ABSTRACT

FIFTH MONARCHIST VISIONARY INCLUSIONS

“We have no king but Jesus” was the repeated rally of England’s seventeenth-century radical religious dissenters known as Fifth Monarchists. Their focus on fulfilling millennial prophecy led them to support Oliver Cromwell’s English Civil War. The mid-seventeenth century stage would be set for the millennial rule of Christ, in which religious repressions would be lifted and their biblical ideals would be fulfilled. Although their orientation by nature was elitist in that “the saints,” as they saw themselves, would reign, their program in part enacted a precedent of recognition for women, Jews, and religious minorities as themselves.

Fifth Monarchists were in positions of influence and believed it in their power and mandate to bring about immediate change. They saw themselves as a hinge of history that would open the doors of opportunity for themselves and others.

Gaylord W. Dixon
May 2010

FIFTH MONARCHIST VISIONARY INCLUSIONS

by

Gaylord W. Dixon

A thesis

submitted in partial

fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in History

in the College of Social Sciences

California State University, Fresno

May 2010

APPROVED

For the Department of History:

We, the undersigned, certify that the thesis of the following student meets the required standards of scholarship, format, and style of the university and the student's graduate degree program for the awarding of the master's degree.

Gaylord W. Dixon
Thesis Author

Maritere López (Chair) History

Jill Fields History

Charles Lipp History
University of West Georgia

For the University Graduate Committee:

Dean, Division of Graduate Studies

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPRODUCTION

OF MASTER'S THESIS

x I grant permission for the reproduction of this thesis in part or in its entirety without further authorization from me, on the condition that the person or agency requesting reproduction absorbs the cost and provides proper acknowledgment of authorship.

_____ Permission to reproduce this thesis in part or in its entirety must be obtained from me.

Signature of thesis author: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the influence of my grandparents, William and Bertha Dixon, who by their words and deeds provided me with “a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path” (Psalm 119: 105).

I also wish to thank my advisors for their counsel and patience in my efforts to complete this work: Dr. Maritere López and Dr. Jill Fields of the California State University, Fresno, and Dr. Charles Lipp of the University of West Georgia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Contemporaries saw members of the seventeenth-century English radical religious Fifth Monarchy movement as fanatics because of their radical views predicting Christ's coming millennium, which they believed would begin in 1666. Fifth Monarchists derived complicated date-setting calculations from biblical prophecies found in the Old Testament Book of Daniel and the New Testament Book of Revelation. According to these, the thousand-year long messianic rule of Christ was to be preceded by four earthly kingdoms which, in their view, were expiring in the seventeenth-century. Seeing themselves as instruments of divine will, Fifth Monarchists emerged as an identifiable and influential group in Oliver Cromwell's New Model Army during the English Civil Wars. Many of its 40,000 adherents were soldiers in Parliament's New Model Army and some rose to higher ranks and positions of power in the process. Cromwell himself contributed to the rise of Fifth Monarchists by his New Model Army policies that allowed promotions based on merit rather than class. Fifth Monarchists, motivated by their millennial views, made good soldiers. Army chaplain Richard Baxter found that "a few proud, self-conceited, hot-headed sectaries had got into

the highest places and were Cromwell's chief favorites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the rest or carried them along with them, and were the soul of the army, though much fewer in number than the rest."[1] According to Baxter, however, Cromwell used this connection "till by the people's submission and quietness he thought himself well settled. And then he began to undermine them, and by degrees to work them out."[2] Baxter compared Fifth Monarchists to "the Munster Anabaptists" and "other fanatics here, both in the army, and the city and country." He derided their Golden Age dreams "to set up Christ in his kingdom whether he will or not."[3] Baxter painted Fifth Monarchy Men, Quakers and Anabaptists with one broad brush as "proper fanatics, looking too much to revelations within, instead of the Holy Scriptures."[4] Contrary to Baxter's view, I will show that Fifth Monarchists were literalists when it came to interpreting the Bible, particularly when it came to prophecy, whether Old Testament or New.

---

[1] Richard Baxter, *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter being the Reliquiae Baxterianae*, ed. J. M. Lloyd Thomas (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1931), 49, 50.

[2] Ibid., 72.

[3] Ibid., 122.

[4] Ibid., 179.

In spite of their literal focus on prophetic events, or because of it, I argue that Fifth Monarchists contributed to the cause of religious freedom for minority groups, women's participation in the public sphere, and the return of banished Jews to English society. Fifth Monarchists have been largely unrecognized for these three emphases, an oversight which my research corrects in part. While not their primary intent, their apocalyptic goals would ultimately serve as precursors for religious freedom for dissenters, the improved status of women in their ranks, and the political restoration of the Jews to England.

How did Fifth Monarchist views promote toleration of religious minorities? How did Fifth Monarchists perceive the status of women? How did Fifth Monarchist views set the stage for the return of Jews to seventeenth-century England? The significance of these questions lies in the inclusionary effect Fifth Monarchists provided these groups as part of their millennial vision. My research shows that, while Fifth Monarchists' views were bounded by literal prophetic interpretations, their efforts foreshadowed widened public boundaries to include those usually circumscribed by seventeenth-century English society.

England's Civil War historians have generally downplayed the significance of the Fifth Monarchy movement.

One of the earliest historians was Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, who was an eyewitness to many of the relevant events. In his *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, he described himself as "a watchful observer of all that had passed in the time of the troubles; and had the opportunity to have seen the actions, and penetrated, in a good measure, into the consultations of those days, and was no ill judge of the temper and nature of mankind."[5] Clarendon's narrative is chronological and Royalist in approach, and thus while detailed, biased against the Fifth Monarchists. In spite of his professed objectivity, Clarendon admitted that his work was undertaken with Charles I's "approbation and by his encouragement and for his vindication."[6] Thus, Clarendon presented Charles I as a victim of the opposers of his rule. Accordingly, Clarendon argued that among those who moved against Charles I as early as 1642 were "the factious and schismatical party of the kingdom, which thought the pace towards the reformation was not brisk and furious enough."[7] According to Clarendon, the Puritan-dominated Parliament "had gotten over the affections of the people,

---

[5] Edward [Hyde], Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, ed. W. Dunn Macray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), 1:li.

[6] Ibid., 4:4.

[7] Ibid., 2:71.

whose hearts were alienated from any reverence to the government."[8] Further, Clarendon added, "New opinions started up in religion, which made more subdivisions, and new terms and distinctions were brought into discourse, and *fanatics* were brought into appellation."[9] Clarendon referred to

> those who professed to be swayed by matter of conscience in religion: since it was out of all question that they should never find the least satisfaction to their scruples and their principle in church government, from those who pretended to erect the kingdom of Jesus Christ.[10]

To further his point, Clarendon also included a later letter from a W. Howard to Charles II depicting the movement as "drunk with enthusiasms and besotted with fantastic notion; and these are called Christian Royalists, or Fifth Monarchists."[11] From Clarendon's contemporary view, fanatical Fifth Monarchists were simply part of the problem confronting royalists.

Later historians embraced Clarendon's perceptions of Fifth Monarchists as fanatics. David Hume (1711-1776) expressed similar disdain for Fifth-Monarchy men "who expected suddenly the second coming of Christ upon earth;

---

[8] Ibid., 2:290.

[9] Ibid., 3:453.

[10] Ibid., 4:157.

[11] Ibid., 6:76.

and who pretended that the saints in the meanwhile—that is, themselves—were alone entitled to govern."[12] He includes them in his list of "the very dregs of fanatics."[13] Critically describing their participation in Parliament, Hume writes:

> They began with seeking God by prayer. This office was performed by eight or ten *gifted* men of the assembly; and with so much success that, according to the confession of all, they had never before, in any of their devotional exercises, enjoyed so much of the Holy Spirit as was then communicated to them.[14]

Later, Leopold Von Ranke, in *A History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century*, enumerated some of the efforts of what he called Cromwell's "Little Parliament" as "remarkable for all time."[15] This Parliament, also known as the Barebones Parliament, which included influential Fifth Monarchists, replaced what was left of Charles I's Long Parliament. Ranke lists the Barebones Parliament's important legislative accomplishments as law reform, judicial procedures, civil marriage provisions, oath taking, and attempts at abolishing tithes. Ranke notes, "It is especially striking to find that a Parliament

---

[12] David Hume, *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Abdication of James the Second, 1688*. (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, [1800?]), 4:550.

[13] Ibid., 551.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Leopold Von Ranke, *A History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth-Century* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1875), 3:87.

of zealous believers was the first to introduce reforms of modern liberal tendencies into the home legislation."[16] However, in spite of this tribute, Ranke laments the fact that some of the members of Parliament were Fifth Monarchy-Men who "ignored all considerations of prudence."[17] Their fault, as Ranke saw it, was that in "confounding religion and politics, they confused what was universally binding in Holy Writ with that which applied only to the Jewish nation."[18] Ranke's interpretation, however, would appear to deny the significance of Fifth Monarchist contributions to what he enumerates as positive outcomes of the Barebones Parliament. As I will show in chapter 2, the establishment of civil marriage and the efforts to abolish tithes were an important part of the Fifth Monarchist's agenda to achieve religious freedom.

Samuel Rawson Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1656* is one of the foundational historiographical works for the period, in which he also identifies Fifth Monarchists as "exciteable fanatics."[19] Gardiner, however, also credits them as having "the courage

---

[16] Ibid., 3:88-92.

[17] Ibid., 3:93.

[18] Ibid., 3:93, 94.

[19] Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1659* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1916), 2:276.

of their opinions."[20] Gardiner describes the Fifth Monarchist leader Thomas Harrison as "a vigorous soldier and a fanatic in religion."[21] Gardiner concludes in one of his less critical comments that "Cromwell was no less sharp-cited in his selection of Harrison to command the forces left in England in his own absence."[22] These comments hint at the important role played by Fifth Monarchists, but Gardiner does not elaborate on their significance, which was a general omission by eighteenth and nineteenth-century historians.

More recent historians have also tended to dismiss the significance of the Fifth Monarchy movement. Maurice Ashley's *England in the Seventeenth Century*, first published in 1952, was revised less than a decade later to reflect revisionist research.[23] Ashley notes,

> At the opening of the seventeenth-century the English 'gentry', that is the class immediately below the peers, was being reinforced and transformed by professional men, merchants, industrialists, and successful yeomen, and that many among this class were of an aggressively Puritan outlook.[24]

---

[20] Ibid., 2:268.

[21] Ibid., 1:267.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Maurice Ashley, *England in the Seventeenth-Century* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), 7.

[24] Ibid., 42.

Ashley adds, “Such people formed the mainstay of the House of Commons which had already waxed in importance under the Tudor monarchs.”[25] This earlier rise of Puritanism formed the context of later Fifth Monarchist ideals. Ashley, along with others, however, fails to distinguish between Puritan factions, which included Fifth Monarchists among the more extreme variety.

Other modern viewpoints include Bryan Ball’s 1975 *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660*, in which he showed that millennial thinking in the seventeenth century was not exceptional.[26] Nevertheless, he, too, designates Fifth Monarchists as fanatics on the fringe. Radical Fifth Monarchists, unlike other groups, however, were more active in their approach to prophecy rather than passively awaiting outcomes. Ball noted, “It was the sword that set the Fifth Monarchists apart. Militancy was their hallmark. While millenarianism gave rise to Fifth Monarchism it was not synonymous with it.”[27] Still, Ball overlooks their involvement in the political arena, which I argue below was crucial to their religious aims.

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] Brian W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 184.

[27] Ibid.

Mark Kishlansky's work, *The Rise of the New Model Army*, makes no direct mention of Fifth Monarchists although they formed an important part of "groups within the Army that held to independent and sectarian doctrines."[28] Kishlansky ignores the influence of Fifth Monarchist officers, chaplains, and soldiers who promulgated their millennial views within the ranks of the New Model Army. Kishlansky further limits Fifth Monarchists to brief mention in his thematic survey in *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*:

> The Fifth Monarchists took the execution of the King as a sign that the final corrupt monarchy of man was at an end. They demanded that the Mosaic code be substituted for the laws of England and that only known saints be members of government.[29]

That opening came for Fifth Monarchists, according to Kishlansky, in the Barebones Parliament, also known as the Nominated Parliament, "composed of 140 members…its composition was much like the Rump's, although there were more religious enthusiasts – though only thirteen known Fifth Monarchists."[30] These numbers may have seemed insignificant to Kishlansky but, when combined with

---

[28] Mark Kishlansky, *The Rise of the New Model Army* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 72.

[29] Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London: The Penguin Press, 1996), 203.

[30] Ibid., 205.

sympathizers to their views, Fifth Monarchist became influential beyond their members.

William Lamont, in his *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution,* expresses his initial reluctance to deal with millenarians "because I then shared the common belief of the time that men who awaited Christ's Second Coming, and who took the prophetic books seriously, must belong to the lunatic fringe of society."[31] Following further research, Lamont later concludes that "it was impossible to understand how the great English Revolution had happened without such a recognition."[32] While Lamont expresses his change of attitude towards millennial thinking he did not give attention to Fifth Monarchists' contributions to the issues of their day.

In contrast to Lamont, Simon Schama has no reluctance in recognizing Fifth Monarchists as "the hottest Protestants, free to speak their minds in the void left by bishopless England, the only proper successor to King Charles was King Jesus."[33] Schama adds:

---

[31] William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979), 9.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Simon Schama, *A History of Britain* (New York: Hyperion, 2001), 2:181.

> Their preachers and prophets said so in the streets and to rapt congregations of apprentices and artisans. But the message resonated with special force in the army where sabres had been honed by the fire of sermons.[34]

As a result, according to Schama,

> For Fifth Monarchists like John Rogers, Vavasor Powell and Major-General Thomas Harrison, their noses buried in scriptural prophecy, the new, last age had dawned with the beheading of the king. So they were under an obligation not to turn their back on the state but to convert it to the rule of the Saints, and so be in a position to prepare the Commonwealth for the consummation of prophecy.[35]

Schama comes closest to recognizing the dynamics of the Fifth Monarchist movement. Even he, however, neglects the more positive contributions of Fifth Monarchists. Historians in general have overlooked the motivations, interpretations, and applications of Fifth Monarchists that gave them significance in the seventeenth-century English scene. Without these players on stage, the setting and historiography of the period is incomplete. My research provides a window to that world.

Movement Dynamics

The context of Fifth Monarchy developments included both external and internal factors. They were driven not only by outward political developments of the English Civil

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

War but by inward theological imperatives by which they saw themselves as instruments of prophetic fulfillment.

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" is a familiar centuries-old, often repeated phrase from the Lord's Prayer.[36] The realization of that ultimate goal has been Christianity's continued inspiration since antiquity. Among the first writings of what later became the New Testament were letters of Paul to the church he started in Thessalonica, Greece, concerning the Second Coming. He wrote: "But of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."[37] This communication was followed by a second letter admonishing:

> Now we beseech you brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.[38]

These two excerpts illustrate the dual effects of millennial prophecy, one of stabilizing hope and the other of unsettling anxiety.

Subsequent New Testament writings, as well as later church history, dealt with both aspects. Delays of

---

[36] Matt. 6:10, KJV.

[37] I Thess. 5:1, KJV.

[38] II Thess. 2:1, 2, KJV.

fulfillment caused further difficulties with which church leaders dealt by reinterpreting the texts. Millennial predictions from the Book of Revelation were later taken by St. Augustine to be symbolic: “If this be so, how much more does 1,000 represent totality, being the square of 10 converted into a solid figure!”[39] These 1,000 millennial years of divine rule began spiritually, for Augustine and those who succeeded him, “with Christ’s first coming.”[40] For Augustine, it followed that “the Church even now is the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of heaven.”[41] Those who viewed the millennium literally, “by the actual number of a thousand years, taking it as appropriate that there should be a kind of Sabbath for the saints for all that time” were negatively categorized by Augustine as materialists.[42] Augustine confessed, “I also entertained this notion at one time.”[43] Augustine added, “Those with spiritual interests give the name ‘Chiliasts’ to the believers in this picture, a term which we can translate by a word derived from the equivalent Latin, ‘Millenarians.’”[44] Augustine’s view would

---

[39] Augustine, *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans,* trans. Henry Bettenson (New York: Penguin Books, 1984),908.

[40] Ibid., 914.

[41] Ibid., 915.

[42] Ibid., 907.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

categorize Fifth Monarchist conceptions of the millennium as materialists, given their literal interpretations of the biblical prophecies.

Following the Reformation, a shift in thinking about the predicted millennium occurred among emerging Protestant groups. According to Tim Thornton,

> It was Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede who applied the lessons of biblical prophecy less to the past, present and imminent future, and rather shifted the balance more clearly into the future, presenting a compelling account of the approaching millennium, with an age of universal harmony which would precede doomsday.[45]

Joseph Mede (1586-1638), one of John Milton's teachers, emphasized the immediacy of prophecy. Both theologians, Brightman (1562-1607) and Mede, argued for future literal fulfillment: Christ's kingdom was yet to come. This shift of prophetic perception became the basis of Fifth Monarchist interpretations of the events of their time. The Fifth Monarchy movement, whose banner was "We have no king but Jesus," was assertive in its approach to the anticipated divine kingdom. The war experiences of soldiers, chaplains, and officers gave their movement a militant tone. Chaplain Richard Baxter noted of Fifth Monarchists, "They plainly showed me that they thought God's providence would cast the trust of religion and the

---

[45] Tim Thornton, *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2006), 56.

kingdom upon them as conquerors."[46] Success in battle gave adherents the expectation of divine blessings on their efforts to bring about the conditions necessary for the inauguration of Christ's millennial rule.

After the execution of Charles I in 1649, the Fifth Monarchists proposed a godly governmental rule based on their apocalyptic views of the anticipated 1,000-year millennial reign of Christ. They worked toward this ideal by promoting a theology of the rule of believers such as themselves. Their precepts were developed from the Old Testament prophet Daniel's vision in which four consecutive earthly empires—Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman—were toppled by the fifth, heavenly kingdom represented by a massive stone.[47] This was the Fifth Monarchy view of history and their perceived destiny. Symbolic language from the New Testament book of Revelation also provided them with a timetable, which they interpreted in light of England's seventeenth-century civil war. They appropriated other scriptures, such as Daniel 7:18, to indicate their future role in governance: "But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever."[48]

---

[46] Richard Baxter, "The New Model Army," in *The Commonwealth of England: The English Civil Wars, The Commonwealth and Protectorate 1641-1660*, ed. Charles Blitzer (New York: P. Putnam's Sons, 1963), 29.

[47] Dan. 2:36-45, KJV.

[48] Dan. 7:18, KJV.

Fifth Monarchists believed that it was their duty to prepare the nation for Christ's imminent rule. With this agenda they pursued a general freedom of religion to perpetuate their cause, and included women as spokespersons, believing that the prophetic times included female participation. The Fifth Monarchists also considered the Jews' return to England, and from there to the Holy Land, as an important precondition for the awaited millennium. These secondary aims would, in turn, promote public space for religious minorities, women, and Jews in seventeenth-century England.

