

**ELIZABETHAN
NON-CONFORMIST
TEXTS**

Volume III
THE WRITINGS OF HENRY BARROW
1587-1590
Edited by Leland H. Carlson

ELIZABETHAN NON-CONFORMIST
TEXTS

ELIZABETHAN NON-CONFORMIST TEXTS

VOLUME I

Cartwrightiana

Edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson

VOLUME II

The writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne

Edited by Leland H. Carlson and Albert Peel

VOLUME III

The writings of Henry Barrow 1587–1590

Edited by Leland H. Carlson

VOLUME IV

The writings of John Greenwood 1587–1590

Edited by Leland H. Carlson

VOLUME V

The writings of Henry Barrow 1590–1591

Edited by Leland H. Carlson

VOLUME VI

The writings of John Greenwood and Henry Barrow 1591–1593

Edited by Leland H. Carlson

ELIZABETHAN NON- CONFORMIST TEXTS

VOLUME III

The writings of Henry Barrow 1587–1590

Edited by Leland H. Carlson



LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1962 by George Allen & Unwin Ltd

This edition reprinted 2003 by Routledge 11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada by Routledge 29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

© 1962 George Allen & Unwin

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data A catalog record for this book has been requested.

ISBN 0-203-50083-0 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-57375-7 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-31988-9 (Print Edition) (set)

ISBN 0-415-31991-9 (Print Edition) (volume III)

Publisher's note The Publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original book may be apparent.

THE WRITINGS OF HENRY BARROW

1587–1590

Edited by

LELAND H. CARLSON

PH. D.

Published for

THE SIR HALLEY STEWART TRUST

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

RUSKIN HOUSE

MUSEUM STREET LONDON

THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED TO DR. LOUIS B. WRIGHT DIRECTOR THE
FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY WITH GRATITUDE AND RESPECT

PREFACE

THIS and its companion are the third and fourth volumes in the series on “Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts.” Volume I was issued in 1951 with the title, *Cartwrightiana*. Volume II was issued in 1953, *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*. I had hoped that Volumes III and IV would have been ready for the printer by 1957, but this hope proved illusory. During the past five years I have served as president of Rockford College in Rockford, Illinois. The problems connected with the transition from a women’s college to a coeducational institution, with the establishment of Rockford Men’s College, and Rockford Evening College, with the constant need for fund-raising and friend-raising, with the insistent demands for speeches, committee meetings, conferences, with the care and feeding of trustees, counselors, faculty, students, alumnae, alumni, parents, donors, friends, critics, and Monday morning academic quarterbacks, have been legion. Correspondence has been heavy, crises have been numerous, trips have been frequent, and the months have been replete with inaugurations, workshops, educational sessions, programme planning, board meetings, interviews, complaints and suggestions. In short, the centrifugal pulls of the president’s office have not been conducive to centripetal research. This book has been prepared in the early hours of the morning, late evenings, snatches of time the summer “vacations.” It has been a labour of love and a very present help in times of trouble. I have learned from hard experience why most administrators are compelled to abandon research.

Volumes III and IV present for the first time the collected works of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, for the period 1587–1590. There are forty items, of which sixteen are by Barrow, six by Greenwood, and five by both men, in addition to thirteen related Barrowist items in the Appendix. In later volumes, *The Writings of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood* for the period 1591–1593, there will be approximately twenty-five items, many of which are made available to the general reader for the first time. It is deplorable that the basic writings of these two founding fathers of Separatism are not

widely known, even to scholars. The reasons are not far to seek. Some of the documents exist in manuscripts difficult to locate, read, and understand. Others exist in rare tracts and books. There are only two copies of *A Plaine Refutation* (1591). There are about a half a dozen copies of *A Brief Discoverie of the False Church*. There are two copies of the first edition of *A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church*, wrongly catalogued, unlisted in the *Short-Title Catalogue*, and competing with other “first” editions incorrectly listed. Some of the material has been made available in esoteric publications with a limited circulation, and some of it has been published with incorrect attributions of authorship. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers have been few, and the consequent crop has been small. There have been about six research specialists in this field during the last sixty years—for an average of one each decade. Certain it is that the origins of Separatism, Independency, and Congregationalism are deserving of serious study, and my hope is that the publication of the basic documents in conveniently accessible books will further this study. Separatism strengthened the Lutheran doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. It promoted the spirit of individualism. It re-enforced the emphasis on freedom of inquiry. And in insisting upon the spiritual principle of a direct, immediate, and intimate relationship between the infinite God of love and the finite man in quest of sanctity and dignity, against the powerful opposition of state and church, even at the cost of imprisonment and loss of life, Separatism and Separatists became the benefactors of true religion and spiritually-minded men by aiding the process of the recovery of the innate rights of man.

There are thirteen entries for Barrow in the *Short-Title Catalogue*. Number 1520 should be dated about 1080–1, Number 1521 is not by Barrow, and therefore numbers 1522 and 1522a are also wrongly attributed to him. Number 1526 is not a first edition, and the Harmsworth copy at the Folger Shakespeare Library is not a first edition, but probably a third edition. Number 1527 is not a second edition, and the copy at the British Museum is identical with the Harmsworth copy. For Greenwood the *Short-Title Catalogue* has four entries. The first item (number 12339) is correct, but the second entry (12340) should be dated 1603. The British Museum copy (3475 b. 20) is not a 1590 edition but a re-issue of the first edition, with the addition of Greenwood’s *A Few Observations*, and with the date 1603 (*A i recto—A iv verso*), although the date 1590 has been reprinted on the title page. The third entry (12341) is correct, but the book may have been printed in England. The fourth item (12342) wrongly attributes *M. Some Laid Open in His Coulers* to Greenwood, on the basis of the initials I.G. It is certain that Greenwood could not have written this book, which is somewhat Presbyterian in viewpoint and somewhat like Martin Marprelate’s pen in style. The probable author is Job Throkmorton.

A statement needs to be made about the principles and rules followed in editing documents. In the first two volumes of this series, an attempt was made to reproduce the documents *literatim*, with superior letters, abbreviations, indications of omission of “er” and “re,” of “m” and “n,” and with slavish accuracy in the reproduction of “i” and “j,” “u” and “v.” Dr. Albert Peel wanted to resist the temptation to modernize the text, but I have concluded that the literal reproduction is expensive to print, slow to read, and difficult to justify in these days when microfilm and photostats are available. Consequently I have reduced superior letters, extended abbreviations, regularized the use of “i” and “j,” “u” and “v.” I have not altered spellings, except that “then” becomes “than,” y^e becomes “the” and y^t becomes “that.” If capitalization and punctuation

occasionally needed adjustment, I felt free to make changes. I have tried to retain the spelling, tone, flavour, and vocabulary of the period, but

I have also tried to assist the general reader who dislikes interruptions to his reading and thinking. Some idea of the differences involved in the two philosophies of editing may be seen in the following example:

Y^c **otñ** **gouñm^t** y^t attēds uppō y^c BB. & patrones curtesie, w^{ch} o^r Saiu^{or} X.
cōdēns wth no **ūōtain** voyse, & w^{ch} like a **silū tōge** is **oppssed** wth a
ñvailous heat, we haue **pued** more dāgerous then sī & **ptēse** but yo^r
mīsters **mīsters** y^c L. table wth whorem^{rs}, usur^{rs}, & **otñ**. O^r god is a
jelous god.

The other government that attends upon the bishops' and patrones' curtesie, which our saviour Christ condemns with no uncertain voyse, and which like a silver tongue is oppressed with a marvailous heat, we have proved more dangerous than sin and pretense. But your ministers prophane the Lord's table with whoremasters, usurers, and others. Our God is a jelous God.

Since England continued to use the Julian calendar after 1582, all dates are given in Old Style. If a date falls between January 1 and March 24, it is given in Old Style for the month and day, but the year is given both in Old and New Style. Therefore, we shall find December 31, 1592, and January 1, 1592/3, March 24, 1592/3, and March 25, 1593.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to the officials and staff of the Folger Shakespeare Library, where I have done much of my research. I am deeply grateful to Dr. Louis B. Wright for three Folger fellowships which have made possible prolonged periods of study and writing. To the staff of the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the Union Theological Seminary Library, the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale University, the Boston Public Library, the Houghton Library in Harvard, the Newberry Library in Chicago, Northwestern University Library, University of Chicago Library, and the Henry E. Huntington library, I express my thanks. Likewise, to the officials and friends in the British Museum, the Public Record Office, the Lambeth Palace Library, Dr. Williams's Library, the Bodleian Library, the University Library and the Trinity College Library, Cambridge, I wish to record my appreciation.

To my former colleagues and friends at Northwestern University I feel grateful, especially to Dr. Gray C. Boyce, Dean Simeon E. Leland, Dean Moody E. Prior, and Dr. Arthur R. Tebbutt, as well as to the Committee on Research of the Graduate School of Northwestern University.

To those who have aided me in making the transition from heavily revised handwritten sheets to typed pages and galley proof, I tender my sincere thanks—especially to my secretary, Miss Rosie Johansen, the printers, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., and to the trustees of the Sir Halley Stewart Trust.

LELAND H. CARLSON.

April 25, 1959.
Southern California School of Theology
Claremont Graduate School

Claremont, California

CONTENTS

PREFACE	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
THE WRITINGS OF HENRY BARROW	28
1587	
I. Four Causes of Separation	30
II. Profes of Aparant Churche	44
III. A Breefe Sum of Our Profession	56
IV. Barrow's First Examination, November 19, 1587	59
V. Barrow's Second Examination, November 27, 1587	70
VI. A Pastoral Letter from Prison	73
1588	
VII. A Brief Summe of the Causes of Our Separation, and of Our Purposes in Practise	93
VIII. Reply to Dr. Some's <i>A Godly Treatise</i>	109

1589

IX. Barrow's Third Examination, January 1, 1588/9	123
X. Barrow's Fourth Examination, March 18, 1588/9	126
XI. Barrow's Fifth Examination, March 24, 1588/9 (Barrow's Version)	139
XII. Barrow's Fifth Examination, March 24, 1588/9 (Register's Version)	150
XIII. A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church	154

1590

XIV. The First Part of the Platforme	167
XV. Letter to Mr. Fisher	190
XVI. A Brief Discoverie of the False Church	199
Index	521

INTRODUCTION

Four Causes of Separation

This is the earliest known writing of Henry Barrow. It is a clear call to the truly devoted and spiritual believers, who profess Christ as Lord and Master, to forsake the Church of England, to separate themselves from the parish assemblies which are a motley, confused, disordered aggregation of nonbelievers as well as of nominal Christians. These assemblies are a repudiation of the New Testament model established in the first century by the apostles and their contemporaries. They are an abrogation of the will and testament of Christ, a repudiation of Christ as king, priest, and prophet, and an exaltation of antichrist who reigneth in the temple of God.

The first cause of separation is that the Anglican churches worship the true God in a false manner. By this allegation the Separatists charge that the worship service is based on the *Book of Common Prayer*. This book is uncharitably termed a piece of swine's flesh, Dagon's stump, a device of men, a human invention, a false idol, a mark of the beast, an abominable sacrifice unto the Lord.

A second cause for separating from the established parish assemblies is that the principle of membership is wrong. The parish churches are geographical and ecclesiastical units. Membership is legal, comprehensive, required, and automatic. Consequently, churches are a spiritual hodge-podge, composed of unwilling and ungodly persons, comprised of the profane and secular, of the indifferent and the hostile, of cool disbelievers and luke-warm Laodiceans. As in the Roman Catholic Church, all are baptized and made automatic members, regardless of profession, practice, or protest. Baptism is general, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is almost general, since only a few egregious persons are excluded, and since the power of excommunication is exercised by the hierarchical courts rather than by the minister and the congregation.

The third cause for separation is that the ministry of the Church of England is antichristian, false, and unscriptural, in reference to the calling of clergymen, to the method of selection, and to the mode of financial support. The ministers have not been rightly called by God, and therefore their entrance into the sheepfold of Christ is not in accordance with the laws and ordinances of the Scripture. Their selection has not been made by the congregation, but by the bishop or the patron, who has imposed them upon the people, and therefore is a violation of the true canons of ministerial election. Since they are supported by tithes, endowments, and wages, instead of by the free-will offerings of the faithful members, their subjection to the Old Testament system of Hebrew tithes instead of to the New Testament dispensation of voluntary support is disgraceful and discreditable.

The fourth cause of separation is the system of discipline, the method of governing the churches through an episcopal system, including the hated spiritual courts that exercise a secular and profitable jurisdiction. The true head of the church is Christ, not the Queen. Prince and parliament are not the source of ecclesiastical law, and their regulations do not take priority over the commands of God Himself. Reformation must proceed without tarrying for any permission from the magistrate, and progress is not effected by petitions to legislatures or suits to parliament. The apostles planted the gospel without the sanction of governments, and the christian church developed in the face of opposition and bitter persecution. The prince or magistrate or lord or commoner is subject to the law of Christ, and the kings of men are subservient to the King of Kings, who yields not his sceptre to any man. God's ways are not man's ways, God's law is higher than man's laws, and God's thoughts transcend the ideas of men. Christ endowed his government with divine power and majesty. No minister can serve two masters, and if man-made government imposes itself upon the servants of Christ, they are enjoined to resist it and to serve Christ only. The government of Christ's church is revealed in the New Testament, consists of pastors and doctors, elders and deacons, and is permanent, perpetual, and prescriptive. If Christ cannot rule through his own officers, he is dethroned, and antichrist rules in his stead. Christian liberty is a precious legacy, subject to no restrictions, and is to be defended unto death. Christ's government is the guardian of that liberty, is immutable, all-embracing, and divinely sanctioned.

Profes of Aparant Church

This essay is a series of reasons why the parish churches of England are not the true, visible, apparant churches of Christ. It is a comprehensive and polemical challenge to the people to forsake the false church and join in building the new Mount Sion.

The true kingdom is the church of Christ, not the whole world. As an integral part of this kingdom, the New Testament pattern of church government is essential. Those who tarry for the magistrate, and who compromise their stand, previously admitted that the true government of the church was lacking. Now they assert that because they preach the word they need not be concerned with polity. Therefore they are not the apparant church.

It is clear to all that ecclesiastical jurisdiction is exercised by lordly archbishops and bishops, deans and archdeacons, chancellors and commissaries. Government has been forfeited to usurpers who continue the papal system, and the rightful government by pastors and teachers, elders and deacons, and the entire congregation, is thwarted. Since

the usurpers do not constitute the true rulers of Christ's kingdom, their assemblies are not the apparant church.

