

ADVOCATE OF THE REFORMED PROTESTANT RELIGION

The Writings (1645-58) of William Kaye, Yorkshire Puritan

A search of English Baptist history reveals the complex network that produced the Baptist community of today. Some strands that enriched the tradition became an ecclesiastical by-path. One example is the case of the few clergymen in the 1650s and 1660s who both held a state living and the scriptural authority of believer's baptism'. Of necessity short-lived, their circumstances remind us today of the breadth of our Baptist heritage. William Kaye was such a man. His writing career spanned the turbulent period in England when government and church were in a state of flux. He wanted a secure political settlement with a reformed national church and a publicly recognized ministry reinforced by a supportive administration. He placed his hopes successively on a political treaty, a rite of initiation, sacramental reconciliation and a credal formula. A conservative, he was worried by the threat to good order in the state and church by radicals both political and ecclesiastical, with a constant weather-eye on the Papists. His watchword was 'the Reformed Protestant Religion'.

Kaye was born in 1615 at his father's house, Ancram Grange, in Coxwold, North Riding. He came from a clerical family with its roots in Yorkshire. Grandfather George had been Rector of Huggate, East Riding, and Prebendary of York, and William's father George became vicar of Topcliffe in 1614. William was educated at Topcliffe and Kilvington Grammar Schools and at Sidney Sussex, Cambridge.¹

In 1639 William married Elizabeth Eure at Stokesley, North Riding. Her brother George subsequently succeeded to the title of Lord Eure.² William was curate of Stokesley in 1640. On the death of the rector, Henry Thurscross, in 1642, Thomas Pennyman, third son of local landowner, Sir James Pennyman of Ormesby, succeeded him. The Pennymans supported the Crown, organizing armed resistance to Parliamentary troops at Stokesley on 28 January 1643/4. James, William and John Pennyman went south to join the King's forces and it seems probable that Thomas left with them. In 1644 he was deprived of his fellowship at Peterhouse and ejected from the living at Stokesley.³ From 1645 Kaye called himself 'Minister of Gods Word at Stokesley' and the parish records described him as 'parson' in 1646, although he did not compound for the living until 1652.

Puritan thought had not taken hold in the north of Yorkshire prior to the Civil War.⁴ This was one of the dark corners of the land. Dr Newton describes the Cleveland Deanery as having the greatest concentration of Puritan clergy in the North Riding 1603-40 and he names only four, including Roger Todd of Westerdale, a perpetual curacy of Stokesley.⁵ Pockets of Roman Catholicism were still prevalent in the area, as across much of the North.⁶ In contrast, William Kaye was a Puritan, keen for reformation of the church and against the Laudian 'innovations'

which he thought sanctioned Papist infiltration of the Church of England. He felt his outspokenness had brought victimization but perhaps he was frustrated at being passed over for the vacant rectory.

The consensus of religious and political thought in England was broken. To reconcile the divisions, William Kaye championed 'the reformed Protestant Religion'. This label had also been used in the *Engagement* of 1641. This embraced the relationship of state and church and the question of right order and belief within the English Christian community. Introduced in his first tract in 1645, *Satisfaction for such as oppose reformation* (published at York), the concept finds fullest expression in his last substantial work in 1658, *The Reformation, in which is Reconciliation with God and his People*. Here he appealed for political loyalty to an establishment which nurtured true religion, a national settlement in a scripturally reformed church and toleration between differing groups of believers. Kaye wanted a magisterial pattern of reformation. Reforming of the church should be overseen by the political rulers acting as agents of the divine will. God was concerned for the welfare of his people and therefore raised up not only prophets but princes to uphold true faith. Kaye approved of the Elizabethan settlement and in Cromwell he applauded what seemed to him the epitome of the godly ruler. Not in principle anti-monarchist, he thought that Charles had failed in his responsibilities and had allowed Popery to infiltrate the Church of England.

The Papist threat is apparent from the beginning in Kaye's writings.⁷ He recognized a universal church - 'the Holy Catholic Church called out of Popery' - but compared Rome to the Brownists in their exclusive claims to truth. It was Romanist tendencies in the Church of England that had first caused him around 1637 to speak out against the ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁸ In *Satisfaction for such as oppose reformation*, he dismissed twelve practices of the Church of Rome which he rejected as anti-Christian and condemned a further catalogue of perceived abuses:

Ceremonies or superstitious Practices, as namely, use of Beads, Pictures, Images, *Agnus Dei*, Reliques of saints, Rings in Marriage, Altars, Letanies, Hoods, Priest-stoole, Surplisses, Rood-staffe, Holy-water, Crisme, Consecrations, sticking up of Rountree on Sain *Ellens* Eve, Pilgrimages, Praying for the Dead, Shrievings, Signing of themselves, bowing before Altars, patting out of the Cup in the Sacrament, putting out the second Commandment, third part of the Lord's prayer, observing Saints dayes, calling upon Saints as mediatours, sacrificing of Christ in their Masse, prohibiting Marriages and meats . . . and prohibiting the people to read the holy Scripture.⁹

God had been provoked 'especially in [our] tolerating of Popery' under Laud. Then, providence had saved the Parliamentary cause from defeat through the Solemn League & Covenant of 1643: 'Let us not forget that wee never prospered till wee made a Covenant'. His tract was dedicated to all reformed Christians united in 'solemn League and national Covenant'. Spiritual and political commitment went

hand in hand. Those who engaged in the Covenant undertook to 'see an union of King and Parliament in the Reformation of Church and State' and 'in the execution of the Covenant we may see Antichrist or Popery thrown down, King and Parliament in the observation thereof united, whereby Christs kingdome may be advanced, to the glory of God'. The League & Covenant was a defence against 'Popery, Prelacie, Superstition, Heresie, Schisms, Prophaneness and Oppression'.¹⁰