Such millennial thinking as the Fifth Monarchist's views permeated English seventeenth-century culture. In 1641 John Archer, a Separatist minister quoted by Fifth Monarchists, wrote *The Personnall Reign of Christ upon Earth.*[49] In this work he claimed that the year 1666 would be the end of the age and the beginning of Revelation's seventh trumpet preceding the millennium.[50] Archer's calculation was based on 1,260 prophetic years following an assigned date for the rise of the papacy in 406 AD.[51] By 1666 the Jews could be converted to Christianity, with the

---

[49] John Archer, *The Personnall Reign of Christ upon Earth* (London: Benjamin Allen, 1641).

[50] Ibid., 50.

[51] Ibid., 47.

lost tribes of Israel restored.[52] In Christ's kingdom to follow, according to Archer, "The Israelites shall have the greatest glory, as the elder brothers double portion, as the natural branches of a stocke before a wild branch ingrafted."[53] However, for all persons "there shall be all fulnesse of all temporall blessings, as peace, safety, riches, health, long life, and whatsoever else was enjoyed under any Monarchy."[54]

Baptist minister Hanserd Knollys, probable author of *A Glimpse of Sion's Glory*, also expressed literal millennial views.[55] Knollys advocated political action:

> This is the work of the day, for us to lift up our voice to heaven, that it might be mighty to bring forth more and more the voice of our Parliament as a voice of thunder, a terrible voice to the Antichristian party, that they may say, *The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.*[56]

Knollys believed in progressive illumination that "when a thing grows nearer and nearer God will reveal it more distinct."[57] In the interim, Knollys' precept was "that all

---

[52] Ibid., 27.

[53] Ibid., 27.

[54] Ibid., 30.

[55] [Hanserd Knollys], "A Glimpse of Sion's Glory," in *Puritanism and Liberty Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents,* ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951), 234.

[56] Ibid., 235.

[57] Ibid., 236.

texts are to be understood literally, except they make against some other scriptures, or except the very coherence and dependence of the scripture shows it otherwise, or it makes against the analogy of faith."[58] Therefore, Knollys concluded, "And that place (Rev. 20) here it is said, *The Saints shall reign with him a thousand years*, which cannot mean reigning with him in heaven."[59] The millennium, in Knollys' view, could not be spiritualized, but was to be an earthly, physical reality. During this future, "All dissensions shall be taken away; and when there shall be a perfect union of all, and not any distinctions of Calvinists or Lutherans, or the like, but all shall come and serve God and be called by one name."[60] Some of the Fifth Monarchists originally came from Knollys' congregation and shared his views. They found comfort in his message: "You see that the Saints have little now in the world; having the poorest and meanest of all; but when the adoption of the sons of God shall come in the fulness of it, the world shall be theirs."[61] That projected hope became the basis for Fifth Monarchist practices.

---

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., 240.

[61] Ibid.

Fifth Monarchist Practices

Fifth Monarchist gatherings provided identity and community among fellow believers. Their social boundaries were fluid and inclusive, cutting across traditional lines of class and background. Participants united in an egalitarianism of purpose and focus. They were instructed, by Fifth Monarchist minister Christopher Feake, to "improve with all diligence their Time and Talents for the Advancement of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, throughout all the earth."[62] Feake wrote his congregation from prison, "I entreat you, looking upon each other as the sons and daughters of the living God, to grow in love…"[63] Fifth Monarchist meetings had a unique format and dynamic. They were "marked by a sense of expectation," according to Michael Watts.[64] Horton Davies described them as "highly emotional services consisted almost entirely of extemporary prayers and prolix sermons, the latter sometimes lasting five or six hours."[65] Reflecting that practice, according to biographer Edward Rogers, "It may be said the saints are so

---

[62] Christopher Feake, *A Beam of Light, Shining in the Midst of Much Darkness and Confusion* (London, 1659), 58.

[63] Christopher Feake, *The New Non-Conformist* (London: Livewell Chapman, at the crown in Pope's-head Alley, 1654), 7.

[64] Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 186.

[65] Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England from Cranmer to Baxte and Foxe 1534*-1690 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eedrmans, 1996), 2:491.

filled with praises and prayers that the noise of the one can hardly be discerned from the noise of another."[66] Such procedures were common to Fifth Monarchists, based on their belief in the equality of their participants.

Mary Cary, a Fifth Monarchist leader, insisted on the right of all to speak publicly, quoting St. Paul:

> And what this Prophesying is, the Apostle shews in the I Cor. 4.3. That it is speaking to edification, exhortation, and consolation. And he makes no distinction in the exercise of this gift of the spirit, between an Officer of the Church and another; for he makes it to appear that any Member of the Church may exercise this gift.[67]

For Mary Cary, this meant women as well as men. As we shall see, this was a significant aspect of Fifth Monarchist practice.

Another Fifth Monarchist custom, according to Horton Davies, was the insistence that communion be received sitting rather than kneeling.[68] This was seen as an act of entering into "the future eschatological rest" commemorating God's creation and symbolizing "the fellowship which they should have in his Kingdome."[69] In

---

[66] Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), 65.

[67] Mary Cary, "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:174.

[68] Davies, *Worship and Theology*, 2:491.

[69] Ibid., 208, 209.

contrast, kneeling meant subservience, “a monarchist posture.”[70] Additionally, Fifth Monarchists composed their own hymns reflective of their beliefs. John Rogers penned, “For God begins to honor us, The saints are marching on; The sword is sharpe, the arrows swift, To destroy Babylon.”[71] Perhaps less militant was Vavasar Powell’s “To Christ our King, let us praise sing, Who is our Savior dear, Who is our Protector and Our Rock, Who will come and soon appear.”[72] Their hymns were consistent with their prophetic hopes.

Fifth Monarchist congregations as such were self-organized. As Edward Rogers explains, “Being affectionately desirous to walk together in this way, and having agreed to it, they do write and give up their names to one whom they appoint to receive them.”[73] Further, “Every person to be admitted must produce some experimental evidence of the work of grace upon his soul for the church to judge of whereby he or she is convinced he is regenerate and received of God.”[74] Such evidences may have included dreams and visions, soul-

---

[70] Ibid., 415.

[71] Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912), 51.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions*, 40.

[74] Ibid., 66.

struggles, or “the ordinary operation of the Spirit in the changing effects of grace upon the judgment, will, and affections.”[75] These experiences were to be given in the open congregation “because by them the Church is able to judge of such as are godly.”[76] Such evidences were deemed necessary to indicate true conversion and commitment.

This direct personal experience approach to religion may reflect the seventeenth-century parallel rise of experimentalism in science. As Chaplain Richard Baxter, who read and quoted Francis Bacon, wrote, “It is soul-experiments which those that urge me to this kind of writing do expect that I should especially communicate to others.”[77] Religion based on experience in turn would open other areas, such as politics, to be based on experiential approaches rather than on tradition. In this sense, Fifth Monarchists may be seen as experimentalists favoring new approaches to old issues.

These Fifth Monarchists believed themselves, in the words of Fifth Monarchist preacher John Spittlehouse in 1652, a part of “a continuation of the primitive church and frame of gospel-government.”[78] This self-identification was

---

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Baxter, *Autobiography*, 103.

[78] John Spittlehouse and John More, *A Vindication of the Continued Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ*, ed. Gery Schmidt (Victoria, BC: Providence Strict Baptist Assembly, 2001), 8.

in contrast to institutional “Papacy, Prelacy, and Presbytery.”[79] Spittlehouse compared these three establishment churches, Catholic (Papacy), Anglican (Prelacy), and Presbyterian (Presbytery), to contending families under one roof trying “to subvert each other’s hierarchies, which they have already done in a great measure in this nation.”[80] Far from being connected to original Christianity, Spittlehouse saw these ecclesiastical structures as part and parcel of “the constitution of the church of antichrist.”[81] Submission to such religious establishments should therefore be avoided. This stance gave Fifth Monarchism a separate identity.

The special status by which Fifth Monarchists defined themselves also brought with it spiritual responsibilities, as John Tillinghast outlined in his book, *Generation-Work*.[82] He affirmed their prophetic time-table, “That before this generation expires, wee shall see most, if not all fully accomplished.”[83] It was time for “the uniting of the Saints that differ” and for “the going out daily of poor despised

---

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid., 11.

[81] Ibid., 14.

[82] John Tillinghast, *Generation-Work*e (London: Livewell Chapman, 1653).

[83] Ibid., 64.

labourers into the Lords vineyard of a large harvest."[84] Their aim would be the conversion of Jews and Gentiles and "the establishment of Justice and Righteousness in the World."[85] Fifth Monarchist hope for the conversion of the Jews, as I shall further argue below, became the rationale for the Jews' readmission to seventeenth-century England.

This futuristic focus was enhanced by a belief in progressive understanding, as expressed by Mary Cary: "I answer, we all expect the breakings forth of truth more & more, & no man can say they have yet attained to perfection."[86] Bryan Ball finds this "doctrine of progressive revelation becomes the doctrine of personal inspiration."[87] To Ball, it is "the root of Fifth Monarchist deviation."[88] More importantly, this form of spiritual experientialism gave the movement impetus to actualize its agenda. Individual inspiration provided authority for action.

Worldview

Fifth Monarchists shared a prophetic world view as described by Mary Cary:

---

[84] Ibid., 65.

[85] Ibid.,70.

[86] Mary Cary, "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England," 177.

[87] Ball, *A Great Expectation*, 192.

[88] Ibid.

> For there are some that are already so far inlightened in their understandings, about the present proceedings of God in the world, as they do in some competent measure, already discern the footprints of God, in these great present providences; and doe discern also what his designes are in these things.[89]

In interpreting the events of their time, Fifth Monarchists spoke in mystical biblical language, as in the words of Christoper Feake:

> Now if thou staggerest not through unbelief, as those exceeding great and precious promises which are recorded in the Scriptures of Truth, concerning the fifth kingdom, thou shalt in due time, behold, with a mixture of joy and wonder, those other grand Mutations and extraordinary Revolutions, which are even at the door, and ready to break in on the Princes and upon the People of the whole earth.[90]

This interpretation provided them with a focus on the events of their time and the foundation for an active agenda. This agenda had a nationalistic and international focus. England was for them the elect nation, destined to carry their millennial cause throughout the world. John Spittlehouse claimed "the Lord hath pleased to call out this our nation as a theater to act as a president [sic] of what he intends to do in all the Nations under the cope of heaven."[91]

---

[89] Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom and Downfall," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering and Chato, 2007), 2:184.

[90] Christopher Feake, "Reader," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom and Downfall," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*, ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering and Chato, 2007), 2:188.

[91] Cited by P. G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 27.

With this outlook, Fifth Monarchists may be seen as the most radical group of their time. Brian Manning defines radicalism as "seeking the abolition or replacement rather than the reform of institutions."[92] He notes,

> The breakdown of ecclesiastical control and the censorship gave the people, including the young and women, unprecedented opportunities to express themselves, and the weakening of control by the ruling class and of the state's means of coercion gave them opportunities to petition and to demonstrate.[93]

This seventeenth-century socio-political terrain made the rise of Fifth Monarchism possible.

In this broader context, Maurice Ashley concludes, "It still has to be recognized that it was a real shifting of economic power within the community that made the civil war possible."[94] Was that change one of a rising gentry or a declining one? According to H. R. Trevor-Roper, it was a declining gentry of Independents, "men whose spectacular actions have given a revolutionary character to a whole period."[95] Trevor-Roper continues, "But to the Independents 'mere gentry' who were still 'mere gentry' one court was no better than another: it was not merely the court of Charles

---

[92] Brian Manning, *Aristocrats, Plebeians and Revolution in England, 1640-1666* (London: Pluto Press, 1996), 2.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Ashley, *England*, 80.

[95] H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Gentry 1540-1640* (London: Cambridge University Press, [1953]), 34.

I, it was the court in general they had fought to destroy."[96] Trevor-Roper explains their angst, "The English mere gentry felt themselves to be a depressed, declining class, and, grumbling, consoled—or armed—themselves with religious dissent."[97] Theirs was a crusade of decentralization of religion, government, law, education, and trade. It was in these contexts—economic, political, and religious—that Fifth Monarchists acted and reacted to the tenor of their times in seventeenth-century England with their millenary enthusiasms and efforts. Based on these beliefs, they sought religious liberty, women's participation in their cause, and the return of the Jews to England.

---

[96] Ibid., 48.

[97] Ibid., 52.

Chapter 2

FIFTH MONARCHISTS AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION

The millennial aim of England's seventeenth-century Fifth Monarchists was to establish Christ's kingdom in their native land, and from there to extend it throughout the world. Not a religious denomination but a loose consortium of individuals, Fifth Monarchists were drawn from various Protestant groups including Puritans, Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Quakers. Fifth Monarchist leader John Rogers claimed that they were of "such a latitude that it took in all saints without regard to the form of religion which they professed."[1]

According to the prizewinner of the 1937 Thirlwall Essay, T. Lyon of Eton College, seventeenth-century English tolerationists came in two basic types: latitudinarians and separatists.[2] Latitudinarians saw the limits of belief systems and were willing to grant equality to all creeds. Separatists had their own agendas, which could not be followed with interference from the state. What emerged from these two streams was the renunciation of governmental

---

[1] Cited by Louise Fargo Brown. *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912), 81.

[2] T. Lyon, *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-1639* (New York: Octagon Books, 1976), 12.

force in matters of religion.[3] This became the focus, in part, of the Fifth Monarchy movement: to free themselves from government interference in matters of faith and practice.

In the process of their outreach, Fifth Monarchists tested and extended the limits of religious toleration in their times. Yet, historians of English toleration have largely overlooked the roles of these diverse Fifth Monarchists in the history of freedom of religion. William Haller's classic work, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*, for example, makes no mention of Fifth Monarchists except for one reference to Robert Baille's brief criticism of Fifth Monarchist leader Major Thomas Harrison.[4] W. K. Jordan's monumental four-volume work, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament 1603-1640,* refers to Fifth Monarchists as being "seditious and incendiary."[5] Even more recent historians of religious tolerance in England, such as Andrew R. Murphy, make little or no mention of Fifth Monarchists. Murphy's *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and*

---

[3] Ibid., 8-9.

[4] William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 191.

[5] W. K. Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament 1603-1640* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1965), 3:455.

Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America, describes developments such as the "the strong support for religious toleration among rank-and-file soldiers and the heavy representation of sectarians in the army" without recognizing significant influences of Fifth Monarchy officers and chaplains in the New Model Army.[6] In his work, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England 1558-1689*, John Coffey mentions Fifth Monarchists among emerging new movements but limits their mention to resistance during the Restoration of Charles II.[7] Other historians of seventeenth-century England marginalize them as extremist fanatics without lasting consequence and as intolerant toward others rather than as agents of religious liberty. Even specialized historians of the Fifth Monarchy movement pass over any importance they might have had in the issues of church-state relations. For example, Bernard Capp's classic work, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism*, minimizes their contributions to toleration: "Despite an ecumenical approach, the Fifth Monarchists thus found little of which

---

[6] Andrew R. Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 92.

[7] John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England 1558*-1689 (Harlow, England: Longman, 2000), 144, 167.

to approve in other religious groups, and this raises the problem of how far they believed in toleration."[8]

My research shows, however, that the Fifth Monarchists were significant participants in the seventeenth-century quest for freedom of religion. Indeed, the efforts of Fifth Monarchists may be seen as threefold: as pamphleteers, political activists, and persecuted resisters to government control of religion. In these aspects, Fifth Monarchists began by influencing public opinion, followed by attempting to enact political legislation, and by exerting pressure on the religious establishment in their final role as martyrs for their cause. Their importance and the multiple dimensions of their involvement may be seen in the lives of individual members. In tracing these aspects, it is necessary to identify actual Fifth Monarchist participants who took upon themselves these roles in the movement, for individual actions in these areas determined the effects of the movement as a whole. Biographical information helps contextualize their contributions, as some of them filled more than one role in this cause, acting as pamphleteers, participating in politics, and becoming persecuted in turn. Historians differ in their listings of individual Fifth Monarchists, but the most documented list is found as an

---

[8] B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 183

appendix to Capp's work.[9] My research concentrates on individual contributions by these identified members.

Before Henry VIII's break with Rome, there were limited attempts for English religious expression outside the sanctions of the Roman Catholic Church. After the Reformation, Protestantism infiltrated English society. Groups gathered to discuss the new Reformation ideals and sought to express those within the established Church of England. Puritanism developed out of the desire to express the new Protestant norms within the existing national church. Separatism arose among those who could not wait for changes and took it upon themselves to reorganize religion along the lines of what they believed to be a more authentic Christianity. Due to differences of emphasis, further fragmentation occurred when these participants could not agree on expressions of that ideal. Queen Elizabeth suppressed these divergent views with her 1559 Act of Uniformity. As Wilbur Jordan notes, "If the religious history of the last decade of Elizabeth's reign were to be written in the light of this legislation, it would detail the complete extinction of religious liberty in England."[10] Yet, the nonconformist cause in fact grew from its repression, and, according to Jordan, "succeeded

---

[9] Ibid., 239-70.

[10] Jordan, *The Development of Religious Toleration in England,* 1:214.

for the first time in English history in making the English a theologically disputationous nation."[11] These debates brought into question the existing order of church-state relationships.

James I and Charles I attempted to continue Elizabethan religious policies of uniformity, though not with the same success. James I held the 1604 Hampton Conference of religious leaders in an attempt at unity, and authorized a new translation of the Bible which, in turn, furthered sectarian divisions. Increased access to the Bible simply multiplied its number of interpretations. By the time of Charles I, religious dissent not only increased, but also influenced Parliament. To strengthen his stand, Charles I issued his 1628 dictum, "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion," which required "all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibit[ed] the least difference from the said Articles."[12] In reaction, Parliament passed the "Resolutions on Religion Drawn by a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons," which claimed "even of the best and wisest princes, are often frustrated through the unfaithfulness and carelessness of their

---

[11] Ibid., 1:241.

[12] Charles I, "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion," in *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*, 3rd ed., ed. Samuel Lawson Gardiner (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 75.

ministers; and that we find a great unhappiness to have befallen His Majesty this way."[13] The tension between royal religious authority and nonconformity became evident in "The Root and Branch Petition," drafted in 1640, which protested "the great conformity and likeness both continued and increased of our Church to the Church of Rome, in vestures, postures, ceremonies and administrations."[14] An inquisition-like atmosphere existed, according to the parliamentary petition, "reaching even to men's thoughts."[15] Charles I responded to the petition with "A Proclamation for Obedience to the Laws," which mandated "due execution against all willful contemners and disturbers of Divine Service contrary to the said laws and statutes."[16] Further, it commanded "that no parsons, vicars or curates in their several parishes shall presume to introduce any rite or ceremonies other than those which are established by the laws and statutes of the land."[17]

---

[13] "Resolutions on Religion Drawn by a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons," in *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*, 3rd ed, ed. Samuel Lawson Gardiner (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 77.

[14] "The Root and Branch Petition," in *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*, 3rd ed., ed. Samuel Lawson Gardiner (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 140.

[15] Ibid., 143.

[16] Charles I, "The King's Proclamation on Religion," in *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*, 3rd ed., ed. Samuel Lawson Gardiner (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 232.

[17] Ibid., 233.

