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PREFACE

This study began as an attempt to find out why certain men became leading Fifth Monarchists during the Interregnum in England, 1649-1660. The outcome of the Civil Wars created an extraordinary atmosphere in which nearly all traditional English social, political, religious, economic, and intellectual relationships were subject to general changes. Because a Puritan Independent, Oliver Cromwell, came to wield final authority through his "Army of Saints," many of the popular attacks on ideas and institutions of the established order were couched in religious terms. Among the religiously oriented groups who sought changes in England, the Fifth Monarchists were the most active and the most radical. Convinced that the thousand year reign of Christ was imminent, these millenarians saw in the successes of the Civil Wars the earthly beginnings of the New Jerusalem, or Fifth Monarchy, in England. They believed they had the God-given right and duty to destroy, by force if necessary, all of the evils and corruptions of worldly governments in order to prepare for the Fifth Monarchy. They were religious revolutionaries who worked within the revolution that had already deposed and executed a King.

Although this environment of radical change was shared by all, each Fifth Monarchist came to his beliefs for his own reasons. But interpretive biographies of almost all of the Fifth Monarchist
leaders still do not exist. From the Restoration to the present, most historians have viewed the Fifth Monarchists as a bizarre aberration in an already unparalleled period in English history. Because the materials are too widely scattered, incomplete, or simply not extant, a comparison of the motives behind the actions of the Fifth Monarchist leaders is beyond the scope of a Doctoral Dissertation at this time. Therefore, this study evolved into an examination of the motives behind the actions of one of the Fifth Monarchists' most prolific writers and more famous propagandists, John Rogers. But such an examination inevitably led to considerations of Rogers as a thinker, a Puritan, a radical Independent dissenter, and a quasi-republican theoretician. This, then, is not just a study of John Rogers the Fifth Monarchist, but of John Rogers the man; a man who was illustrative of a way of thought made possible by the Puritan Revolution; a man whose life was unique because of the political commitments he drew from his religious beliefs; and a man whose career casts additional light on the reasons behind the failure of Englishmen to find a viable alternative to monarchy in the 1650's.

In the preparation of this volume I have incurred many obligations. I am grateful to the staffs of the British Museum, the Public Record Office, the Bodleian Library, the Institute of Historical Research, the University of Toledo Library, the Indiana University Library, and The Ohio State University Library who have furnished me with valuable services and innumerable courtesies. My
research in England was facilitated by a fellowship and a grant from The Ohio State University. I would like to thank Professor Leo F. Solt of Indiana University for permission to peruse his microfilms of seventeenth century books and pamphlets. My greatest debt is to Professor Clayton Roberts of The Ohio State University from whom I have received invaluable suggestions, keen and helpful criticism, and constant encouragement.

All spelling, punctuation, and capitalization in the quotations has been modernized except where the original enhances the author's meaning. Dates are according to the Old Style, but the year has been taken to start on January 1.
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INTRODUCTION

On a cold, damp day in February 1655, twelve men from the Independent congregation of St. Thomas Apostles Church made their way through the narrow streets of London towards the Palace of Whitehall. Their mission was a grave one. They were going to beg for the release of their minister from the prison where he had been detained for sedition against the Government. Their minister was John Rogers. His captor was none other than the Lord Protector of England, Oliver Cromwell.

Anyone who had known John Rogers in 1653, had traveled out of England for eighteen months, and then returned in 1655, would have found it well-nigh impossible to believe that Rogers could have angered Cromwell to any degree, let alone to the extreme degree of provoking the Lord Protector to imprison him. Following the victories of Cromwell's "Army of Saints," Rogers, along with many Englishmen, eagerly looked forward to the establishment of a government in England based on religious principles rather than on political necessities or the interests of powerful men. When Cromwell disbanded the Rump Parliament in April 1653, the golden opportunity for implementation of such a government seemed to be at hand. Of the many who offered advice on the details of the new order, John Rogers was one of the
most eloquent and persuasive. He evidently attracted the attention of Cromwell's Council of Officers, for they eventually adopted Rogers's ideas of government almost to the letter. Yet by 1654 John Rogers was a prisoner of the state. What happened? Who was John Rogers? What were his beliefs? How did they relate to the problems of the governance of England during the Commonwealth and Protectorate?

In 1653 John Rogers was a Puritan Independent reformer who was associated with a political and religious sect which expected the imminent establishment of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth. Because this would be the fifth of the great historical kingdoms of the world, the sect came to carry the name "Fifth Monarchy Men." In a highly religious age such as the seventeenth century, millenial fervor was not unusual. But the Fifth Monarchists were unique. While they espoused many spiritual truths of Christianity, the hallmark of their visions of salvation was their pursuit of a material historical Kingdom of Christ. From this deep commitment to millenialism they drew extreme political implications. They claimed the right, and the duty, to overthrow existing worldly governments, by physical violence if necessary, and to establish theocracies in which the Saints would enforce a Godly discipline over the unregenerate masses until the Second Coming. To make room for the masses in such a society, the Fifth Monarchists brought an element of

---

1See below pages 99-101 for details of Rogers's proposals.

2See below page 31 and Appendix II for more information on the four previous kingdoms or monarchies of the world.
free will into their theological posture. They held out to the ordinary man the promise of a future age when he would enjoy social equality and material splendor, and at the same time offered him the opportunity to save England from the factional dissensions of the day. But by dividing the Saints from the rest of mankind, and by creating an elite among the Saints, the Fifth Monarchists retained a position of leadership that is hard to imagine they would relinquish, even after Christ himself took power. Although they attacked the church in England, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, for its lack of toleration of dissent, it seems that the Fifth Monarchists intended to enforce their own kind of conformity on the masses.