In the true and rightly gathered assembly, any member may "tell the church," and may seek correction of abuses and transgressions. This right does not exist in the English churches, since the bishops and their courts have preempted this jurisdiction. Therefore they are not the apparant church. The commissaries and their courts have usurped the keys of the kingdom of Christ, and have deprived the congregation of the power to bind and loose. No true subject, entrusted with an office by his monarch, would overthrow that office without incurring the charge of being a traitor to his king. But the tolerating preachers have abdicated their disciplinary office to the bishop and commissary, and therefore are traitors to their heavenly king. Therefore they are not the true visible church.

The Anglican parsons have been called by a bishop or a patron. They in turn proceed to gather the good and the bad indiscriminately. But a true minister receives his calling from God and is selected by the consent of godly Christians without any admixture of profane multitudes, and he is called to keep separate the wheat and the chaff. Although men are fallible and sinful, and their secret sins cannot be fully known, the retention and toleration of open wickedness and gross pollutions constitute a blot against the church. Even if a teacher is joined with an Anglican parson, the latter is frequently an idol shepherd, a time-server, a dumb dog who cannot preach. Since the teacher lacks the authority of a true pastor or doctor, he cannot minister to a select company of gathered saints. The maintenance of this intolerable system proves that the present assemblies are not the apparant church of Christ.

The use of the magistrate's sword to enforce wicked ceremonies, punish those who seek to maintain a good conscience, impose read prayers, persecute the saints, and prevent the spiritual worship of God, is sufficient proof that the ecclesiastical establishment is not the apparant church. Furthermore, this false establishment not only continues its falsity, but it prevents the true church from developing. The false ministers not only refuse to reform the crying abuses but even submit willingly and cravenly to their taskmasters who have usurped the functions of God's chosen vessels. Their great concern is for their own wages and stipends, rather than for the heavenly pattern of the church. During his ministry Christ instructed his disciples, and after his resurrection he spent forty days with the apostles, teaching them how to build the church according to his divine plan. The Anglican church is a refutation of this beautiful pattern. Not only is it deficient in small details of pins and curtains, which is inexcusable, but it lacks the chief pillars and walls, which is intolerable. Therefore, it is not the true apparant visible church of Christ.

A Breefe Sum of Our Profession

This manifesto of one page is a brief statement of the purposes of the Separatists and a presentation of the four reasons why they have forsaken the parish assemblies in England. The Separatists intend to seek the protection and peace of Almighty God, and to further the kingdom of Christ on earth. This general purpose is applicable to any christian sect, but different groups will place their own interpretation on the meaning and structure of Christ's kingdom. Specifically, the Separatists intend to establish a church with a covenant, with faithful and obedient Christians as members, and with officers chosen by

the members. This church will be guided and governed by the laws of Christ, without alteration of, omission from, or addition to the pattern set forth in the New Testament. In this faith and order they will lead their lives, despite persecution and even deprivation of life. By these intentions, realized in a true church, they will repudiate the false worship, profane membership, the antichristian ministry, and unscriptural polity of the Church of England.

Barrow's First Examination, November 19, 1587

This examination does not provide us with ideas or teachings, but it affords us biographical details of Barrow's life. We learn that Barrow and a Mr. Hul visited Greenwood in the Clink on November 19, 1587, just six weeks after the arrest of the Separatists. It is clear that the authorities had been searching for Barrow, since Mr. Shepherd, the keeper of the prison, arrested Barrow without a warrant, and Watson, the pursuivant, said he had sought Barrow for a long time. We learn of Barrow's presence at Cambridge University and Gray's Inn. It becomes clear from Barrow's testimony that he had been indicted for non-attendance at church, having violated the statute of 23 Elizabeth, *caput* 1. Barrow also testified that he did not live in London, that his father, Thomas, was still living in Norfolk, from which we may conjecture that both father and son were living in Shipdam in East Anglia.

The appearance of Barrow at Lambeth Palace before Archbishop Whitgift, Archdeacon Mullins, and Richard Cosin, vicar-general of the Province of Canterbury, gives us a fascinating insight into the character of two defiant men, Archbishop Whitgift and Barrow. The archbishop has a reputation among Puritans and Separatists for displaying "choler," and his temper rises above the surface occasionally. He was irritated because Barrow refused to accept and read the pursuivant's letter which emanated from Lambeth. He labelled Barrow a Donatist and a schismatic, accused him of pride and sedition, and threatened to arraign him as a heretic. He and Dr. Cosin accused Barrow of being clamorous, derided him for his memory, and gloated that his divinity was like his law.

The resistance of the Separatists to the *ex-officio* oath is depicted in this examination. Barrow believes that an oath is lawful, in proper circumstances, but he refuses to swear an oath before Whitgift. He irritates the archbishop by refusing to swear by the Bible or with hand on the Bible. He will not place his hand on the table or in the hand of the archbishop, and although he admits that it is not amiss to hold his hand towards heaven and swear, he will not do so under pressure or requirements; but will use his liberty. He tells the archbishop bluntly that he will not swear before he knows the substance of the accusations against him. When Whitgift charges him with non-attendance at church, with disobedience to the queen, and with asserting that the Church of England is a false church, Barrow replies that since these are mere reports, he will not deign to answer until witnesses are produced. An impasse is reached, and when Barrow refuses to be bound to attend the Church of England service, although he is willing to enter bond with surety for his good behaviour, he is imprisoned in the Gatehouse.

Barrow's Second Examination, November 27, 1587

This examination was held eight days after the first one, at Lambeth Palace, before the Court of High Commission. When Barrow refused to take an oath until he knew the charges against him, the archbishop relented and caused a bill of objections to be read. The indictment summarized allegations against the Church of England, its false worship, ministry, membership, and polity. It charged Barrow with saying that the archbishop and bishops were antichrists, that elders were really bishops, that ministers and preachers were secret hypocrites, that Calvin and Beza were in error, and that catechisms were idolatrous. Archbishop Whitgift caustically remarked that Barrow in his impartiality regarded all of his enemies as equally reprehensible.

Having satisfied Barrow's humour by informing him of the matter of the bill, the archbishop expected immediate compliance from Barrow in taking the oath. Barrow irritated the archbishop by replying that the form of the bill was false. When Whitgift demanded a direct answer to his question of taking the oath, Barrow threw caution to the winds, refused to swear, and bluntly retorted that there was more reason for demanding that the archbishop take an oath. Whitgift exploded, peremptorily ordered Barrow into close imprisonment, and forbade him to have any visitors. Whitgift boastfully prophesied that Barrow would tell another tale before the archbishop had finished with him, but he was completely wrong. Barrow yielded not an inch, amplified his tale through his books, and remained in prison, defying the archbishop even by his death in 1593.

A Pastoral Letter from Prison

Shortly after his arrest, imprisonment, and appearance before the Court of High Commission, Barrow wrote a letter to the Separatists, who appear to have organized themselves into an assembly of believers. This assembly seems to have been an informal one, an incipient Separatist congregation. Evidently many people were engaged in a serious soul-searching as to what they should do. Was it better to continue in their parish assemblies, remain obedient to the ecclesiastical law and hierarchy, and hope that religious conditions would improve? Should they heed the advice of those who said that it was better to bear the burdens for a time until the Lord's pleasure ordained otherwise? Was it honest principle or only expedient policy to hope for the best in the meantime and to use prayer and such liberty as they possessed to bring in the kingdom of God? In short, what was God's will in the critical issues which these radical Puritans confronted?

Barrow warns his friends of three prevailing conditions or factors. One was the prevailing conditions of materialism and indifference. The times were evil, people were preoccupied with worldly cares, and the Lord's field was untilled and even unattended. A second factor was the negligence of the preachers, those false husbandmen, those incompetent and lazy builders, those deceitful labourers. They have planted good seed in poor soil, and they have sown unsound seed in the Lord's field. They have been building an ecclesiastical edifice for the last twenty-eight years (1559–1587), but the foundation is still lacking and not even one stone is rightfully placed. They have pretended to do the Lord's work, but they are deceiving themselves and others, and labour in vain. These false preachers are unwilling to preach a true gospel of repentance, but as false prophets they purchase peace with the world. Also, that ancient enemy, Satan, remains as watchful, as envious, and as malicious as ever.

Because of the adverse *Zeitgeist*, Barrow exhorts his brethren to separate themselves, to avoid the wicked, and to refuse fellowship with the throng of iniquity. He reminds his readers that they are a chosen generation, a light set on a hill, a holy nation, a people set at liberty, a royal priesthood. He urges them to avoid vacillation, and, remembering the warning given to the lukewarm Laodiceans, to be either hot or cold. Since the Lord abhorreth a double-minded man, Barrow warns them not to halt between two opinions or two courses of life, not to sit on the religious fence, not to forsake the society of Christ's servants. Christ has ordained that beautiful order and pattern of government for his church, and it is worthy of all the suffering it entails.

Barrow concludes his pastoral letter by describing his experience before the Court of High Commission. It is a pontifical court of bishops and well-fed silken priests, who show forth neither equity, charity, nor conscience. He relates his refusal to take an oath, his promise to answer truly and directly, and his defiance of the archbishop, who loses his temper and orders Barrow committed to close imprisonment.

A Brief Summe of the Causes of Our Seperation, and of Our Purposes in Practise

The first portion of this treatise is a repetition of "A Breefe Sum of Our Profession," and needs no restatement or further summary. The rest of the treatise is George Gifford's answer to each article and to the four principal transgressions. Barrow disclaims any purpose of meddling with the reformation of the state, and even insists that the Separatists do not seek the repair of the ruins of Jericho or the reformation of the Babylon-ish deformities in the Anglican church. The sole purpose is to establish a church in conformance with the laws and ordinances of Christ's Testament, and if that is done, the decline and fall of the Anglican church may safely be left to the Lord's visitation and judgment, which was exemplified in the destruction of Sodom and Babylon.

To the first purpose, that of seeking the peace and protection of the most High, and of seeking the kingdom of Jesus Christ, Gifford agrees that this is a purpose for all Christians, but he objects to the identification of the kingdom with separation and a new form of church discipline. The kingdom is inward and spiritual, not partial and disciplinary. To the second purpose, that of worshipping God aright, Gifford offers no objection or qualification. To the third purpose, that of organizing a church of believers only, bound together by a covenant, and of electing a group of church officers, Gifford asserts that such an action is pure Donatism. To the fourth purpose, that of establishing and obeying the laws of ecclesiastical polity as prescribed in the New Testament, Gifford replies that this is not the function of private individuals who have no lawful calling. To the fifth purpose, that of standing firm in faith and polity, even unto death, Gifford applauds the spirit of the martyrs, but points out that those who stand firm in error are guilty of great obstinacy, as Anabaptists and heretics have demonstrated in the past. To the sixth article, which is a transitional statement introducing the four principal transgressions, and which affirms the English churches to be heinously faulty and wilfully obstinate, Gifford indignantly answers that such an affirmation reveals intolerable pride and presumption by private men who have intruded themselves into God's judgment seat.

The first principal transgression charged is that the Anglican worship is the invention of man, even of antichrist. Gifford contends that the Anglican worship is the embracing of the Holy Bible and that many English ministers approve the *Book of Common Prayer* only to the extent that they believe it is consonant with the Scripture. The charge is made in the second principal transgression that the profane and ungodly are received without exception into the membership of English churches. Gifford counters with six observations. First, some pastors refuse to admit sinful persons to the sacrament. Secondly, the *Book of Common Prayer* expressly commands that those who lead ungodly lives shall not be admitted. Thirdly, some individuals have been justly excommunicated. Fourthly, the worship of the faithful is not polluted by the presence of profane persons. Fifthly, worship in the Jewish Temple was practised by mixed multitudes. Sixthly, private men have no authority to reform the worship in temples or churches.

The third principal transgression alleged is that the Anglican ministry is false and antichristian. Gifford refutes this sweeping assertion by appealing to the judgment of learned and famous theologians in many churches, men who have approved of the Church of England. Is not such a church the true church, rather than a Separatist assembly, comprised of uncharitable members, closely resembling the churches of Anabaptists and Donatists? Why are English clergymen false and antichristian? He wisely asks for specific criteria by which ministers may be approved or condemned.

The fourth transgression charged against the English churches is that they are ruled by an ungodly, unchristian, and unscriptural ecclesiastical hierarchy. In keeping with his latent Presbyterian beliefs, Gifford is compelled to admit that there is an antichristian yoke under which the Church of England labours, but despite this weakness and handicap, the church is still the spouse of Christ.

Reply to Dr. Some's A GODLY TREATISE

Dr. Some's treatise consists of 37 pages, but we have Barrow's interleaved notes only through page 12. Since his comments answer various phrases, clauses, and sentences, they are necessarily brief and unsystematic, but they provide us nevertheless with some of his beliefs.

For Barrow the unpreaching ministers, those "dumb dogs"—to use the phrase of the prophet Isaiah (56:10)—are unlawful clergymen. Since the preaching and expounding of the word are essential, since faith cometh by the hearing of the word, the unpreaching minister is failing to fulfill his true function. Furthermore, a true calling is given by a particular congregation, not by the bishop or the patron. A double-beneficed clergyman and an unpreaching minister were not permitted by the teaching of Augustine or Calvin, and Scripture is against such abuses. Hence such ecclesiastical officials are not true ministers of Christ. Therefore, they cannot truly administer the sacraments. Likewise, the sacraments administered by the Roman Catholic priests are false, because the church itself is false.

The maintenance of ministers should not be by endowments, Jewish tithes, or mercenary wages. The Old Testament dispensation has been superseded by that of the New Testament, and the law has been abrogated by Christ. Too many Anglican clergymen, especially the roving ministers, mercenary chaplains, and collegiate divines, live in idleness and irresponsibility. The lordly prelates are the worst violators, and their

princely palaces, worldly splendour, large revenues, and fat livings are in striking contrast to the simplicity of the gospel and the poverty of the disciples and apostles. The true minister of Christ lives by the free contributions of the faithful members, in accordance with need. They do not require the endowments of the past to maintain their work. Inasmuch as university endowments and church livings have the same popish origin as the abbeys, Elizabeth should confiscate them, even as her father, Henry VIII, seized the monastic establishments. Tithes, glebe lands, impropriations, benefices, prebends, and temporalities should redound to the prince and commonwealth, not to sychophantic parsons and lordly prelates and collegiate idle bellies.