Seventeenth-century radical groups holding pronounced end-of-days millennial views, such as the Fifth Monarchists, firmly resisted state-church demands for religious uniformity on the basis of their prophetic interpretations. As Bernard Cottret finds, “The primary moving force of this Messianism – which is close to the thinking of other enthusiasts – is primarily the transformation of the doctrine of salvation into an impending reality – the second coming of the Lord is at hand.”[18] Cottret adds, “This belief definitely set apart the English revolution, and treated it as the apex, if not the end, of history.”[19] For Fifth Monarchists, the Apocalypse was near, calling for action on their part, firstly as general pamphleteers, secondly as political activists, and finally as persecuted participants. Some members experienced all three aspects in their quest for religious liberty.

Fifth Monarchist Pamphleteers

During the mid-seventeenth century, governmental censorship in England collapsed under a variety of undermining strategies. Haller describes these as smuggling of materials from abroad, falsification of authorizations,

---

[18] Bernard Cottret, *The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 126.

[19] Ibid.

anonymous works, and moving about of printing presses.[20] Not only were the means of dissemination important, but the climate of public response was favorable to such publications. Under these conditions, according to Haller, "The presumption that anyone who could quote scripture for his purpose must be permitted to speak and so to print whatever the spirit prompted him to utter was difficult to resist."[21] According to Anna Beer, "Writers, printers and booksellers competed with each other, both for their share of the new market and for the hearts and minds of their readers."[22] Readers were drawn from a wide range of backgrounds and economic status and they formed a ready audience for Fifth Monarchist views on religious liberty.

The result of unenforced censorship was an increase in published literature, the effect of which Ian Atherton describes as "an information revolution with profound consequences for the political, religious, social, cultural and intellectual life of its citizens."[23] Not only did the amount of printed material mushroom, but discussion in the

---

[20] Haller, *Liberty and Reformation*, 139.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Anna Beers, *Milton: Poet, Pamphleteer, and Patriot* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008), 139.

[23] Ian Atherton, "The Press and Popular Political Opinion," in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003), 88.

public sphere increased.[24] As G. E. Aylmer notes, "The output of printed works in the 1640s was larger than that of the entire previous period since Caxton had begun printing in the 1470s, and probably greater that it was to be again until into the eighteenth century."[25] Aylmer adds, "The main effect of this great outpouring of the printed word was to influence and shape opinion in a radical direction."[26] Indeed, these radical publications reached a new emerging audience. The publishing activities of individuals associated with the Fifth Monarchy movement not only enlarged their outreach, but also solidified their message and consolidated their gains. This effort, I argue, was a major factor in their quest for religious liberty.

Fifth Monarchists such as minister and printer John Canne entered into the arena of pamphleteers armed with their views of church-state relations. John Canne had served as chaplain to Colonel Robert Overton in Cromwell's New Model Army and written a justification for the execution of King Charles I, titled *The Golden Rule*.[27] Canne's early work also included a separatist tract titled *A Necessitie of Separation from the Church of England,*

---

[24] Ibid.

[25] G. E. Aylmer, *Rebellion or Revolution? England 1640-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 65.

[26] Ibid., 66.

[27] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, 51, 52.

Proved by Nonconformists' Principles.[28] Moreover, in his pamphlet *The Time of Finding*, Canne opposed the collection of tithes for governmental support of the state church, an issue which united minority religious groups.[29] This particular issue of forced tithes struck to the heart of the Church of England's support from government funds. Without government funds there would be no state church. Sectarians such as Fifth Monarchists believed their own congregations should be supported by voluntary gifts from believers. They objected to having to pay tithes for the maintenance of state religion.

According to Canne, in his *A Second Voice from the Temple to Higher Powers,* which he addressed to Parliament, tithes were "devised first by the Pope and his Councel, and established by the Law of the Land, contrary to the true maintenance of a Gospel Minister, and therefore by the Magistrate to be taken away."[30] Canne continued, contending that to pay these tithes was "to serve Antichrist, according to that saying, His servants yee are whom yee doe obey."[31] Canne's position required elimination of tithes to

---

[28] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), s.v. "Canne, John."

[29] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men,* 177.

[30] John Canne, *A Second Voice from the Temple to the Higher Powers* (London: M. Simmons, 1653), 10.

[31] Ibid., 19.

effect complete separation from what he saw as corrupt religion. One recipient of Cannes's views was Roger Williams, later founder of Rhode Island. Williams penned a tribute to Cannes as "a faithfull Witnes of his truth."[32]

Another published Fifth Monarchist advocate of religious freedom was Colonel Henry Danvers, one-time governor of Stafford. His tract, titled *Certain Quaeries Concerning Liberty of Conscience*, pled against persecution.[33] His views included toleration of even blasphemy and heresy, based on the idea that no one had religious authority or infallibility of judgment.[34] Danvers also argued for the toleration of the Jews, "on whom also are conferred so many glorious promises yet to be fulfilled."[35] Fifth Monarchists believed that their hopes of the future millennium were dependent on the conversion of the Jews before that event could occur, which made them advocates not only of toleration of the Jews, but of other groups as well.[36]

---

[32] Roger Williams, *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), 1:386.

[33] Henry Danvers, *Certain Quaeries Concerning Liberty of Conscience* (London: Giles Calvert, 1649), 4

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid., 1.

[36] Ibid.

Fifth Monarchist minister John Rogers also opposed the existing state-church establishment in accordance with his prophetic views of state-supported religion. Rogers argued in his pamphlet, *Sagrir,* that it was Cromwell's duty "to strip the whore [the established church] both of her outward scarlet array and to rend the flesh off her bones, by throwing down the standing of lawyers and Priests."[37] After the dissolution of Parliament in April 1653, Rogers proposed to Oliver Cromwell, in *A Few Proposals Relating to Civil Government*, a new form of government based on the highest Jewish authority, the seventy-member Sanhedrin.[38] In this pamphlet, Rogers recommended freeing the people from "tithes, from the 'soul-tyrannizing' system of presentation to livings, and from all the rest of 'Parish Church Constitutions.'"[39] According to Rogers, "God alone is the Lord and Judge of consciences, and that until magistrates keep their own proper sphere and ministers meddling only with spiritual, 'we shall be far from a good reformation, and must only look for a lamentable check.'"[40]

---

[37] P. G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 34.

[38] Ibid., 24.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Cited by Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867),* 67.

Not the least among Fifth Monarchist pamphleteers was Mary Cary, who affirmed:

> Whether it be learned or unlearned; or whether it be male or female; I say, a soul indued with Understanding and Reason, is capable of Religion, and all religion performances, if it be indued with the Spirit; and there is not other thing absolutely necessary thereunto."[41]

Mary Cary's views required, in fact, complete freedom of religion in preaching, practice, and propagation. In her pamphlet, *A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England*, Cary addressed these needs.[42] She warned, "The troubling, wronging, and oppressing the Saints of Jesus Christ, is the way to ruine a kingdom."[43] Cary continued: "That kingdome that shall say unto the Prophets, prophesie not, & shall stop the mouths of those which God hath opened to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, & shall charge them not to preach Christ any more; takes the way to ruine and destruction."[44] Furthermore, authorities must "make you no Laws for the consciences of his people, nor suffer any to do so by any authority derived from you, for that were to take the Crown off the head of Jesus Christ, and

---

[41] Mary Cary, *A New and More Exact Mappe* (London: Printed by W. H., 1651), 239.

[42] Mary Cary, "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*, ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:169-80.

[43] Ibid., 2:172.

[44] Ibid.

put it on your own head."[45] Governmental regulations of worship should be abolished, according to Cary: "O therefore beware how you subject your selves, or your people in spirituall worship to any rules, but those that Jesus Christ hath appointed."[46] To do otherwise, according to Cary, was to "oppose the freeness of the spirit, who is a free Agent."[47]

Cary's idea of toleration was based on the concept of progressive religious understanding:

> What hast thou, that thou hast not received? And know, that that God that hath communicated so graciously to thee, may in his own time communicate more abundantly to thy brother, and thou thy self mayest also see more hereafter then now thou doest, as thou now seest more than thou hast seen and this Age sees more than the former Age.[48]

According to Cary, civil authority "being but men, may judge a truth to be an errour through their imperfection in knowledge, and so may commend errour instead of truth, and condemn truth instead of errour."[49] Judgment was to be left "to the great Magistrate of the whole world, the great God."[50]

---

[45] Ibid., 2:173.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid., 2:174.

[48] Ibid., 2:178.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid.,2:179.

While these publishing efforts informed the public of their views of religious liberties, Fifth Monarchists also prepared themselves for more direct political participation. What Fifth Monarchist members advocated in print they would contend for in the political arena.

Political Activists

Fifth Monarchists' ideas of religious freedom, in their view, needed to be implemented in Cromwell's new government. Cromwell's New Model Army soldiers protested:

> Not withstanding we have engaged our lives for you, ourselves, [and] posterity, that we might be free from the yoke of episcopal tyranny, yet we fear that the consciences of men shall be pressed beyond the light they have received from the rule of the Word in things relating to the worship of God.[51]

Members pressured for this enactment in the New Model Army political debates to which Fifth Monarchists, such as Thomas Harrison, were privy. Harrison, the son of the four-time mayor of Newcastle-under Lyme, rose quickly through the ranks of the New Model Army to become regimental commander in 1648. His military successes contributed to his promotion to Colonel, which in turn led to his participation in the Council of War committee that brought

---

[51] "From the Grievances of Regiments, Presented at Saffron Walden, 13-14th May," in *Puritanism and Liberty, being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents,* ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1951),399.

Charles I to trial.[52] Harrison had accompanied Charles I from Hurst Castle to London, and became one of the signers for Charles's execution. Following these events, the New Model Army's Putney Debates (named for the location) began over "The Agreement of the People," a proposal originated by Leveller leader John Lilburne and his associates. It called for a new parliament with elected representatives. Harrison did not have much hope for Lilburne's proposal because he saw it as displacing the divine kingdom Fifth Monarchists anticipated, although he felt it might be better than nothing in the interim.[53] Harrison declared during the Putney Debates, "This government will fall short. I think God doth purposely design it shall fall short of that end we look for, because he would have us know our peace."[54] Harrison added, "Our Agreement shall be from God, and not from men, and yet I think the hand of God doth call us to hold forth (something) to the nation."[55]

The issue of liberty of conscience was too important to the Fifth Monarchy cause to be politically compromised.

---

[52] Charles H. Firth, "Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison," in *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* new series, vol. 8, April 1892-April 1893, 390-446 (Worcester, MA: Published by the Society, 1898).

[53] Ibid., 406.

[54] C. H. Simpkinson, *Thomas Harrison, Regicide and Major-General* (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1905), 93.

[55] Ibid.

Thus, while religious issues were not resolved in the Putney Debates, the groundwork was laid for the more crucial Whitehall Debates in which Thomas Harrison later participated in 1648. These political debates were pivotal to the Fifth Monarchists' attempts to secure freedom of religion for themselves and others. Issues of such liberties were at stake and the source of much discontent from those who had fought in New Model Army during the English Civil War to obtain them.

The Whitehall Debates were also named for their location, in London, where the New Model Army Council of Officers convened in December for the further consideration of religious rights. Whitehall had been the residence of Charles I and was also the palace from which he was brought for his execution on 30 January 1648.[56] Nearly a year had passed since Charles I's death without resolution of basic governmental issues such as the relationship between church and state. Renewed discussion began again with the original provisions of "The Agreement of the People." During the previous Putney Debates, the Army's Committee of Officers had considered that document among other alternatives for government policy. Religion had then

[56] William Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth of England: From Its Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second* (Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 2003), 4:679.

become a sticking point, however, for the 1647 document stated:

> Matters of religion and the ways of God's worship are not at all entrusted by us to any human power, because we cannot remit or exceed a tittle of what our consciences dictate to be the mind of God without willful sin: nevertheless the public way of instructing the nation (so it not be compulsive) is referred to their discretion.[57]

The controversy became, among Fifth Monarchists, "whether the magistrate have, or ought to have, any compulsive and restrictive power in matters of religion?"[58] Fifth Monarchists were among the first to drive a wedge between the spiritual and secular spheres. Their position was that individuals were responsible directly to God alone in spiritual matters. Government was neither to uphold nor oppose religious positions. With this rationale Fifth Monarchists foreshadowed the later development of separation of church and state.

Fifth Monarchists had a further stake in the political debate's outcome. According to their beliefs, the millennium of Christ's rule was at hand, and His followers, the believer saints, would rule with Him. Fifth Monarchists' personal responsibility in the interim was to

---

[57] "Agreement of the People, 1647," in *Basic Documents of English History*, ed. Stephen B. Baxter (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), 126.

[58] "The Whitehall Debates," in *Puritanism and Liberty, Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents,* ed. A. S. P. Woodhouse (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951), 125.

prepare the way for that day, which, at least until fulfillment, would require their freedom of religion without government interference. They would not otherwise be free to pursue their spiritual role as preparers for the millennium.

Participants in the Whitehall Debates included not only identified Fifth Monarchists but, equally important, others sympathetic to their views in a loose coalition. As the debates continued, the lines were drawn between those who wanted some sort of government control on religious activities and those who, including the Fifth Monarchists, did not want any governmental oversight. The Whitehall Debate evidenced the political differences between Fifth Monarchist participants and their sympathizers on one side demanding no state-supported religion, and advocates of government-directed religion on the other. For this reason, a closer examination of the proceedings is needed to illumine the Fifth Monarchist's participation in the creation of political policy.

The Whitehall Debates' moderator, Henry Ireton, who was second in command and son-in-law of Oliver Cromwell, cited Old Testament commands to justify government control of religion. While he shared Puritan beliefs, Ireton felt it necessary to protect those beliefs with civil power. The question for Ireton was "whether you shall make such a provision for men that are conscientious, [in order] that

they may serve God according to their light and conscience, as shall necessarily debar any kind of restraint on anything that any man will call religion?”[59] He further stated his position: “Yet whether we shall make our provision for that in such a way as shall give to all men their latitude, without any power to restrain them, [though they were] to practice idolatry, to practice atheism, and anything that is against the light of God?”[60] Ireton’s position of governmental religious oversight carried with it the consequence of intolerance for those who differed from officially sanctioned views and practices.

John Lilburne, Leveller author of the “Agreement of the People,” interrupted Ireton during the Whitehall session to say that the question was simply whether provision for religion should be made “in the Agreement or not.”[61] Fifth Monarchist leader Thomas Harrison concurred with Lilburne by asking “whether the magistrate, in matters of religion, hath any inspection at all?”[62] Phrasing the question in this way implied that religion as such, in the Fifth Monarchist view, was beyond the purview of civil

---

[59] Ibid., 143.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid., 144.

[62] Ibid., 145.

government. “And therefore,” Harrison added, “if you will fall into the debate of the business, I do humbly offer this to your Excellency as the first question: Whether the magistrate hath any power of no?”[63] This power of “no” would authorize governmental suppression of differing views, including those of Fifth Monarchists.

This argument started another round in the Whitehall Debate. Ireton claimed that Old Testament examples continued in force and “unless you can show that those things are not a perpetual right…you must give us leave to think that the magistrate ought according to the old institution to follow that right.”[64] Harrison warned of the consequence: “You will leave [thereby] the judgment to the civil magistrate whether the doing of such a thing be relating to God [only] or no.”[65] Harrison’s words indicated a fine line between one’s duty to God and one’s responsibility to one’s neighbor, and the risk of leaving that distinction to civil authority. Harrison continued, “[I would know] whether, [when the magistrate punishes] error or heresy, he do not [always profess to] punish it as it relates to the neighbor.”[66] This distinction was based on

---

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid., 146.

[65] Ibid., 154.

[66] Ibid.

an interpretation of the Ten Commandments as consisting of two tables. The first table consisted of duties to God, while the second specified responsibilities to others. Fifth Monarchists held that duties to God were not subject to governmental control. This important distinction would place their religious practices outside the government's sphere.

Ireton's rebuttals to this argument claimed scriptural authority. He continued, "In the next place I go to grounds of scripture, and show that this is the magistrate's duty."[67] After citing Old Testament commands enforcing Sabbath observances, Ireton concluded: "What was sin [before] remains sin still, what was the duty of a magistrate to restrain before remains his duty to restrain still."[68]

Welsh minister William Erbury closed the 14 December 1648 session with a question not directly raised but implied by Ireton's agenda: "[I would know] whether they do by that go about to set up a state religion."[69] Erbury's concern brought to light the underlying fear of Fifth Monarchists and others that Cromwell's government would reestablish a national church. At the subsequent session on

---

[67] Ibid., 155.

[68] Ibid., 156.

[69] "The Whitehall Debates," 170.

13 January 1649, Erbury began with a lengthy speech that the "Agreement of the People" was a "hellish thing…as in relation to religion, is that will do much hurt."[70] Harrison, however, was more conciliatory:

> Though I look upon it as the truth of God, that the magistrate should not have [any] power in these cases; yet, since it is my liberty [if I choose] to part with that which is my right for a weak brother, and [his burden], I can bear it as my own."[71]

Harrison's apparent change of heart may have been influenced by a "provision for a public ministry as the Agreement contemplates, with due guarantees for liberty of conscience."[72] Harrison's accommodation in this instance may have been self-serving, as he later headed the committee for government subsidized religious missions to Wales. This position would allow him to further the Fifth Monarch cause by later disbanding the Rump Parliament.

The "Agreement of the People" was subsequently revised in 1649 to read:

> Concerning religion, we agree as followeth: It is intended that the Christian religion be held forth and recommended as the public profession in this nation; which we desire may, by the grace of God, be reformed to

---

[70] Ibid., 171.

[71] Ibid., 177.

[72] Ibid.

> the greatest purity in doctrine, worship, and discipline, according to the word of God.[73]

This statement continued to provide for public instruction in religion at state expense, although not by compulsory tithes. Persons who differed in doctrine or worship were not to be penalized or restrained as long as they professed "faith in God by Jesus Christ."[74] However, because of past prejudices, Catholics and Anglicans were specifically excluded from this limited toleration as idolaters.[75]

Fifth Monarchists had their own ideas of governmental policies, which they felt should reflect Jewish Old Testament practices as divine law. Their concept was that a select body of men, similar to the Jewish Sanhedrin, should be chosen from the gathered churches to rule the new commonwealth, effectively installing a theocracy. To accomplish this, the dissolution of the Long Parliament, originally called by Charles I, later reduced by Pride's Purge to be known as the Rump Parliament, was necessary. According to H. R. Trevor-Roper, Thomas Harrison influenced Cromwell to give the order to disband the Rump Parliament, which Harrison himself carried out under Cromwell's

---

[73] "An Agreement of the People (1649)," in *Sources of English Constitutional History: A Selection of Documents from the Interregnum to the Present,* rev. ed., ed. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), 2:514.

[74] Ibid., 2:515.

[75] Ibid.

authority.[76] Sean Kelsey notes that support for its dissolution came from Harrison's Commission for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, for which Parliament had discontinued funding.[77] The dissolution of the Rump Parliament paved the way for a reconstituted Parliament in 1653, known as the Nominated Parliament, or Barebones Parliament after one of its members, which became the high-water mark for Fifth Monarchist participation in politics. They now could vote.

Composed of members recommended by independent church leaders, the Barebones Parliament consisted of 144 participants. With the new Parliament in place, the embryonic kingdom of believers had begun exercising political power. At least that was what Cromwell indicated in his opening remarks to their assembly on 4 July 1653: "You are Called with a high Call, and why should wee bee afraid to say, or think, that this may bee the door to usher in things that God hath promised and prophesied of, and to let the hearts of his people to wait for, and expect?"[78] Cromwell continued, "Indeed, I do think something

---

[76] H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), 364.