The second part of *Satisfaction* dealt with objections to taking the Covenant oath.¹¹ No novelties were being imposed on those who had agreed to the Protestation of 1641, nor did the oath annul loyalty to the Oath of Allegiance, which solidly supported King and Parliament. These ruled and governed respectively as 'head and members'. Charles had broken that partnership but proper authority was still legitimately vested in Parliament. Honest subjects should submit 'for wee have a Parliament and Assembly, Magistrates and Ministers convened together for Reformation of Church and State; to preserve our Liberties, Lawes and Religion'. The King has betrayed the true nature of kingship. The Covenant was a seal of the reformed Protestant cause, its true character being 'The Union of the three Kingdomes. The Reformer and Supporter of Church and State. The true Declaration of the Cause that ingageth God's people'.¹²

Many Presbyterians showed a renewed enthusiasm for the Covenant in 1645 after their unsatisfactory dealings with the Independents.¹³ Echoes of the weariness of civil and religious conflict can be heard in Kaye's plea to let the Covenant be 'A Bulwarke of God's providence to the Kingdom . . . that a blessed peace may be concluded to preserve the three nations in faith and Love to live in God's Glory'.¹⁴

The relationship of church and state was the basis of Kaye's next work. He had been following the dispute in print about infant baptism between John Tombes and Richard Baxter. The pamphlet war started in 1650 with Baxter's *Plain scripture proof of infant church-membership and baptism*. Tombes replied in *Praecursor: or a forerunner to a large review of the dispute concerning infant-baptism and Antipaedobaptism, or no plain nor obscure scripture proof of infants baptism*, both published in 1652.¹⁵ Others took sides. In 1653 Cuthert Sidenham, a Newcastle Presbyterian, wrote *A Christian sober and plain exercitation on the two grand practicall controversies of these times: infant baptism and singing of psalmes* in support of Baxter. William Kaye offered *Baptism without bason; or plain scripture proof against infant-baptisme* (1653), dealing with Baxter's original tract, but considering Sidenham's work at greater length.¹⁶

The book traced the spiritual path of William Kaye. Episcopally ordained, he had subsequently rejected the authority of bishops and by 1650 he was pastor to a gathered church at Stokesley. Convinced of the need for believer's baptism, initially he approached the Baptists in Newcastle.¹⁷ This church, drawn mainly from Army personnel, was committed to a radical separation of church and state. They objected, among other things, to his receiving tithes and consequently they rejected the status of Kaye's congregation as 'a true Gospel church' and his own standing as

minister. The church at Stokesley wanted a corporate baptism, to be able individually to undergo the rite of baptism without breaking fellowship and founding their church afresh. Kaye referred to all this in *Baptism without Bason*.¹⁸ A more receptive hearing was given by Thomas Tillam, leader of the baptized believers at Hexham, who himself received state funding as lecturer at Hexham Abbey. Like Kaye, Tillam was also a supporter of psalm singing. On 3 July 1653 Kaye and nineteen of his church members were baptized: 'a work of wonder and calling for our high praise'. Although Kaye kept in touch with Tillam, and sent him a letter of support at the time of the scandal of the False Jew, the mercurial Tillam had left the north by the middle of 1655 and Kaye's church was effectively isolated from other Baptist congregations.¹⁹

In his book, Kaye devoted most discussion to refuting Sidenham's central claim that infant baptism is analogous to circumcision. He stressed that baptism related to the church and circumcision to a nation. Baptism presupposed active and not passive involvement. The analogy further broke down because circumcision was for males only, whereas the church included both sexes. What was at stake was the nature of the church and not the status of children before God; it was faith that marked out the parameters of the church and so to baptize children on the strength of the faith of others was wrong. Preaching the gospel created the people of Christ who in faith are prepared to separate from the world and be gathered into a church. Infants cannot attain to this faith and therefore to say that they were part of the church of Christ was to compromise it, and to bring 'all the world into the Church'.²⁰ Vicarious faith was inadequate, a person must own their own faith, witnessed to in believer's baptism in the trinitarian name.

Abolition of the practice of baptizing children would complete the reforming of the church after the primitive model, following on the rejection of episcopal government and discarding the Prayer Book. Church government, 'the mysteries of the Kingdom', had developed through successive stages: from Papal rule through episcopal government, presbyterian and the Independents, all to prepare for the return of 'the most glorious Apostolical government' - a gathered church formed by believer's baptism.²¹ This largely reflected the story of Kaye's life. He agreed with Sidenham that baptism made neither a believer nor a church, yet he argued that it was the sign of every Christian and that every true church had accepted the necessity of profession in baptism. Therefore baptism can be the key to church unity: 'Let Presbyterians gather what they can, if they gather in Christ's way, to make none of their church but such as they baptize upon the profession of faith as believers: And if the Independents gather none into their Church, but such as believe and are baptized, then they shall all be united and centred upon one and the same foundation'.²²

Church structures were secondary to the need for a secure framework to unite the diversity of Christian believers. True baptism according to scriptural command was by total immersion. To do otherwise was to run counter to the command of

Jesus and the practice of the primitive church. Remove infant baptism and all the churches could unite around a common rite. So believer's baptism was not inevitably linked to one form of church government; it could be appropriated by all (excepting episcopal and Papal).