Barrow is caustic in his criticism of the false ministers. He is equally scathing in his criticism of Dr. Robert Some and the Church of England. He derides Dr. Some's title, doctor of divinity, and declares that there is but one Doctor, even Christ, in whom the divine godhead dwelleth bodily. Dr. Some and his companions are proud Pharisees and counterfeit scribes. The Church of England, which Dr. Some equates with the commonwealth, as later, Edmund Burke also did, is a portion, a small part, a remnant, but it is not the visible church of Christ.

Barrow's views on the powers of the magistrate to enforce religion are blunt, terse, and lacking in toleration as understood to-day. The magistrate may set up true religion, may abolish false religion, and he may compel people to hear the word of God and participate in prayers. Thus, he may enforce external worship upon all his subjects. Open impenitent offenders cannot be made members without true faith and repentance. In asserting that such profane persons who participate in external worship and sacraments actually pollute the services and compromise the believers, Barrow seems to be inconsistent. If the magistrate can compel attendance for all, he seems guilty of compelling pollution, which results from such attendance. If the magistrate fails to do his duty, or if he establishes false worship—in violence of Scriptural standards—the only course open to the faithful is to reject such false worship and to suffer the penalties imposed. Barrow admits the right of the magistrate to coerce, and by his imprisonment demonstrates his willingness to suffer.

The magistrate may not select ministers to teach and preach God's word. This is the function of the individual gathered churches, of which the magistrate is but one member. The magistrate may assist the churches with the civil sword, even as the civil power of the Jewish monarchy assisted the Levites. But he may not encroach on the jurisdiction of the believers in calling their own minister. Faith cometh by the hearing of the word, and the people must always be careful in selecting true teachers and promoting right doctrine, and in rejecting false ministers and wrong teaching. In effect, Barrow transfers some of the ecclesiastical prerogatives of Queen Elizabeth to the individual congregations, and permits the crown to enforce what the congregations decide. Such a permission and such a transference were unpalatable to the queen, her government, her church, and her subjects, and consequently were rejected.

Barrow's Third Examination, January 1, 1588/9

This brief and incomplete examination provides us with a minimum of general information and with one Barrowist teaching. We learn that the lords of the Privy Council had ordered Richard Young and Dr. Robert Some to interrogate Barrow about some

marginal writings in Dr. Some's book, *A Godly Treatise Containing and Deciding Certain Questions, Moved of Late in London and Other Places, Touching the Ministerie, Sacraments, and Church*. The examination occurred on Tuesday, January 1, 1588/9, in the Fleet prison, where Barrow was a close prisoner, the warden being present. It is evident that the handwriting was not that of Barrow, but whether Greenwood or some other Separatist served as an amanuensis, we do not know. It is likely that the book had been seized in one of the prison chambers, and it is almost certain that Barrow knew who had made the marginal notations. When Barrow answered: "I know not what may be in the booke," he may be saying that he doesn't remember all the points discussed therein, or he may mean that he doesn't recall all the marginal notes added to the book.

The one doctrine manifested in this collection of marginal notes is the Separatist belief that the church has one head, even Christ. Therefore, Henry VIII was wrong in assuming the title of "only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *anglicana ecclesia*," and Elizabeth erred in taking a modified title of "the supreme governor...in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes." Only a false church could have two heads, but in the Separatist church, Christ was the head, the magistrate was a humble member, the pastor was the leader of the particular church, and the congregation was the ultimate source of discipline. No wonder there "began a great discourse of the majestrate's power"!

Barrow's Fourth Examination, March 18, 1588/9

This examination before the Privy Councillors was one of the most important events in Barrow's prison life. It affords some biographical details, indicates two or three beliefs, and reveals the temper and spirit of Barrow, as well as the impression of him by his judges.

From this examination we learn that Barrow was imprisoned in the Gatehouse prison for about six months. The reasons for his incarceration were that he refused to take the oath *ex officio*, had refused to enter bond and to promise attendance at his parish assembly, and had defied and irritated the archbishop. But Whitgift said that he imprisoned Barrow because he was a sower of errors. Barrow challenged the archbishop to prove any errors, and when the archbishop indicated that he had matters of heresy to be charged against Barrow, the latter replied that he might err, but that by the grace of God he would never be a heretic. In complaining of injustice, Barrow contended that he had been imprisoned without due trial. When confronted with his admission that he had been found guilty of violating the statute of 23 Elizabeth, *c.* 1, Barrow replied that this statute was intended for papal recusants, not Protestants. When asked by Lord Burghley if Barrow had been allowed any conference, Bishop Aylmer and Dr. Some and Justice Young spoke of two conferences and of Barrow's mocking, arrogant, and unreverend speeches.

Barrow's beliefs emerge from his answers to questions. He recites the familiar four charges against the Church of England, and when both Bishop Aylmer and Lord Burghley asked wherein the worship of the Anglican churches was idolatrous, Barrow replied that there was nothing else in the *Book of Common Prayer*, that the commemorating of the saints in the church violated the first commandment, that the sanctifying of eaves and the observing of fasts was idolatrous, and that worship should be

directed to God and not to any creature, even a saint. He dislikes the practice of naming days after saints, and, as the Quakers in the next century, he urges that Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc., be called the first, second and third days. Challenged because he had referred to Sunday as the Lord's day, Barrow quickly replied that so the Holy Ghost had termed it in Revelation 1:10. Asked what was wrong with the prayers in the *Book of Common Prayer*, Barrow answered that prayers should not be stereotyped and stinted, nor should they be tied to place, manner, time, or form. Lord Burghley was much interested in Barrow's view that Parliament could not provide tithes for clergymen, since tithes were a part of the Jewish law that had been abrogated by Christ. How then should the clergy be supported? Barrow contended that the profane and worldly people should not be taxed to pay the salaries of God's servants. Rather, let those who had been taught in the word—the faithful believers—support their minister by free-will offerings, by clear alms.

Barrow's high spirit is revealed in his unbridled tongue. After sixteen months of misery and lingering close imprisonment, after living with daily thoughts of injustice, unfairness, illegality, religious decay, spiritual cowardice, it is not surprising that Barrow spoke sharply, defied his questioners, threw caution to the winds. He did not believe in compromise, and he feared no man. He never learned that a soft answer turns away wrath, and that there are two sides to many disputed questions. Consequently, his temper flared upon provocation. He corrected the Bishop of London in a Scriptural quotation. He took issue with the Lord Chancellor, contradicted Lord Burghley, and irritated Lord Buckhurst. He bluntly told Archbishop Whitgift and Bishop Aylmer that they were devoid of all true learning and godliness. He probably amused Lord Burghley by describing the archbishop as a monster, a miserable compound neither ecclesiastical nor civil, that second beast, that man of sin, that son of perdition. Lord Burghley slyly asked for the Scriptural proofs of these labels. No wonder that Whitgift gnashed his teeth, spoke "in great choller," and very peremptorily denied Barrow's request for a conference.

Barrow's character and manner are partly revealed by the impressions made on his judges. Lord Buckhurst characterized Barrow as a proud presumptuous spirit, as one out of his wits, as a man who delighted to hear himself speak, and yet he complimented Barrow for his denial of heresy. Lord Chaneellor Hatton declared that he never heard such stuff before in all his life. Lord Burghley perceived that Barrow was a fantastical fellow, who took delight in being the author of a new religion, who was possessed of a hot brain, who seemed to have a troubled conscience, and who took the Lord's name often in vain. The Bishop of London asserted that Barrow had mocked those who questioned him in prison, and Justice Young accused Barrow of arrogant and unreverend speeches against Archbishop Whitgift.

These criticisms give us an idea of the impression that Barrow made on others, but the fact that Barrow himself is the source of all these strictures on himself gives us a deeper insight into an honest soul.

Barrow's Fifth Examination, March 24, 1588/9. Barrow's Version

In the examination of March 18, 1588/9, Archbishop Whitgift said he had matter to call Barrow before him as a heretic. Although Barrow denied any charge of heresy, he was summoned six days later to appear before a special Commission appointed by the queen.

This commission consisted of Sir Christopher Wray, Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench; Sir Edmund Anderson, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas; Sir Roger Manwood, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer; Sir Gilbert Gerard, Master of the Rolls; Baron Thomas Gent, of the Court of the Exchequer; Archbishop John Whitgift, Bishop John Aylmer, and Bishop Thomas Cooper; and also chancellors, civil doctors, registrars and scribes.

The atmosphere of the examination was somewhat different from that of March 18, 1588/9. Although Barrow refused to take an oath, the Lord Chief Justice Wray did not berate him, and Whitgift behaved with restraint. Accepting Barrow's statement that he would answer nothing but the truth, the archbishop concluded that a christian man's word was as true as his oath, and began the examination. In the course of the examination the bishops accused Barrow of evasion, said the papists answered more directly, and interrupted the interrogation with slanders and untruths. But Lord Chief Justice Wray complimented Barrow by saying he answered directly and compendiously and that he spoke well. He even stated that if Barrow had doubts on an answer it should not be recorded.

The examination consisted of twelve main questions besides those which were prompted by Barrow's answers. The questions were based on material which Dr. Some had obtained from conferences and reading, and also on confessions made by Clement Gambell, John Dove, and Mr. Love. Material had been taken from manuscript treatises found in the possession of Quintin Smith and Roger Jackson. Much of this material may be seen in "Certain Wicked Sects and Opinions," conveniently summarized in "The Assertions of the Conventicles Lately Apprehended." Barrow explained his view on the Lord's Prayer, saying it was a foundation for all prayer but that it was not prescribed as a substitute for individual prayer. He denounced read prayers and prescribed liturgies, and characterized the *Book of Common Prayer* as popish and idolatrous. Although he believed that sacraments were not rightly administered in the Church of England, he concluded that those who had been baptized in Queen Elizabeth's reign needed not and ought not to be rebaptized. He characterized the ecclesiastical laws, courts, and governors as unlawful and unchristian. On the touchy question of the queen's prerogative in ecclesiastical matters, Barrow acknowledged the queen as supreme governor of the realm and church, but denied to the queen or to the church itself any power to make laws for the church other than those found in the word of God. He was somewhat hesitant about the prince's extent of power to alter the law of Moses, and concluded that the moral law must be upheld but that the ceremonial law had been abrogated by Christ and therefore could be altered by the prince. Barrow denied the right of private men to reform the state in a public reformation if the prince neglected his duty, but no man should consent to any unlawful action commanded by the prince. Barrow had previously answered that the prince could not make laws for the church, and when he was asked if each church or parish should have a presbytery, he replied that each congregation to the utmost of its power should seek to establish an eldership.

At the conclusion of his examination, Barrow was taken back to prison while his brethren were examined. Then he was brought back again before his examiners, and Archbishop Whitgift asked if Barrow would take an oath in accordance with the Act of Supremacy. He protested his loyalty as a subject to the queen and against her enemies, but said he could not swear loyalty to a successor whom he knew not and who might be a

papist. Then the archbishop asked two more pointed questions. If the prince neglected his duty or failed to correct abuses, not in the state but in the church, could the church reform without tarrying for the prince. Barrow said the church could do so, and ought to do so, even though the prince prohibited the same and threatened death to violators. Then the archbishop asked if the church could excommunicate the prince, and who would pronounce the same. Barrow did not flinch or hedge, but replied that with the church of Christ there was no respect of persons, that if anyone persisted in sin he should be excommunicated, the prince included, for the sake of his own salvation, and that the pastor should pronounce the excommunication.

Barrow's Fifth Examination, March 24, 1588/89. Register's Version

This examination is the record made by the register of Barrow's answers. It is substantially the same set of questions and answers, but the register's record is briefer and less interesting than Barrow's version. In the register's version, one question on the judicial law of Moses is omitted because the bishops ordered that the question and the answer be blotted out, evidently on the suggestion of Lord Chief Justice Wray. There are two questions on baptism in the register's version, but Barrow has omitted the one that pertained to infant baptism.

If we compare the questions and answers in the two versions, we notice that in Barrow's version the answer to the first question is slightly longer and includes a question on the meaning of *Pater Noster*. The second, third and fourth questions and answers are basically the same. In the fifth answer (Barrow's seventh), Barrow's version is longer, and includes disagreements and exceptions made by Bishop Aylmer and Judge Anderson. In one version the archbishop seems to be asking the question, but Barrow says Judge Anderson caused the question to be moved. In the sixth question (Barrow's fifth), the answers vary, and it seems that Barrow may have confused the answer he made. Part of his answer includes material in reply to the tenth question in the register's version. In the seventh question (Barrow's sixth), the register has shortened the question and has omitted Barrow's statement that persons once baptized need not and ought not to be baptized again. In the register's version, the eighth question pertains to infant baptism, but Barrow has omitted it, perhaps because he had already included a question and answer on baptism in general. In the register's ninth question (Barrow's eighth), the two versions agree, but Barrow includes the reactions of the bishops, their slanders and evil speeches, his reprimanding the Bishop of London, and Judge Wray's compliment. The tenth question and answer in the register's version agree with Barrow's fifth question and answer. In the eleventh question, both versions have presbytery in the question, but in the answer Barrow has "eldership" and the register has "presbytery" again. The register's twelfth answer pertains to the touchy matter of the queen's possible excommunication. Barrow's version is three times as long. In the thirteenth and final question (Barrow's tenth and twelfth), the register has omitted Barrow's statement that private men should not intrude into the office of the prince.

The register has omitted some of the interesting aspects, such as the refusal to swear, the questions of the Bishop of Winchester and Judge Anderson, the statements of Judge Wray, the quibbling exceptions, the inquiry whether Barrow would take an oath

according to the Act of Supremacy, and the archbishop's refusal to provide Barrow with a written copy of his answers.

A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church

In all ages men have described the church in various ways. They have spoken of the Church Intellectual, with Augustine, Jerome, and Thomas Aquinas in mind. They have spoken of the Church Militant, under the leadership of Gregory the Great, Innocent III, and Boniface VIII. They have responded to the Church Spiritual, with inspiration from Francis of Assisi, Catherine of Siena, and Bernard of Clairvaux. They have marvelled at the Church Architectural, as they gazed upon St. Peter's Cathedral, Notre Dame, and Beauvais. And in times of corruption and worldliness, they have dreamed of the Church Invisible which transcended the limitations of sinful men.