[77] Sean Kelsey, "Unkingship, 1649-1660," in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003), 336.

[78] Oliver Cromwell, *The Lord General Cromwell's Speech Delivered in the Council-Chamber, Upon the 4th of July 1653* (Printed in the Year 1654), 24.

is at the door, we are at the threshold, and therefore it becomes us to lift up our heads, and to encourage ourselves in the Lord."[79] The source of that encouragement was the expected fulfillment of Daniel's Old Testament prophecy as cited by Cromwell: "And the Kingdom shall not be delivered to another people."[80]

Fifth Monarchist representatives went to work in the Barebones Parliament under Thomas Harrison's leadership. Wearing more than one hat, pamphleteer Henry Danvers represented Leicester in the reconstituted Barebones Parliament.[81] Further, Danvers also served with other Fifth Monarchists on committees to abolish tithes and allow freedom of preaching in public places.[82] Frequent Fifth Monarchist prayer meetings convened in private places, with agendas discussed before being brought to Parliament.[83]

The accomplishments of the Barebones Parliament were few, but significant. In terms of religious freedom, marriage became a civil contract after 24 August 1653.[84] Registration of births and deaths also became a civil

---

[79] Ibid., 25.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, 68.

[82] Ibid., 70.

[83] P. G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, 36.

[84] Ibid., 36, 37.

matter.[85] This removed the established state church from controlling marriages and life-events, and allowed sectarians to formulate their own norms. In accordance with Fifth Monarchists' hopes for the conversion of the Jews, a proposal was made for the return of the Jews to England.[86] The Fifth Monarchists and their sympathizers constituted a majority in the Barebones Parliament, even if slim. Their influence was made effective, not necessarily by their numbers, but by concerted efforts. As mentioned above, their prayer meetings became policy-making sessions, which in turn gave them leverage within Parliament. One of the issues they tackled was the question of compulsory tithes, a controversial subject because of its support for the existing religious establishment. By this time the Puritans were reforming the national church, which was still dependent on the government support that Fifth Monarchists opposed. Although a committee appointed by the Barebones Parliament had recommended retention of the compulsory tithe, the measure was narrowly defeated by a vote of 56 to 54.[87] This close tally, in effect, became a test of strength, and led, according to Charles Firth, to

---

[85] David L. Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689* (London: Arnold, 1999), 138.

[86] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men, 191.*

[87] Charles W. Firth, "Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison," 426.

the mass resignation of the tithe-supporters on 12 December 1653.[88] According to William Godwin, this act threatened the state church and Parliamentarian Colonel Sydenham saw it as "destroying the clergy, the law, and the property of the subject."[89] Sean Kelsey explains:

> Cromwell and many of his fellow officers may well have had a hand in orchestrating the resignation of the conservatives within Barebone's Parliament because they actually feared the implications of abolishing control over church patronage which some its members were discussing.[90]

Kelsey adds,

> If the radicals had had their way, they would have called into question one of the main property rights enjoyed by a large proportion of the English gentry, as well as their control over the appointment of the clergy, important aspects of any gentleman's authority in his local community.[91]

With this impasse, the Barebones Parliament came to an end, and was dismissed by Cromwell. Within the month Cromwell took the title and office of Lord Protector.

Persecuted Resisters

Just as Egypt's pharaoh had turned against the biblical Israel, Fifth Monarchists likewise saw themselves betrayed by Oliver Cromwell in his new role as England's

---

[88] Ibid., 427.

[89] Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth of England,* 6:583

[90] Kelsey, "Unkingship, 1649-1660,"335.

[91] Ibid.

Lord Protector, which began as the Barebones Parliament came to an end. Most glaringly, a new twenty-one-member council was installed at December's end under the Lord Protector, which then ended Fifth Monarchists' political positions and influence.

Questions of religious freedom, however, continued to plague the Protectorate. Under the 1653 "Instrument of Government," the provisions of the 1649 revised "Agreement of the People" were carried forward point by point with the mandate that "the present maintenance shall not be taken away nor impeached."[92] This meant that the contested tithe system would be continued. A further enactment to settle religious questions appointed a Commission of Triers, whose responsibility was to approve and oversee ministers. In the words of Cromwell to the first Protectorate Parliament, the commission was "to put a stop to that heady way…of everyman making himself a Minister and Preacher."[93] Such authority directly threatened Fifth Monarchists and others who saw their leaders as God-appointed, not subject to human qualification. This act posited religious institutionalization against individual spiritual freedom.

---

[92] "The Instrument of Government," in *Sources of English Constitutional History: A Selection of Documents from the Interregnum to the Present,* rev. ed., ed. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), 2:528.

[93] Thomas Carlyle, ed. *Oliver Cromwell's Letter and Speeches* (New York: Harper and Brothers, [1924?]), 2:99.

Fifth Monarchists were anti-hierarchal in religious matters and believed their leaders spiritually qualified, though not ecclesiastically ordained. William Aspenwall declared, "If ordination be and of from God, then whether are men immediately and extraordinarily made Ministers by God himself as were the Prophets and Apostles…?"[94]

Cromwell called his new Protectorate Parliament into session in September 1654, and then he lambasted past efforts by Fifth Monarchists to influence legislation in their favor. "But, I say," said Cromwell to his first Protectorate Parliament, "there is another error of a more refined sort; 'which' many honest people whose hearts are sincere, many of them belonging to God, 'have fallen into:' and that is the mistaken notion of the Fifth Monarchy."[95] Cromwell continued his complaint:

> But for men, on this principle, to betitle themselves, that they are the only men to rule kingdoms, govern nations, and give laws to people, and determine of property and liberty and everything else,—upon such pretension as this is:—truly they will need 'to' give clear manifestations of God's presence with them before wise men will receive or submit to their conclusions.[96]

This was followed by Cromwell's more direct threat: "If men do but 'so much as' pretend for justice and righteousness,

---

[94] William Aspenwall, *Certaine Queries Touching the Ordination of Ministers* (London: Printed by Mathew Simmons for Henry Overton, 1647), 1.

[95] Ibid., 93.

[96] Ibid., 95.

and be of peaceable spirits, let them be the subjects of the Magistrate's encouragement."[97] That euphemistic warning, in Cromwell's words, consisted of "punishing visible miscarriages."[98] It served notice that Fifth Monarchists would be subject to government regulation. Cromwell's stance was met with a published rebuttal by Fifth Monarchist minister John Spittlehouse, who declared, "We are hereby the more assured that we are servants of our professed Lord and Master, who was dealt with in the very same manner."[99] Such was "blowing the bellows of Persecution," according to Spittlehouse.[100]

Fifth Monarchist leaders found themselves in and out of prison in the following years. Christopher Feake wrote to his followers from his Windsor Castle imprisonment: "And therefore I desire you to spread my condition before the Lord, that I am sent here by an arbitrary power, no accusers brought face to face, no witnesses produced."[101] These conditions revealed the arbitrariness with which

---

[97] Ibid.

[98] Ibid.

[99] John Spittlehouse, *An Answer to one part of the Lord Protectors Speech: Or, A Vindication of the Fifth Monarchy Men, In reference to an Accusation of Evil charged upon them in his speech to the Parliament in the Painted Chamber, the 4 of September, 1654* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1654), 11.

[100] Ibid., frontpiece.

[101] Feake, *The New Non-Conformist*, 7.

Fifth Monarchists were incarcerated. In February 1658, Cromwell instructed the Lieutenant of the Tower to seize "such as are eminent Fifth-Monarchy-Men," many of whom were once foremost supporters of Cromwell's rise to power.[102] Cromwell further directed, "And we do also hereby authorize and require you to seize or cause to be seized, all books, writings, letters and papers."[103]

One such incident was described by an anonymous "Friend to the prisoners and the good old cause they suffered for" in *A Narrative wherein is faithfully set forth the suffering of John Canne.*[104] In April of 1658, as the writer described, "As they were waiting on the Lord in Prayer and other holy duties, on a sudden the Marshall of the City, with severall other Officers, rushed in with great violence upon them."[105] This altercation was followed by the arrest of the Fifth Monarchist John Canne "while he was thus speaking to the people, exhorting them to patience."[106] After three weeks in prison without charges, he was brought forward and commanded to be silent.

---

[102] Edward Rogers, *Life and Opinions,* 313.

[103] Ibid., 314.

[104] Friend to the prisoners and the good old cause they suffered for, *A Narrative wherein is faithfully set forth the sufferings of John Canne* (London, 1658).

[105] Ibid., 3.

[106] Ibid.

From there Canne was sent to Newgate Prison with seven other Fifth Monarchists, including Christopher Feake. Canne "earnestly entreated them three or four times."[107] Comparing his situation to the Apostle Paul, Canne said, "Give me the liberty which the Heathen gave Paul when he was before them."[108] While Canne was eventually discharged, the incident evidenced extreme forms of harassment under the Protectorate.

Fifth Monarchists' persecution did not end with the Protectorate. The most immediate effect of Charles II's Restoration after Cromwell's death in 1658 was the passage of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, which forgave some of the regicides and condemned others. Among the condemned was Thomas Harrison.[109] Harrison's defense was that he acted under orders of an improperly constituted "one-house" Parliament.[110] Found guilty, his decapitated head was placed outside Westminster Hall, facing the city of London.[111] Henry Vane, a Fifth Monarchy sympathizer, though not a signer of the death warrant of Charles I, was later

---

[107] Ibid, 11.

[108] Ibid.

[109] J. B. Kenyon, *The Civil Wars of England* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988), 231.

[110] Maurice Ashley, *Cromwell's Generals* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1954), 224, 225.

[111] Ibid., 226.

executed for treason.[112] While Fifth Monarchists were specifically targeted as dangerous to the state others, such as Quakers and Baptists, were included as well.

The Restoration of Charles II brought new challenges to religious minorities in England including punitive measures, some of which were apparently brought on by the Fifth Monarchists themselves. In 1661, Thomas Venner led an armed attempt by fifty followers to take London, crying "King Jesus—and their heads upon the gate."[113] Most of the insurgents were arrested and sent to Newgate Prison. Conditions were poor in Newgate Prison according to Chamberlin: "At the height of the Fifth Monarchist panic in 1661, 100 people were packed into one room with no space to lie down. In hot weather, the filth and stench could be unbearable, and plague was a constant threat."[114] Such conditions weakened Fifth Monarchist resistance. In the words of Perez Zagorin, "The brief insurrection of 1661 was to be the last explosion of the Fifth-monarchy men's zeal."[115]

---

[112] Kenyon, *Civil Wars,* 232.

[113] E. R. Chamberlin, *Antichrist and the Millennium* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1975), 105.

[114] Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration,* 176.

[115] Perez Zagorin, *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954), 105.

George Fox, seventeenth-century founder of the Quakers, attributed renewed governmental persecutions to actions of Fifth Monarchists:

> And the King promised liberty of conscience to such as live peaceably and that none should call them in question so that they lived peaceably and we had the word of a king for it. But after the Fifth Monarchy men rise [sic] and made a disturbance many thousands of us and our houses rifled with armed men, and we were much abused.[116]

Fox continued his narration to describe the various punitive fines charged to the Quakers for holding their meetings, so that the cumulative effect came up to "about a hundred thousand a year."[117] After Venner's Rebellion, Baptists were also targeted, according to Fifth Monarchist John Sturgion's *Plea for Toleration*.[118] In an address to Charles II in 1661, Sturgion reminded him of his 1660 Breda Declaration, in which "liberty of tender consciences" had been promised.[119] Sturgion urged the king not to "take away his favor, nor withdraw his grace from all men, because some abuse it."[120]

---

[116] Henry J. Cadbury, ed. *Narrative Papers of George Fox Unpublished or Uncollected* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1972), 28.

[117] Ibid.

[118] John Sturgion, "Plea for Toleration of Opinions and Persuasions in Matters of Religion, Differing from the Church of England," in *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution 1614-1661*, ed. Edward Bean Underhill (New York: Burt Franklin, 1966), 317.

[119] Ibid., 324.

[120] Ibid.

Fifth Monarchists remained the primary target, however. In 1661, Fifth Monarchist John James was taken to the gallows for seditious preaching from Psalm 8:2: “Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger.”[121] John James prayed before the cart was drawn off, “Lord I am now a coming to thee, send down thy holy Angels to convey my Soul into Abrahams Bosom.”[122] The significance of John James’s demise is in the passion it displayed because of the lasting impressions it made upon those who witnessed it. This incident, as well as others, placed Fifth Monarchists in the role of martyrs in the tradition of *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*, which described “the glorious constancy of Christ’s martyrs, the rage of enemies, the alteratin of times, the troubles and travails of the church, from the first primitive age of Christ’s gospel.”[123] Fifth Monarchists identified themselves with the early Christians who suffered persecution by the authorities of their day.

---

[121] Ps. 8:2, KJV.

[122] John James, *The True and Perfect Speech of John James, a Baptist, and Fifth-Monarchy-Man* (London: Printed for George Horton, 1661), 4.

[123] John Foxe, *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe* (New York: AMS Press, 1965), 8:754.

According to historian Christopher Hill, “Fifth Monarchists disappeared, leaving hardly a trace.”[124] The Fifth Monarch movement, however, did set the stage for the cause of religious liberty for nonconformists. There would always be those who did not fit in the established order, and some accommodation by the establishment would become necessary. Suppression of dissenting religious belief only served to enhance the nonconformists’ determination. Fifth Monarchist publications, political pressure, and continued disturbing resistance thus served to help prepare the way for religious minorities in England when it became more acceptable to tolerate than to suppress.

---

[124] Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1972), 306.

Chapter 3

FIFTH MONARCHY WOMEN

As part of their quest for complete religious freedom needed for Christ's millennial rule, the Fifth Monarchists encouraged women's active participation in their movement by providing women with public platforms, supporting networks, and a theoretical framework. In fact, women such as Elizabeth Poole, Anna Trapnel, and Mary Cary became influential public spokespersons for the movement. Little otherwise is known of these ordinary women except for the extraordinary parts they played in the movement they embraced and by which they were embraced in turn.

Existing scholarship on women in the Fifth Monarchy movement has been limited by the perception of it as a male cause, as seen in its academic categorization and description as "Fifth Monarchy Men." B. S. Capp's seminal study, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-century English Millenarianism*, reflected that preoccupation, limiting most mention of women to the Biographical Appendix.[1] Louise Fargo Brown's study, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum,* traced Fifth Monarchy

---

[1] B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 239-70.

women's participation to Baptist worship styles in which "female members also were allowed 'liberty of prophesying,' that is, of saying during the services whatever they believed themselves inspired of God to say."[2] Brown, however, does not pursue this lead much further. P. G. Rogers devotes two pages of his study, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, to show that "women were allowed to play a considerable part in the affairs of the sect."[3] More recently, Tai Liu's *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1600,* which dealt extensively with the rise of Fifth Monarchists, made only one passing reference to women.[4] Despite these statements, studies understated women's public roles in the movement. These striking omissions call for a corrective look at the lives of female Fifth Monarchists, for the role they played extended beyond their group into the public sphere and power structure of their day.

Women's Expected Behavior

Fifth Monarchy women contrasted with seventeenth-century English society by their roles as spokespersons,

---

[2] Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912), 5.

[3] P. G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 147.

[4] Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 125.

visionaries, and activists. Social mores of the day precluded women's participation in the public sphere. New Testament scriptural passages in particular dominated thinking about women in Europe's early modern period, some of which are attributed to St. Paul:

> Let the women learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.[5]

In *The Prospect Before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe*, author Olwen Hufton explains, "The models of female and male which received expression in holy text and the institutions of church and state, in the law and in custom and in the workings of the market place sought to define the scope of action of both men and women."[6] This process directed women's lives, from birth to death to include childhood, motherhood, and widowhood under the guidance, protection, and control of men. Another of St. Paul's admonitions further precluded women from vocal community participation:

> Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at

---

[5] I Tim. 2:11-14, KJV.

[6] Olwen Hufton, *The Prospect before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998), 60-61.

> home, for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.[7]

St. Peter referred to women as "the weaker vessel."[8] Anthony Fletcher notes that the phrase first appeared in 1526 in William Tyndale's New Testament translation and subsequently became common parlance, as well as passing into the 1611 King James Version.[9] Applications of these texts severely limited women's social roles. Fletcher further observes:

> Everyone who attended church, meanwhile, was receiving the constant reiteration of the principles of husbandly authority over wives and parental authority over children and other subordinates, whether servants or apprentices, through the Homily on Obedience, which was often read on Sundays, and through sermons and catechizing.[10]

Women limited their own perspectives within this framework, according to Susan Karant-Nunn who summarizes the status of early European women as follows:

> Most European women undoubtedly went about their business as they always had. They accepted their society's lower valuation of them, believing that subordination to men was indeed God's punishment for Eve's disobedience, and as far as we are able to tell, they did not reflect on this; they were not restive. Their chief concern was probably providing for themselves and their families. At the same time

---

[7] I Cor. 14:34, 35, KJV.

[8] I Peter 3:7, KJV.

[9] Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 60.

[10] Ibid., 205.

> religion was embedded in their worldview. They practiced their religion with a fervor varying from individual to individual and took part in all the movements of their day. It is likely that only a few regretted their marginal status within each creed. The concern for equality, both within religious institutions and in society at large, belonged to the future.[11]

"There was not much to choose," Hufton argues, "between the standards that the Protestant and Catholic churches sought to apply."[12]

While the Protestant reformation did little to change the status of women, later radical, particularly millennial, seventeenth-century English sects saw a future that included women as prophetesses. Fifth Monarchists based their view of women on a quotation from the Old Testament prophet Joel indicating a future time of spiritual infusion that transcended gender:

> And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaidens in those days will I pour out my spirit.[13]

This passage indicated to Fifth Monarchists a spiritual era with increased expectations, particularly for women, before the millennial rule of Christ. This new emphasis produced

---

[11] Susan C. Karant-Nunn, "The Reformation of Women," in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, 3rd ed., ed. Renate Bridenthal, Susan Mosher Stuard, and Merry E. Weisner (New York: Houghton Mifflin 1998), 197.

[12] Hufton, *The Prospect before Her,* 19.

[13] Joel 2:28, 29, KJV.

changes in women's status among Fifth Monarchists, opening to them a category of rank as prophetic speakers and writers. According to Diane Willen, "What were seen as the traditional female qualities—passivity, irrationality, and passion—allowed contemporaries to accept women as visionaries."[14] Nigel Smith finds that "1640 was the first time the phenomenon had broken out on such a scale, set as it was against the wider background of political and civil turmoil in the following years."[15] He attributes this effect to the "abolition of episcopal government, the collapse of censorship, and the absence of church government throughout the Interregnum."[16] Similarly, Orianne Smith traces a tradition of female prophecy to the English Civil War,

> Although the female prophet can be found throughout Judeo-Christian history, and can arguably be traced even back to the sibyls of antiquity, the English Civil War created a new and entirely different type of visionary. Writing in a time of extreme uncertainty about England's future, they tended to be overtly political and apocalyptic.[17]

---

[14] Diane Willen, "Women and Religion in Early Modern England," in *Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe: Public and Private Worlds*, ed. Sherrin Marshall (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 147.