The main argument of *Baptism without Bason* was followed by a short catechism which described baptism as a gospel ordinance and the answer of a good conscience towards God and man. Those who respond to the preaching of the word ought to be baptized and receive the Lord's Supper and be gathered into churches. Kaye encouraged the civil authorities to root out infant baptism, having already deprived it of the service book from which it drew nourishment and of the episcopal structure that it supported. Then the church would be 'effectively called out of Babylon'.²³ The parish records bear out Kaye's change of mind. From 1654 entries read 'born' instead of 'baptized'.

The leadership of Cromwell was rarely free from plots, real and imagined, by radicals and Royalists. Government spies and *agents provocateurs* were rife. In 1654 Naudin, a London Baptist and Fifth Monarchist, had tried to negotiate French support for a plot against Cromwell. Early in 1655 several prominent Fifth Monarchists were arrested and held in prison. In 1655 the Penruddock uprising had been suppressed and ushered in rule by the Major-Generals. In May 1658 West Country Baptists met with Fifth Monarchist activists. In March 1657 Kaye wrote 'we have Information of a New Insurrection, and Foreign Invasion by the Cavaliers and Popish Party', and he and his church declared their intention 'To indeavour in the Power of God not only in our judgments, but to give our assistance against all Plots and Risings against this Power that is set over us'. In 1658 he referred to a recent plot to assassinate Cromwell by blowing up Whitehall chapel.²⁴ In such an atmosphere, Kaye published four works that deal with orderly rule: *God's presence with the present government* (1655), *A Tripartite Remonstrance* (1657), *The Reformation* (1658), and *God's gracious presence with the present government* (1658). In these works he rejected opposition to the government in power, singling out the Fifth Monarchy Men. As the Papists were the 'old disaffected', the Fifth Monarchists were the 'new disaffected'.²⁵ By arguing for rule by the saints, they threatened Cromwell and ignored the obvious providence in his rise to power; they also jeopardized the success of reformation in church and state.

God's presence with the present government was subtitled 'Answering the Fifth Monarchists and Anarchists Arguments' and *God's gracious presence* 'To the pretended Fifth Monarchy Men, anti-monarchists or Gain-sayers of all Authority or dignities'. Fifth Monarchists 'stand for Anarchy, in rejection of Magistracy and Ordinances'. They were a political threat to the stability of the Commonwealth. They accepted the benefits of the Protectorate but did not respond with respect. 'None ought to seek protection where they shall deny faithful obedience'.²⁶ In *God's presence with the present government*, by exaggeration and caricature Kaye belittled Fifth Monarchist aspirations to political power. It was not possible for all

the saints to exercise power; where would it lead if all troops were equal and had no officers? Order - high and low - was a quality that God imparts and it was offensive to God to overturn. Darkly he hinted at those 'who [have] caused confusion as in Germany [i.e. Munster] &c to destroy God's Order'.²⁷ Expounding a key text (Daniel 7.27), he turned Fifth Monarchist expectations on their head to show that everything that had been promised found fulfilment through Cromwell. The power of the saints was exercised in the placing of godly men as Army officers, in the magistracy and in the ministry so that true religion, with toleration of conscience (within limits) would be established and maintained.

Seeing then the present power restores, or grants al saints their Christian liberty, owns and commissionates them, as called & qualified to be in Government; then there is all that can be expected in the Dominion of Saints, which commonly is called the Fifth Monarchy;

adding 'though a further improvement of Saints liberties is successively (until wee come to the Acme of perfection) to be prayed for, and expected'.²⁸ Kaye well understood where power lay, directing his appeal to the Army officers to defend the reformed Protestant religion from all dangers.

In their assertions, the Fifth Monarchists could not lay claim to the Puritan tradition. Those heroes worked for the reformation of the church, their latter-day pretenders for deformation. Their interpretation of the scriptures was mistaken and they have wrested prophecy out of context. Above all, their presumption has blinded them to the providence of God, who had set up Oliver Cromwell to bring reformation in church and state. They have failed to recognize the presence and sanction of God with Cromwell and have misconstrued the failure of their own conspiracies. Even though many people have been stirred up by the Fifth Monarchist message, all their plans have come to nothing and they have had to fall back on excuses. Anyone could see that it was God who was frustrating them. Equally Kaye pointed out a 'somewhat more then of an extraordinary providence in raising up his Highness [Richard Cromwell]'. The structure of magistracy and ministry were essential for the proper rule of the saints. God would not entrust the vital task of reformation to a 'proud, disorderly and headlesse people'. A settled state was the basis for moulding a people reformed in morals and conduct and for maintaining an impartial judicial system, with the courts 'an Assilium [sic] to appeal unto for all the oppressed'.²⁹

The Christian owed obedience to the state and the state had responsibilities to the believer, primarily to protect and nurture true faith. People had flocked to Parliament's side in the wars because they had believed it was 'set up especially for the Protection and reformation of the Christian reformed Protestant Religion'.³⁰ The ruler of the state was equally the ruler, under God, of the church. Ecclesiastical courts should have no place in the civil judicial system. The power to organize and administer affairs of state and religion rested with the king or head of state. William Kaye often appealed to the Elizabethan settlement and to a

scriptural charge on the civil authorities (or 'magistrates', Ezra 7.25) to be 'nursing fathers' (Isaiah 49.22f), with a unique opportunity to use their influence for good. From 1653 at least, Kaye firmly rejected the argument of those who took the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision to argue for infant baptism as an entry into the religious and political body. To be born was to become a political subject and not a member of the body of believers.