For Barrow the Church Invisible did not exist either in the New Testament or in real life. There was no Platonic spiritual archetype which had actual existence, but there was an Aristotelian nominalistic concept which did exist as an ideal. This ideal was the Church Visible, which was realizable, cognizable, and meaningful in daily affairs and localized in true visible churches, which collectively comprised the Church Visible, spiritually unified but geographically diverse.

Since the word of God was the last will and testament of Christ, its authority was absolute and unerring. Since the Scripture contained the laws and ordinances of Christ, its regulations were final. And since Christ had prescribed the infallible ordinances of His church, since He had stamped once for all His beautiful pattern, since He had established an unalterable model, and since He had effected through the disciples and apostles the New Testament church, men were bound to accept it. The development of the Roman and Anglican churches has been a deviation from the true course. The map was in the New Testament. All that was necessary was a re-examination of the New Testament and a description of the church as found in its pages. This Barrow proceeded to do.

His description of the true church is a masterpiece of brevity, beauty, and simplicity. It is a skillful weaving together of Biblical language; it is succinct, comprehensive, and christian. It begins with an affirmation of the oneness of God, the supremacy of Christ, the singleness of truth, the unity of faith, the uniqueness of the church, the solitary hope, the sole way, the pure salvation, the one rule—the word of God. This church is then defined as a fellowship of believers, rightly gathered out of the world, truly worshipping God aright, correctly governed by laws and officers of Christ. It is described by similes taken from the Old and New Testament. The church is a temple, a chosen generation, a vineyard, a sister, a spouse, a queen, the joy of the whole earth, the kingdom of Christ united by a covenant and strengthened by the presence and power of God.

The officers of the church are elected by the faithful members, who have an interest not only in the selection but also in the ordination and administration of their officers. The pastor must be a true shepherd of the flock, patient, watchful, loving, and wise. The doctor or teacher must be able to divide the word of God aright, apt to teach, and able to edify his hearers. The elders or ancients are the presbyters, the governors of the church. Their task is to assist the pastor and teacher, to enforce the laws and ordinances, to prevent and redress evils, and to maintain order and decorum. The deacons are responsible for collecting and distributing money and goods, for attending to the needs of

the poor, and for providing proper maintenance to the officers of the church. The relievers or widows are women, of a minimum age of sixty years, whose task is to minister to the sick, to bring comfort to the weary, and to set a christian example for the younger women. These officers are all members of one body, whose head is Christ, and if any office is not filled, lameness, injury, and deformity ensue.

The visible church through each member possesses the keys of the kingdom of heaven to bind and to loose. Discipline is a necessary practice, and is not left to the discretion and arbitrary desires of persons who may neglect their duties and vacillate in their censures. The church has power to cast down Satan like lightning, to overthrow strongholds, to rebuke anyone who exalteth himself against God, to excommunicate anyone—even queens and kings. Methods are prescribed for dealing with private and public offences, but great care must be used in admonishing, rebuking, and excommunicating weak and sinful members.

The tract, *A True Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church*, is less a creed, as Williston Walker has suggested, and more a constitution for the true church of Christ. It consists of a preamble, a description of the church, a definition of the church, a specification of officers, a summary of the duties of each office, and a prescription for disciplining and excommunicating erring brethren. It closes with a kind of malediction on those who are outside the church.

Thus, the structure of the true visible church, in conformity with the New Testament model, is seven-tiered: Jesus Christ, the pastor, the teacher, the elders, the deacons, the relievers, and the members of the congregation. To all of the people belongs the power of election, calling, ordination, administration, disciplining and excommunicating, in accordance with the laws of Christ and the examples of the apostles, as revealed in the Scriptures.

The First Part of the Platforme

Barrow and Greenwood were examined by Lord Burghley and others in March, 1588/9. Burghley was sharp and caustic in his statements, and showed neither patience nor sympathy, but the Separatist leaders continued to hope that the Lord Treasurer would aid their cause. In April, 1590, fifty-nine Separatists in prison addressed a petition to Lord Burghley, and in 1591 Barrow and Greenwood addressed their “Epistle Dedicatory” of *A Plaine Refutation* to William Cecil, Baron of Burghley. On September 13, 1590, Barrow and Greenwood wrote a letter to Lord Burghley, and also sent him a treatise, *The First Part of the Platforme*. They had desired to send this work to the queen or the privy council, but Burghley had suggested that it be sent to him. When he received it, he made known his displeasure immediately, Thereupon, with heavy hearts, Barrow and Greenwood wrote a second letter on September 18, 1590, in which they craved his pardon for any possible offence, and urged as a last request that they were ever likely to make that they “be allowed some peaceable and christian conference, in loving and sober maner, where these hie and weighty matters in controversy may by the worde of God be discussed and decided.” Unfortunately, Lord Burgh-ley was unwilling to accede to their petition, despite the pitiful, almost abject, tenor of the letter, and Barrow and Greenwood remained in jail. The second part of the platform was never written.

The *First Part of the Platforme* contains four main ideas. The first recommendation which Barrow makes is that the entire Anglican hierarchy, with its attendant courts and officials, should be abolished. This means that the offices of archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, deans, sub-deans, prebends, stipendiary lecturers, vicars, and curates should be eliminated. Likewise, archiepiscopal courts, diocesan courts, and archidiaconal courts should be abolished. A second emphasis is that the revenues of these officials should be appropriated by the queen. Church endowments, glebe lands, temporalities, tithes, advowsons, fees and fines should be converted to civil uses, at the discretion of the monarch. A third recommendation is that the true ministers of God should be supported not by the taxes imposed upon the rank and file of the people but by the free-will offerings and loving benevolences of faithful Christians who really believe in the New Testament and its pattern of church government and maintenance. A fourth suggestion is that the prince should promote the true preaching and practice of the gospel of Christ. What is also recommended is that the prince should forbid and extirpate all other religions within the realm. In other words, Barrow is suggesting that there is only one true form of religion, found in the pages of the New Testament, that men can ascertain and agree upon that form, that divergent views should be eliminated, that intolerance should prevail, and that Anglicanism, Catholicism, Judaism, and Anabaptism should be extirpated.

How this millenium is to be ushered in is not always clear. Barrow assigns the task to the prince and rulers, and denies to private subjects the right to usurp the office of the magistrate and to use force. What shall be done if the magistrate neglects his duties, or if public abuses prevail? Then is it the duty of Christians to protest, to pray, to exhort, to propagandize, and to use all other peaceable methods to influence the prince. If this avails not, the true Christian must accept suffering and imprisonment as the price of his ineffectual protest.

Barrow concludes his treatises by replying to objections to his platform. The main arguments which he seeks to refute are that intolerable innovation, dangerous alteration, and subversion of the state will follow. He denies that those who wish to change the ecclesiastical *status quo* are enemies of the realm. He found it necessary to repudiate the charge that learning would decay, ignorance and barbarism would flourish, and democracy and anarchy would replace monarchy. And he feels called upon to suggest that if his ideas are taken seriously, it will not be difficult to make certain adjustments. Such ecclesiastical functions as performing marriages, proving wills and testaments, adjudicating cases of adultery, can and should be handled by the civil magistrate. And those who will lose their positions, such as civilians in the courts, priests, and bishops, should follow some lawful calling, such as teaching and preaching, provided they have faith and gifts unto edification.

Letter to Mr. Fisher

This is one of the more interesting letters of Barrow, and is valuable for the insights it provides of Barrow's private life and thought. Barrow rejoices that a Supplication or petition has been delivered to the queen personally, and he is sustained by the hope that her majesty will search out the truth of the Separatists' cause. There is a kind of naivete in Barrow's vain hope that the queen or Lord Burghley will somehow discover the

tyrannous behaviour of the bishops and correct this abuse. Throughout his five and a half years in prison Barrow maintained the belief that if an impartial conference could be held, the Separatists would justify their cause, and understanding and harmony would prevail.

This letter gives us additional and corroborating information about the arrest and treatment of Separatists. Since October, 1587, about 82 had been imprisoned. By April, 1590, there are 59 in prison, and by December, 1590, about 50 still remain in various jails. Evidently Archbishop Whitgift is sensitive to the charge of having caused needless deaths of prisoners, and allegedly is courting the favour of jailers to mitigate the reports from the various prison wardens. Barrow cites the cases of Richard Jackson, Margaret Maynerd, Alice Row, and Nicholas Crane as examples of persons who have died without a proper inquest. In fact, he states that Bishop Aylmer had ordered that no *post-mortem* be held. Barrow states that when the venerable clergyman, Nicholas Crane, died, the authorities forbade the carrying of his body into the city through Newgate, lest the people learn of the cruelties of the bishops. He speaks of the barbaric treatment of John Purdye, who was beaten with a club and put into that torture hole, "Little Ease." He is bitter in his denunciation of Dr. Edward Stanhope, chancellor to the Bishop of London, for putting a young man, about seventeen years old, Roger Waterer, into the dungeon, laden with irons for a whole year.

Barrow denounces Archbishop Whitgift unmercifully. He castigates his policy of indiscriminate and wholesale arrests of christian believers, of cruelly punishing innocent wives and children, of devouring Christ's poor sheep, rending their flesh, and breaking their bones. Is not this a christian bishop?—he ironically asks. He represents the archbishop as seeking to alter or suppress the reports of the jailers, of cleverly turning over cases to the civil magistrates and Quarter Sessions to avoid criticism. And Barrow is convinced that the Archbishop of Canterbury is determined to inflict death upon him and Greenwood.

Barrow's close imprisonment must have been close indeed. He has seen no visitors. Only one person has access to his cell—a "poore simple creature," perhaps a maidservant, charwoman, or an employee who brings food to his chamber. Barrow does not know what to do, has concluded that he dare not appeal to Lord Burghley again (since his rebuke in September, 1590), and asks for counsel and advice. It is an abject picture indeed.

A Brief Discoverie of the False Church

This is Barrow's main work. It is certainly a "discoverie," or disclosure or unmasking of the false church, but it is not brief. In the original printed edition, it required about 270 pages of close print, and in typescript with notes it is about 410 pages long. Although it is not his first writing, it is his first full-length book. It is also the work from which extracts were taken by his accusers. Because of this book, he was accused of violating the statute of 1581, was arraigned, indicted, and executed. It is interesting, therefore, to inquire what Barrow's motives were in writing this volume, which seeks to expose, reprove, and cast down the false church.

Barrow was constrained by the love of Christ and zeal for the glory of God. He was deeply committed to the Bible as the word of God, as the infallible book whose

admonitions, injunctions, and examples must be heeded at all costs. His patriotic love of England, his concern for the salvation of sinners, his conviction that his friends and kinsfolk were spiritually dying, his conviction that men were afraid to speak the truth, and his conclusions that the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559–1589 was a half-way programme of reform, a lackadaisical acquiescence in the *status quo*, an obsequious deference by the church to the state, and a dangerous compromise with Roman Catholicism—these were some of the ideas that agitated his restless spirit and led him to express his thoughts in militant and crusading fashion. He makes no claim to a beautiful or literary style, but desires to speak in words taught not by human wisdom but by the Holy Ghost. In fact, he apologizes for his weakened memory, and reminds his readers that he has written this book in prison, one sheet at a time. Without a library or even reference works, without an opportunity to revise his chapters, without the privilege of reading proof, Barrow has produced a remarkable book which reveals a vital and vibrant spirit in its pages. There is a moving eloquence in his direct and impassioned style, despite its obvious faults.

Barrow begins by examining the foundation stones of the Church of England. It was established in 1559 by Parliamentary decree and a blast of Queen Elizabeth's trumpet. Alas, the entire realm does not become a church by the promulgation of the magistrate, without a trial, examination, and true confession of christian faith. This church rests upon the authority of Calvin, not of Scripture. Even by the criteria of Calvin, who said that the true marks of a church were manifest when the word was rightly taught and when the sacraments were rightly administered, the Church of England is deficient, since it lacked both requirements. No true church may retain the unfaithful and profane in its membership, and no true church may dispense with the power to chastise, correct, and cast out offenders. There must be a faithful people gathered by the word of Christ, governed by a New Testament discipline, and possessed of the power to censure and redress sins and sinners.

Barrow is sharply critical of the ministry of England, which he divides into three categories. The governing officials include the archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, chancellors, commissaries, high commissioners, civil doctors, registers, scribes, proctors, summoners, and pursuivants. The serving ministry includes parsons, vicars, curates, lecturers, preachers, house priests, chaplains, half-priests or deacons, churchwardens, sides-men, questmen, and parish clerks. In the third category of the collegiate ministry he includes deans, and sub-deans, pre-bendaries, canons, petty canons, gossellers, pistellers, vergers, and sextons. Most of these officers, he asserts, are unscriptural. They had their origin in antichrist, and they developed further in the popish church. They emerged from the smoke of the bottomless pit, and are like unto the monstrous, crowned, horned, poisonous locusts that issued therefrom. Satan is their general, Apollyon is their lieutenant-general, and they are the captains of the hosts of evil.

Barrow is equally critical of the educational preparation of the clergy. The colleges are like cages of unclean birds, like the seminaries of the pope, and not unlike the Turkish seraglios with their captive Janizaries. The colleges are comprised of boys and young men who lead lives of idleness and revelry. Their study of Greek and Latin is based on the writings of lascivious poets and heathenish philosophers. The study of logic is formal and barren; rhetoric is superficial and stilted ; philosophy is devoid of true theological doctrine. Aristotle and Cicero are the chief mentors. Furthermore, the study of divinity is

dependent on men's writings rather than on the word of God. When students for degrees issue their bills of challenge and post them on the doors of the colleges, they dispute in Latin to give a semblance of learning, but they neither edify nor are edified, and they prove the obvious and disprove that which men already generally disbelieve.

Once they have completed their degrees, these young divines are not called by a congregation of christian believers, but they must rely upon a patron, even though he be a glutton, an absentee lord, or an atheist. Once settled in his parish or church, the new minister will present and observe the injunctions, read the *Book of Common Prayer*, administer the sacraments, visit the sick, and church women. But preaching the word will be conspicuously absent from his duties. Non-residency is possible by using a vicar, and moving to a better living is achieved without the permission of his parishioners. In these services he will be maintained not by the benevolences of the faithful, but by the Jewish tithes of the profane, by the offerings, fees, and mortuaries of the poor.

In the public administration of the church, the *Book of Common Prayer* is their pattern and guide. Here is a calendar to regulate the services of each week. Here are given their stinted prayers and prescribed liturgies. Provision is made for their Jewish and popish feasts, in keeping with ceremonial law, and they are celebrated with riot and gluttony, with May games and laughter. Their worship of saints deceased is unscriptural, and their fasts are hypocritical. Regarding the observance of fasts, the magistrate may not make a positive law. Even the church itself should never prescribe fasts as a matter of course, but use them only for urgent and special occasions.