[15] Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 3.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Orianne Smith, "'Unlearned and ill-qualified Pokers into Prophecy': Hester Lynch Piozzi and the Female Prophetic Tradition," *Eighteenth Century Life* 28, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 89.

Unsettling political events were to occur before the Second Coming of Christ. Fifth Monarchists worked toward this event in the interim by promoting a theology of the coming rule of saint-believers who were defined as those sympathetic to their views. With this prophetic interpretation, Fifth Monarchists supported women's public activities beyond the normative roles of women in their time. According to Susan Wiseman, these activities "canvassed what the role of women might be in a new order of spiritual and political hierarchy."[18] Historian Philip Rogers notes:

> Although the Fifth Monarchy Men were not in general what in modern parlance would be called "progressive" thinkers, in one question, at least, the status of women, they showed an enlightened attitude, which was unusual in an age which on the whole relegated women to a domestic and subordinate role.[19]

This inclusion was best exemplified by Fifth Monarchist preacher John Rogers's words urging women congregants to "Keep your rights which Christ hath got and won for you, maintain your rights, defend your liberties even to the life; lose it not, but be courageous and keep it."[20] Similarly, Hugh Peters, Cromwell's chaplain, made

---

[18] Susan Wiseman, "Anna Trapnel," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:218.

[19] P. G. Rogers, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, 146.

[20] Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), 69.

this tribute to Fifth Monarchist Mary Cary, "That she hath taught her sexes that there are more ways than one to avoid idleness (the devils cushion on which so many sit and sleep their last. They that will not use the Distaff, may improve a pen."[21] This indicated freedom for women to choose their roles, no longer circumscribed by prescribed activities. The difference for these women was, in the words of Nigel Smith, "the authority which they claimed through special access to the divine."[22] As Hilda Smith explains,

> Women's role within the sectarian movement came less from a political than a religious commitment, but of course these two areas were not distinct in the seventeenth century. When God's will was being thwarted on earth, it was the duty of the true believer to right this wrong, and such efforts often involved criticism of the established government."[23]

Elizabeth Poole's Prophesying

Elizabeth Poole joined Fifth Monarchist John Pendarves' Baptist Church at Abingdon after her falling out with London's Particular Baptists, a Calvinist sect. She brought with her the reputation of a prophetess who had

---

[21] Hugh Peters, "To the Reader," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:185.

[22] Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed*, 25.

[23] Hilda L. Smith, *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1982), 53-54.

unsuccessfully pled for the life of King Charles I before Cromwell's General Council at Whitehall. In December 1648 she had been introduced by Oliver Cromwell himself as "being sent by God to the Army with a Revelation."[24] The fact that Elizabeth Poole presented herself before the ruling power at that time indicates the seriousness with which her claims were taken by the New Model Army's leaders and also reveals the tenor of those times. The English Civil War was an overturning of norms and traditions that created opportunity for women such as Elizabeth Poole to be heard and to publish their views. The apocalyptic tenor of the era, in particular the views of the Fifth Monarchists, gave shape and substance to their voices. As Hilary Hinds explains:

> It was under these circumstances and in this context that notions of spiritual equality came to be of such significance for the proliferating sects. The "ungendered soul" on which this equality depends is key to an understanding of both the proliferation of writings by women from the sects in the mid-seventeenth century, and the dynamics of the textual processes themselves, for it offered a discourse that was both oppositional to and rooted in the status quo, both subversive and conservative.[25]

---

[24] William Clarke,*The Clarke Papers: Selections from the Papers of William Clarke* (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), 2:xx.

[25] Hilary Hinds, *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth-Century Radical Sectarian Writing and Feminist Criticism* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), 49.

Hinds further notes, as a consequence "texts by women from the radical religious sects…constituted the majority of women's published writings in the seventeenth century."[26]

Poole had fully supported Cromwell's military success. To her, God's timing in a larger prophetic scenario was evidenced by Cromwell's New Model Army. "You have been Noble-men, behaving yourselves with much valor and courage," she intoned.[27] On the other hand, her visionary pronouncement was one of warning that they not fall short of "acting your parts before God and man."[28] The army was in danger of giving into popular demands, she claimed, and of securing their own self-interests, rather than pursuing the well being of the nation. She called upon the army "to be dead unto all your own interests, lives, liberties, freedoms, or whatsoever you might call yours."[29] Poole elaborated her argument using religious language:

> The Kingly power is undoubtedly fallen into your hands; therefore my advice is, that you take heed to improve it for the Lord. You have justly blamed those who have gone before you, for betraying their trust therein. I speake not this as you are souldiers, but as the spirit of Judgement and Justice is most lively appearing in

---

[26] Ibid., 3.

[27] Elizabeth Poole, "A Vision: Wherein is Manifested the Disease and Cure of the Kingdome," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:49.

[28] Ibid., 50.

[29] Ibid., 48.

> you, that this is therefore the great worke which lieth upon you, to become dead to every pleasant picture, which might present it self for your delight, that you perfectly dying in the will of the Lord, you may finde your resurrection in him.[30]

Soldiers needed to surrender self-interests to fulfill their mission of bringing change to the nation, according to Poole's metaphor of death and resurrection. Their power needed to be used wisely and authoritatively, in Poole's rationale, and not be compromised. In Poole's view, "The Agreement of the People," drawn up by egalitarian Leveller followers of Lieutenant-Colonel John Lilburne calling for democratic reforms, was to be rejected on the grounds that in doing otherwise "thereby you give up the trust committed to you."[31] The army's gains were God-given and non-transferable "in as much as the Kingly Power is fallen into your hands."[32] According to the Council's clerk, Lilburne's petition was to be read for consideration by Council immediately afterward.[33] Ironically, Elizabeth Poole later came to the defense of John Lilburne.[34] Relationships between these various competing factions remained fluid in spite of their differences.

---

[30] Ibid., 49.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Clarke, *The Clarke Papers,* 2:154.

[34] Susan Wiseman, "Elizabeth Poole," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:45.

Poole's earlier defense of the life of Charles I brought her further public attention. Unfortunately, she was expelled from the church of her choice for her stance.[35] She had been a Particular Baptist but, like many others of that faith, had been drawn to Fifth Monarchist millennial views. Elizabeth Poole declared, when asked directly about Charles I by Cromwell's Council, "Bring him to his trial, that he may be convicted in his conscience, but touch not his person."[36] This final declaration was based on several biblical injunctions, including the Golden Rule. Just as the biblical wife could not put away a husband, neither could subjects take the life of their husband-king. They were bound as Nathan and his wife Abigail, who interceded before David for her husband's life, even though he was abusive. As Poole saw it, although Charles I had broken this bond, the army was still bound by their honor. The army alone held the power to "commit an unsound member to Satan (though the head) as its flesh; that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord."[37]

An anonymous writer at that time considered Poole's appearance before the Council as an arranged event "taught beforehand by Cromwell and Ireton, by whose order she was

---

[35] Diane Watt, *Secretaries of God: Women Prophets in Late Medieval and Early Modern England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997), 128.

[36] Poole, "A Vision," 52.

[37] Ibid., 53.

entertained at Whitehall."[38] Cromwell, as described, primed the Council to hear her with full attention, even weeping as she entered.[39] Her detractor depicted her revelation as:

> That the glorious time of setting up Christ's Kingdom was near at hand, and that Antichrist must be speedily thrown down, and that they were the instruments that were ordained to throw him down, and how they were about that great work, and that if they would prosper in it, they must first remove the King out of the way, which they must do by proceeding first to try him, and then to condemn him, and then to depose him, but not put him to death.[40]

Katharine Gillespie notes, in *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere,* that some thought "Poole's role had been part of a plot by Cromwell to find divine sanction for his power struggles against the Levellers."[41]

Poole's critics may have been right about the timing of her prophecy. She herself recognized the immediacy of the moment. She acknowledged, "I know and am very sensible, that no small straight lyeth upon you in respect of securing his person."[42] This issue of what to do with

---

[38] William Clarke, *The Clarke Papers,* 2:xx.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Ibid., xxi.

[41] Katharine Gillespie, *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 141.

[42] Poole, "A Vision," 51.

the king had been repeatedly debated between the factions represented in the General Council of the Army. Cromwell sought to negotiate the king's power and preserve the office, but radicals saw the king's demise as the final answer to their dilemma. Poole was closely questioned as to "what demonstration or token she can give that it is from God."[43] She replied, "I saw no vision, nor no angel, nor heard no voice, but my spirit being drawn out about those things, I was in it. So far as it is from God I think it is a revelation."[44] That claim to revelation gave Poole her voice. As Manfred Brod explains, "The very few women who walked the corridors of power in their own right were prophetesses, and of these it is only Elizabeth Poole who is known to have participated directly in the discussions of high policy."[45]

To spare the life of Charles I was the sticking point. Elizabeth Poole reiterated her stand the following year in "An Alarum of War, Given to the Army and to their High Court of Justice (so called) by the Will of God."[46] She reminded the Council of her original statements,

---

[43] Clarke, *The Clarke Papers,* 2:167.

[44] Ibid., 2:167-68.

[45] Manfred Brod, "Politics and Prophecy in Seventeenth Century England: The Case of Elizabeth Poole," *Albion* 31, no. 3 (Autumn, 1999): 411.

[46] Elizabeth Poole, "An Alarum of War, Given to the Army and to their High Court of Justice (so called) by the Will of God," in *Women's*

> I did also plead with them about the life of the King, and it hath been sayd since, if I had spoken indeed in the word of the Lord, they had not power to have taken his life, though they cannot be ignorant that many have been spoken to in the word of the Lord, who have been punished for not obeying.[47]

Poole then turned her attention to the consequences of the beheading of Charles I, stating,

> When I told you the Kingly power was fallen into your hand, it was manifested by your earnest pursuit (in profession) after righteousness, judgment, truth, equities, which appeared also most livelie in you, till there was nothing that would satisfy you, but the blood of the King, a man with whom you were in Covenant, and had sworn to defend his person.[48]

Now, she added, "The Lord's controversy is with you."[49]

Poole did find some limited support for her views, particularly the rejection of the Levellers' Agreement of the People. In the words of Council member Cowling, the document "surrendered the Army's power" which to him represented a return to Egypt.[50] Fifth Monarchist Colonel Nathaniel Rich likewise expressed sympathetic agreement with her views:

Political Writings, 1610-1725, ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2: 54.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., 57.

[49] Ibid., 58.

[50] A. S. P. Woodhouse, ed., *Puritanism and Liberty: Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951), 471.

> I cannot but give you that impression that is on my spirit in connection with that testimony which God hath manifested here by an unexpected providence…I think every man is to search his own heart, and to see what is within and not to look for deliverance from himself or from men from outward means, but from that kingdom which, when it comes, will have no end.[51]

This indicated the millennial perspective by which Rich received Poole's prophecy. Coronet George Joyce was also influenced by Poole's presentation as he later echoed her words, "We should not so much endeavor to give away the power God hath called us to."[52] Poole also found support from her new pastor, Fifth Monarchist John Pendarves and his wife, Thomasine Pendarves.[53]

Anna Trapnel's Visions

As with Elizabeth Poole, Anna Trapnel attracted national attention with her revelations and also appeared before ruling authorities to defend them. Anna Trapnel could not have pursued her style of prophetic career without the material aid, physical assistance, and emotional support available to her through the network of Fifth Monarchy members and followers. Trapnel summarized her Fifth Monarchist connections:

---

[51] Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty,* 469.

[52] Charles H. Firth, "Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison," in *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* New Series, April 1892-April 1893 (Worcester: Published by the Society, 1898), 8:404.

[53] Wiseman, "Elizabeth Poole," 45.

> I have walked in fellowship with the Church meeting at All-Hallows, (whereof Mr. John Simpson is a member) for the space of about four years; I am well known to him and that whole society, also to Mr. Greenhil Preacher at Stepney, and most of that society, to Mr. Henry Jesse, and most of his society, to Mr. Venning Preacher at Olaves in Southwark, and most of his society, to Mr. Knollis, and most of his society, who have knowledge of me, and of my conversation.[54]

Within this fellowship Trapnel began her spiritual career in which, according to her inner voice, "the universality of Saints shall have discoveries of God through thee."[55] Earlier experiences had prepared the foundation for her prophetic role. Nine years before her dying mother had prayed, "Lord! Double thy spirit upon my child."[56] Trapnel later had a vision of New Jerusalem at All-Hallows Church where she experienced "rivers of tears, that I shrunk down in the room; and cryed out in my heart, 'Lord, what is this?'"[57] The answer came, she said, as "thou shalt have more visions hereafter."[58]

These earlier experiences were followed by depressive episodes which Trapnel ascribed to God who "suffered Sathan

---

[54] Anna Trapnel, "The Cry of a Stone, or a Relation of Something Spoken in Whitehall by Anna Trapnel, being in the Visions of God," in *Women's Political Writings 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:224.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., 2:225.

[58] Ibid.

to buffet me."[59] Although she did not doubt her revelations, Trapnel struggled with thoughts of suicide. Her thoughts were self-deprecating and she saw herself "as the worst of God's flock."[60] During these times, "two Godly men and a Godly man watched with me every night," according to Trapnel.[61] In spite of this support, she was tempted in her conflict "never to come among the Saints again."[62] It was only after these personal struggles that she said, "The Lord filled me with many spiritual Hymns, as to my temptations, promising that my joy should abundantly outpass my sorrow."[63] Her inner voice reassured her, "I let thee see what thou art in thy self to keep thee humble, I am about to shew thee great things and visions which thou hast been ignorant of."[64]

Trapnel emulated the prophetess Wight, a member of Henry Jessey's London Fifth Monarchy-influenced church, and Trapnel's ensuing career was "remarkably similar to her predecessor, as if Sarah Wight had established the required behaviour and rhetoric for a gathered church prophetess."[65]

---

[59] Ibid., 2:228.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid., 2:229.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid., 2:224.

[65] Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed,* 49.

Both women were given to extended fasts, prophetic trances, and oracular outpourings, which were often sung. Crucially, according to Nigel Smith, both "needed to be part of godly communities in order to have the authority to prophesy."[66] Crucially, authentication of Trapnel's theology and prophetic gift was provided by her Fifth Monarchist pastor of London's All Hallows, John Simpson.[67]

All Hallows was a center of Fifth Monarchist discontent with Cromwell's policies. Informant Marchmont Nedham attended the congregation and found Trapnel's prophesying there a source of threat to Cromwell. "She is much visited and does a world of mischief in London, and would do in the country," Nedham reported.[68] Her mischief, as it were, was in portraying Cromwell as having failed Fifth Monarchist millennial hopes. Trapnel further came to the attention of Cromwell's officials when she attempted to attend the 1654 Whitehall trial of Fifth Monarchist preacher Vavasor Powell for treason against Cromwell. She began a near-fortnight noon-to-nightfall siege of on-site fasting, singing, and prophesying against Cromwell, as later recorded in her work, "The Cry of a Stone." According to this account, "she was beyond and besides her

---

[66] Ibid., 51.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Wiseman, "Anna Trapnel," 2:219.

thoughts or intentions, having much trouble in her hearts, and being seized upon by the Lord."[69] Colonel Sydenham, a member of Cromwell's Council of State, and Colonel Robert Bennet and his wife were among "many eminent persons" who gave her a hearing, according to Trapnel's account in "Strange and Wonderful Newes from White-hall."[70] Colonel Sydenham had served as governor of Weymouth and the Isle of Wight.[71] Robert Bennett was a member of the Barebones Parliament and supporter of religious liberty.[72] These highly placed attendees were a measure of her influence.

Trapnel's visions at that time revealed her perception of Oliver Cromwell's dual nature. On the one hand, Trapnel saw him as a potential biblical Gideon, leading God's army to their promised destiny. On the other hand, she viewed Cromwell as Daniel's prophesied oppressive fourth horn which was different from the other three, according to Trapnel: "Because of great proud and swelling words, and great promises of kindness should go forth to it from all

---

[69] Trapnel, "The Cry of a Stone," 223.

[70] Anna Trapnel, "Strange and Wonderful Newes from White-hall: Or, The Mighty Visions Proceeding from Mistris Anna Trapnel," in *Women's Political Writings 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:282.

[71] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), s.v."Sydenham, William."

[72] Ibid., s.v. "Bennett, Robert."

people, like unto that of Absolom, speaking good words to people in the gate to draw their affections away from the honest David."[73] The horn metaphorically represented authority and power, which Cromwell held at the time. In her view, just as the biblical Absalom tried to displace his father's rule, so did Cromwell attempt to substitute his Protectorate for the true kingdom of Christ and His saints. This revelation was followed by another vision indicating the ultimate victory of the saints. Trapnel envisioned children walking on the earth with a shining light around them and a glorious Being in their midst with a crown on his head, who said, "These will I honor with my Reigning presence in the midst of them, and the Oppressor shall die in the wilderness."[74] With striking scriptural imagery, Trapnel not so subtly declared the demise of Cromwell. The children of her vision were the believer-saints, and Christ himself the glorious Being. The oppressor of her vision was Cromwell. After her ordeal at Whitehall, she simply "rose up in the morning, and the same day travelled on foot from White-hall to Hackney; and from thence back to Mark-lane in London in health and strength."[75] When later questioned about her experiences at

---

[73] Ibid., 2:283.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid. 2:285.

Whitehall, Trapnel described Cromwell as the real prisoner. "He is in Chains," she said, "by reason of that pomp and glory that is round about him."[76] She added, "Besides, the kingdom of the Lord Jesus is at hand, all the Monarchies of this world are going down the hill."[77]

After revisiting London, Trapnel followed her inward call to Cornwall in defense of Fifth Monarchist preachers Christopher Feake and her pastor John Simpson, who were charged with treason against Cromwell. Trapnel was subsequently arrested in Cornwall where she was staying with Fifth Monarchist sympathizers Captain and Mrs. Francis Langdon. Captain Langdon had been a member of the Barebones Parliament in 1653, and had visited Trapnel earlier in London.[78] She described her arrest:

> These justices that came to fetch me out of my bed, they made a great tumult, them and their followers, in the house, and some came upstairs crying "A witch! A witch!" making a great stir on the stairs. And a poor honest man rebuking such that said so, he was tumbled downstairs and beaten too, by one of the justices' followers. And the justices made a great noise in putting out of my chamber where I lay many of my friends; and they said if my friends would not take me up, they would have some should take me up.[79]

---

[76] Trapnel, "Cry of a Stone," 2:238.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Anna Trapnel, "From: Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea," in *Her Own Life: Autobiographical Writings by Seventeenth-Century Englishwomen*, ed. Elizabeth Graham, Hilary Hinds, Elaine Hobby, and Helen Wilcox (New York: Routledge, 1989), Footnotes, 85.

[79] Ibid., 76.