Grounded in Biblical millenialism, the Fifth Monarchists produced no concrete system of social or political theory. They produced none because they believed the ultimate solution to all problems lay in the imminent inauguration of Christ's Kingdom. But each Fifth Monarchist was concerned about certain political, social, economic, and intellectual ills which he believed were characteristic evils of the fourth monarchy. Since these concerns varied with the individual Fifth Monarchist, as did personal judgments as to how the ills would be resolved in the millennium, there was no single ideology or comprehensive theory acceptable to all members of the sect. Consequently the Fifth Monarchists comprised neither a disciplined party nor an organized movement. They could agree on only a few basic points: the necessary destruction of governments of the fourth monarchy; the appearance of Jesus Christ and His Kingdom on earth;
the necessity of the rule of the Saints, either with or for Christ; and a literal reliance on the Scriptures. Why, then, did the Fifth Monarchists become so influential in English political, social, and religious life in the 1650's?

During the reign of Charles I, both before and during the Civil Wars, there were two general areas of contention — constitutional and religious. Accordingly, two currents of opposition to the status quo emerged. One was primarily concerned with secular constitutional questions, and the other with religious questions. One expressed the desire to put liberty in the place of tyranny, and the other to put Godliness in the place of materialism and idolatry. In the early stages of the conflict, when the common goal was the destruction of Stuart policies, these two currents often traveled together. But after the execution of Charles I in 1649, each current began to develop divergent and increasingly radical programs. The demand for political liberty reached its height in the Leveller movement. The most active and radical search for Godliness came in the early 1650's with the Fifth Monarchists. Both contained demands for social and political reform, but within two different philosophical systems. Both sought the abolition of tithes, the bridling of corrupt lawyers, the streamlining of the cumbersome legal system, the abolition of a political and clerical hierarchy, and an end to preferences for the rich and powerful. But when Cromwell silenced the Levellers, only the religious group was left. Any hope of reform had to come out of their ideas and activities. Since the group searching for Godliness, among
which the Fifth Monarchists were pre-eminent, enjoyed the protection
and favor of those in power, the cause of reform was not lost. It is
no wonder, then, that the ideas and hopes of the Fifth Monarchists
permeated English politics and society in the mid-seventeenth century.

To their contemporaries, the Fifth Monarchists appeared to be
violent revolutionaries. And indeed they were. They were so close to
political, as well as to religious, supremacy (especially in 1653)
that it is impossible to doubt the fear they aroused in anyone who had
a stake in the status quo. Just as the conservative Cromwell found it
necessary to silence the constitutional radicals in 1649 and 1650, so
he found it necessary to silence the religious radicals in 1653. But
unlike the Levellers, the Fifth Monarchists eventually came to be more
an object of ridicule than of fear or regard.

The Fifth Monarchists did not survive in any significant way
into the eighteenth century. The age which produced the political
theories of Bacon, Hobbes, and Locke had no room for the medieval
relic of political millenialism. Perhaps this helps explain why even
modern historians have tended to regard the Fifth Monarchists as a
temporary aberration from sanity, incapable of analysis. G. N. Clark
calls Thomas Venner, the militant organizer of the only two actual
Fifth Monarchist rebellions, a crack-brained enthusiast. G. P. Gooch
writes that in the "turbid torrent" of Fifth Monarchism, one pamphlet

alone had any pretensions to sanity. C. V. Wedgwood describes the actions of the Fifth Monarchists as the breakneck rashness of extremists. Thomas Babington Macaulay describes them as warlike men who were ready to employ without scruple, any means, however violent and lawless. H. R. Trevor-Roper calls the Welsh contingent of the Fifth Monarchists, led by Vavasor Powell, hypocrites and a mere knot of demagogues. But if the Fifth Monarchists have been ill appraised by these authors, they have been ignore completely by most other historians. Nearly all of the sect's more prominent leaders have yet to find their biographers. Only three modern writers have dealt with these religious radicals. In 1911 Louise F. Brown did a study of the combined activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchists, but she considered only their political roles in the Interregnum. In 1966 Philip Rogers published a broader treatment, but due to brevity and a lack of footnotes, his book is inadequate. Probably the most thorough and academically reliable treatment of all aspects of the sect is that of Bernard Capp which appeared in 1972.


The appearance of these and several other recent works suggests that historians are discarding the view that millenialism was a temporary insignificant phenomenon in seventeenth century England. In fact, given the widespread contemporary beliefs in astrology, miracles, and prophecy, Fifth Monarchism was not wholly inconsistent with seventeenth century thought. Rather it was one manifestation of millenialism, which in itself was part of the belief in supernatural intervention in the affairs of nations and individuals. Fifth Monarchists like John Rogers operated within the accepted limits of this general belief. That is, they did so until they developed a religious-political synthesis which seemed to justify political violence and social revolution in the name of Godliness. It was then that English millenialism gained the stigmas of fanaticism, insanity, and treason which it has carried ever since.

CHAPTER I

THE SEEKER

Men come to religion for various reasons. Some inherit the ceremonies and rituals used by their parents. Others seek a refuge from fear of eternal damnation, or from fear in general. Some find security and hope in time of despair. Still others feel a conscious need to deepen their experience and awareness of life. And some find religion a challenge, an adventure, a revolutionary vehicle for dreaming "impossible dreams." Each one of these motivated John Rogers at some time in his life. What he first did automatically and out of fear, he later did from personal conviction and satisfaction. What he first did in a search for security, he later did in response to the challenge of a new political, social, and religious order in England.

In 1627 at Messing, Essex, a son was born unto the wife of the vicar of the parish. Nehemiah and Margaret Rogers named their son John after a direct ancestor who had been one of the first Protestant martyrs in the reign of Queen Mary Tudor.¹ The Rogers household was a model of Anglican piety and ceremony, and not inconsequently of royalist sympathy and loyalty. Because of this piety and loyalty,

¹See Appendix I for an abbreviated genealogy of the family.
Reverend Rogers and his wife were highly regarded by their parishioners. But this same piety and loyalty created a stifling atmosphere in which to raise children. Nehemiah continually preached to his son. Biblical passages were continually on his lips. He used parables to teach John a practical religion, but not necessarily a deeply felt religion. Nehemiah was a diligent writer while he could safely publish (before 1642 and after 1658), and he often wrote expositions on the same parables he used with his family.  