There was civil power and church power, both under the leadership of the 'Supream Magistrate', who was Cromwell. For Kaye, Cromwell was an idealized figure who represented all that was to be desired for the good of church and state. There ought to be no confusing of the respective authorities, which was what the Fifth Monarchists threatened. Undoubtedly, ministers *could* exercise political authority but God had set up magistrates to ensure order. Their spheres of operation were complementary. 'As the Wife, though she could rule without the Husband, must not usurp authority over him, so must not Ministers, though they could rule, usurp the power of the Magistrate'.³¹ So any who threatened these twin pillars upon which the godly society rested were to be denounced, be they Fifth Monarchists, 'Familists, Brownists, Quakers, For-sakers &C' whose 'causelesse Separation is the cursed Tree'³² and he urged the Quaker, John Whitehead, that 'by Christ's light [he] may see to obey Magistrates, Ministers, Lord's Day, Worship, Baptism, Fasting, Praying, Singing . . .'³³

The civil authorities had a duty to maintain unity and harmony among believers. They were to make sure that everything relating to the church was done in an orderly fashion and in particular to fight against schism.³⁴ This did not mean that magistrates could coerce people to faith, but they had a responsibility to make sure that people were not lax in attending those occasions that could be instrumental in their conversion - at worship or hearing the word - and the sabbath should receive special attention (Parliament did pass a Sabbath Observance Act in June 1657, requiring attendance at Christian worship). In the first flush of Baptist enthusiasm, Kaye had also urged the authorities to adopt anti-episcopal and anti-paedobaptist legislation and to encourage preaching promoting believer's baptism. However, at the same time he argued that a religious conformity should not be imposed, perhaps fearful that Baptist congregations would be subject to pressure but also with a genuine tolerance towards others that is evident in most of his writings.

As part of this national settlement in religion William Kaye spoke for state maintenance of ministers. He himself received tithes. This was a bone of contention in his discussions with the Baptists of Newcastle in 1652-3 and a feature in his dispute with John Whitehead. In *God's presence with the present Government* he rejoiced that under the true rule of the Saints 'the godly Ministry shall not only be countinanced, and have their dayly bread provided them'.³⁵ He commended the actions of lay impropiators during the reign of James I, who had made possible a preaching ministry and he contended that, for suitable ministers, tithes were 'the benefit of God's providence'.³⁶

The tithe system was a scandal to George Fox and his followers. William Kaye had first encountered Quakers when Fox came to Stokesley in 1651. Fox records how he went to the parish church and confronted the priest after the sermon in front of the congregation. He further challenged him to a dispute in the open air but 'it was in the snow in the winter and he did not come'. Fox formed a Quaker meeting mainly from former Seekers. The Quaker missionary, John Whitehead, wrote in his journal for 1653 that he was preparing to go 'into the Moors, where I hear there is much hungering after the Truth'.³⁷ He challenged Kaye by letter and Kaye subsequently in 1654 published his reply as *A Plain Answer to Eighteen Queries of John Whitehead commonly called QUAKER*, 'being required to make answer, and being willing to confesse our Christian Reformed Protestant Religion, now so much questioned and opposed'.³⁸ The Quaker message struck doubly at Kaye's basis of a secure settlement in church and state. In their appeal to inner experience, Quakers undermined the authority of church and ministry and in their willingness to be confrontational they challenged the social structures.

Whitehead had argued for the superiority of spiritual enlightenment in Christian experience. In response, Kaye emphasized the need for Scripture and external ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. However, Kaye did defend his call to ministry as being extraordinary, a point he repeated later.³⁹ He avoided any hint of antinomian thought when dealing with the thorny question of sins committed after profession of faith, arguing that the saints will never be perfect in this life. He vigorously defended as scriptural taking tithes, singing of Psalms (with an appropriate metrical tune) and the right to respect due to ministers. Kaye's pamphlet received a characteristic response from Francis Howgill.⁴⁰ Coming as it did shortly before Kaye's believer's baptism, could Whitehead's arguments have been the catalyst?

By January 1655 it was communion that Kaye saw as the point of reconciliation between divided ecclesiologies. He published *A Free, Plain and Just Way concerning Communion*, to which was appended a printed sermon, *The Doctrine of our Martyrs Remembered* and a declaration of the wrongful practice of barring people from communion. In these Kaye argued that communion was the common ground between Christian believers and there should be free admission to it; 'not onely . . . Presbyterians, Anabaptists and Independents but that every of the least of the weakest believers of them, or any that believeth may, and ought joyfully and sincerely to break bread or commune together at the Lord's table'. There should be no other qualification than to acknowledge baptism 'according to the measure of the light that they have received'. Differing rites should not be a barrier, nor should differences of opinion about the singing of psalms, practice of prayer or the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Apparent weakness in faith was also no excuse, for it was as 'bad to keep a repentant sinner away from the Lord's Supper as to keep a wounded man from the Doctor'. If this appeared to throw too wide the invitation, let it be remembered that communion was a time for self-examination and

repentance for sinners 'because the use and end of the Supper of the Risen Lord is for the comforting, uniting and reforming of them'.⁴¹