Trapnel's friends became her mainstay, and their support continually surrounded her and supplied her needs in every situation. They acted as a barrier so that Trapnel could say, "The Lord kept me this day from their cruelty, which they had a good mind further to let out against me."[80] The charges against her were not only spiritual, including witchcraft, but also political as sedition. Her accusers "came to catch at my words. And it was probable that the rulers sent some to watch for that could be further against me," according to Trapnel.[81] She further relied on friends who "kept most part of that night in prayer on my behalf."[82]

Trapnel pled not guilty to the charges. When questioned about her Whitehall visions of Cromwell as the fulfillment of Daniel's little horn prophecy, she said,

> What was spoken at Whitehall, at a place of concourse of people, and near a council I suppose wise enough to call me into question if I offended, and unto them I appeal. But though it was said I appealed to Caesar and unto Caesar should I go, yet I have not been brought before him which is called Caesar.[83]

That Caesar, to Trapnel, was Oliver Cromwell himself. Her use of St. Paul's experience before Roman authorities asserted her own legal rights before the court, creating a

---

[80] Ibid., 77.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid., 78.

[83] Ibid., 80.

parallel between her own case and the persecution of early Christians. When asked why she left Whitehall, she replied, "Why I may not be with my friends anywhere?"[84] During her trial, she assertively informed her inquisitors:

> I will leave one word with you, and that is this: a time will come when you and I shall appear before the great judge of the tribunal of the most high, and then I think you will hardly be able to give an account for this days work before the Lord at that day of true judgment."[85]

Trapnel had many supporters during her imprisonment in Bridewell, which had a scandalous reputation for holding the worst women offenders. "There goes a Bridewell bird," Trapnel heard in her head, if not in reality, as she said, the Tempter suggested.[86] "I should be a byword and a laughingstock while I lived, and that everyone would point at me as I went up and down the streets," she explained.[87] Her greatest comfort came from Ursula Adman, one of the women of the All Hallows congregation, who stayed with her in Bridewell for seven weeks.[88] Trapnel described Adman as "a friend born for the day of adversity, as Solomon speaks; and indeed she, night and day, showed her tenderness to me

---

[84] Ibid., 81.

[85] Ibid., 84.

[86] Anna Trapnel, "Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea," in *English Women's Voices,* ed. Charlotte F. Otten (Miami: Florida International University, 1992), 67.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Ibid, 71.

and helped to bear my burden."[89] Although Trapnel was later exonerated she would not have survived without the support of her co-religionists, who came to her six at a time.[90] Her relationships within the Fifth Monarchy movement and her prophetic views sustained her in times of personal turmoil and outward trial.

Mary Cary's Proclamations

Of all the representative Fifth Monarch women, Mary Cary became the most political. While she, too, derived her support from the movement, she influenced its direction to a greater degree than other women. Her style was different from that of Elizabeth Poole and Anna Trapnel. Less visionary than these, according to Katherine Gillespie, Cary followed "the strictest plain-style emphasis upon argumentation through enumeration of reasons and points."[91] Her pronouncements were both more expository and practical. In a political sense, she became the Fifth Monarchy movement's theoretician within their millennial framework. In her perspective of events, "That time is already come."[92] The fact that Charles I was beheaded may be

---

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., 68.

[91] Gillespie, 222.

[92] Mary Cary, "The Resurrection of the Witnesses and England's Fall from the Mystical Babylon Rome," in *English Women's Voices*, ed. Charlotte F. Otten (Miami: Florida International Press, 1992), 101.

traced in part to statements of Mary Cary, who termed Charles a “man of blood.”[93] That appellation caught on quickly among Cromwell’s more radical followers, including Fifth Monarchist Major-General Thomas Harrison, who was assigned to guard Charles I before his trial.[94] The designation of Charles I as “man of blood” later justified his execution.

It is further significant that among the forewords to Cary’s 1651 prophetic essay, “The Little Horns Doom and Downfall or a Scripture-Prophesie of King James and King Charles and of this Present Parliament, Unfolded,” was the endorsement by Cromwell’s chaplain Hugh Peters:

> A holy, modest, and painfull spirit, runs through her endeavours; which I desire may not be slighted by any, nor thrown by: for good wine may be found in Cluster; in this dress you shall neither see naked Brests, black Patches, nor long Trains; but an heart breathing after the coming of Christ and the comfort of Saints.[95]

Peters further linked Cary with Elizabeth of Bohemia, sister of Charles I, and Anna Maria van Schurman “of deserved note.”[96] This linkage enhanced Cary’s reputation as a woman of letters. According to Joyce Irwin, seventeenth-century Dutch mystic Schurman “achieved international fame

---

[93] Cary, “The Little Horns Doom & Downfall,” 2:199.

[94] Godwin, *History of the Commonwealth,* 4:655.

[95] Peters, “To the Reader,” 2:185.

[96] Ibid.

in early adulthood as the most learned woman of the age."[97] Additionally, Schurman's writings and correspondence made it "evident that there was already an international network of women interested in pursuing and defending the intellectual life."[98] By writing his generous tribute, Peters indicated sympathy with Cary's Fifth Monarchism, although he differed from some of Cary's views of "the personal reign," presumably of Christ himself rather than through believers.[99] The fact that he wrote as he did indicated a kind of seventeenth-century alliance and networking among those holding parallel expectations. This also indicated endorsement of Cary by non-Fifth Monarchists.

Baptist preacher Henry Jessey was also among those who wrote endorsements of Cary's work. Even though he was not formally a Fifth Monarchist, he was closely linked to their perspectives. He wrote:

> I have been frequently greatly refreshed in my spirits, for above twenty yeers, with the consideration of the glorious state and priviledges of the New Jerusalem that shall be on earth, and the certainty therof, foretold by the Prophets and Apostles; whose prophecies to this

---

[97] Joyce Irwin, "Anna Maria van Schurman: Learned Woman of Utrecht," in *Women Writers of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Katharina M. Wilson and Frank J. Warnke (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989), 164.

[98] Ibid., 167.

[99] Peters, "To the Reader," 2:185.

> purpose being cited in this book, are therin, with much cleerness, familiarly explained."[100]

Fifth Monarchist pastor Christopher Feake referred to Cary's discourse as "a Gentlewomans thoughts put into form and order by her self."[101] It was that order of exposition that made Mary Cary's contributions to the movement's prophetic platform unique. "Indeed, many wise men after the flesh have been (and now are) much offended," Feake noted, "that a company of illiterate men, and silly women, should pretend to any skill in dark prophecies, and to a foresight of future events."[102] In contrast to seventeenth-century English society, Fifth Monarchists embraced these contributions.

What did Mary Cary have to say? Not only did she link Charles I with Daniel's Old Testament prophecy of a doomed little horn, but she also saw the whole Cromwellian revolution as the divine means "to judge this little Horne, and to take away his dominion, to consume, and to destroy it unto the end."[103] In Cary's view, contemporary events

---

[100] Henry Jessey, "Touching this Treatise the Judgement of H. Jessey," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:187.

[101] Feake, "Reader," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom and Downfall," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*, ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:189.

[102] Ibid., 2:188.

[103] Ibid, 2:197.

lined up item by item with ancient prophetic descriptions. Charles I had ruled over three kingdoms, he had oppressed and made war on non-conformist saints, and now they, through Parliament, sat in judgment of him. Now it was time "that his blood was also justly required at his hands, having caused so much innocent blood to bee shed."[104]

Then there were Cary's "Twelve Humble Proposals," addressed in 1653 to the Barebones Parliament. The Proposals lay the spiritual foundations for setting "up the Kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth."[105] In this new order of things, previously closed non-conformist meeting places were to be opened, tithe laws were to be repealed, universities reformed, the poor aided and given work, postal rates fixed, justice equally applied, local government empowered, laws simplified, and public service and lands be maintained with integrity.[106] Further, directing her message to political authorities, she proclaimed,

> Be wise ye rulers…and let it be your care to relieve the oppressed, and to judge the cause of the poor & needy, and let justice and judgment take place with you, suffer not others to oppress, neither let it be found among you; Let not the complaints of the poor, and the sighing of the needy, enter into the ears of the Lord of Sabboth

---

[104] Ibid.,2:199.

[105] Ibid.,2:204.

[106] Ibid., 2:206-15.

> against you; but execute judgment and justice in your gates: so shall the kingdome be blessed and prosper.[107]

These were intended to "to give the world a taste, what it is to have Jesus Christ to reign over the Nations of the earth."[108] This, according to Cary, "will as visibly demonstrate that he is King and reigneth, as if he were personally on earth."[109] His saints were "to be his forerunners."[110]

Esther Gilman Richey, in *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance*, finds Cary's social program "rooted in egalitarian economics."[111] Further, Dorothy Ludlow sees this agenda as "the most comprehensive corrective of social ills drawn up by a woman in the period."[112] However, Ludlow notes, "The implementation of her program is less clearly spelled out."[113] Perhaps this is because Cary's idealizations were linked to Fifth

---

[107] Mary Cary, "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:172-73.

[108] Mary Cary, "Twelve Humble Proposals to the Supreme Governors of the Three Nations Now Assembled at Westminster," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725,* ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 2:204.

[109] Ibid.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Esther Gilman Richey, *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance* (Colombia: University of Missouri Press, 1998), 199.

[112] Dorothy Paula Ludlow, "Arise and Be Doing: English Preaching Women 1640-1660" (Ph. D. diss., Indiana University, 1978), 267.

[113] Ibid.

Monarchy millennial hopes, to a heaven on earth. In this future, "No infant of days shall die, none shall die while they are young; all shall come to a good old age."[114] In *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England,* Phyllis Mack concludes, "For most prophetic women, the final solution was to project their utopian visions of equality into a spiritual millennium outside normal life."[115] That gap between practical realities and millennial ideals would remain as the movement's ultimate vulnerability, because the projected future was more fluid than the present.

Another important plank in Mary Cary's platform was freedom in religious matters. She was ahead of both her peers and her time in these issues. Fifth Monarchists pled for their freedom to pursue their own course, but generally were not clear about freedom for others once their objectives had been reached. Fifth Monarchists assumed that once millennial light had dawned all would be in harmony. Cary rejected narrow sectarianism:

> I answer, they are not confined to any society of men, that are distinguished by such or such a title, as Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Seekers…and therefore cannot be defined by any such title, as to

---

[114] Cited by Elaine Hobby, "'Discourse so unsavory': Women's Published Writings of the 1650s," in *Women, Writing, History, 1640-1740*, ed. Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 26.

[115] Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 122.

> say, only such as are Presbyterians are the Saints of Jesus Christ, or only such as are Anabaptists are the Saints of Jesus Christ."[116]

Each group had its own truth with the Presbyterians emphasizing church government by rule of elders, Anabaptists focusing on adult baptism, Independents insisting on congregational autonomy, and Seekers finding their own way. To Cary, their commonalties outweighed their differences.

In addition to these positions was Mary Cary's compelling advocacy of women's voices in the public sphere. She praised Oliver Cromwell's wife, Elizabeth, and his daughter, Bridget Ireton, and Margaret Rolle, wife of Chief Justice Henry Rolle, in her *Little Horns Doom* dedication as "The Vertuous, Heroicall, and Honourable Ladies."[117] Seeing them as exemplary jewels of the Commonwealth, she observed:

> God hath selected and chosen out your Ladyships, and placed you in some of the highest places of honor (according to your present capacities) in the three Nations; wherein you have more than ordinary opportunities to honor him.[118]

Furthermore, they were examples to other women entering the public sphere, shining "gloriously, in the severall spheres wherein God hath set you."[119]

---

[116] Cary, "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England," 2:179.

[117] Cary, "Little Horns Doom," 2:182.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Ibid., 2:183.

But it was not just women in high places whom Mary Cary exhorted to take their place in public life. Her spiritual mandate extended to all women. Following her *Little Horns Doom*, with its analysis of the fate of the late Charles I, was her 1656 blueprint for the future, *A New or More Exact Mappe or Description of New Jerusalems Glory*. In it she challenged her sex:

> And if there be very few men that are thus furnished with the gift of the Spirit; how few are the women! Not but that there are many godly women, many who have indeed received the Spirit; but in how small a measure is it? How weak are they? And how unable to prophesie?[120]

Cary foresaw better things for both men and women:

> Christianity; or whether it be learned, or unlearned; or whether it be male, or female: I say, a soul indued with Understanding and Reason, is capable of Religion, and all religious performances, if it be indued with the Spirit; and there is not other thing absolutely necessary thereunto. And when the Spirit shall be more abundantly poured out upon Saints, this shall be made evident; so that, according to this gracious promise, sons and daughters, servants and handmaids, old men and young men shall prophesie.[121]

Not everyone approved of these women preachers. Contemporaries such as Thomas Edwards often held them in contempt. He described a particular incident:

---

[120] Mary Cary, "The New Jerusalem's Glory," in *Internet Modern History Sourcebook: Radical Women during the English Revolution* http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/17women.html (accessed May 31, 2008).

[121] Cary, *A New and More Exact Mappe*, 239.

> Whereupon this Lace-woman turned herselfe to the company, and spake to some of them to exercise, excusing her selfe that she was somewhat indisposed for this worke, and said if any one there had a word of exhortation let them speake; but all the company keeping silent, none speaking: Then the Lace-woman began with making a speech to this purpose, That now the days were come, and that was fulfilled which was spoken of in the Scriptures, That God would pour out of his Spirit upon the handmaidens, and they should prophecy.[122]

Unfortunately, this incident ended with "such laughing, confusion, and disorder at the meeting that the minister professed he never saw the like."[123] But while others were dismissive of the women's attempts to be heard, the wonder was that they were heard at all.

Elizabeth Poole, Anna Trapnel, and Mary Cary took their place in the public sphere as spokespersons during England's critical mid-seventeenth century years with the Fifth Monarchy movement's message and support, and thereby received national attention. On their own, without these supportive connections and contexts, their voices and writings would have been lost.

---

[122] Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena* (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1977), 85.

[123] Ibid., 86.

Chapter 4

THE FIFTH MONARCHISTS AND THE JEWS

Franz Kobler, writing for the World Jewish Conference in 1956 about the history of the British movement for the restoration of the Jews, notes, “Nowhere more than in Britain has the idea of the Restoration of the Jews been developed into a doctrine and become the object of a movement extending over more than three centuries.”[1] In crediting non-Jewish advocates, Kobler adds, “The most provocative expression of the Restoration idea was sounded by the Fifth Monarchy Men who looked forward to the establishment of a new World Monarchy.”[2]

The Issue of Jewry

The larger question of readmitting Jews to England, from which they had been banned since the time of Edward I (1272-1307), has been generally overlooked by both Christian and Jewish historians. Both camps have tended to ignore Fifth Monarchist activity, but for different reasons. Mainstream Christian writers have been influenced by “replacement theories” which held that the New Testament

---

[1] Franz Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine* (London: Lincolns-Prager, 1956), 7.

[2] Ibid., 21.

church had displaced the Israel of the Old Testament and precluded further consideration of Jewish history.[3] Jewish writers, on the other hand, have traced their own history apart from Christianity.[4] What Kobler, as well as other historians, did not elaborate upon, was the development and influence of Jewish sympathies among Fifth Monarchists themselves. This chapter traces that relationship by showing the links that existed between the Fifth Monarchists and the Jews. Linked to Jews by strong sympathetic identification, and literal biblical interpretations of Jewish conversion and restoration, Fifth Monarchists played a significant role in promoting the return of the Jews to England.

Old Testament Influences

Seventeenth-century England experienced "a revival of Old Testament and Hebrew studies," according to David Katz. This, Katz adds, "at least familiarized Englishmen with the rudiments of Judaism."[5] Nahum Sokolow, in his *History of Zionism 1600-1918*, explains,

> Hence among the Puritans there were many admirers of "God's ancient people" and Cromwell himself joined in

---

[3] Jaques B. Doukhan, *Israel and the Church: Two Voices for the Same God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 56.

[4] Kobler, *The Vision Was There,* 8

[5] David Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 17.

> this admiration. It was by this Biblical *Hebrew* movement that public opinion in England had been prepared for a sympathetic treatment of the idea of a readmission of the Jews into England.[6]

This identification with the Old Testament provided a link for Fifth Monarchists to all things Jewish. After the execution of Charles I, in-governmental issues were, for Fifth Monarchists, to be dealt with on the basis of how things were handled in the Israel of the Old Testament. When Fifth Monarchist Major-General Thomas Harrison, Cromwell's one-time right hand, was asked how the country should be governed, as we have seen, he referred to the example set by the seventy-member Jewish Sanhedrin as their highest authority.[7] The new Israel, or the coalition of the English godly including Fifth Monarchists, was to be modeled after the original biblical patterns. Charles Firth explains, "It was to realize on English soil the ideal commonwealth, a society which would resemble more closely the Jewish theocracy, than the republics of the Greeks and Romans."[8] The scriptural examples, for Fifth Monarchists, took precedence over other historical influences. Fifth Monarchists thus tended to promote Mosaic

---

[6] Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism 1610-1918* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1969), 14.

[7] Charles H. Firth, "Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison," in *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* New Series, April 1892-April 1893, 390-446 (Worchester: Published by the Society, 1898), 7:422.

[8] Ibid., 424.

law, a development that disturbed Cromwell.[9] He later denounced attempts "to set up the judicial law of Moses in abrogations of all our administrations."[10] Cromwell felt that English traditions should be maintained over Jewish ones. Oliver Cromwell himself, however, was influenced by Fifth Monarchy views about the future of the Jews. "And it may be some do think, God is bringing the Jews home to their station from the Isles of the Sea," Cromwell said at Whitehall on 4 July 1653, as he inaugurated the Barebones Parliament, adding "you are at the edge of the Promises and Prophecies."[11] As this speech indicates, C. H. Simpkinson notes, "So thoroughly was the Lord General united to Harrison and his friends in their high hopes for the establishment of the Kingdom of God."[12] Fifth Monarchists saw themselves as Israelites, according to the contemporary periodical, Mercurius Politicus, to be accompanied by "a cloud by day, and a pillar by night, as is promised and was

---

[9] Louise Fargo Brown, *Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912), 62.

[10] Wilbur Cortez Abbot, ed., *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1970), 4:489.

[11] Oliver Cromwell, *The Lord General Cromwell's Speech Delivered in the Council Chamber, Upon the Fourth of July 1653* (London: Printed in the Year 1654), 25.

[12] C. H. Simpkinson, *Thomas Harrison, Regicide and Major-General* (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1905), 172.

of old upon the Tabernacle."[13] This identity was to move forward the Fifth Monarchist agenda of resettling the Jews in England.

Some Fifth Monarchists also began observing the Jewish Sabbath as part of their identification with biblical precepts. Bernard Capp explains, "The call for the laws of the Jews was consistent with the Fifth Monarchists' demand for the Old Testament political institutions, and their interest in Jewish religious practices, such as the Seventh-Day Sabbath."[14] Among those adhering to this practice was John Spittlehouse, who initially considered Cromwell as a second Moses.[15] In support of observing Old Testament practices Spittlehouse wrote, "Doth not Moses present the Law-maker himself to give forth his own law?"[16] For Fifth Monarchists such as Spittlehouse there could be no greater law than God's as revealed in Scripture. William Aspinwall, another Fifth Monarchist, wrote: "Though the Laws [of God] be few and brief, yet they are perfect

---

[13] Cited by Jane Lane [Elaine Kidner Dakers], *Puritan, Rake and Squire* (London: Evans Brothers, 1950), 16.

[14] B. S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men, A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarians* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 166.

[15] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), s. v. "Spittlehouse, John," 952.