Barrow boldly states that the queen may not forbid her subjects to eat flesh on special days or seasons—as a religious measure. This right is a gift of God and is in the liberty of each individual. If the queen wishes to promulgate a secular measure to increase the supply of meat, to aid the fishmongers, or to provide for the needs of the navy, she may, but she may not regulate the conscience of men. Dr. Some, following Calvin, contended that the queen's law did not bind the conscience but only the outward action. To this argument, Barrow replied that the distinction between the external court and the court of conscience was a subtle and false one, and therefore sophistry. Any law affecting the public actions of the church, any prescription for worship, prayer, or fasting, was a matter of conscience. If a person conformed in outward action, but not in conscience, he would set the stage for a struggle between mind and heart, for a warfare between right and wrong. Actions must be in accord with conscience or else they become hypocritical expressions of a divided soul.

In evaluating the sacraments of the Church of England, Barrow specified three criteria which must be satisfied. There must be a lawful ministry, a faithful people, and a correctness in outward elements and forms. Since these are lacking in the Church of England, with its Romish antichristian ministry, its profane and confused people, and its trifling ceremony, the consequent administration of the sacraments is false and adulterated. Barrow is critical of the sacrament of baptism because its administration includes a hallowed font and water, use of gossips, godfathers and godmothers, and a pretty dialogue between the priest, parish clerk, and attendants. He is also critical of the second baptism, known as bishoping or confirmation. He is scornful of the third kind of baptism—the hasty baptism by a midwife of a child that is in danger of death, and he regards as useless the fourth kind of baptism, one in which the priest repeats the baptism if he is in doubt about the efficacy of the midwife's action—a baptism by supposition.

The subject of baptism was a touchy issue. Many of the Anglican bishops had been baptized in the Roman Catholic faith. Were they truly baptized? Dr. Some entered into this discussion by asserting that the baptism of the Roman Catholic Church was a true sacrament. Dr. Fulke contended that the Roman Catholic Church was a false church, and therefore its sacraments were not valid. If this latter position was correct, then the queen was not properly baptized, since she had received the sacrament of baptism from John Stokesley, Bishop of London, on September 10, 1533, when England was still a Catholic nation. Into the fray jumped the clerk of Oxford, the friend and defender of John Penry. This was probably Job Throkmorton, who wrote a book called *M. Some Laid Open in His Coulers*. Because this work carried the initials "J.G.," it has been ascribed to John Greenwood, and is so listed in the *Short-Title Catalogue* (12342). This is an error, inasmuch as the ideas and style are not those of Greenwood. Greenwood was in prison, and he would not invite the strong criticism which came from his intimate fellow-prisoner, Henry Barrow. But the ideas and style are very close to those of Job Throkmorton, who was an Oxford graduate and a friend of Penry and a critic of Dr. Some. Throkmorton, or "J.G.," argued that the Roman church was a false church, but it did not follow that the queen was in need of rebaptism. She was persuaded in her conscience that she was baptized, and therefore gave proof that she had received the inward grace and did not need the outward sign or seal of God's covenant.

Barrow departed from his disclosure of the false church to resolve this problem. He attacks the position of Dr. Some that the Roman Catholic Church is a true church. If this is true, then the popish priests were true ministers, their sacraments were valid, and the Church of England is in schism from the Roman Church. Then Dr. Some is also a schismatic. Barrow agrees with Dr. Fulke that the Roman Catholic Church is a false church and that its priests are false ministers. From this position Dr. Fulke proceeded to the conclusion that the sacraments were false, that those who were baptized in the Roman church up to 1559 were not truly baptized, and—by implication—the queen was not truly baptized. With this latter conclusion Barrow disagreed. But Barrow reserves his deepest scorn for the argument of Throkmorton, or "J.G." To suggest that the queen is truly baptized because she is persuaded in her conscience that it is so is to give away the whole case to the bishops. Then anyone is truly baptized who is persuaded in his conscience by an easy mental legerdemain. Then the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Winchester are right because the queen is persuaded in her conscience that this is so. Then subjective thought replaces objective action, and relativity replaces objectivity. It is of no avail to bring unchristian flattery or imaginary comfort to the queen. Such delicate handling of the queen's baptism is insincere sychophancy, poor logic, pure sophistry, and terrible theology. Furthermore, it is dangerous doctrine. If the queen takes comfort in illegality and unrighteousness, may she continue in sin? If a papist takes comfort in his shrines and relics, may he perpetrate superstition?

How to cut Gordian knot? How to steer between the rocks of popery and the quicksands of Anabaptistry? This is the problem which Barrow seeks to resolve. He concludes that Calvin is wrong in stating that the church of Rome is a church, though corrupted. He asserts that Dr. Some is in error and schism in holding the sacraments of the Roman church to be valid. He repudiates the doctrine of Throkmorton or "J.G." that one may dispense with the outward sign or action of God's covenant by taking comfort in

a persuaded conscience. He accepts Dr. Fulke's belief that the Roman church is a false church, with false sacraments, but rejects the implication that baptism must be repeated.

To solve the problem Barrow goes to the Old Testament. The ordinances and promises of God stand firm and unchanged. In the times of Hezekiah, Josiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the Israelites were guilty of apostasy and schism. Yet when they forsook their false worship and returned to the true temple to worship God aright, they were not required to be circumcised anew. God's covenant in this seal was nullified when the Israelites practised false worship, but it was renewed when they returned to faith and obedience. Even so, baptism, though it be wrongly performed, need not be repeated if the faults of incorrect baptism are purged by repentance and faith. God in his wisdom and mercy does not require the outward action to be repeated for those who forsake their apostasy, rely upon the ordinances of God through faith, and give evidence of a new baptism of God's spirit in the inward man by true worship, christian conduct, and heartfelt repentance.

The administration of the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, he finds trifling and superstitious. It is performed publicly in the churches, or privately in the homes as a communion for the sick. All is done according to the *Book of Common Prayer*, in popish manner, with special ceremony.

The sacrament of penance as practised in the Church of England and in the Church of Rome is an assumption of power that belongs to God. The power of binding and loosing was given to Peter, but also to the twelve apostles and to the seventy disciples. It was given to the whole church, and any member may bring comfort and peace to an erring sinner who has confessed his wrongs to God in true repentance. The word of God, believed and apprehended by faith, frees or looses anyone from his sins through the blood of Christ. The word of God, rejected or transgressed, binds or enslaves a person in his sin until he comes to the judgment seat of Christ.

In the sacrament of marriage, the ceremony was performed usually on a Sunday morning by the priest. The ring was placed upon the *Book of Common Prayer*, and thus hallowed. Some priests regarded the ring as an idolatrous relic, and refused to use it. In so doing, said Barrow, they violated their oath of canonical obedience, since the use of the ring was enjoined by the service book and the bishop. Furthermore, such a mild protest was insufficient. What was needed was a frank recognition that marriage was properly a civil action, not an ecclesiastical function. Boaz and Ruth were married in a civil ceremony, without a priest or religious ceremony. Marriage is an ordinance of the second table, and should be arranged by parents, performed in private houses, in the presence of witnesses, without a priest.

Barrow is even more caustic in his remarks about the method of burying the dead. Why should the corpse be covered with holy cloth and linen crosses? Why should a rich man be given preferential treatment by burial in the church, where he may remain high and dry? Is it necessary that the grave be cut east and west that he may rise with his face towards the east? Are the common people right in thinking that if burial be not in the church or churchyard, with priest, pomp, ceremony, dirges, heralds, mourners, then are the dead buried like dogs? Why should rich men have their tombs embellished with exquisite sculpture, engraved with arms, decorated with images, garnished with figures? Why all the hypocritical preaching and oratorical nonsense? Will rhetoric make a dead man a better Christian in the grave than he was in life? Will the recitation of excellent virtues convert a corpse into a god-fearing Christian, though in life he was an atheist, a

glutton, a worldling, and an extortioner? And why should all the mourners, arrayed in black, with hoods, caps, and crosses, be gathered together after a solemn funeral in a costly and sumptuous banquet? “Is not this jolly Christian mourning? Who would not mourne thus everie day in the yeare?”

Barrow is scornful of the behaviour of priests at weddings and funerals. He is even more vexed at the way they preach the gospel or fail to preach the word. By their oath of canonical obedience, they have sold their birthright as free men. They have promised to observe whatever is or shall be commanded by the bishop. They are subject to discipline, censure, fine, suspension, deposition, or prison. Their licence to preach, what to preach, where to preach, how long to preach, when to preach, depends upon episcopal grant. They are sworn not to speak against anything by public authority enjoined or hereafter to be enjoined, and they are required to exhort their parishioners unto obedience to injunctions, be they right or wrong. They are required to use vestments which are too nice, curious, and affected.

Their numbers are legion. Some are collegiate priests, others are roving mercenary ministers, and some are parsons and vicars. There are non-residents, pluriplied parsons, dumb ministers who cannot and will not preach, sychophants who insinuate themselves into a nobleman’s household, where they are well fed and safe from all storms. There they lead lives of luxury and idleness. As cunning physicians of the soul, they prescribe medicine according to the inclinations of their rich patients, they cater to the prejudices of their host, and they demonstrate by their fawning and obsequious behaviour that expediency rather than principle is the best policy, that the word of their lord is more to be heeded than the word of the Lord. They neglect preaching, to their shame, and they wrongfully seek to confine the exercise of prophesying to themselves. Prophesying, as the expounding and interpretation of the Scriptures, is a prerogative of the entire membership of the church. The Apostle Paul, I Corinthians 14:20–40, declares that this right belongs to all the believers. To deny the faithful the privilege of hearing and speaking, of publicly teaching and exhorting in the church, is a potent denial of a Scriptural injunction.

As a final criticism of the Church of England, Barrow asserts that its government and ordinances are not in conformity with the pattern and canons of the New Testament. The Bishop of Winchester, Thomas Cooper, in his book, *An Admonition to the People of England* (1589), had presented the Anglican view that Christ’s kingdom was not perpetual, that history and circumstances altered the original pattern, that growth and expansion necessitated changes, that Christ left to the discretion of his followers the right to effect changes, and that the widespread differences observed in the many nations proved the flexibility of the pattern, as altered by the will of man. Therefore, the pattern as it existed in England was fitting and proper, and any attempt to copy the old model was fraught with dangerous consequences for the government, the courts, the civilians, and the clergy. To this argument, later revised and supplemented by Thomas Bilson and Richard Hooker, Barrow replied that the Church of Christ in all things must conform to the pre-scriptions specified by God himself, and that the canons and ordinances of the New Testament were necessary, inviolable, and perpetual, subject to no changes by the will and whim of man. Therefore, the rule by bishops, who governed hundreds of churches in their dioceses, was false. Therefore, the evolution of a system of ecclesiastical courts, such as the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, the Court of High

Commission, the Court of Faculties, of Delegates, of Arches, was unscriptural, with no prototypes in the New Testament, and therefore false. These courts represented the extension of power of one man—the bishop, but Christ gave the power of censure not to one individual but to the entire church. Consequently, the plan of the Reformists or Presbyterians, who wished to establish a hierarchy of courts such as the presbyteries, classes, councils, and synods, was also unscriptural and false. The new presbyter or elder was but old bishop writ large.

Barrow directs his hardest blow against the Court of High Commission. This monstrous engine of injustice is the very throne of the beast. Its power is absolute and final. Who can stand against it? Its jurisdiction is as wide as the land itself. Its writ runneth wherever it listeth, and its pursuivants invade whatever homes and places they please. Its warrants are general and indefinite, and its summoners may command any of the queen's subjects or officers to serve and attend, to watch and to ride, by day or by night. The actions of this Court of High Commission are a threat to the royal prerogative, to the common law courts, to the liberty of all subjects, yea, to Magna Carta itself. It has invaded the precincts of the civil courts and has not even hesitated to intercept causes belonging to the High Court of Parliament. In its arroganee and power, it even stops the course of God's word and of his church.

Among the most heinous of the Spanish arts practised by this court is the insistence upon taking the oath *ex officio* by a defendant before he knows either his accusers or accusations. He must place his hand or three fingers upon the Bible, swear by God and the contents of the Scripture, to answer truly unto such questions as are presented to him, even though he be driven to incriminate and accuse himself and his friends. If he refuses to take the oath, the defendant is committed to close prison, there to remain until he yield or die. If he takes the oath, he is subject to the decision of the court, which can impose, depose, determine, judge, censure, and punish, without any control or contradiction or review by a higher court.

For Barrow the English Court of High Commission had usurped absolute power over all laws, causes, persons, and estates. It had become a filthy sink from which flowed all the errors and abuses, disorders and poisons, of church and commonwealth. It represented the Romish Spanish Inquisition transplanted in English soil, and every true-blooded liberty-loving Englishman should seek to extirpate it. With a canny prescience, Barrow predicted that God, who disclosed all secrets, would reveal the sneaking practices of the inquisitorial bishops and make them as odious as they were now honorable. A half-century later, in 1640–42, his predictions were fulfilled. Not only did the Court of High Commission fall, but episcopacy collapsed, and what Barrow would have called the false church toppled.

Fragment of a Letter

This letter is dated 1587, and is the earliest one that we have from John Greenwood. It is valuable because it gives us the early views of the Separatists and of one of their critics. A prisoner in the Clink, Greenwood had received money from one of his critics. This good deed, tempered by criticism, evoked a reply which is characterized by a rare spirit of gratitude, amity, forbearance, and honest disagreement.

Greenwood's critic had suggested that inasmuch as King David had been forbidden to build the temple, therefore the Separatists erred in seeking to establish a church until the Lord commanded it. Greenwood alleged the familiar thesis of Robert Browne that Christians should proceed with reformation without tarrying for any. No prohibition had been given by God to Queen Elizabeth. Furthermore, the task of building a true church belonged to the whole body of Christians, of whom the queen was only one member; her royal power was civil, not ecclesiastical.

Greenwood had criticized those who had translated the prayers and collects of the Catholic liturgy and had incorporated them into the *Book of Common Prayer*. His critic asserted that the martyrs were good men, not antichrists. Greenwood replied that men such as Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were good men, but they were guilty of the sin of ignorance. It was necessary to make a distinction between good men and bad actions. God was aware of the special sins of Noah, Isaac, Jacob, the patriarchs, Aaron, Miriam, the princes, King David, and Peter, but in his mercy he had pardoned them. Even so, he had pardoned Cranmer for his work in translating and patching the ancient prayers and for his sin of accepting the unscriptural office of archbishop or metropolitan.