Admission to communion was not to be used as part of the apparatus of control as in the Church of Rome where people were kept from the altar 'as though the Church keys were turned into Door-bolts'. For people to be turned away from communion because they were thought undeserving was to judge their consciences, when this was the prerogative of God. If people were effectively called by God then they would 'in his appointed time become worthy partakers'. There was as much to blame in making communion too restricted as in its becoming too accessible. How, he asked his fellow ministers, could they baptize children on the strength of a father's faith and then deny those same men entry to the Lord's Table? Of course, there should be preparation before the Lord's Supper. It should be administered at least monthly, if not more frequently, and announced at least one day prior to allow people to prepare themselves to receive in both kinds. There should be a sermon expounding the sacrament. For good measure he attached three of his own compositions to be sung after communion.⁴²

To support his arguments, Kaye appealed to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Jerome, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine and Dionysius from the Fathers and also Protestant martyrs in sixteenth-century England. He listed numerous defenders of the faith (all to be found in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*) who had protested against the Mass. Now, what the reformers had achieved was in jeopardy. Those who would be 'Repairers of the Breach' must avoid divisions which weaken relationships within the reformed church: 'to refuse to give each other the right hand of fellowship, as weak or strong brethren, what doth one Saint (pretend what smooth language so ever they please) but in effect so judge another's Conscience as to say Thou art an unbeliever, thou art an ignorant person, thou art a Heretick or unrepentant, with whom I ought not to communicate'. This attitude threatened the welfare of the Commonwealth since 'the Church [is] divided and the very face of Christianity ready to split'. However, communion for all who professed the lordship of Christ could become the focal point of unity: 'agreeing in the general that all that are Believers are to be admitted to the Lord's Table'.⁴³ If necessary, this ought to be supported by legislation. Here, as elsewhere, Kaye made plain his utter dislike of schism and the needless fragmentation of the Christian community in England.

A contemporary dispute on free admission to the Lord's Supper appeared in print between 1652 and 1656 between certain Independents and Presbyterians.⁴⁴ John Humfrey of Frome began with *An Humble Vindication of a Free Admission unto the Lord's Supper* in 1652. Four editions had been published by 1656. This was answered by Roger Drake, a London Presbyterian, and the discussion was taken up by Anthony Palmer, who published the conclusions of a group of Gloucestershire ministers in *A Scripture Rale to the Lord's Table* (1653). Other contributions came from John Timson in 1654 and Daniel Cawdrey in 1657. Hezekiah Woodward had published *The Lord's Table, whether it is to be spread like a Table in an Inne for*

all comers in 1656. Another pamphleteer was William Prynne with *A Seasonable Vindication of free-communion and frequent administration of the Holy Communion to all visible Church-members, regenerate or unregenerate* (1656).⁴⁵ Kaye appears to have been the only one who wrote at this time on this subject using it as a basis for uniting Christians rather than as a defence of the integrity of the sacrament.

In March 1657, while Cromwell deliberated about the throne, Kaye published *A Tripartite Remonstrance* addressed in particular to 'the honourable and valiant officers that have prospered under the command of His Highness'. In the second and third parts of this he specifically considered Cromwell. He was the Supreme Magistrate and magistracy was set up by God for the good ordering of his people. He had been chosen by God 'as we cannot say that His Highness came to be exalted of the Lord by chance or fortune'. What was wrong with Cromwell being called King? 'We may as well give the Title, as yield that subjection which a King can require under another title'. Such a move would not offend against the Engagement, since Parliament had the power to change laws and create precedents. Neither was kingship in itself wrong, rather a king who had forfeited his rights through failing to exercise his responsibilities had been opposed in the Civil Wars. Through Cromwell God had acted: 'For if there is a man in the World that ought to be honoured, it is the Conqueror that is exalted by God to rule, and reform his people and fight against Antichrist'. If any proof were needed to confirm Cromwell's divine favour, let people consider the miraculous escapes he had had from plots and attacks, as Elizabeth had been protected from revolution so that the reformed Church might be safely established. The welfare of Commonwealth and Church, especially the Church, depended on the co-operation of both civil and religious parties. 'Again, it were a mercy if we would not think to prosper without the means that God hath appointed for the reforming and union of his Church & Churches. I mean, if he would think of a General Assembly at which all Pastors of gathered Churches might be present with other magistrates, Ministers & select Brethren, to consider of Truth & Union &c.'

Cromwell was God's instrument to govern, the 'Lord's Viceregent'. So Kaye's warning was addressed to all, but particularly the army officers: 'Take heed then, and beware of Prejudice, Ignorance and a Root of Bitterness: Kings are God's Ordinance and to resist is to receive our own Condemnation'.⁴⁶

Together with *A Tripartite Remonstrance* was a broadsheet entitled *An United Profession of Faithfulness concerning Religion and UNION in the same*. It was a declaration of loyalty on behalf of William Kaye and his gathered church, pledging themselves to support Cromwell. The subject's duty was twofold: 'Submit, 1. *Negatively*, In eschewing the evil of disobeying. 2. *Positively*, Do the good that is required in obeying'. Clearly he felt that everything would be lost if Cromwell's rule and the hopes for the reformed Protestant cause were torn apart by internal power struggles.