[16] John Spittlehouse, *An Answer to One Part of the Lord Protector's Speech, or A Vindication of the Fifth Monarchy Men* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1654), 9.

and sufficient, and so large, as the wisdom of God judged needful for regulating Judgment in all Ages and Nations."[17]

Millennial Expectations

The ultimate connection with the Jews for the Fifth Monarchists was their interpretation of the immediacy of Old and New Testament prophecy fulfillment in their time. Others, such as Puritan preacher Stephen Marshall, distanced themselves from such literal prophetic views. In his address before the House of Commons in 1646, Marshall stated,

> This kind of knowledge, though every man hath an itch after it, and many doe as Nebuchadnezzar did, when his thoughts troubled him in the night, that hee might know what should come to pass afterwards; yet our Lord hath told us, That it is not for us to know the times and seasons, which the Father hath kept in his own hand."[18]

Such arguments, however, did not deter other preachers. Separatist minister John Archer declared, "As the twelve Tribes shall be subjects of this Kingdome, so the Cities of the Tribes shall be built againe, and inhabited by naturall Israelites, especially Jerusalem, which shall be the most eminent City then in the world."[19] Literalist

---

[17] William Aspinwall, *A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy* (London: M. Simmons, 1653), 11.

[18] Stephen Marshall, *The Right Understanding of the Times: Opened in a Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons December 30, 1646* (London: Stephen Bantell, 1647), 6.

[19] John Archer, *The Personall Reign of Christ upon Earth* (London: Benjamin Allen, 1642), 7.

interpretations such as Archer's raised millennial expectations among Fifth Monarchists. "Come, come, Sirs, prepare your companies, for King Jesus His Mount Sion muster-day is at hand," rallied Fifth Monarchist preacher, John Rogers, in anticipation of the imminent return of Christ.[20] Rogers's militant language continued:

> His Magazines and Artillery, yea His most excellent Mortar-pieces be ready; we wait only for the word from on High to fall on, and faith and prayer to do the Execution according to Rev. xviii.6, "Reward her as she hath rewarded you."[21]

Contemporary minister Robert Maton, in his essay, *A Treatise of the Fifth Monarchy*, also argued that Christ's reign on earth was to be understood literally rather than simply figuratively: "And what repugnancy is there betwixt these things and our Saviors reigning on earth? Certainly they shall be ever with him on earth, when he comes again, on this earth while he reignes."[22] To this Maton added the necessity of "the conversion, deliverance, and establishment of the *Jewes* in their owne land: the destruction of their opposers and subjection of all other Nations unto them."[23]

---

[20] Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), 296.

[21] Ibid., 297.

[22] Robert Maton, *A Treatise of the Fifth Monarchy* (London: Printed for John Hancock, 1655), 3.

[23] Ibid., 15.

The restoration of the Jews was a central tenet of their millennial expectations. In this emphasis Fifth Monarchists spoke in coded language best understood by their adherents. Christopher Feake, Fifth Monarchist expositor of scripture, was a prime example:

> Now, if thou "staggerest not through unbelief," at those great and precious promises which are recorded in the Scriptures of Truth, concerning the fifth Kingdom, thou shalt, in due time, behold, with a mixture of joy and wonder, those other grand Mutations, and extraordinary Revolutions, which are even at the door, and ready to break in upon the Princes, and upon the People of the whole earth.[24]

Mary Cary expressed herself in a forceful, similar visionary manner concerning the Jews:

> And they were all the while, they passest the land often exercised with much wars, and at last were utterly rooted out of their own Land, and of Jerusalem by the Romans, in the time of Vespasian the Emperour. Therefore certainly, these promises being never yet made good to them the time will come (as surely is the word of God true) in which these promises are made good to them, to the uttermost jot of them.[25]

These key words in her exposition indicate that she believed the events of her time were fulfilling prophecy. Cary's historiography centered on the fate of the Jews. Her fellow Fifth Monarchists were seen by Cary as agents of this divine plan who would possess the kingdom, not only in

---

[24] Christopher Feake, "Epistle," in *A New and More Exact Mappe* by Mary Cary (London: Printed by W. H., 1651), xxviii.

[25] Mary Cary, *A New and More Exact Mappe* (London: Printed by W. H, 1651), 160.

terms of political power, but also in terms of the eternal spiritual reign of Christ in which they were participants. They were to be part of history and prophecy as she further indicated. These promises included the restoration of the Jews to their former land as well as their conversion according to Cary:

> This is also a cleere Prophesie of the calling of the Children of Israel to the obedience of Christ, their Lord and ours; and of the bringing of them when they are thus converted into their owne land; for which end the river of Egypt is to be beaten off, that so clear way may be made, for them to go over dry shod; for when God will work, who shall let it? and when he will bring his people to any place, it is not vast and great rivers that lying in the way shall hinder it. But wee finde that when the Nation of the Jews, and all the seed of Jacob shall again be converted unto the Lord; that that great worke shall not be too hard for God to do, but he will do therein that which shall be too hard for men to beleeve. As, that a Nation shall be born at once: That they shall come to the birth, & be brought forth in one day: And that before Sion travelleth, before the Church doth any thing considerable in order to the converting of a Nation to Christ, it shall be done.[26]

Cary provided Fifth Monarchists a working blueprint for their future, in which the central focus was upon the destiny of the Jews. Jewish conversion was in divine hands. On this outcome their own perceived future as the Saints depended. Without the return of the Jews to their homeland and their conversion to Christianity, the divine clockwork would be delayed.

---

[26] Ibid., 164, 165.

Independent pastor John Tillinghast, in his Fifth Monarchy treatise, *Generation-Worke*, forcefully emphasized the number one priority of converting Jews to fulfill ancient prophecies of "God's glorious worke of redeeming Sion, literall Sion, or the Jewes from their long captivity."[27] He felt it incumbent for the men of his particular time to take specific action, arguing that every generation had its divinely mandated mission and that this task of restoring the Jews was theirs. Tillinghast further calculated the year 1656 as the target date, adding Daniel's prophetic 1290 years to the year of Roman Emperor Julian's failed attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, in 366.[28] Tillinghast argued, "We are fallen into that age in themselves, though under another notion."[29]

That other notion to which Tillinghast specifically referred to was Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel's book, *The Hope of Israel*.[30] Leading Dutch Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel attracted a great deal of seventeenth-century attention with his narrative of rediscovered Hebrews in the New World, as well as in other places, including China and

---

[27] John Tillinghast, *Generation-Worke* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1655), 57.

[28] Ibid., 54.

[29] *Ibid.,* 49.

[30] Ibid.

Ethiopia.[31] Seventeenth-century traveler Antonio Montezinos, who related his discovery of Hebrew descendants to Menasseh ben Israel, claimed the New World connection. Ecuadorian natives, Montezinos said, recited Deuteronomy 4:6 in Hebrew, *Shema Israel, Adonai Elohenu Adonai Ehad*.[32] Menasseh further cited Matteo Ricci's discovery of Israelites in Hangchow, China, who maintained an early synagogue there. These connections were linked by the rabbi to Isaiah 11:11 which stated, "The Lord shall set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people."[33] Even America was included as "The islands of the Sea."[34] "All those are the sayings of the holy prophets, whence does appear the return of Israel into their country," the rabbi argued.[35] "Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel became the hero of English society," according to Katz, "as the role that the Jews were expected to play in seventeenth-century England became a vital contemporary issue."[36]

---

[31] Menasseh ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel,* trans. Moses Wall, ed. Henry Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 102.

[32] Ibid., 108.

[33] Ibid., 141.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid., 146.

[36] Katz, *Philo-Semitism,* 42.

Jewish Return

That contemporary issue was the return of the Jews to England as a means to their ultimate restoration to the Holy Land. Edward I had banned the Jews from England in the late thirteenth century, "some sixteen thousand, all told," according to Raphael Patai.[37] Evidence indicated that a few remained later, including "some Jews, posing as Lombard traders, [who] returned in the fourteenth century."[38] David Katz notes, "Some of the evidence went as far back as 1545, so it is apparent that a continuous Jewish presence was maintained in England even after the persecution and imprisonment of merchants and musicians a few years before."[39] H. S. Henriques, however, finds that "a period of more than three centuries English history is a blank so far as the Jews are concerned."[40] Some came during the reign of Charles I as Spaniards, "sheltering themselves under the protection of the treaty" with the king of Spain regarding commerce between England and Spain.[41] A petition to rescind the Jews' banishment from England was presented

---

[37] Raphel Patai, *Tents of Jacob: The Diaspora-Yesterday and Today* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1971), 332.

[38] Ibid.

[39] David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England 1485-1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 10.

[40] H.S.Q. Henriques, *The Jews and the English Law* (Clifton, NJ: Augustus M. Kelley, 1974), 62.

[41] Ibid., 80.

to Cromwell's General Council of the Officers of the Army by Baptists Johanna and Ebenezer Cartwright in 1649.[42] It declared,

> That this nation of England, with the inhabitants of the Nether-lands, shall be the first and readiest to transport Izraells sons and daughters in their ships to the land promised to their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for an everlasting inheritance.[43]

However, the petition was never acted upon.

What did occur during the middle of the seventeenth-century was a merger of Jewish messianic vision and particular Fifth Monarchy views of Old Testament prophecies. Both groups used the vocabulary of Old Testament prophets, particularly Daniel's portrayal of the rise and fall of kingdoms followed by the messianic rule, or Fifth Monarchy. There were important differences, however, in that Jews looked for a first messianic coming and the Fifth Monarchists looked for a second coming connected to Jewish conversion to Christianity. The tension between the two messianic views, Jewish and Christian, according to Menasseh ben Israel, "consists onely in the

---

[42] William Clarke, *The Clarke Papers: Selections from the Papers of William Clarke*, ed. C. H. Firth (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), 2:172.

[43] Cited by Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *The Politics of Apocalypse: The History and Influence of Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2006), 3.

circumstance of the time."[44] In spite of differing perspectives, both groups could share belief in a future messianic age and cooperate in common cause.

Describing the Fifth Monarchy scenario, Rabbi Cecil Roth notes, "Only the conversion of the Jews remained to be effected."[45] Roth adds, "This view, held by very many visionaries of simple piety, became almost a cardinal doctrine with the advanced apocalyptical theorists, the so-called Fifth Monarchy Men."[46] Fifth Monarchists were not alone in this emphasis, but were joined by others such as contemporary Samuel Hartlib who wrote, "The world may not expect any great happiness before the conversion of the Jews be first accomplished."[47] Timing was another issue. Although earlier Jewish writers had set dates for future events, Menasseh ben Israel wrote, "It is given to none to know the time thereof."[48] In his words, "The time of the Fifth Monarchy shall be hid, till the time when it shall

---

[44] Cited by Michael Zell, *Reframing Rembrandt: Jews and the Christian Image in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 174.

[45] Cecil Roth, *A Life of Menasseh ben Israel: Rabbi, Printer, and Diplomat* (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 195.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Cited by Charles Webster, ed. *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 201.

[48] Israel, *The Hope,* 146.

begin."[49] However, he continued, "Though we cannot exactly show the time of our redemption, yet we judge it to be near."[50] That nearness, according to Roth, was based on the idea that England represented "to Menasseh's mystical mind that, if the Jews were introduced into that portion of the globe known as the 'end of the earth,' the biblical prophecy of woe might be deemed fulfilled."[51]

Date-setting English Fifth Monarchist views gave rise to a would-be Jewish messiah, Sabbatai Zevi. Zevi was the son of Sephardic Jews living in Turkey. According to Kobler, "Young Sabbatai heard the stories of English merchants about the Puritans who loved and studied the Scriptures, identified themselves with the Jews and looked forward to the Restoration of Israel."[52] Kobler continues, "The most precious gift he received from England was the tidings of the Fifth Monarchy men and their certain expectations that the year 1666 would inaugurate the Millennium."[53] The year 1666 had replaced previous calculations by adding the number of the antichrist to the first thousand years since the birth of Christ. It became

---

[49] Ibid., 147.

[50] Ibid., 148.

[51] Roth, *A Life of Menasseh ben Israel*, 207.

[52] Kobler, *The Vision,* 31.

[53] Ibid.

known as the Annus Mirabilis, attracting even the attention of diarist Samuel Pepys.[54] Zevi attracted a number of world-wide followers until he was made prisoner in Constantinople. Faced with death or conversion to Islam, he chose the latter. The significance of Zevi's rise as prompted by Fifth Monarchist views shows the spread of their teachings among Jews.

Conversion of the Jews to Christianity became the focus of most English millenarians, including Fifth Monarchists. "In order to convert the Jews it was first necessary to bring some of them to England," Katz explains, "since, according to these millenarians, the chief reason why Jews persisted in their religion was that they had never seen the pure Protestant faith in its English interpretation."[55] Once converted, Jews would return to the Holy Land, and the messianic age could begin. According to Christopher Feake, Fifth Monarchist preacher, "We shall gather home the Jews out of the Isles first."[56]

With this in view, as well as other possible political considerations, Cromwell called the Whitehall Conference in December of 1655. Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel was in London at the time. His petition to Cromwell for the readmission

---

[54] Ibid., 33.

[55] Katz, *Jews in the History of England*, 113.

[56] Cited by Brown, *Political Activities,* 24.

of the Jews to England had been transferred to a committee of twenty-eight invited participants composed of clergy, lawyers, and merchants. Cromwell sought consensus among the differing factions.

Katz claims, “It was quite clear that motives of economics or trade had little to do with the readmission of the Jews to England.”[57] However, Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel argued for economic benefits that Jews would bring to the nation. In this he was influenced, according to Benjamin David, by the Venetian Jewish experience as formulated by Simha Simone Luzzato. Luzzato’s *Discorso* “constituted the first systematic exposition of the role of the Jews in international trade and presented the theoretical background for the practical commercial *raison d’etat* that determined their treatment by the Venetian government.”[58]

Frederick Schweitzer notes, “Though these religious motives certainly inspired Oliver Cromwell, who took the initiative with regard to the Marranos, he was equally animated by imperial and economic motives.”[59] Schweitzer explains, “Cromwell has been called ‘the first Englishman to think imperially,’ and in commercial rivalry with

---

[57] Katz, *Jews in the History of England*, 109.

[58] Benjamin David, “The Venetian Government and the Jews,” in *The Jews of Early Modern Venice*, ed. Robert C. Davis and Benjamin Ravid (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 24.

[59] Frederick M. Schweitzer, *A History of the Jews since the First Century A. D.* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 140.

Holland, he was quick to see the advantage to England of Marrano energy, expertise, and capital."[60] Marranos were Spanish and Portuguese Jews who had nominally converted to Catholicism under threat of expulsion. English millenarians did not regard Catholicism as true Christianity.

Other Englishmen opposed admission of Jews on economic grounds, fearing a Jewish takeover.[61] However, Cromwell's cousin, Major-General Edward Whalley, found "that there are both politique and divine reasons; which strongly make for theyre admission into a cohabitation and civil commerce with us."[62] Army chaplain Hugh Peters, sympathetic to the Fifth Monarchists, was also present. Peters had declared in his *A Word for the Armie*,

> That merchants may have all the manner of encouragement, the law of Merchants set up, and strangers, even *Jewes*, admitted to trade, and live with us, that it may not be said we pray for their conversion, with whom we will not converse, wee being all but strangers on the Earth.[63]

Peters's millenary logic provided a rationale for the eventual readmission of the Jews to England.

The four-session Whitehall Conference started on Tuesday, 4 December 1655, in which discussion began on Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel's petition, *The Humble Address to*

---

[60] Ibid.

[61] Katz, *Jews in the History of England*, 113

[62] Ibid., 123.

[63] Cited by Sokolow, *History of Zionism,* 183.

His Highness the Lord Protector. The petition included requested revocation of anti-Jewish laws, permission to establish cemeteries and synagogues with their leaders to settle member issues, and trade rights.[64] According to Wilbur Cortez Abbot,

> Thus when, as it appears, the Protector brought the question before the assembly, he endeavored to limit the discussion to two points—the legality of readmission and the terms on which settlement might be allowed.[65]

It was decided that the original royal banishment did not apply to the present, and the only problem was to set the terms for Jewish resettlement.

Taking part in the conference was Henry Jessey, who at one time had been associated with Fifth Monarchists Christopher Feake and John Simpson as weekday lecturers at All Hallows church.[66] Jessey recorded details of the conference in his *A Narrative of the Late Proceeds at White-Hall Concerning the Jews,* arguing that readmission of the Jews "might not onely be beneficial several ways to our selves, but be some satisfaction for the unhandsome dealings of our Nation against that people."[67] Jessey noted,

---

[64] Abbot, *The Writings and Speeches,* 4:34.

[65] Ibid., 36.

[66] Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, 59.

[67] Cited by Sokolow, *History of Zionism*, 214.

> In our Nation, the good people generally have more believed the promises touching the calling of the Jews, and the great riches and glory that shall follow to Jews, and us Gentiles; and have, and do still, more often, and earnestly pray for it, than any other nation that we have heard of.[68]

On the final day of the Whitehall Conference Cromwell himself said that the anticipated conversion of the Jews was conditioned on their readmission to England: "Since there was a Promise of their Conversion, means must be used to that end," he argued, "and that could not be had unless they were permitted to reside where the Gospel was preached."[69] Expectations were high that the Jews would be officially readmitted to England. Menasseh ben Israel was joined by Jews from France and Italy to "watch the progress of events."[70] They were to be disappointed, as no official action resulted. However, unofficially, old laws affecting the Jewish presence were no longer enforced. Rabbi Manesseh died without bringing about official legalization of Jewish immigration. However, according to Michael Zell, he "forged a discourse with Christian theologians and statesmen by emphasizing that Jews shared their expectation of universal redemption."[71]

---

[68] [Henry Jessey], "A Narrative of the Late Proceedings at Whitehall, Concerning the Jews," in *Harleian Miscellany* (New York, AMS Press, 1969), 7:619.

[69] Abbot, *The Writings and Speeches*, 4:53.

[70] Roth, *A Life,* 250.

[71] Zell, *Reframing Rembrandt,* 96.

According to Schweitzer, Cromwell's unofficial practice of toleration "worked out for the best: for, when the monarchy was restored and everything Cromwell had done was undone by Charles II, there was nothing formal to undo with regard to the Jews."[72] Actually encouraged by Charles II, Schweitzer concludes, "London took its place beside Venice, Amsterdam, Hamburg, and Leghorn as a Marrano center."[73] In hindsight, the result was, according to Simon Schama, "For the Jews and their descendants the Protector's title was something more than a formality."[74] Cromwell's support of the Jews marked the turning point in their return to England.

Fifth Monarchists did not live to see their efforts culminated. In this instance, however, there existed, as shown, a traceable relationship between an article of their faith and ensuing events. "Apocalyptic history is visionary history,"[75] wrote Katherine Firth. While their idealization of the mass conversion of the Jews did not occur, settlement and integration into English society and influence did take

---

[72] Schweitzer, *A History of the Jews,* 141.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Simon Schama, *A History of Britain (*New York: Hyperion, 2001), 2:333.