Again, he had charged that a formalized reading of prayers was a quenching of God's spirit. Since his critic disagreed, Greenwood contended that there was a warfare between the flesh and the spirit. The flesh persuaded the worshipper to use book prayers. The flesh intimated that since extemporaneous prayer resulted in poorly conceived words and ideas, the use of book prayers was preferable. But the spirit urged man not to yield to the promptings of the flesh. God looks not to form, ritual, beautiful words, or mechanical reading. The prayers of a righteous man, uttered in simple terms with a contrite spirit, availed much. The poor publican asking for mercy, the holy women falling at Christ's feet, did not use book prayers but poured out their spiritual feelings. Some book prayers, such as those of Calvin and other good men, but not those in the *Book of Common Prayer*, were good for meditation and education. They revealed how others prayed and felt, and they made readers more fervent in their own prayer life. They should be read in the same way that other books were read for edification and spiritual instruction, but they should not be a substitute for prayers conceived in our own hearts and minds. God never despised a contrite heart or a troubled spirit. If book prayers were used, the worshipper failed to use the spirit. This practice resulted in mental atrophy and effectual quenching of the spirit.

One special criticism called forth a strong reply by Greenwood. His critic had asked what the small incipient struggling church of the Separatists amounted to in comparison with the Church of Geneva. Greenwood replied with a passionate plea for the poor persecuted church. It had the same God and Father, the same Lord, the same faith, the same baptism, and the same spirit. It preached the same gospel. It exercised the same discipline enacted in the New Testament. It had the same officers, such as pastors, teachers or doctors, elders, deacons, and widows or relievers. But it did not tolerate known hypocrites in the membership of the church, and it did not observe the superstitious feasts at Easter and Whitsuntide.

Reasons against Read Prayer

This is one of the earlier writings of Greenwood, written in 1587 or 1588. It launched the long, written controversy between Greenwood and Gifford. Since there is not much that is new in ideas or arguments, we may summarize the reasons briefly.

Read prayers are apocryphal. They lack the warrant of Scripture. They are not inconsequential, since they convert the spirit into an idol, and they destroy the liberty which Christ purchased for his followers. True prayers involve the heart and the lively voice, but book prayers are tantamount to spiritual ignorance. Set prayers result in idolatrous worship and quenching of the spirit, preclude fervency and steadfastness, and lead to a babbling of vain repetitions without reference to our present necessities. All Christians should abhor stunted services and read prayers, knowing that they are superstitious relics and man-made devices used by an idol ministry serving under a false ecclesiastical government.

Reply to George Gifford

This treatise is an expansion or reaffirmation of the ideas in “Reasons against Read Prayer.” We have a perfect rule in the Scripture for knowing the will of God. Since man’s wisdom is often foolishness in the sight of God, the devices of man should not be substituted for the procedures prescribed in the Bible. Unless there is Scriptural warrant for an action of worship, it should be carefully avoided, because it may lead to idolatry. Read prayers are a device of men, lacking any warrant from the Scripture, and they are not conducive to a worship of God in spirit.

Greenwood’s Examination [March 24, 1588/9]

This examination is the first of which we have any record regarding Greenwood. It is similar to Barrow’s fifth examination of March 24, 1588/9. Inasmuch as Barrow had been questioned four previous times, it is likely that Greenwood also had been examined previously, perhaps on October 8, 1587, and May, 1588, and March 18, 1588/9, but we have no record of such occasions.

This examination affords us a little biographical information. We learn that Greenwood had been ordained into the Anglican priesthood, that he had abandoned the ministry in the Church of England, that he had been a prisoner in close confinement, and that he had been transferred from the Clink to the Fleet prison. We discover that he had witnessed the marriage of Christopher Bowman and his wife in the Fleet prison in accordance with the simple Separatist marriage rites without an officiating clergyman. It is clear that he had a son named Abel who was born in the autumn of 1587, and who was still unbaptized. We know that he refused to take an oath before the court, and that he rejected portions of the oath of the queen’s supremacy specified in the Act of Supremacy of 1559, so long as it included a promise to give true allegiance to the queen’s heirs and lawful successors, whom he did not know, and who perchance might be papists. Furthermore, we perceive the distinction that Greenwood acknowledged the queen as a supreme magistrate, but not as supreme governor of the church. Christ alone was the sole head of the church, and no civil magistrate could alter His laws.

His examination discloses his views on the Lord's Prayer, read prayers, the *Book of Common Prayer*, marriage rites, the Church of England, baptism, Anabaptists, church officers, excommunication, the proper powers of the queen, and the oath of the queen's supremacy.

An Answer to George Gifford's Pretended Defence of Read Praiers

For Greenwood the first principle of religion is to call upon God through the mediation of Christ in spirit and truth, with heart and voice, for our present needs in accordance with the will of the Heavenly Father. This principle is not observed by reading set and stinted petitions from the *Book of Common Prayer*. Reading is helpful for meditation and edification, but it is not true prayer. Only the inward faith of the heart bringeth forth true invocation. Singing psalms is a part of God's service, but it is not prayer. The vain repetition of fifteen *Ave Marias* and five *Pater Nosters* by the papists is not true prayer but a mechanical recitation of words.

There is nothing really new in this treatise. Much of the discussion is a refutation point by point of the arguments set forth by Gifford.

An Intercepted Letter

This letter by John Greenwood, about 1590–1, expresses approval for arguments which had been formulated by an unknown author against the Martin Marprelate pamphlets. It expresses the hope that someone with ability and acumen will examine the major theses in the Martinist writings and then refute them. The Martin Marprelate controversy was of great significance in the years 1588–89, and the authors were unmerciful in attacking bishops and archbishops. Although Barrow and Greenwood were also staunch enemies of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Church of England, they did not approve of the arguments or methods of the Martinists. We know from *A Brief Discoverie of the False Church* that Barrow attacked the writer of *M. Some Laid Open in His Coulers*. Inasmuch as it is probable that Job Throkmorton was the author, and since it is also probable that Throkmorton collaborated in the writing of the Martin Marprelate tracts, it seems clear that Barrow and Greenwood were anti-Martin Marprelate.

The True Church and the False Church

This brief treatise is a description of the true church. There is a partial similarity in the language and ideas found in this first paragraph with the attributes presented in the second paragraph of *A True, Description out of the Worde of God, of the Visible Church*. The familiar marks of a true church are similar to the ideas suggested in *Four Causes of Separation*, such as true worship, a rightly gathered membership, a ministry selected by the local congregation, and a discipline and government that accords with the ordinance of Christ.

The description of the false church, and the eleven proofs why the Church of England is not the true church, elaborate the same ideas in a more detailed manner. Similar indictments may be seen in *Profes of Aparant Churche*, in *A Brief Discoverie of the False*

Church, and in *A Brief Summe of the Causes of Our Separation, and of Our Purposes in Practise*.

A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles

This publication was a militant tract which denounced “the bishops’ bloudie mandate” and decried their arbitrary and savage treatment of Christians who sought religious reform. The book contains an address to the reader, a copy of Bishop Aylmer’s letter to the London clergymen, a summary or “briefe of the [twelve] positions” allegedly held by the Separatists, a list of the forty-two clergymen and fifty-two prisoners, and a reply to the “briefe of the [twelve] positions”; then follows a summary of two prison conferences with John Greenwood, one with Henry Barrow, and one with Greenwood and Barrow jointly. The final section is “A breif answere to certayne sclaunderous articles and ungodlie calumniations sparsed abroad by the bishops and their adherents.” In this set of twelve articles and replies, seven of them differ from the abovementioned “briefe of the [twelve] positions.”

The first set of articles, entitled a “briefe of the [twelve] positions,” is simply a restatement of the replies which Barrow made in his examination of March 24, 1588/9, before a special commission of judges and bishops. The replies here given to these same articles in “A brief answere to such articles” represent a more expanded form and very likely represent the work not only of Barrow, but also of Greenwood and other Separatists. These Separatist replies in turn are answered about three months later by Richard Alison in *A Plaine Confutation*, pp. 106–113.

The second set of articles is given and then refuted in the section entitled, “A brief answere to certayne sclaunderous articles and ungodlie calumniations.” This Separatist refutation is also answered by Richard Alison in *A Plaine Confutation*, pp. 113–121.

The ideas given in this treatise are not new. The articles or positions, together with their refutation, have been mentioned before. The summary of the four conferences on March 9, 17, 18, and April 13, 1590, is new, but the conferences are mainly polemical in character, with much quibbling, verbal sparring, and arguing about Scriptural interpretations. Much time was spent in discussing John the Baptist, who were baptized, what was the difference between sectories and schismatics, heretics and infidels, bishops and pastors.

A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences

This work is a sequel to *A Collection of Certain Sclaunderous Articles*. It summarizes the discussions held in three conferences, on March 14, March 20, and April 3, 1590. There are also seven letters written in April and May regarding the issues discussed in the conferences.

The main points in this treatise are that the bishops have usurped civil power, that excommunication by the bishops and their courts is unscriptural, that the English parish churches are not true churches. Unpreaching clergymen are not true ministers of Christ, and their calling by bishops and patrons instead of by the congregation violates the ordinances of Christ. The principle of universal membership without regard to profession of faith and obedience to the will of God constitutes a serious problem, and until the

profane are separated from the true believers, the parish assembly remains as an admixture of confused and ungodly persons.

The letters between Barrow, Greenwood, and Egerton constitute a *post-mortem* and recapitulation, with charges of adding, falsifying, and perverting, and with counter-charges of blasphemy, vanity, and vituperation.

Letters to Lord Burghley

On September 13, 1590, Barrow and Greenwood addressed a letter to Lord Burghley, together with a treatise entitled *The First Part of the Platforme*. They sought to prove that in its establishments the Church of England, together with the ecclesiastical courts, merely continued the ministry and orders of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, it was not founded upon Christ's ordinances, and consequently was popish and false. "Shall this famous land, then, right honorable, lye still in the knowne dregges of popery under God's wrath for the same?"

Barrow and Greenwood intended to write *The Second Part of the Platforme*, wherein they would explain how reform should be effected. But Lord Burghley indicated his immediate displeasure, and the second part was never written. In a second letter of September 18, Barrow and Greenwood replied with heavy hearts, appealed for a peaceable and christian conference, and pleaded for freedom from their miserable imprisonment. Their hope of aid from the Lord Treasurer never materialized. The conference was never granted, and the imprisonment continued until death in 1593. To the Separatists Lord Burghley was a broken reed.

THE WRITINGS OF
HENRY BARROW
1587–1590

I

FOUR CAUSES OF SEPARATION

This writing is a part of the Giles Wiggenton MSS. in the Congregational Library at Memorial Hall, London (I. e. 14). The entire manuscript of seventy-five pages consists of seven treatises, of which the last one, reprinted here, occupies pp. 63–75. The manuscript is first noticed in C.H.Cooper and Thompson Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses*, II, 331, and again by T.G.Crippen, in “A Remarkable Puritan Manuscript,” in *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society*, II, no. 3 (September, 1905), pp. 147–150. It is printed in *ibid.*, II, no. 4 (January, 1906), pp. 292–301, and also issued separately in 1906 as a pamphlet by the Congregational Historical Society, with two other treatises, under the general title, *Relics of the Puritan Martyrs 1593*.

* * *

The commonly accepted opinion, based on the judgment of Champlin Burrage and T.G.Crippen, is that in October, 1585, Robert Browne made his recantation before Archbishop Whitgift and became reconciled to the Church of England Barrow and/or Greenwood sent him a letter of remonstrance, to which Browne replied in a treatise called *A Reproofe of Certaine Schismatical Persons*. Barrow in turn replied with his *Four Causes of Separation*, to which Browne made his rejoinder in a treatise of which we know only a fragment quoted by Richard Bancroft.

The difficulties inherent in this explanation cannot be minimized. First, there is no evidence that Barrow or Greenwood sent a letter to Browne, and we must consider that the date of Browne’s recantation is 1585, which antedates by two years any of Barrow’s known writings. Secondly, it is doubtful that Browne wrote *A Reproofe of Certaine Schismatical Persons*. The author may be Thomas Cartwright, as Dr. Peel believes. Thirdly, it is difficult to see any connection between Barrow’s *Four Causes of Separation* and *A Reproofe of Certaine Schismatical Persons*. There is no common basis of ideas, no

similar phraseology, no systematic development of arguments, to indicate relationship. The only point which does seem certain is that Browne wrote a treatise against Barrow. The evidence for this may be seen in the fragment quoted by Richard Bancroft and printed in Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, p. 515.

In a sermon preached on February 9, 1588/9, Bancroft quoted from a treatise of Browne. We may conjecture, therefore, that Browne's treatise is dated 1588 or 1587, and that Barrow's *Four Causes of Separation*, from which Browne quotes, precedes Browne's work by a few weeks or months. Since there is no reference to Barrow's imprisonment—a bit of negative evidence—we may hazard a guess that the date of writing is prior to Barrow's arrest on November 19, 1587. Furthermore, the simple direct form of stating the four causes at the beginning of the treatise differs from the more refined amplified phraseology used in 1588, as one may readily see if he will compare the opening paragraphs of *Four Causes of Separation* with those of *A Brief Summe of the Causes of Our Separation*. One other bit of evidence indicating a date prior to November 19, 1587, is that in Barrow's examination on November 27, 1587, he was presented with a bill of objections in which he was accused of saying that the archbishop and the bishops were antichrists, that all ministers in the land were thieves, murderers, secret hypocrites, and hirelings [pp. 57f., *Four Causes of Separation*]. This bill of objections is certainly dependent on the *Four Causes of Separation* for its information, and enables us to say that this is the earliest extant writing of Barrow, and that the date is prior to November—approximately the spring or summer of 1587. It is a clarion call for the people of England to forsake the Church of England. The internal threat of Barrowist Separatism thus begins in 1587, one year before the external danger from the Spanish Armada, six years after the Brownists had emigrated to Middelburg, and two years after Robert Browne had made his submission to Archbishop Whitgift.