Growing up in such an atmosphere, young John was expected to be the model child. He was extremely susceptible to religious pressure and social approbation. Although he seemed to accept his parents' religion, it was automatic and not a personal faith. He went to catechism, said his prayers, and read the Scriptures every day. But religion by rote, twenty-four hours a day, was psychologically unhealthy (as well as boring) for a boy not yet ten years old. Then in 1637 young John was introduced to the zealous and fiery preaching of Dr. William Fenner and Reverend Stephen Marshall. Unaccustomed as he was to such strongly felt religious convictions, John Rogers

---

2For example see Nehemiah Rogers's The Parable of the Prodigal Son, 1632; The Fast Friend, 1658; The Figless Figtree, 1659; The Good Samaritan, 1640; The Penitent Citizen, 1640; The True Convert, 1632; A Strange Vineyard in Palestine, 1640. Copies of the last four may be found in Dr. Williams's Library in London.

3William Fenner was born in 1600, became Rector of Rochford in Essex in 1629, and died in 1640. He was much admired and often consulted by the Puritans. Benjamin Brook, Lives of the Puritans (London, 1813), II, 451.

Stephen Marshall was a Presbyterian minister at Weathersfield and Finchingfield in Essex. He was a constant preacher before the Long Parliament. Brook, Lives of the Puritans, III, 241.
first thought the two men were mad. He shuddered at such phrases as, "O you knotty! rugged! proud piece of flesh! you stony, rocky, flinty hard heart! What wilt thou do when thou art roaring in hell amongst the damned!" Young John had never seriously worried about such things, and his father was not at all happy that his son seemed to be preoccupied with thoughts of eternal damnation. Nehemiah prescribed the only remedy he knew, and John began to read Scriptures more diligently, to hear sermons morning and evening, and to pray more fervently. Later he wrote, "I was afraid every night lest the Devil should carry me away to hell, if I did not first to myself say my prayers, and my Our Father, and I Believe in God, and the Ten Commandments, and my Little Catechism." Sometimes he would even repeat all of this twice or three times over lest he forgot anything or said it badly. As with most young people, John tried to find comfort and companionship with other boys his age. But he usually ended up preaching to them about Heaven and hell, and how hard it was to be saved!

No matter what he did, Rogers's terror did not subside. He doubled his spiritual rigors and began to write down and memorize both Scriptures and sermons. His self-imposed ritual of prayers and


5Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 420.

6Rogers claimed that his memory was so retentive that he could recall whole sermons up to ten years after he first heard them. Ibid., p. 423.
recitations became so lengthy that he often began it before supper and continued until after he was in bed. If he truly did impose such a discipline upon himself, then John Rogers was an exceptional boy, even for seventeenth century England. It would have taxed an adult's self control to abide by such a regimen. Perhaps more realistically, we must assume that John's pious Anglican father prescribed such exercises, and the young boy's torments were due to trying to meet his father's demands.

In any case, visions of fire and death and devils continued to destroy young Rogers's peace of mind. The more he read, prayed, and fasted, the more he "roared in the black gulf of despair...past all recovery." He started sleeping with his hands clasped over himself in a praying posture, hoping that if he died in his sleep the devil would not harm him. He was inordinately afraid of death. As a result of this mental anguish, John suffered what he himself called "raging fits" for which he was tied hand and foot to his bed until the fits abated. Outward stress turned to inward melancholy. "I thought I heard the damned roaring and raving," Rogers later recounted, "and I saw them roasting and their frisking and frying in everlasting torments. My mind and all was taken up with their howlings and screechings." Five years of such a morbid way of life inevitably took its toll.

In desperation, John Rogers attempted suicide. Even in an age of

---

7Ibid., p. 426.
8Ibid., p. 430.
visions and religious fanaticism, this drastic answer to religious uncertainty indicated a definite mental abnormality.

From the first time he encountered Dr. Fenner and Stephen Marshall in 1637, John nurtured his association with Puritans and Presbyterians. His father was angry that the Puritan ideas had so afflicted John, but he was even more concerned that his own spiritual guidance seemed to be of no value to his son. Amidst these strained relations, young Rogers suddenly announced that in a dream he had been persuaded that he had been searching for justification by all the wrong means, that by faith alone was the righteousness of Christ made his own, and that in righteousness was salvation. At the age of fifteen John Rogers seems to have found the truth of the New Testament that through love and faith are true believers justified before God.

Nehemiah Rogers received the news with mixed emotions. Although he rejoiced at his son's spiritual assurance, he distrusted the new revelation because he assumed it was John's Puritan ideas and not the revered Anglican faith that brought it forth. A religious gulf was beginning to develop between father and son, a religious gulf that was to be widened by the drastic political events which occurred in 1642.

On August 22, 1642, Charles I set up his standard at Nottingham and the English Civil Wars began. In October the forces of Parliament and King met in battle at Edgehill. During the following months, counties in which Parliamentary support was the strongest formed themselves into Associations for common defense. That of

---

9Ibid., p. 431.
Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Hartfordshire, Cambridgeshire, and later Huntingdonshire, came to be known as the Eastern Association. Within these counties the Puritans had enough strength to turn out the Anglican clergy and to take over their livings. At Messing, Nehemiah Rogers was one of the first victims of Puritan dominance.

John Rogers was not a comfort to his family during this trying period. Rather he became the object of disagreement and of controversy. He began to associate more closely with members of the Eastern Association, and he frequented Puritan congregations in the area. Added to his raging fits and his tacit denunciation of the Anglican faith, John’s consorting with his father’s religious enemies was just too much for Nehemiah Rogers. Only a few weeks after he himself had been turned out of his living by the Puritans, the devout Anglican vicar demanded that his son leave the family home forever.

Nehemiah Rogers was known as a moderate and a fair man. He probably would have taken John back if the boy had agreed to return to the Anglican Church. But John, already branded a moody, stubborn, and slightly mad child, had set his feet upon a path which to him seemed God-given. Obviously he could have avoided this drastic conclusion to a very painful childhood if his conversion to Puritan ideas had been only a matter of fashion. But he was sincere. And what is more, he was now associated with those whose influence was strongest in the eastern counties of England.