[75] Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 251.

place beginning in 1656, which was Fifth Monarchist John Tillinghast's originally selected date of Jewish destiny.[76]

[76] Tillinghast, *Generation-Worke*, 54.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

Fifth Monarchists fell on hard times. Louise Brown found, “On the whole, the indications during the spring and summer of 1656 were that the Fifth Monarchy party was declining in numbers,” partly due to losses to Quakers and divisions within the movement.[1] In the spring of 1657, Cromwell’s informant Thurloe reported that some Fifth Monarchists, including John Rogers and Thomas Harrison, were planning insurrection based on the expiration of a prophetic three and a half years since the dismissal of the Barebones Parliament, which coincided with the efforts by some to make Cromwell king.[2] John Rogers was particularly adept at arousing emotion with his calls to action:

> Yea, these called Fifth-Monarchy-Men and Commonwealth-Men must unite too on the principle of Righteousness to all men, which may easily be obtained, and then, March, for the signs are upon us, and the trumpets found, Horse, horse and away.[3]

---

[1] Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912), 101.

[2] James Holstun, *Ehud’s Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (New York: Verso, 2000), 298.

[3] John Rogers, “Jegar Sahadutha: An Oyled Pillar Set up for Posterity,” in Edward Rogers, *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867), 243, 244.

It was this combination Cromwell feared most, when Fifth Monarchists would unite with other groups in concerted action. Abbot wrote, “Cromwell was reported as having spent at least two nights until two or three in the morning examining the conspirators.”[4] As far as Abbot was concerned, “The Fifth Monarchists, whatever else they wanted, were as their doctrines and their history showed, bitterly opposed to any government save that of King Jesus and his Saints, that is to say themselves.”[5]

Puritan leader Henry Vane, who had spent time in prison with Fifth Monarchist John Carrew, attempted to bring parties together in common cause. In February of 1658, after a series of failed insurrections, Cromwell instructed the Lieutenant of the Tower to seize “such as are eminent Fifth-Monarchy-Men,” many of whom were once foremost supporters of Cromwell’s rise to power.[6] Cromwell further directed, “And we do also hereby authorize and require you to seize or cause to be siezed, all books, writings, letters and papers.”[7] Looking back on their history, their “grand old cause” seemed to be a lost one.

---

[4] Wilbur Cortez Abbot, ed., *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1970), 4:465.

[5] Ibid., 475.

[6] Edward Rogers, *Life and Opinions,* 312.

[7] Ibid., 314.

Although the movement did not survive intact, similar groups emerged later in history. Brian Ball described "the militant and exclusive self-confidence of the Fifth Monarchy Men" as bearing "some resemblance to the eschatological convictions of the present-day Jehovah's Witness movement."[8] Other movements, such as Seventh Day Adventists and Pentecostals, have continued to pick up where Fifth Monarchists left off, emphasizing millennial hopes and agendas to this day.

What the seventeenth-century Fifth Monarchists managed to enact were switches, much like trains' rails, in new directions. To a society ingrained in intolerance they pioneered new paths of acceptance for religious sectarians, women, and Jews. This they did in spite of their own narrowly focused millennial visions. I have argued that Fifth Monarchists adopted the concept of separation of church and state, in that regard anticipating John Locke's 1689 work, *Letter Concerning Toleration.* I have also shown that their embracing the contributions of women in their ranks foreshadowed later changes of attitudes of the larger society towards women. Fifth Monarchists' inclusion of the Jews on the basis of biblical prophecy anticipated the

---

[8] Bryan Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 10.

continued development of future religious and political influences regarding the Jews in Britain and the world.

Further investigation is warranted in Fifth Monarchist connections to colonial America. William Aspinwall, Thomas Venner, John Clarke, and others played parts on both sides of the Atlantic. John Clarke, who with Roger Williams co-founded Rhode Island, wrote his Fifth Monarchist rhetoric into the colonial code:

> All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, everyone in the name of his God. And let the saints of the most high walk in this colony without molestation, in the name of Jehovah, their God, forever and ever.[9]

A further inference of Fifth Monarchist rhetoric may be drawn from the use of "We have no king but Jesus" during the American Revolution.

Morton Bloomfield observed, "Gradually, we who live in an apocalyptic age are coming to recognize the importance of the eschatological and prophetic strain in the West."[10] With the modern threats of nuclear holocaust, it is not easy to shrug off alternative visions, which may in the end enact new options in history.

---

[9] *The National Cyclopaedia* , 1897 ed., s. v. "Clarke, John."

[10] Morton W. Bloomfield, "Recent Scholarship on Joachim of Fiore and His Influence," in *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*, ed. Ann Williams (Burnt Hill, Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman Group, 1980), 38

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Abbot, Wilbur Cortez, ed. *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. Vol. 4. New York: Russell & Russell, 1970.

"Agreement of the People, 1647." In *Basic Documents of English History.* Edited by Stephen B. Baxter, 126, 127. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

"An Agreement of the People (1649)." In *Sources of English Constitutional History: A Selection of Documents from the Interregnum to the Present.* Rev. ed. Vol. 2. Edited by Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham, 511-16. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Archer, John. *The Personall Reign of Christ upon Earth*. London: Benjamin Allen, 1642.

Aspinwall, William. *A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy*. London: M. Simmons, 1653.

———. *Certaine Queries Touching the Ordination of Ministers.* London: Printed by Mathew Simmons for Henry Overton, 1647.

Augustine. C*oncerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. New York: Penguin Books, 1984.

Baxter, Richard*. The Autobiography of Richard Baxter being the Reliquiae Baxterianae*. Edited by J. M. Lloyd Thomas. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1931.

———. "The New Model Army." In *The Commonwealth of England: The English Civil Wars, The Commonwealth and Protectorate 1641-1660*. Edited by Charles Blitzer. New York: P. Putnam's Sons, 1963.

Cadbury, Henry J., ed. *Narrative Papers of George Fox Unpublished or Uncollected*. Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1972.

Canne, John. *A Second Voice from the Temple to the Higher Powers*. London: M. Simmons, 1653.

Carlyle, Thomas, ed. *Oliver Cromwell's Letter and Speeches*. Vol. 2. New York: Harper and Brothers, [1924?].

Cary, Mary. "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall." In *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 181-200. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

———. *A New and More Exact Mappe*. London: Printed by W. H., 1651.

———. "The New Jerusalem's Glory," in *Internet Modern History Sourcebook: Radical Women during the English Revolution.* http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/17women.html (accessed May 31, 2008).

———. "The Resurrection of the Witnesses and England's Fall from the Mystical Babylon Rome." In *English Women's Voices*. Edited by Charlotte F. Otten, 100-03. Miami: Florida International University Press, 1992.

———. "Twelve Humble Proposals to the Supreme Governors of the Three Nations Now Assembled at Westminster," in *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725.* Vol. 2. ed. Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman. 201-15. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

———. "A Word in Season to the Kingdom of England." *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 169-80. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

Charles I. "The King's Declaration Prefixed to the Articles of Religion." In *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660.* 3rd ed. Edited by Samuel Lawson Gardiner, 75-76. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

———. "The King's Proclamation on Religion." In *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*. 3rd ed. Edited by Samuel Lawson Gardiner, 232-33. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Clarke, William. *The Clarke Papers: Selections from the Papers of William Clarke*. Vol. 2. Edited by C. H. Firth. New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1965.

Cromwell, Oliver. *The Lord General Cromwell's Speech Delivered in the Council-Chamber, upon the 4th of July 1653*. Printed in the Year 1654.

Danvers, Henry. *Certain Quaeries Concerning Liberty of Conscience*. London: Giles Calvert, 1649.

Edwards, Thomas. *Gangraena*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1977.

Feake, Christopher. *A Beam of Light, Shining in the Midst of Much Darkness and Confusion*. London, 1659.

———. "Epistle." *In A New and More Exact Mappe*, by Mary Cary, xxviii. London: Printed by W. H., 1651.

———.*The New Non-Conformist*. London: Livewell Chapman, at the crown in Popes-head-Alley, 1654.

———. "Reader." Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall." In Women's *Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman. 188-89. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe*. Vol. 8. New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Friend to the prisoners and the good old cause they suffered. A Narrative wherein is faithfully set for the sufferings of John Canne. London, 1658.

"From the Grievances of Regiments, Presented at Saffron Walden, 13-14th May." In *Puritanism and Liberty, being the Army Debates (1647-9*) from the Clarke Manuscript with Supplementary Documents. Edited by A. S. P. Woodhouse. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Limited, 1951.

[Hyde], Edward, Earl of Clarendon. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*. Edited by W. Dunn Macray. 6 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.

"The Instrument of Government," in *Sources of English Constitutional History: A Selection of Documents from the Interregnum to the Present.* Rev. ed. Vol. 2. Edited by Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham, 525-28. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Israel, Menasseh ben. *The Hope of Israel*. Translated by Moses Wall. Edited by Henry Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

James, John. *The True and Perfect Speech of John James, a Baptist, and Fifth Monarchy-Man*. London: Printed for George Horton, 1661.

[Jessey, Henry]. "A Narrative of the Late Proceedings at Whitehall, Concerning the Jews." In *Harleian Miscellany*. Vol 7, 617-24. New York, AMS Press, 1969.

Jessey, Henry. "Touching This Treatise the Judgement of H. Jessey," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall." In *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 187-88. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

[Knollys, Hanserd]."A Glimpse of Sion's Glory." In *Puritanism and Liberty Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents*. Edited by A. S. P. Woodhouse, 233-41. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951.

Marshall, Stephen. The Right Understanding of the Times: Opened in a Sermon Preached to the Honorable House of Commons December 30, 1646. London: Stephen Bantell, 1647.

Maton, Robert. *A Treatise of the Fifth Monarchy*. London: Printed for John Hancock, 1655.

Peters, Hugh. "To the Reader," Preface to Mary Cary, "The Little Horns Doom & Downfall." In *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 184-86. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

Poole, Elizabeth. “An Alarum of War, Given to the Army and to their High Court of Justice (so called) by the Will of God.” In *Women’s Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 53-65. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

———. “A Vision: Wherein is Manifested the Disease and Cure of the Kingdome.” In *Women’s Political Writings, 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 47-52. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

“Resolutions on Religion Drawn by a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons.” In *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*. 3rd ed. Edited by Samuel Lawson Gardiner, 77-82. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

“The Root and Branch Petition.” In *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*. 3rd ed. Edited by Samuel Lawson Gardiner, 137-44. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Spittlehouse, John. *An Answer to one part of the Lord Protectors Speech: Or, A Vindication of the Fifth Monarchy Men*. London: Livewell Chapman, 1654.

Spittlehouse, John, and More, John. *A Vindication of the Continued Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ*. Edited by Gery Schmidt. Victoria, BC: Providence Strict Baptist Assembly, 2001.

Sturgion, John.“Plea for Toleration of Opinions and Persuasions in Matters of Religion, Differing from the Church of England.” In *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution 1614-1661*. Edited by Edward Bean Underhill. 323–41. New York: Burt Franklin, 1966.

Tillinghast, John. *Generation-Worke*. London: Livewell Chapman, 1655.

Trapnel, Anna. “Anna Trapnel’s Report and Plea.” In *English Women’s Voices*. Edited by Charlotte F. Otten, 65-78. Miami: Florida International University, 1992.

———. “The Cry of a Stone or a Relation of Something Spoken in Whitehall by Anna Trapnel, Being in Visions of God.” In *Women’s Political Writings, 1610 1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 221-80. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

——— “From: Anna Trapnel’s Report and Plea.” In *Her Own Life: Autobiographical Writings by Seventeenth-Century Englishwomen*. Edited by Elizabeth Graham, Hilary Hinds, Elaine Hobby, and Helen Wilcox, 75-86. New York: Routledge, 1989.

———. “Strange and Wonderful Newes from White-hall: Or, The Mighty Visions Proceeding from Mistris Anna Trapnel.” In *Women’s Political Writing 1610-1725*. Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 281-85.London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

Webster, Charles, ed. *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

“The Whitehall Debates.” In *Puritanism and Liberty, Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents*. Edited by A. S. P. Woodhouse, 125-78. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951.

Williams, Roger. *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*. Vol.1. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.

Woodhouse, A. S. P., ed. *Puritanism and Liberty: Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts with Supplementary Documents*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1951.

Secondary Sources

Ashley, Maurice. *England in the Seventeenth-Century.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

———*. Cromwell’s Generals*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1954.

Atherton, Ian. “The Press and Popular Political Opinion.” In *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Edited by Barry Coward, 88-110. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003.

Aylmer, G. E. *Rebellion or Revolution? England 1640-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Ball, Bryan. *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

Beers, Anna. *Milton: Poet, Pamphletee, and Patriot*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008.

Bloomfield, Morton W. “Recent Scholarship on Joachim of Fiore and His Influence.” In *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves*. Edited by Ann Williams, 21-52. Burnt Hill, Harlow, Essex, UK: Longman Group, 1980.

Brod, Manfred. “Politics and Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England: The Case of Elizabeth Poole,” *Albion* 31, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 395-412.

Brown, Louise Fargo. *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1912.

Capp, B. S. *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarians*. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.

Chamberlin, E. R. *Antichrist and the Millennium*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1975.

Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England 1558-1689*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. *The Politics of Apocalypse: The History and Influence of Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2006.

Cottret, Bernard. *The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement c. 1550-1700*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

David, Benjamin. “The Venetian Government and the Jews.” In *The Jews of Early Modern Venice*. Edited by Robert C. Davis and Benjamin Ravid. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England from Cranmer to Baxter and Foxe 1534-1690*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdman, 1996.

Doukhan, Jaques B. *Israel and the Church: Two Voices for the Same God*. Peabody, MA: Henrickson, 2002.

Firth, Charles H. "Memoir of Major-General Thomas Harrison," in *The Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society,* New Series. April 1892-April 1893. Vol. 8, 390-446. Worcester: Published by the Society, 1898.

Firth, Katherine R. *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530-1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate 1649-1656*. Vols. 1-4. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1913.

Gillespie, Katharine. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women Writers and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Godwin, William. *History of the Commonwealth of England: From Its Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second*. Vols. 4, 6. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 2003.

Haller, William. *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Henriques, H. S. Q. *The Jews and the English Law*. Clifton, NJ: Augustus M. Kelley, 1908.

Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*. London: Temple Smith, 1972.

Hinds, Hilary. *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth Century Radical Sectarian Writing and Feminist Criticism*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Hobby, Elaine. "'Discourse so unsavory': Women's Published Writings of the 1650s." In *Women, Writing, History, 1640-1740*. Edited by Isobel Grundy and Susan Wiseman, 16-32. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.

Holstun, James. *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution*. New York: Verso, 2000.

Hufton, Olwen. *The Prospect before Her: A History of Women in Western Europe*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.

Hume, David. *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Abdication of James the Second, 1688*. Vol. 4. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, [1800?].

Irwin, Joyce. "Anna Maria van Schurman: Learned Woman of Utrecht." In *Women Writers of the Seventeenth Century*. Edited by Katharina M. Wilson and Frank J. Warnke, 164-185. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.

Jordan, W. K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Accession of James I to the Convention of the Long Parliament 1603-1640*. 4 vols. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1965.

Karant-Nunn, Susan C. "The Reformation of Women." In *Becoming Visible: Women in European History.* 3rd ed. Edited by Renate Bridenthal, Susan Mosher Stuard, and Merry E. Weisner, 175-201. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Katz, David S. *The Jews in the History of England 1485-1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

———. *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Kelsey, Sean. "Unkingship, 1649-1660." In *A Companion to Stuart Britain*. Edited by Barry Coward, 331-49. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2003.

Kenyon, J. B. *The Civil Wars of England*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988.

Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. London: The Penguin Press, 1996.

———. *The Rise of the New Model Army*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Kobler, Franz. *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*. London: Lincolns-Prager, 1956.

Lamont, William M. *Richard Baxter and the Millennium: Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979.

Lane, Jane [Elaine Kidner Dakers]. *Puritan, Rake and Squire*. London: Evans Brothers, 1950.

Liu, Tai. *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640-1660*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

Ludlow, Dorothy Paula. "Arise and Be Doing: English Preaching Women 1640-1660," Ph. D. diss., Indiana University, 1978.

Lyon, T. *The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-1639*. New York: Octagon Books, 1976.

Mack, Phyllis. *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Manning, Brian. *Aristocrats, Plebeians and Revolution in England, 1640-1666*. London: Pluto Press, 1996.

Murphy, Andrew R. *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

The National Cyclopaedia, s.v. "Clarke, John," Vol. 7, 346. New York: James T. White & Company, 1897.

Patai, Raphael. *Tents of Jacob: The Diaspora—Yesterday and Today.* Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Richey, Esther Gilman. *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance.* Colombia: University of Missouri Press, 1998

Rogers, Edward. *The Life and Opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy-Man.* London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867.

Rogers, P. G. *The Fifth Monarchy Men.* London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Roth, Cecil. *A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel: Rabbi, Printer, and Diplomat*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

Schama, Simon. *A History of Britain.* Vol. 2. New York: Hyperion, 2001.

Schweitzer, Frederick M. *A History of the Jews since the First Century A. D.* New York: MacMillan, 1971.

Simpkinson, C. H. *Thomas Harrison, Regicide and Major-General*. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1905.

Smith, David L. *The Stuart Parliaments 1603-1689*. London: Arnold, 1999.

Smith, Hilda L. *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

Smith, Nigel. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Smith, Orianne. "'Unlearned and ill-qualified Pokers into Prophecy': Hester Lynch Piozzi and the Female Prophetic Tradition." *Eighteenth Century Life* 28, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 87-112.

Sokolow, Nahum. *History of Zionism 1600-1918*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1969.

Thornton ,Tim. *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2006.

Trevor-Roper, H. R. *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

———. *The Gentry 1540-1640*. London: Cambridge University Press, [1953].

Von Ranke, Leopold. *A History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth-Century.* Vol. 3. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1875.

Watt, Diane. *Secretaries of God: Women Prophets in Late Medieval and Early Modern England*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997.

Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Willen, Diane. "Women and Religion in Early Modern England." In *Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe: Public and Private Worlds*. Edited by Sherrin Marshall, 140-65. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Wiseman, Susan. "Anna Trapnel," In *Women's Political Writings 1610-1725.* Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 216-20. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

———. "Elizabeth Poole." In *Women's Political Writings, 1610-1725.* Vol. 2. Edited by Hilda L. Smith, Mihoko Suzuki, and Susan Wiseman, 45-46. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

Zagorin, Perez. *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954.

Zell, Michael. *Reframing Rembrandt: Jews and the Christian Image in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

California State University, Fresno

Non-Exclusive Distribution License
(to make your thesis available electronically via the library's eCollections database)

By submitting this license, you (the author or copyright holder) grant to CSU, Fresno Digital Scholar the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined in the next paragraph), and/or distribute your submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video.

You agree that CSU, Fresno may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation.

You also agree that the submission is your original work, and that you have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. You also represent that your submission does not, to the best of your knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright.

If the submission reproduces material for which you do not hold copyright and that would not be considered fair use outside the copyright law, you represent that you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant CSU, Fresno the rights required by this license, and that such third-party material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission.

If the submission is based upon work that has been sponsored or supported by an agency or organization other than California State University, Fresno, you represent that you have fulfilled any right of review or other obligations required by such contract or agreement.

California State University, Fresno will clearly identify your name as the author or owner of the submission and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission. **By typing your name and date in the fields below, you indicate your agreement to the terms of this distribution license.**

Gaylord W. Dixon

Type full name as it appears on submission

March 8, 2010

Date