Many of the themes that Kaye had introduced in his earlier works were brought

together in *The Reformation, in which is Reconciliation with God and his People* (1658). Intentionally or not, it appears to be a recapitulation. A substantial work, it was not provoked by any single circumstance. Facing the first page was a pictorial emblem, a remembrancer for the faithful of their hopes and their vows to defend the Reformed Protestant cause. The tone was more defensive and a little more despairing. These were 'overturning times' and he writes to strengthen the faint-hearted in a cause that was in danger of failing. In particular, Kaye underlined the threat to the political establishment from the Fifth Monarchy men, that loose alliance of political and religious radicals who, disappointed by Cromwell, sought to establish the rule of the saints. he set out his programme:

Sing, pray, baptize, receive the Lord's Supper, pray for magistrates, ordain Ministers, set rulers over the saints, and not at all suffer the saints to rule over us Heb 13, acknowledge Scripture Bishops like Timothy and Titus to ordain and suffer none to preach but such as are approved & separated.⁴⁷

The claim to the Protestant heritage was at question. Kaye stated that the former nonconformists were not separatists. Men like Gouge, Sibbes, Preston, Taylor and Rogers found their successors not in the radicals but in those who are working for the reformation of state and church through the legitimate authorities. Cromwell and his administration carried the mantle of true reform and should be treated with due respect.

The second section, addressed to the 'Holy Catholick Church, called from popery and all other sects & heresies', dealt with church government. This was a 'Divine Power' in which 'all Members of the Church ought to be united and governed under the oversight and censure of Pastors & presbyters, subordinated under the Supreme Magistrate'. Unnecessary separation was to be avoided and Kaye approved of Samuel Bolton's *Arraignment of Error* (1648) and Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* (1646), both anti-schismatic works written by Presbyterians. Apologists for a reformed national church were sensitive to accusations from Roman Catholics of wilful and unnecessary separation, and Kaye asserted 'we must communicate with every saint that will separate from no Saint'. He listed a variety of church officers: Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist (or Scripture Bishop), Pastors, Teachers, Ruling Elders, Presbyters, Widows and Deacons. There were to be General Assemblies (or 'Church Councils consisting of Pastors, Presbyters, Elders & Evangelists') and a system of church visitors to administer discipline within groups of churches. He considered the various forms of church government - Roman, Independent, Presbyterian, Bishops, Erastian - to reject them all in favour of the Reformed Protestant Church government 'which ought to be obeyed by all Saints *Jure Divino*'. His intended audience was now not only Independents and Presbyterians but also those who were moderately Episcopally inclined'.⁴⁸

Reformed Protestant church government consisted of baptized believers 'unitedly presbyteriated and submitted to Scripture Bishops'. A Scripture Bishop was one who 'is set in the chair of the Presbytery, which as imbodyed, takes the oversight

of all particular churches, in which every Pastor is as much to be governed'. Kaye's previous objections to bishops concerned their temporal power and authority. The Scripture Bishop was a 'chief Brother' with his fellow presbyters, and the 'Presbytery is a number of Ministers (as far as may be dependently congregated) and united for the ruling of all Pastors and Congregations as are in the whole nation'.⁴⁹ Here are echoes of the calls for a reduced or primitive pattern of episcopacy and of Archbishop Ussher's *Reduction of Episcopacie unto the Form of Synodical government* framed as early as 1641 (and published again by Nicholas Gauden in 1656), which found favour with both Edward Stillingfleet and Richard Baxter.⁵⁰

The *Reformed Protestant Catechism* appended to *The Reformation* was an exposition with annotations of the Apostles Creed. The Creed was intended for use in worship and at baptism. It would be 'a Center in which parties, circumstantially differing, might be really and essentially united'. It would be the agreed formula for personal confession as in primitive Christianity where 'catechists were required to professe the Apostles Creed at their baptisme'. Kaye defined the rite of baptism again as 'the answer of a good conscience towards God and man with submission to the water upon the profession of the Faith of the Gospel'.⁵¹

After the death of Cromwell, Kaye published in 1658 *God's Gracious presence with his Highness Richard, Lord Protector of Great Britain and Ireland*. Appealing once more to the army officers, Kaye warned against the plotting of the Fifth Monarchists. He encouraged the army to see the hand of Providence in the transfer of power to Richard. Civil strife had been avoided. The reformation of the church had to be upheld, if necessary by the rule of magistrates; 'though men cannot be compelled to believe yet may they & ought to be compelled by the Magistrate to wait on the meanes of Believing'. Ministers played their part by making sure that the people were built up in worship and welcomed at the Lord's Table. Finally the saints must hold firm: 'Let all come out of all Schismaticall church dividing, pretended unitings, Christ hath more Ministers and Saints then is in any one dividing opinion'. He concluded, 'if any man stand up, and be found in the Apostles Creed, and owne the Church-government, in which all Saints ought authoritatively to be united, and communicate together, and become subject to the Supream Magistrate that God hath exalted over us: This is an union in grace'.⁵² The state, the church, the fruits of reformation were all at risk. This was Kaye's final published work.

With the Restoration, everything that Kaye had stood for was lost. Authoritarian episcopal government was reinstated under an autocratic king. Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists alike were to find themselves outside the law, along with Quakers. Ministers of the national church who would not conform were ejected from their livings and many who failed to submit were prosecuted through the church courts. Kaye himself was ejected in 1660 in favour of Thomas Pennyman, as a result of Prynne's bill for *Establishing Ministers settled in Ecclesiastical Livings*, which dealt with intruded ministers by securing in their benefices all clergy appointed since 1642 unless the previous incumbent were alive or the present

minister had sought the trial of Charles I, opposed the Restoration or repudiated infant baptism. Kaye failed on two counts. Pennyman's attitude to the intruder is apparent in the Stokesley parish records, where references to him are heavily scored through or tagged with an insult.