John Rogers’s first lessons away from home were hard ones. He travelled toward Cambridge, begging food and shelter along the way.
His goal was to enter Cambridge University, from whence his father had taken degrees in 1614 and 1618. But after the Colleges had attempted to send their plate to the King in August 1642 (ostensibly to keep it safe, but probably to finance the King's cause), Parliament had garrisoned the town, and University activities had been drastically altered. Gownsmen were ill-used by soldiers. King's College Chapel was turned into a drillroom. Other Colleges were turned into barracks. Upwards of two hundred fellows and tutors were expelled. For lack of money, and because of such troubled times at Cambridge, Rogers's studies were interrupted and he came close to starvation. Reduced to eating grass and consuming leather and even old quill pens, Rogers began to slip back into the gulf of despair from which he had so recently escaped. Once again he sought the answer to his problems in attempting suicide.

It is obvious that John Rogers's abnormal behavior was not entirely due to his mental anguish over his own salvation. Even with the assurance he found in Puritanism, when things got really rough he turned to self-murder. Perhaps the immaturity of youth can be held responsible for such deeply felt despair. Yet it cannot be denied

---


12 John Rogers did enter Cambridge in 1642 and became a student of King's College. He received a B.A. in 1646. Venn and Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part I, Vol. III, 479.
that this was an extremely sensitive young man who felt things more sharply than other young people. His greatest problem was finding sensible solutions to adversity. Unfortunately he found little valuable guidance from his parents. In trying to earn approval and recognition from those closest to him, he had been driven to a rigid discipline beyond his youthful mental endurance. Then he had been totally rejected by those whom he sought to please. That he could threaten but never commit the final act of murdering himself is not surprising. By his own admission he was inordinately afraid of death. But the threats of suicide and the raging fits brought recognition and sympathy. Perhaps it was Rogers's way of telling his father and the world to take notice of him. On the other hand, by attempting to face death, he might have hoped to prove to others that he could deal with the utmost torment—death itself. The ambivalence in motives here is not unusual and can be traced throughout Rogers's life. The seeds of a martyr complex had been sown. If life seemed not to serve his purposes, the threat of death might.

John Rogers was saved from himself the second time by an offer of a position as a tutor in Didington, Huntingdonshire. The very night this offer was made, Rogers had another dream or vision which gave him both hope and doubt. In this vision Rogers was

---

13John Rogers seemed to have a proclivity for alighting on disturbed districts. Cambridge was less than peaceful when he was there in 1642. Huntingdonshire was beginning to feel the financial pressure of the Eastern Association in 1643. And later, when he arrived in London, that city was the prime arena of controversy between the Army and the Parliament.
persuaded that God had chosen him to preach the Gospel. But this was a disconcerting prospect. Rogers had never seriously considered taking up his father's profession. He had already been offered a teaching position. And with the Puritans gaining strength in the Eastern Association, preachers walked a doctrinal tightrope of which he had little knowledge. Rogers decided to go to Huntingdonshire anyway, and once there he found it comparatively easy to combine teaching and religion.

Because of his earlier religious exercises at Messing, Rogers was well prepared to conduct catechism and to expound on the Scriptures which he did as often as he could. His deliverance of old memorized sermons seemed to please the Puritan and Presbyterian congregations of Huntingdonshire, and soon he was offered a permanent position at Toseland. Whether from sincere conviction or from necessity, he also managed to persuade the Committee of the Association in Huntingdonshire that he supported Parliament against the King. Clutching the mantle of religion, he told them that he had come "to be convinced of the Parliament's proceedings and cause, to be more regular and in order to the great work that God hath to do in nations than Kings, by comparing them together and bringing them to the Word; and then I saw clearly that God would do what He hath to be done by them and for them and for the Commonwealth."

14 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 435-37.
15 Ibid., p. 438.
John Rogers finally seemed to have found success. He gained a favorable reputation in Huntingdonshire. In 1647 he passed twice through the Presbyterian Assembly on Examination to receive the Presbyterian ordination. Shortly afterwards he was called back to his native Essex to become Rector of Purleigh, one of the best livings in the district. But apparently Rogers's contact with and acceptance by the Parliamentarians of the Eastern Association gave him a taste for bigger things. The rural town of Purleigh provided little chance to indulge new interests. So with the blessing of his Superior, he hired a curate to administer his parish and he moved to London.

Rogers always had a need for security and acceptance. As we have already seen, rejection brought him to the lowest depths of despair. Therefore it is unlikely that he left Purleigh without some assurance of better things to come. Affairs in London were anything but conducive to security in 1648, unless you happened to be in favor with the party or group that held the balance of power. In 1648 that group would have been the Independents, both in Parliament and Army. Thus it was to the Independents that John Rogers turned for acceptance and preferment in 1648.

The Civil War had given freedom of thought a great impulse in England. In 1644 John Milton saw in London "a city of refuge, the mansionhouse of Liberty encompassed and surrounded with his [God's] protection." The religious consequence of this stimulus was the

---

appearance on many sects, among which were the Independents. These sects rested spiritually on progressive revelation, the willingness to accept from any source any truths that might be revealed by God. Independency attracted those who were seeking something fresh and alive in religion. It attracted those like Milton who desired genuine liberty of thought. And it drew unto itself those who wanted to escape the bonds of both Episcopacy and Presbyterianism. It was from the concept of church government which its members held (the autonomy of each separate congregation, the independency of each from the rule of bishops or presbyters) that the sect drew its name.

Independency grew noticeably in the Army where Oliver Cromwell, as a practical military leader, was not about to lose a good soldier because he held unorthodox religious views. Cromwell's position on toleration seemed to be justified by the Army's victory at Marston Moor. In that battle Cromwell and his professional soldiers of the Eastern Association literally prevented a rout by the King's forces. And always the opportunist, Cromwell advertized the success of his policy of toleration in his Army. "It had all the evidence," he wrote, "of an absolute victory obtained by the Lord's blessing upon the Godly party principally."\(^{18}\) Parliament could not argue with success. The result was the New Model Ordinance passed in February 1645 which reorganized the Army and led eventually to the Parliamentary victory over Charles at Naseby in

\(^{18}\) Thomas Carlyle, Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches (Vols. 1-3 combined; London, 1888), p. 152.
June 1645. Not insignificantly, this reorganization, plus the enforcement of the Self-Denying Ordinance passed also in 1645, led to the strengthening of the Independents' position in the Army. The places of the higher Presbyterian Officers swept out by the Self-Denying Ordinance were filled by men who, if not declared Independents, were sympathetic to some Independent ideas. 19