Two questions remain: what occasioned the treatise, and for whom is it written? Barrow's defence of the four causes, his scornful denunciation of the preachers and bishops, and his caustic disagreement with their protests, indicate that he is aware of the arguments of those who disagree with him. These arguments, used in pulpit, manuscript treatises, and books, Barrow is desirous of refuting. Furthermore, like Browne, he is desirous of "reformation without tarying for anie." He is impatient with the "tolerating preachers," the compromisers, the abettors of the bishops, the ecclesiastical politicians, the holders of sinecures; he condemns men like Giles Wiggenton and Thomas Cartwright, who strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel. The desire to see his conception of the New Testament model of the primitive church realized in England is the underlying cause, but the occasion of this treatise may have been a letter, a manuscript treatise, a sermon, or a request to have some doubts resolved. The treatise is a refutation of, a defence against, and a denunciation of, the tolerating preachers—especially the Presbyterians such as Thomas Cartwright, Walter Travers, William Charke, William Floyde [Fludd?], and Giles Wiggenton.

The other question remains. To whom is the treatise addressed? Since Robert Browne undertook to answer Barrow, the presumption is that Barrow wrote against him. This is a possibility, but it does not necessarily follow that because Browne wrote against Barrow, that the latter wrote against Browne. Furthermore, there is no reference to Browne, nor to his recantation, nor to his former preaching and writing. In the treatise Barrow writes as

follows: “thus mak[e] they your Christ an idoll and you idolaters.” This would indicate that Barrow is writing to more than one person—perhaps to several, who have asked Barrow’s judgment on the conforming clergy and their stock arguments, or who have submitted a manuscript treatise to be refuted.

There are two other possibilities that should be mentioned. The ideas expressed in this treatise are similar to the arguments which Barrow used as a challenge to the Presbyterian leaders, and which were published in *A Collection of Certain Letters and Conferences* (pp. 67–70), and which are printed in Volume IV as “The True Church and the False Church.” The emphasis therein on Christ as king, priest, and prophet has its counter-part in *Four Causes of Separation*, where Barrow discusses the kingdom of Christ, the priesthood of Christ, and the prophecy of Christ. The counter argument seems to have been that the Presbyterians received Christ as king, priest, and prophet. To this argument Barrow explains how they deny Christ in his offices. We know from Gifford, who was regarded as an interloper, that the Separatists “had made chalenge, and looked to be encountred by the learnedest in the land. They take it greivously, and reprehend me [Gifford], as having intercepted this businesse, and taken it from the hands of the learned.” Thus, this treatise may have been part of the controversy with the “tolerating preachers,” the learned Presbyterians such as Thomas Cartwright, Walter Travers, William Charke, William Floyd [Fludd?] and Giles Wiggenton. This is perhaps the most likely conclusion we can draw from incomplete evidence.

The other possibility, less likely, is that this treatise represents the earliest phase of Gifford’s controversy with Barrow and Greenwood. We know that a schoolmaster in Essex brought to Gifford a copy of “A Breefe Sum of Our Profession,” together with diverse arguments against read prayer. The schoolmaster used the argument that “diverse of the people about them were troubled, and did hang in suspense, and for their sakes he did require it.” Accordingly, Gifford replied to their arguments, and his answer was brought to the Separatists, who in turn framed “large replies” (Gifford, *A Short Treatise*, signature a 2.). Conceivably, *Four Causes of Separation* was written to refute this reply by Gifford, or to resolve doubts raised in the minds of people who had read Gifford’s arguments, who had written to Barrow, and whom Barrow described as persons misled by the tolerating preachers. Since both were manuscript treatises, it is understandable how Gifford’s could have disappeared, but it is fortunate that Barrow’s treatise has survived.

* * *

FOUR CAUSES OF SEPARATION By HENRY BARROWE

Fower principall and waighty causes whie every on[e] that knoweth God and acknowledgeth the Lord Jesus, or seekethe salvation in him, ought spedelye without any delay to forsack those disordered and ungodlye and unholye sinagogs, and the false teachers of these tymes as they generallye stand in England.

1. The fals maner of worshiping the true God. Esaias 66:17; Deuteronomy 17:1.
2. The profane and ungodlie people received into and retayned in the bozom and bodie of ther churches. Esaias 65:11, 12.
3. The false and antichristian ministrie imposed upone ther churches. Numbers 16:21, 35.
4. The false and antichristian government wherwith ther churches ar ruled.

¹ This sentence, beginning with the words, “but sumarylye, you shall find,” helps to establish the authorship of Barrow. These words were quoted by Richard Bancroft, in his famous sermon of February 9, 1588/9: “Furthermore it may please you brethren to heare the same man’s [Robert Browne’s] judgement of such, as do labor so busily in this matter: in a treatise of his against one *Barowe*. “Whereas you charge us (saith he) in denieng Christ in his office, and consequently not to be come in the flesh: it shall appeere by your presbyterie or eldersmen, that indeede you are and will be the aldermen even to pull the most ancient of all, Christ Jesus himselfe by the beard: yea, and seeke not onely to shake him by the lockes of his haire out of his offices, but also all his ancients under him, I meane the lawfull magis-trates and ministers, which have lawfull authoritie from him” (Richard Bancroft, *A Sermon Preached at Paule’s Crosse*, pp. 76f.).

The haynous and fearfull enormities that insue of these are infinitt and cannot be sufyciently expressed ether by word or writing; but sumarylye, you shall find herbye Christ Jesus denied in all his offices, and so consequently not to be com in the flesh.¹ You shall find herby the last will and testament of our saviour Christ abrogat, his pretious bodie and bloud torne and troden under feette of dogges and swine, Christ Jesus throwne out of his howse and antichrist his enimie exalted above God and rayning in the temple of God as God.

The profisie of Christ is denied when anything is aded to or taken from his written word, or wher Christ’s voyce [*sic*] onlye is not h[e]ard and obeyed in the church. These to be don with them: the apocriphae; worship mad[e] of the invention of man, even that man of sinne, eronious, imposed and thrust upon ther churches;¹ the burdenns and idolatrus inventions with the endles heap of their traditions, approveth; and for mor particular profs of thes things, lett that idolatrus book of the bishops, comonly called the *Boock of Comon Prayer*, be scanned by the word of God.

The presthood of Christ is defiled, yea, denied, when any unlawfull worship is offered to Christ, or in his name. This to be don with them the p[ro]mises [premises?] prove.

The kingdom of Christ is denied wher his lawes and order-nances ar rejected and not obeyed, or anie other thurst [thrust] upon the church, *etc.* This to be with [them] is mor than manifest by ther straung offices, officers, and laws, even the statuts of Omry,² never re[a]d of, never h[e]ard of, in the Scriptures.

The testament of Christ is abrogate wher any thing is aded to it or taken from it; or wher it is neckleckt to be performed, yea, rejected as with them. These the promises prove and our dayly complaynts and sufferings manifest.

The body and bloud of Christ Jesus is most haynously torne and troden under fott by dogges and swyne wher the hollye things of God, as the sacraments, *etc.*, ar geven to the aparrant wicked and ungodlye. Thes the second principall cause by dayly experience manifesteth.

Christ is thrown out of his house and antychrist exalted and raineth by his officers and lawes. This the promises and present estate declareth.

¹ This sentence on worship is almost identical with the first transgression. See “A Breefe Sum of Our Profession,” p. 84.

² The statutes of Omri. See I Kings 16:27, 28 and Micah 6:16.

Neyther cann all the pretended titells and decevable gloses, [which] the false profitts [prophets] use, any longer cover or hied these mischefes; for the God that condemneth them is a myghtye God, who discovereth them and consumeth them with the breath of his mouth.

To the first principall cause they comonlye aleadg that this ther worship is not altogether false, but much of it good and godlye; and they ether use not the book at all or but the least part of it, etc. First, I wold know of them whether the worship of God maie be in part true and in part false. Then, whether any devise of man or angell may be thrust into the worship of God or imposed upon the church of God the church of God [*sic*].

Now to ther using or not using the boock, we all know and theie cannot denie, howsoever they may desembell, that this idoll is sett upe, and they and all ther peopell stand under it; yea, that no man can by or sell without this mark of the beast, without bowing to this idoll in ther markes [marts?]; so that ther quiet standing under it, ther peac purchased by using part of it, ther joining hands with them that use it and stand under it and justyfy it as brethren; yea, ther joyning with them in the sacraments and reseveing the sacraments at ther hands, even at the hands of the moste dombe idoll and unworthie prests, do manifest what conscience and affection they cary. Further, the evene joyneng of ther sermons to these abhominations, ether justifieng or tolerating them, showeth bothe what and how they preach. Can lyght and darknes be issued together? Can straw remaine in the flaming fyer unconsumed? Suer, though this could be, yeat can the word of God never justifie idolatry, nor Dagon¹ stand up befor the ark of God. And even that best part of it they use is but Dagon's stump devoted[?], but a pece of swyne's flesh,² an abhominable sacrificyse unto the Lord, and so far ar they from withdrawing anie on[e] sowle all this whill with all ther preaching from it, that they becom the most bitter persecutors of such as with draw them selves and keep them selves puer and undefyled from this false worship.

To the second principall cause they have litell to aleg save that it is lawfull to preache the word to all, and for all to hear. From whenc it flowethe [followeth?] not that it is lawfull to receve all into the bozom and bodie of the church, to delyver the most holly and pretious things to God to all, evene the sacraments. And who is not baptised in Ingland? Who is not of ther churche? For this ther generall baptisingge of all I never as yeat co[u]ld hear on[e] reason proveed; but it is as easie to coine som as for the rest. For the other sacrament [the Lord's Supper] they alleage the

¹Dagon was the god of the Philistines.

²This is the earliest use of this phrase. Barrow was later quoted and criticized for this strong language, and especially for using these words. It is discussed in Article 7 in *A Collection of Certaine Sclaunderous Articles*, signature F4 verso and G1 recto.

power of suspension allowed them by the bishops' book,¹ and how that thereby they keep the unworthy from the sup[er], etc. First, I find that [to be] an instrument of the folyshe and idoll sheperd, unknownen to our saviour Christ and his apostels, never used by them. Then I find it of no vawle, for nothing is done bie it; and suerlye if ther righte eie wer not utterly darkned, it could not be but they must nedes perseve how that ther weapone wantethe bothe edg and poynt; for what is don by it? Can they or ther parishe proseed to excommunication otherwise than by the antychristian courts, which lye as open for the party suspended to be asoyled² as punished by bribing Mr. Comissary, etc.? Nether can they kepe back the partie suspended from the joyning with them in ther prayers or fr[om] being receved into anie other pareshe.

To the third prinsipall cause they aunswear by rayling and blaspheming and persecuting, because it touchethe them nearlye, even to the quick, and uncovereth the fothould of all ther tythes, wages, and living. And som reasons they aleg to prove ther ministrie lawfull. First, for their callyng, they aleg a fine distinction of matter and maner. They have a right calling in matter; that is, they have inward graces as knowledg, learning, and so forthe; how so ever, they have it not in a right maner, that is, after that outward ordeynaunce of the calling and entrance that Christ hath prescribed. First, therfor, it wold be known of them whether this maner they speak of may be severed from the matter. Then whether he may be esteemed and held as a lawfull minister in the church of God, that hathe not a lawfull and trew calling in the church of God, and that standeth by and justifieth his unlawfull and ungodlye callynge? Then it wold be knowen whether ther be any other treue enteraunce into the shepfould than by our saviour Christ's outward ordinances sett down in his last will and testament? Then, [if] he that entreth in another way be not a thefe, a hirlyng, and a murtherer? Then, whether all the treu shep of God owght not to fle from such a wolf and hirlyng, etc.

¹ 'The bishops' book is Barrow's phrase for the *Book of Common Prayer*. The disciplinary Rubrics formed part of the First Reformed Liturgy of 1549 and of 1552. "And if any of those [to be partakers of the holy Communion] be an open and notorious evil liver, or have done any wrong to his neighbours by word or deed, so that the Congregation be thereby offended; the Curate, having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's Table until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented and mended his former naughty life..." But the problems attendant on brotherly correction, suspension, and excommunication are so difficult, and the habits of individual resistance to authority are so common, that curates, ministers, and priests have rarely been successful in coping with this unpleasant obligation. It is much easier to permit the tares to grow up with the wheat.

² Asoyled, or assoiled: to be acquitted, released from ecclesiastical penalty.

Lett them therfor which willbe h[e]ard and held as treue ministers of Christ approve them selves such drectly and playnlye by the lawes and ordinaunces of our saviour Christ in that behalf provided, or else we by the same lawes will not dowbt to denounce and pronounce them theves, robbers, hirlings, murtherers, wolves, *etc.*,¹ and shunne them our selves, and warne as many as love the Lord Jesus and hould ther own salvation dear to fle from them according to our savior's comandement. But because it apeareth to all men that they have not his lawfull they [the, that?] true entrans into the shepfold, but are clymed up another way, and mask disguise and seek to cover ther ravin² and intrusion with shep's clothing, and to mak men beleve that they abownd with inward graces, lerning and giftes, and that these may suffice to mak them lawfull ministers, though they be not chosen and apoynted to the ministrye by God, whoe is the geveer of all the giftes they have, and best knoweth bothe the measuer, the use, and the end of them. They wold howld it an inderect aunswer to an inditmente of wrong or thefte to aleg that they are wise or riche, *etc.* Suerlye, nether cane this ther plea of inward graces justifie ther open breach of God's comandements; and evell dothe it bewray any inward grace of the spirit of God when they plead for and justifie by ther utmost indevours open and haynous transgressions. We are taught by our saviour Christ to judge the tree by the fruts, and ether to mak the tree good and the frut good or else to mak the tree bad and the frut evell. The graces they bost of indeed are inward indeed if they be anye, for they evell appear as yeat ether in love to God, to his truth, or to his servants. But we will not sease to beseeche the Lord for them to bring forthe his own gifts to the service of his own glorie and the use of his church, that thancks may be geven to his holly name for them by manye. But they are so far from this as yeat that they mak the word of God a clock [cloak] unto ther sinnes. They say they preach the word of God trulye and senserlye [sensibly?], and therfor theye that leve them forsack the ordinarye meanes that God hath leffte to the begetting and preserving of faythe; yea, they forsake even the word of life, and therfor they must nedes be invaded with daungerus and damnable erores, *etc.*, and such lyke popishe thunderbolts wherby

¹ These words were cited against Barrow in his examination of November 27, 1587. This citation, therefore, affords some evidence that *Four Causes of Separation* was written prior to Barrow's imprisonment on November 19, 1587.

² Rapine, robbery.

they afray¹ the simple from hardines so much as to dare to call ther ministrie into question or to examine it by the word of God, much les to judg it by God's word.