Kaye had re-married in 1656, shortly after the death of Elizabeth probably in childbirth. From his first wife he had inherited property.⁵³ After his ejection he seems to have lived quietly. Baptisms of children from the second marriage are recorded in the parish registers. His eldest son became a conformist clergyman.⁵⁴ The episcopal visitation in 1669 did not link Kaye with the Baptist church in Stokesley.⁵⁵ The reformed Protestant Christian held his peace and the parish registers note the burial of William Kaye on 4 July 1690.

Kaye eludes our easy categorization. Was he simply a state-funded minister who accepted the arguments for believer's baptism? Or do the likes of Kaye, John Tombes, Henry Jessey, Thomas Tillam, John Skinner, Richard Harrison and Edward Skipp represent a type of Baptist able to reconcile a state-supported ministry with their gathered church convictions? Any such experiment was foreshortened by the Restoration and the Act of Uniformity. Perhaps it was only possible under the interim religious settlement of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Nevertheless, it prompts the question - were these ministers not quite proper Baptists because of their involvement with the state or does their position add to understanding what it meant to be a Baptist in that brief, turbulent and formative period of our history?

NOTES

- 1 Admitted sizar aged 17, graduated BA 1636/7; A. G. Matthews (ed.), *Calamy Revised*, 1934, p.303. Father attended Queen's College and grandfather Trinity (BA) and St John's (MA). William's eldest son, Horatio, matriculated Sidney Sussex in 1657 *Al.Cant.*
- 2 He was MP for York County (1653) and North Riding (1654-5, 1656-8). He was a Member of the Council of State (November-December 1653), and one of the peers in Cromwell's 'other house' of 1657. *G.E.C.N vol.IV Appendix B.*
- 3 Yorkshire Baptist Composition Papers (Yorks. Arch. Soc. Vol.XV, 1893, p.188f. For Thomas Pennyman, see A. G. Matthews (ed.), *Walker Revised*, 1948, p.396f.
- 4 Compare R. Howell, 'Puritanism and Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1967.
- 5 J. A. Newton, 'Puritanism in the Diocese of York (excluding Nottinghamshire) 1603-40', unpublished London PhD thesis, 1955.
- 6 See C. Hill, 'Puritans and "the Dark Corners of the Land"' in *Continuity and Change in Seventeenth-Century England*, 1974, pp.3-47.

- W. Addison *Worthy Dr Fuller*, p.285, quotes Fuller, 'Lancashire, a frontier country of papists and Protestants, where the reformed religion had rather a truce than a peace'.
- 7 *Satisfaction for such as oppose reformation*, 1645, pp.1, 3.
- 9 In *Doctrine of our Martyrs Remembered*, 1655, Kaye praised the Protestant martyrs of the Marian persecution and attacked the practice of excommunication by the Church as unjustifiable, equating Papists with the schismatic Brownists in claiming for themselves alone access to God.
- 9 *Satisfaction*, p.10/1.
- 10 *ibid.*, p.3.
- 11 written as a discussion with a Mr Oddy, probably Thomas Oddy, vicar of Kirkby-in-Cleveland, 1624-61; *Al.Cant.*
- 12 *Satisfaction* pp.29, 13.
- 13 See Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion*, 1973, p.51.
- 14 *Satisfaction*, p.33. This tract was reprinted at York in 1647 and sold by Nathaniel Brookes of London. Further see C. Hill, 'Covenanted Peoples: Scotland and England', in *The English*

- Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution*, 1993, pp.271-84.
- 15 The latter work listed his opponents on the title page: Stephen Marshall, John Gere, Thomas Cobbet, Thomas Blake, Josiah Church, and Nathaniel Stephens, as well as Baxter. By the second part of *Antipaedobaptism* (1654), the list included John Cotton, Nathaniel Homes, Robert Baillie, Daniel Featly, John Brinsley, Henry Hammond and Thomas Fuller, as well as Cuthbert Sidenham. *Plain Scripture Proof* had a third edition in 1653.
- 16 Sidenham's work was reprinted in 1657. Neither author responded to Kaye in print, although Baxter noted him as an opponent. N. H. Keeble and G. F. Nuttall (eds.), *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter*, 1991, i, p.117.
- 17 Had Kaye seen the Particular Baptist Confession, 1644? *Baptism without Bason*, p.3, refers to Baptists as 'commonly (tho unjustly) called Anabaptists', strikingly similar to the title of the Confession 'commonly (Tho falsly) called Anabaptists'.
- 18 *Baptism*, p.38: 'yet if the said Independent churches should in mercy have their eyes opened (as some can experience) to see and submit to the minde of Christ in the Order of the Gospel, whereby the first that is in baptism be last discovered, then in this extraordinary work of grace . . . that the said church be found to be gathered saints, and the seal of the Ministry, then the said church, as a household of the faithful without breaking their relation of Pastor and Flock, may be baptized . . . provided that the Pastor of the said church be baptized by such a Pastor of a Church that is under the practice of Baptism'.
- 19 E. B. Underhill (ed.), *Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys & Hexham 1644-1720*, 1854, p.292.
- 20 *Baptism without Bason*, 1653, p.42.
- 21 *ibid.*, p.3.
- 22 p.42.
- 23 *ibid.*
- 24 B. R. White (ed.), *Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England Wales & Ireland to 1660*, part 2, pp.96-8; *An United Profession of Faithfulness* (broadsheet); *God's gracious presence* p.3.
- 25 *The Reformation*, 1658, p.11.
- 26 *God's presence with the present government*, pp.15, 13.
- 27 *God's gracious presence*, epistle to reader.
- 28 *ibid.*, p.17.
- 29 *ibid.* pp.3, 11, 13.
- 30 *God's presence . . .*, p.4.
- 31 *Tri-partite Remonstrance*, 1657, p.8.
- 32 *Reformation*, Part II, epistle to reader.
- 33 *A Plain Answer to Eighteen Quaeries*, p.6.
- 34 *God's presence . . .*, p.8.
- 35 *ibid.*, p.18.
- 36 *Reformation*, p.15.
- 37 N. Penney (ed.), *Fox's Journal*, 1952, p.79 [Short Journal]; W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 1919; *The Life & Writings of John Whitehead*, 1852, p.13; *Plain Answer*, p.11.
- 38 *Plain Answer*, p.2.
- 39 *Tripartite Remonstrance*, Epistle to the reader, 'If thou question my call; I must humbly in the Name of God assure thee that it was extraordinary; which though to name is to be under aspersion of dreams and delusions . . . '.
- 40 *The Common Salvation Contended for*, 1655, but there is no indication that Howgill had personal knowledge of Kaye.
- 41 *Doctrine of Our Martyrs Remembered*, 1655, p.12; *A Free, Plain and Just Way concerning Communion*, 1655, title page; *ibid.*, p.3; *Doctrine*, p.14; *Free, Plain and Just Way*, p.4.
- 42 *Free, Plain and Just Way*, p.4; ditto; *Doctrine*, p.27; *Free, Plain and Just Way*, p.4.
- 43 *Doctrine*, title page; *ibid.*, p.27; *ibid.*, p.12; *Free, Plain and Just Way*, title page.
- 44 W. W. Biggs, 'The Controversy concerning Free Admission to the Lord's Supper 1652-60'. *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, Vol.XVI, 1951.
- 45 William Prynne is claimed as 'our zealous faithful witness to the Truth' in his *Separation Separated*, 1646, *Free, Plain and Just Way*, p.4.
- 46 *Tri-partite Remonstrance*, title page; p.15; p.19; p.21; p.11; p.22.
- 47 *Reformation*, p.14.
- 48 *Reformation*, Part II, epistle to the reader; p.2; p.53; p.8f; p.33; p.53.
- 49 *Reformation*, Reformed Protestant's Catechism Epistle; p.33; p.41.
- 50 See J. C. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-89*, 1991, p.26.
- 51 *Reformation Reformed*, Protestant's Catechism, p.32; ditto; p.30.
- 52 *God's Gracious Presence*, 1658, p.8; p.11; ditto.
- 53 Victoria County History, *North Yorkshire*, vol.II, 1923, p.39 - a manor at Easby.
- 54 William Kaye's father remained Vicar of

Topcliffe from 1614 to 1661. According to Walker, William was 'the rebellious son of a very loyal father'. Horatio Kaye was Vicar of Barnby-on-Don, Notts., until he resigned after

marrying a wealthy widow. J. Foster (ed.), *Visitation of Yorkshire in 1584/5 & 1612, 1875.*
55 G. Lyon Turner, *Original Records of Early Nonconformity*, 1911.

STEPHEN COPSON *Minister, Erdington Baptist Church, Birmingham*

* * * * *

Peter Riedemann, *Love is like Fire: The Confession of an Anabaptist Prisoner*, 1993, iii + 74pp. £3-50 + p&p.

Eberhard Arnold, *The Individual and World Need*, 1992, xi + 72pp. £3-25 + p&p. Both from the Plough Publishing House, Robertsbridge, Sussex.

The Hutterian Brethren have placed us in their debt by reissuing an older and a younger classic of their tradition, the former of which, introduced by Robert Friedmann, appears in English for the first time. The cobbler Reidemann (1506-1556), converted to Anabaptism and then imprisoned for it, composed his *Confession* in the gaol at Gmunden, Upper Austria, between 1529 and 1532. Replete with biblical quotations and allusions, it is designed to express his own faith and to counter what he perceives as errors. On doctrinal matters he pulls no punches: '[I]nfant baptism is no baptism at all, but idle talk', 'Christ was sent that he might be the Savior of all men', "'This is my body" must not be understood in . . . a physical sense". On Christian living he is equally clear: 'What a blessing marriage is if it is kept as befits the saints; but what a wretched thing when not kept as God and Christ will! It is no better than fornication in God's sight'. For good measure, in two appended chapters he offers advice on developing church fellowship, and concludes with an exhortation to whom it may concern: 'You children of Lot, go out from Sodom, that you may not receive her plagues'.

Written during the broken times following World War I, the tract by Eberhard Arnold (1883-1935), whose life is summarized in an Epilogue, has a word for us also. His theme is that the dire consequences of human sin and guilt can be rectified only by God's saving work in Christ; and that our appropriation of salvation entails, positively, life in community ('Life is community. There is no other life'), and, negatively, resistance to selfish individualism ('All I need for my thinking and existence is my own ego'). There is solemnity here ('All that mankind has in common today is suffering'); there is challenge ('In our festively decked rooms we hang up pictures and set up beautiful lighted crib scenes . . . We edify ourselves by trying to feel the poverty and need in which the Christ Child was born . . . And yet we allow countless children in our own "homeland" . . . to be without their own little beds!'); but above all there is hope, for the crucified is risen and God's Spirit is outpoured. Because of this God's earth 'shall be peopled by a unified humanity. There shall no longer be any isolated individuals . . . '.

ALAN P. F. SELL, *Aberystwyth and Lampeter University School of Theology*