The Independents increased their influence not only in the New Model Army but also in Parliament itself. During the War, the Royalists had abandoned their seats in Parliament. After Naseby, the House of Commons began to issue writs for elections, and by the end of 1646 nearly 250 new Members had been chosen. 20 Many of these were Independents, but Presbyterians still held a majority. And this Presbyterian majority in Parliament continually searched for ways to counter the growing influence of the Independents in both the Commons and the Army. Evidently the Independents had become a real power to be reckoned with, for to eliminate them the Presbyterians attempted to form an alliance against the Independents with the third party in the whole dispute—King Charles himself. In a compromise

19 S. R. Gardiner, Oliver Cromwell (New York, 1962), p. 33. Cromwell's recruits from the Eastern Association brought a strong Puritanism into the Army. This might have been countered by the Presbyterian Chaplains had not most of the moderate Presbyterians left the Army after the battle of Edgehill. The more fanatical Chaplains remained, and into the hands of these Independents passed the religious life of the Army. Richard Baxter, Reliquiae Baxterianae, ed. N. Sylvester (London, Toronto, 1925), p. 51.

struck between King and Parliamentary Presbyterians, the King was to confirm a Presbyterian church settlement for three years and give up to Parliament the power of the sword for ten years. In return, the Parliament would recognize him as lawful King of England. However, before this compromise could be consummated, Cornet Joyce, with the tacit approval of the Army leaders, seized the King at Holmby House and brought him to Army headquarters. Now the Independents held the balance, and the Grand Council of the Army began its own negotiations with the King.

The capture of the King's person was crucial both to the Army and to the Independents. The Independents realized that if the King and the Presbyterians finalized their agreements, religious toleration would never become a reality. Independents would probably be the first to suffer persecution and death. By removing the King, they effectively stopped his negotiations with the Presbyterians.

In addition, the Presbyterian majority in Parliament had proposed a plan in February 1647 for disbanding the New Model Army which would have eliminated virtually all Independent officers. More importantly, it would have given no guarantee for back pay due to the soldiers. If Parliament had been able to win over the King, the Presbyterians would have put this plan into effect without any opposition. Reports of certain military activities by Parliamentary agents also disturbed the Independents and the Army Officers. The leaders of Parliament

---

had caused the City's trained bands to be remodeled in the Presbyterian interest, thus creating a fighting force to control the Independents. And it was rumored that Parliamentary Presbyterians were planning to bring the Scottish army into England to subdue the New Model. Besides, reports had circulated that Parliament itself was ready to bring the King from Holmby House to London, ostensibly to conclude their plans for cooperation. So Cornet Joyce and the Army merely got to the King before Parliament could.

At Army headquarters Charles I was presented with two documents. The Declaration of the Army was a list of military grievances to which was added a political program for constitutional changes. It claimed for the Army the right of speaking on behalf of the people of England. It demanded shorter Parliaments. And it demanded toleration for the various religious sects. The Heads of the Proposals was the framework of a new constitution supported by the Council of the Army. Generally it provided for subordination of King to Parliament for at least ten years, for subordination of the Parliament to its constituencies, for a new Council of State, and for protection of religious sects from any type of persecution. Obviously religion was an important issue. The fact that a call for toleration was included in both documents shows the influence of the Independents in the Army. But not all elements supported the Army demands. The

---

22 Printed in John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London, 1682), IV, 564-70.

most vocal objectors were the Levellers who felt that the proposals did not go far enough. King Charles was aware of these dissensions within the Army and he made the most of them. He escaped to Carisbrooke where he opened his own negotiations with the Scottish Presbyterians. The result was the invasion of England by the Scots on behalf of the King in July 1648. However, by the end of August 1648 Cromwell had roundly defeated the Scots at Preston and the Second Civil War was over.

After the victory over the Scots, Independents held undisputed control of the Army leadership. But they still faced a hostile Presbyterian majority in Parliament. Colonel Pride, acting for the Army, provided the solution to this problem when, on December sixth and seventh, 1648, he physically purged the recalcitrant Presbyterian members of the House of Commons. By the end of the year, then, the Independents unquestionably controlled both the Army and the Rump Parliament.

The point naturally arises as to why John Rogers, an ordained Presbyterian preacher, felt secure in entering a city where most Presbyterians were anything but welcomed by those in command. The answer lies in Rogers's own conversion to Independency. At Toseland and Purleigh, Rogers the Puritan had constantly run afoul of the moderate Presbyterians in his congregations. His never-ending sermons on the wrath of God, the evils of sin, and the necessity of inward faith irritated those who preferred a more comfortable worldly Presbyterian existence. "I have preached! prayed! catechized!
expounded!" he wrote, "and they have not believed nor obeyed the Word; but many of them are as ignorant, arrogant, bitter, profane, ungodly opponents of Christ and his Gospel still as ever." He refused to administer the Sacraments because his parishioners refused to hear him preach. "The world," he said, "hath filled your hearts that Christ should find no room. It is this worldliness that makes you... kick at Heaven with your heels." That martyr complex which had been planted when Rogers was a young man began to show signs of growth as he accused his congregations of lies, libels, scandals, scorn, backbiting, railing, and even threats against his life. "What kind of injury and abuses have you not returned to me," he asked, "for all my love and pains and care and continual prayers for you? Have you not vowed to leave us 'til you had rooted all of us from you, and not left a Roundhead or Independent to dwell nigh you?" Obviously John Rogers did not like Presbyterians and they did not like him.

Rogers must also have been shackled by authorities in the Presbyterian Church in some way, for very soon after he arrived in London he made it known that he did not agree with Presbyterian ideas in a number of ways. He specifically cited matters of doctrine,

---

24 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 230.
25 Ibid., p. 236.
26 Ibid., p. 231.
His overriding objection seems to have been that Presbyterians were too much akin to the hated Papists. "I shall not be the first nor the last," he announced, "that on good grounds do affirm Presbyterianism and Popery to live one in the other and that the Presbyterian way is maintained and kept by Popish points and principles, and keeps Popery alive in England." Rogers's wholehearted conversion to Independency cannot be doubted as he wrote:

There can be no such thing as National Churches, Diocesan or Provincial. The Church Universal is made up of the particulars, yet cannot be said to be all this particular or that particular, all of them Independents, Anabaptists, etc. One cannot usurp another's place, every Congregational Church is a whole church and entire in itself.