In few words, therfor, to discover the falshod and wickednes of this reason, we shall fynd this ther preching as false and as corrupt as ther calling and entraunce, and to be as far from that ordeynary blessed meanes left by the Lord to his church as they ar from the ordeynary true entraunce. And dowtles even from this false calling and entraunce of thers may a reason be framed, [namely,] they ar not trulye and rightly sent; therfor, they can not trulye and rightlye preach. Ther sending is aparaunt to be of men and not of God. They ar knowen whose servants they ar, bothe by ther livery and band and obedience. Ther comission is lymited unto them, and writen and sealed. And mark ther doctrine well: I warrant you they transgrese not ther comission; for behould how they kepe them within ther band, and how they dawbe and undershore² that anti-christian wall of ther masters, the bishops, and stand under it. For with us they gather not, nay, they opose them selves agaynst us, wrasting and constrayning the word of God agaynst us withe open violence to the Scriptures and injurye to us, slaundering us in the pulpitte³ against ther own knowledge and conscience with su[n]dry erores devised falsly of ther own brayn; and thus destayne [disdain] they the mouth of God, which they in that place wold seme to posses, with lies. And all to save ther own scines [skins] wholl and purchas peac with the bishops by proclaiming open ware [war] with us, or rather with God, whose we ar and whose cause we defend against them and the bishops. Furder, herby they lyckwise may purchase credit withe the peopell, who ever by the Lord's wonder-full working have bym [byn, been] inclined to the most forward prechers and such as speak the truthe most bowldlye; escaping herby ther m[aste]rs' jealous eies, and that this may be wrought thus, now and then cast out some darke Delphicke words againste ther masters' regiment, and seme to bewayll the lamentabell estat of the church, *etc.*; yeat shall it be so warylie as nether the peopell shall draw them therby into practic to cast of[f] this antychristyan youk of the bishops, nor ther lords have evident ocasion of wrath, howsoever the Lord by his most wyse justice hath kin[d]led an envious hatred betwixt these lords and the courtiers. Furder observe this docktrine they preach, and you shall fynd it not onlie half and unperfecte truths, doubtfull and ambiguous trutthes lamley and unfaythfuley utterd; but you shall find this gospell they prech no gospell of lybertie and power, but a gospell framed to the pollysyses of the times, and wrested to uphould and serve this haynous idolatrie they use and stand under, and this antichristian government of the bishops and ther officers. And this I say not that the gospell of Christ Jesus cane this [can thus] be preched or transfygured in it self, for no thing is mor free, mor perfecte, or mor powerfull to consume this chafe and stuble wher it is trulye received, even in the mowthes of the most simple; but this I say to lett you see the haynous dealyng of the tolarating prechers, even those that ar best esteemed, and your own fearfull estate that ar misled by them. They, as you see, betray not onlye themselves

¹ Disturb, frighten, startle.

² Prop up, strengthen, sustain.

³ The reference may be to George Gifford or Robert Some, or to some of the Presbyterian leaders whom Barrow had condemned, such as Thomas Cartwright or Giles Wiggenton.

and you but even Christ Jesus hime self and his gospell into the hands of antichrist. For see howe these deceivers joyn the word of God and idollatrye together, the gospell of Christ and bondage, Christ and antichrist to gether in on[e] temple. See what kynd of gospell and what kind of Christ they geve you: a Christ without power to governe and kep his owne, a gospell without lybertie; or else whie ar you thus intangled with begerlye rudyments, *etc.*; whie ar you thus in subjection to the traditions of men?¹

Thus mak[e] they your Christ an idoll and you idolaters. Be therfor no longer deceived; Christ putethe not up these injurys; his father hath delyvered into his hands all power in heaven and earth, and he will shortlye show himself with his myghtye angels in flaming fier, rendering vengance unto them that know not God, which ar disobedient to his gospell; alsuche shalbe punished withe ever lasting perdetion from the presence of the Lorde, from the glory of his power. Then shall none of those pretensed titles of graces, word of God, gospell, Christ Jesus, faith, comfort, *etc.*, serve them; for he whos eies ar a flam of fier can not be deceived; no secrett is hiden from his bright eies. Though they byld as highe as Babell and digg as low as hell,² *etc.*, he seeith ther hipocrisie and will disclose

¹ See Galatians 4:9 and Colossians 2:8.

² See Amos 9:2 and Psalms 139:8.

it, and will judg them by ther fruts, even the bitter and accursed fruts of ther disobedience.¹ This word of God, gossell, and Christ, which they use as a snar and a fayer [fair, beautiful] stall to draw gaynes and ignorant sowles unto them and therby to justify ther wickednes, shall judg and condemnn them amongst the devells with all ther knowledg and inward graces, *etc.* Neyther can this fayth [be] wrought by ther ministrie, wherby they subillie draw the wholl multytud of ther hearers upon us; as who shold saye ye muste ether condemne all these and every on[e] of them to be without faith or justifye our ministry by the effectts. Alas, we judg not; we with Jerymey wishe even so be it;² but ther is on[e] that judgeth them, even that Christ they boste of judgeth them, and his word judgeth them allredye. Ther is no true faythe but that which is builte upon the word and bringethe forthe fruts accordinglye. Allas, the word condemnneth them, ther fruts condemnn them, yea, them selves, when the boock of ther consciens shalbe opened by the lyght of God's word unto them, shall condemne themselves. The multytud of God's enimies shalbe as one mane [man]; he that spared not the angells, he that spared not the owld world, he that spared not his own people, cannot spar them.

Another false proffe they have depending upon the former of the effectes; and this is the comfort reseved by ther preaching, and herin, lyck Jamnes [Jannes] and Jambres,³ they apishlie imytate Paull, approving themselves to the consciences of ther auditory because they have beaten down sinne by the power of the word in them, and againe have healed the wounded consience withe the comfortable promises of the gossell. It hath before bin shewed how haynously and wilfulye they transgressee againste the first table, and obstinatly remaine in those transgressions evene against the moste highe and his anoynted son Christ Jesus; so that nowe they cannot geve the frut of ther bodye for the sine of there sowll. Ther is no keping the second table without the first;⁴ he that breakethe one commandemant breaketh all; he that breaketh the least commandement and teacheth men so shalbe called the least in the kingdom of heaven.

¹ In the margin, in another hand, are the words: "where shall we fynd such a judgment so peremptorylye uttered by any of God[']s children."

² The reference is to Jeremiah 11:5.

³ II Timothy 3:8. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith."

⁴ The ten commandments were written on two tables of stone. See Exodus 34:1; Deuteronomy 5:22; 10:1-5. The first table related to religious duties, the second to moral obligations.

But to com to ther own efectts, as the beating down of sinn, *etc.* Do not the heathen so without the lawe? Do not the papists herin exceed them? This doen [is done at] Westminster Hall, the Assises generall in every shier, yea, every court barone in every letell town aprovethe:¹ being compared in these our happie dayes to the times of gross popery. Dothe not sin abound, yea, overflow? How is it then beatten down? Nay, mark your mynisters well, you shall find that as they joine and frame the word of God to these haynose transgryyonts against the first table, as idolatrye, *etc.*, so joyne they ther own bodies and becom mynisters to secuer worldlyngs, profane, glutons, covetus, athists, proud, vaine, and carnall epicuers and hipocrits, so that [provided that] these men be rich or have possibillyte and will to plesuer them, feast them and contenance them and com to ther sermons. These they uphowld² by thus many yeares in ther sinnes, sothing, flattering, and justifieng them, terming them Christians, yea, the pillers of the church. We must bear with them, if these men showld tack offence at the gospell, the peopell wold soner forsack it. And so the gospell should be contemted [scorned] and such lyck stuf. Yea, doubtles these preachers ar very petifull [pitiful] surganes, that mak so foule wounds, and so incurable. They of ther tender harts may not endur to rannsack to[o] deepe, lest they put ther patients to too gret grefe for ther sinnes. It is easier to mak a wound than to cuer it; therfor, they will not search them to the bottom, but bynd them up quickly with the promyses of the gospell, and power in the oyll of grace.³ O folysh pittye. Nay, o cruell mersye. Destroye they not herby all ther patients? What wound if it be not searched, or ulcer if it be not launced, and have apte and convenient medycines applyed, can be cured? Will they power [pour] the sweett oyll upon dead fleshe, or into stinking and corrupt wounds? Will they laie strong [?] comfortative employsters to owld rotten festered soores? So shall they lose bothe ther oyll and ther labor.

Is this the gospell [people?] to whom the gospell belongeth? Is this repent and “amend your lyves, for the kingdom of God

¹ See Jonas Adames, *The Order of Keeping a Court Leete, and Court Baron: with the Charges Appertayning to the Same* (London, 1593).

² In the margin, in another hand: “Charitie would have named the offenders rather than thus to condemne all.”

³ Another marginal note reads: “O what profe is there of these slaunders.”

is at hand,¹ *etc.*”? Is it not rather that impoysoned playster of peac wher ther is no peac? Can they geve the promises of the gopell to these ignorant, profane, wicked, and open idolaters? Can they geve Christ or the benefits of his deathe and resurrection, as libertye, power, salvation, to a peopell that remayn and will not com out from under the yock of anti-christ? Is not this to bless God’s enemies, to justifie the wicked, yea, to curse God’s saynts and to condemne the just?

These ar the comforts they geve you; this is the peace, so many spirituall whordoms and wichcraftes remaining in so great number. Ther can be no comforte but such as is grounded on the promyses of God; the promyses of God belongethe not to all unbelieving, disobedient, and obstinat people; “but the foundation of God remaynethe suer, and hath this seall: The Lord knoweth who ar his, and lett every on[e] that calethe on the name of the Lord depart from iniquitey.”² This comfort then geven by these ministers and taken by this people, is not without blasphemye in the one and presumption in the other; and God’s fearfull vengeance [falleth] upon bothe the one and the other. What promyse of blessing have they from God so long as they remayn in this open wickednes, idolatrie, disorder and rebellyon? But rather a fearfull looking for of judgment. Surlye if they tack comfort to desobey God, God will tack comfort to destroy them. And suerlye I cane but wonder and trembell at the judgment of God upon them, to see them geven over so generally to so strong delusions and to so great blyndnes, as not having [?] among them any on[e] trew signe of God’s presence, any on[e] true profitt [prophet], nor any on[e] that can tell how long these ministers shall last. Yea they comfort them selves in the calamities, promising them selves peace with good, yea, great happines, not perseving that they ar wretched and miserabell and poore and blynd and naked. The Lord therfo[re] of his gret mercie draw out such as be his from among them, and anoynt ther eies with eisalve that they may see and fle from this mor than Egipcicall darknes and Babilonishe bondage into that most joyus light and libertie of the servants of God. The Lord grant them dezerning spirits to know the true worship of God from false, and the true ministers of God from false; that they may save them from the wicked generation and find comfort withe the Lord in his day of refreshing.

To the fourthe principall cause they aleg many slyght and lame excuses, as that the fault is not in them but in the civill majestrat that these disorders and bondages remaine; if it wer in them, it should not [remain]; they wish for reformation and sighe for it daylie, yea, they pray with tears both publycklye and privatlye for it, and as far as it lyethe in them they seek it by all meanes. They sue to the parlyments for it; and seing it cannot be obtayned, they perswad all men to have pacienc untill it may please God to torne the prince’s harte, and in the mean tyme to rest contented with this measur of God’s truthe and fredom they have: ther can be no church without some blemishes and defects in this

¹ The reference is to Matthew 4:17. In the Genevan version for 1560, the words are: “Amend your lives: for the kingdome of heaven is at hand.” Evidently Barrow is quoting from memory, or using another version. He did use also the Latin translation by Immanuel Tremellius and Francis Junius, issued in 1585.

² II Timothy 2:19.

world; suche wer the church of Corinthe, Galatia; thanked be God we have greter measuer of God's grases [graces] than any nation in the world; and such lyck fleshly unfaythfull reasons therby to blear men's eies and hyd ther infidellytye, yea, ther treason to Christ him self, to our prince, and the wholl land. But what is this chaff to the wheat when it cometh to the fane [banner] of the gospell? They have but conseved chaf and brought forth the stubell. First, wher find they that ether our saviour Christ or his apostells sued to parlyments or princes for the planting or practising of the gospell; and whether the word it self if it be faythfullie taught be not of power both to tack princes in the nett and to bind them in chaynes and fetters. Then if princes resist or necklect, wher [do] they fynd that the faithfull ought to rest in ther defawlt and disorders untill God change the prince's hart?¹

Then, wher [do] they find that our Lord Jesus ever sent owt any without geving them power; or whether the true mynisters and people of God may be without this power of Christ to reforme them selves, and to put in practyce Christ's comandements according to the measuer of faythe and grace the Lord hath geven them? Then, whether he cane be a true mynister that wantethe [lacketh] this power, or necklectteth it? Then, whether on[e] man can serve t[w]o masters at once, or whether he shall not be judged his servant to whom he yeldeth obedience? Then, whether he be a faythfull servant that not only faythfulye yeldethe obedience and subjection to his m[aste]r enemie, but unfaythfullye [yeldeth?] the most pretious things of Christ, yea, Christ himself, into the hands of antychrist? Furder, it wold be known of them whether the church of Christ can be without the government and officers that he hath asigned in his last will and testament unto it.

Then, whether his government be not a thing of nesesytye to the church?

Then, whether his government be not a part of Christ's testament?

Then, whether it be a principall part of Christ's kyngdome, and whether Christ can be a kyng and not governe by his own lawes and officers?

Then, whether the church of Christ can be governed by anti-christ, *etc.*?

Then, whether our christian lyberties and the holye order of Christ's governmente be not a thing to be stood for unto the deathe by every servant of Christ Jesus?

To these poynts of doctrine, if they assent not, it is because ther is no lyght in them; if they assent, ther remayneth no mor to do but that they repent and amend without any furder allegation of delaye, for certaynlye ther is no subtill distinctioun or slye evasion will stand before our God whose lawes these ar. Inward intents will not excuse owtward, yea, obstinat, transgressions; the King of kings will not com in subjection to any king; he yealdeth not his septer to another, nor his sheep to a strainger.

¹ Barrow's arguments seem very close to those of Harrison and Browne. See Harrison's lament in "Notes Owt of Harryson's Booke" and Browne's arguments in *A Treatise of Reformation without Taryng for Anie*, in Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson, *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, pp. 151–170, 532–537.