 10:215; Writings and Speeches of Cromwell*, ed. Abbott, 2:529.
- ²⁵ *Commons' Journals*, 7:602-3; *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers (1932)*, 4:152; *Diary of Thomas Burton*, ed. J. T. Rutt (1828), 3:241-53; *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 1:399; 2:320.
- ²⁶ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 1:419, 477.
- ²⁷ *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 3:51, 461, 608, 652-53 [William Hill], *A Brief Narrative of That Stupendous Tragedie (1662)*.
- ²⁸ *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, 5:582; *C.S.P.D., Chas. II*, 7:463; 11:283; 16:407; 26:96; 27:302.

RICHARD L. GREAVES,
Professor of History, Florida State University.