Rogers compiled a very scholarly but tedious catalogue of the specific points on which he believed the Presbyterians agreed with the Papists and, of course, differed from the Independents. Some examples will show how far the Presbyterians had diverged from the Anglicans and had been left behind by the Independents. Rogers claimed,

27 At this time the parishes and parochial churches of the country were mostly in the hands of the Presbyterians whose system of church government had been sanctioned by Parliament. Church government was carried on by Presbyteries and Assemblies which were parochial, classical, provincial or national. Each local parish had its parochial presbytery. A number of adjoining parishes combined to form a classis with a classical assembly. The classes were united into provinces with provincial assemblies. These provincial assemblies sent representatives to one large national assembly.

28 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 479.

29 Ibid., pp. 482-83.

30 Ibid., Book II, Chapter 9.
in the first place, that Presbyterians and Papists agreed in their
discipline, and he did so in ten ways. (1) They both divided the
Church into principal and less principal—either the Pope and his
Cardinals or the Assembly and classes, and then the people. (2) They
both claimed the Universal Catholic Church to be a visible Church.
The Independents believed the Church Catholic to be invisible and to
include all Saints. (3) They both admitted a twofold headship of
the Church—first Christ, but then the Pope or Synods and Elders.
Rogers said the Independents believed in only one head, Jesus Christ.
He cited John Huss and his own ancestor John Rogers to support this
contention. (4) Both said that all belong to the Church who make a
profession of Christ, whether Saints or not. Rogers cited John Cotton,
Richard Hooker, Nicholas Ridley, and Hugh Latimer to support the
Independent belief that the only true members of the Church were the
Saints. (5) Both abused the Independents as schismatics or heretics
for separating from Pope or Synod. (6) The form of both was uniformity
rather than unity in the Spirit. (7) Both laid the foundations of
their Churches on something other than Christ, the Papists on St. Peter
and the Presbyterians on confessions of faith. (8) Both persecuted
those who differed from them. (9) Both gave the power of the Keys
not to the independent congregations, but to prelates or Synods.

31 In this observation Rogers’s early belief in toleration
is clearly evident. "The Independents," he wrote, "use words and
Spirit as weapons. No man must be persecuted, but with all
gentleness and meekness instruct the opposers, if God will give
them repentance to know the truth." Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh,
p. 496.
(10) Both gave undue power of appointment, punishment, and decree to their Councils or Synods.

In the second place, Papists and Presbyterians agreed in doctrine, six points of which Rogers discussed. (1) The Papists kept the people from reading the Scriptures. They found fault with the vulgar translations. They affirmed Scripture to be hard or difficult or obscure, necessitating explanation or interpretation by priests or Councils. Similarly, the Presbyterians discouraged people from reading Scriptures by telling them that they lacked the original, or by asserting that Synods had to authorize the sense of the Word. The Independents, on the other hand, taught that the vulgar translation was sufficient in matters of faith, that Scriptures were to be believed because the Spirit wills it and not because Synods or Councils authorize them, that all things necessary to salvation are found in the Scriptures, and that the Scriptures are not so dark and uncoverable.

(2) They both imposed Baptism as necessary to salvation, maintaining that infants ought to be brought to Baptism because of the faith of their parents. All this the Independents denied, affirming that the children of the faithful who were holy, were holy before Baptism.

(3) They both misused the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, bidding men fast the day before they received it, dispensing it indiscriminately to all, demanding that people fall down before it or keep their distance from it, and proclaiming that all have had Christ who have had the Sacrament. (4) They both affirmed the necessity of works to salvation and agreed in pressing works and duties for fear of hell and
hope of Heaven. Rogers, of course, had found from personal experience that only by faith in Christ was the true believer justified. Perhaps over-generalizing, he projected this belief to all Independents.

(5) They both emphasized too greatly the merit of works. (6) They both gave the civil magistrates too much power over the Church.

Though stretching the point here, for the Presbyterians often opposed civil magistrates, Rogers aimed his primary criticism at the Presbyterians. Grounding his statements in the Independent belief in autonomous congregations, he attacked the Presbyterian idea that both those who propagated religious error and those who tolerated it ought to be dealt with by the civil authority. Unless someone committed a civil action worthy of punishment, Rogers believed God alone was the Lord and judge.

Thirdly, the Presbyterians and Papists agreed in practice. Rogers gave six examples. (1) As to the matter of ordination, both made the laying on of hands essential. The Independents regarded it as mere ceremony. Papists said ordination was to be dispensed by the Bishops; Presbyterians said by the Presbytery; but Independents said by the congregation. Papists and Presbyterians first ordained a man and then let him be called or chosen. Independents claimed that the Church must first choose a man, after trial and examination, and then ordain him. Using his own personal experience, Rogers wrote

I affirm that as ordination Popishly dispensed does not give the essentials to the outward call of a minister, so the Presbyterian ordination [does not], which I now
disown before God and men (though I was once, through dimsightedness, under it.) 32

(2) Both Papists and Presbyterians kept up a distinction between ministers or priests and the people. (3) They both distinguished ministers or priests by vestments, which the Independents considered superstitious folly. (4) Both had a hierarchy among the clergy, while Independents claimed no superiority among pastors any more than among churches. (5) Both agreed as to the absolute duty of tithing, whereas the Independents hoped for a system in which the people were free in the manner of support. (6) Both seemed to hold a speciality in their churches, as if they were holier than other places. They even kept them locked up or closely guarded so none other than approved persons could preach there. Evidently this was a sore point with Rogers, for he claimed that several times he had been forced to preach in the rain for the lack of a Presbyterian Church's hospitality.

Of course these are but the observations of one man, a man who was trying hard to convince Independents, as well as Presbyterians, of the rightness of his beliefs. He was well aware of the fact that Independents disagreed on many things internally. 33 But in 1648

32 Ibid., p. 498.

33 Rogers observed and assessed Independent dissensions in Ohel or Bethshemesh as follows, "We must acknowledge too many differences amongst us, and that about forms, too. But there may be unity where there is not uniformity. And though we have too, too many divisions and differences amongst us, God knows, which is our daily grief, yet they are not so many or so dangerous as the bitter brethren would have all believe by looking into their magnifying glasses. But those few that are, are not about points of faith, but for the most part forms, which are by some too hotly and hastily pressed." Ibid., p. 512.
Independency seemed the path to follow if one wanted to be active in religious or political affairs with some degree of security. John Rogers wanted to spread his religious beliefs with the assurance of a better reception than he had encountered at Toseland or Purleigh. Given his professions of Independent beliefs, it should not seem surprising that soon after he arrived in London, Rogers was appointed Independent lecturer at St. Thomas Apostle's Church, a position he had probably been offered before he left Purleigh. For two years he preached Independent ideas to his London congregation. It is quite probable that a measure of political support for the Rump Parliament was mixed with his religion. For in 1651, the Council of State appointed Rogers one of six preachers who were to go to Dublin to spread not only the Gospel but also Independency.

By 1651 John Rogers had not yet developed systematic plans for reforms. But in his criticism of the Presbyterians we can find his concern over the power of the civil magistrate, the oppressive burden of tithes, and the hierarchical structure of society as seen in the clergy. But he had only identified and proclaimed the problems. His solutions were yet to come. Nevertheless, he was an Independent, and as such he must have shared the hope for the constitutional reforms proposed by the Army. His mind had begun to work in both the religious and the political spheres. It took a year of reflection and writing for John Rogers to draw his thoughts together into a pattern of reform.

---

By the time John Rogers left for Ireland, he had already come into contact with the ingredients of Fifth Monarchism. Through his Biblical studies and his association with Puritans he had become familiar with ideas about the approaching thousand year reign of Christ. By his acquaintance with members of the Eastern Association Rogers gained knowledge of the religious beliefs of men recruited by the Association for service in Cromwell's New Model Army. (These were the beliefs later incorporated by the Independent Chaplains of the Army into a system of religious thought known as Antinomianism. 1) Finally, by his own conversion to Independency Rogers placed himself among those who believed in the imminent return of Christ to rule over an earthly Kingdom of the Saints. As an Independent lecturer at St. Thomas Apostle's in London, John Rogers, perhaps unknowingly, had become the spiritual leader of many people who would later become the popular support of Fifth Monarchism.

The primary inspiration for the millenial views of the Fifth Monarchists was the Bible. In the seventh chapter of Daniel there is found an account of a dream in which the prophet Daniel saw four beasts come up from the sea. The fourth beast had ten horns. And there came up among them another little horn which destroyed three of the first ten horns.² To Daniel and his contemporaries the fourth beast represented the Syrian kingdom. It had followed the other three beasts which were thought to represent the earthly empires of Babylon, Persia, and Greece. Daniel believed the fourth beast would be overthrown in time, and eventually the Saints, or the Jews as was then thought, would take over the Kingdom of the world. No dates were given, but there were references to a time of troubles lasting 1290 days and a time of joy after 1335 days.

The Jews were soon overcome by the Roman Empire and Daniel's dream went unfulfilled. However, the doctrine of the millenium lived on among the early Christians. Its expression is found again in the New Testament book of Revelation where the kingdoms of the world are also symbolized as monstrous beasts with horns whose destruction ushers in the reign of the Saints. Again there are no dates given, but the reign of the Beast was said to last for 1260 days or forty-two months. When the persecution of Christianity ended in the Roman Empire, and the Church began to consolidate itself, its leaders came to disapprove of the literal application of these Scriptural passages on the millenium. They believed such an application tended to disturb

²See Appendix II.
the established order. The metaphorical interpretation of Saint Augustine, in which the thousand years reign was merely the work of the Church on earth, became the generally accepted interpretation until the Protestant Reformation. 3

However, during the Middle Ages, especially in times of economic misery or political oppression, the old beliefs in a divine upheaval, resulting in the righting of earthly wrongs, were revived by certain groups. Among the followers of John Huss in Bohemia, a radical element called the Taborites believed that the millennium was near. 4 All social and economic inequities would disappear, as well as private property and all forms of human authority. These millennial concepts reappeared in Germany in the early sixteenth century when Thomas Müntzer proclaimed that the New Jerusalem was at hand and ought to be hastened by force of arms. 5 Millenialism probably found its most extreme expression in sixteenth century Müntzer where John of Leyden and his Anabaptists created a reign of terror in preparation for the thousand year reign of Christ. 6 For many years after, the name Anabaptist was used loosely to describe religious fanatics of

3E. L. Tuveson, Millenium and Utopia (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1949), pp. 1-17.
5Ibid., pp. 172-75, 176.
6Ibid., pp. 272-73.
all kinds. The term conjured up terrible images of excess and anarchism, and consequently millenialism suffered a period of mass unpopularity.

Millenarians sought the solutions for earthly social, economic, or political problems in a future age unlike anything known before. They wanted to separate themselves from the wrongs that were prevalent under the reign of Antichrist, or the fourth monarchy, and eventually to destroy that monarchy itself. Coupled with the implied deprecation of both past and present as unrighteous and evil times, their revolutionary eschatology precluded the possibility of the millenarians as a body being accepted by any historical, established, all-inclusive Christian Church. Consequently, millenialism tended to operate outside traditional religion until the age of the Reformation.  

By 1545 Martin Luther had come to regard Daniel and Revelation as genuine historical prophecies which occurred in actual historical times. For Luther, the fourth monarchy and the Beast both represented the Papacy. The thousand years were a literal period of time, but according to the German reformer they had begun at the time of Christ and already were over. John Calvin only agreed that the Beast was the Papacy, but Bullinger and Melanchthon seem to have followed Luther more closely. Most importantly, the Augustinian interpretation of

---

7 Millenialism was not of the normative "Church-type" religion. It had to wait for the appearance of the "sect-type" before it gained wider acceptance. See Ernst Troeltsch, The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches (London, New York, 1931), II, passim.

the millennium was no longer sacred. The millenarians who believed in
more than just an allegorical view of the New Jerusalem began to find
religious homes among the new Protestant sects.

Several things gave rise to this new interpretation. The
Protestants in general placed a greater emphasis on the literal
interpretation of the Scriptures than did the Roman Church. In the
Hussite tradition, many Protestants found the new millennialism one
more way to attack the Pope as Antichrist. Millennialism also
fulfilled the Protestant need to explain historically how the Roman
Church had been able to persecute the "truth" for so many centuries.
In addition it helped to explain the chaos which seemed to follow the
Reformation throughout Europe. For all of these reasons, among others,
a more literal, and sometimes material, interpretation of the
millenium spread with the Protestant Reformation.

This was not exclusively a Continental phenomenon either. The
Protestant exiles who had fled the persecution of England's "Bloody"
Queen Mary picked up these new ideas in Europe and took them back
home at the accession of Elizabeth I. Among the most prolific of the
writers of these Marian exiles was George Joye, who not only
translated the works of Continental reformers, but also wrote his own
interpretation of the book of Daniel for his fellow Englishmen.9
And of course there was John Foxe whose Acts and Monuments gave

9George Joye, The Exposition of Daniel (Geneva, 1545). For
further information on George Joye see Charles Butterworth and Allan
English millenial ideas their greatest impetus. Although these early apocalyptic writers tried to maintain their loyalty to the traditional Christian interpretation of the millenium, they did stray from its bounds. The real focus of their dreams lay in a thousand year reign that was primarily a future event of revolutionary proportions. This was an indication that English millenialism was going to take a different tack from the Continental variety. From the middle of the sixteenth century to the eve of the English Civil Wars, the connection between millenarian hopes and sectarian thought grew stronger and stronger.

Thomas Brightman (1562-1607) was a late Elizabethan Puritan who set forth an interpretation of Revelation that was basically non-traditional. Brightman told his readers that the first resurrection, mentioned in the fifth and sixth verses of the twentieth chapter of Revelation, actually occurred in the first rumblings of the Protestantism of Marsilio of Padua and then John Wycliffe. The millenium really began about 1300 A.D. and was a fixed temporal entity rather than a metaphorical state. By dating the millenium some 300 years before his own time, Brightman demonstrated the conservative nature of early English millenialism. A true millenarian would have placed the whole of the thousand years in the future. While his approach had an element of tradition in it, Brightman's view of Christ's

---

11 Thomas Brightman, The Revelation of St. John (London, 1616)
12 Ibid., p. 1047.
Kingdom was weighted in terms of the future. There were 700 years of
the great age still to be unfolded. He tried to counterbalance this
unorthodoxy by depicting the future era in strictly "spiritual" terms.
In 1300, none of the physically dead Saints had been raised up, but
men "who had been dead and buried before Romish superstition did open
their eyes to see the Truth." And as the wondrous times had begun
spiritually, so the whole age itself was one of spiritual flowering.
The millenium was the purified, or spiritualized, Presbyterian Church!
Obviously Brightman was talking about something quite removed from the
Augustinian tradition.

While Brightman saw the future as a clear highway, Joseph Mede
(1586-1668) tempered this optimism by calling attention to the
difficulties which lay ahead for the Saints. Although he remained
within the Anglican Church, Mede could be considered a more formal
millenarian than Brightman since he placed the whole of the thousand
year reign of the Saints in the future. Spiritually secure and
politically inactive, Mede only came to the book of Revelation through
an academic interest in the history of the Protestant struggle against
Rome. He never claimed he was divinely inspired or that he held the
final answers. Nevertheless, both Brightman and Mede were quoted
frequently by the later Fifth Monarchists.

13 Ibid., p. 1047.
15 Ibid., II, 121.
16 For a list of the millenarians quoted by Fifth Monarchist
   writers, see Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 45-46.
This feeling of anticipation did not mean that all those who expected the millenium held identical visions or hopes. Some believed that the kingly mission of Jesus would be realized in the new age. For these people, the Second Coming had to be monarchical since there was not much more Christ could do as a prophet or priest. From this strain of thought came the Fifth Monarchists of the English Interregnum. But there were others who envisioned the new age as one that would witness a greater outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Where the one millenarian anticipated a New Jerusalem of material blessings, the other expected a world of spiritual joy alone. Where one tended toward a collectivist or community concern, the other tended toward an individual or even anarchistic viewpoint. The one was activist, the other passivist. One was "outward," the other "inward." It was from the former, not the latter, that the Fifth Monarchists took their basic millenial ideas. But it was from the latter, not the former, that most Independent millenarians drew their inspirations.

Until 1640, most English millenarians emphasized the spiritual aspects of the coming Kingdom. But when governmental censorship began to crumble, it became unnecessary to write in an allegorical manner, and Puritan millenialism took a decisive turn. This turn is clear when we examine A Glimpse of Sions Glory written by Thomas Goodwin. 17

17 Although there is some doubt as to Goodwin's authorship of this book, the latest authority on the subject, B. S. Capp, definitely assigns Glimpse to Goodwin. In any case, the fact that William Kiffin, later one of the leading Baptists, provided the Introduction to Glimpse leaves little doubt that it had the support of the segment of Independency that would soon be defined as Baptist. Capp, Fifth Monarchy Men, p. 30.
Goodwin addressed the recently assembled Long Parliament as the instrument of God, the instrument which would carry the great battle against the Beast to victory in England.18 Such acknowledgment of so earthly a body as Parliament was, of course, at variance with the usual millenial vision of rule by Christ and the Saints. But in the context of 1641, when the enemy of Christ seemed to be the enemy of Parliament, too (that is, Laudianism), the distinction between rule by the Saints and rule by Parliament must have seemed tedious at best. Besides, at this time the concept of Sainthood had not yet reached the point of exclusiveness where Parliamentarians could not be brought under its cover.

Goodwin became truly unconventional when he described the future glory awaiting the Saints. In this description he cut himself off from Brightman and Mede and pointed the way to the Fifth Monarchists concept of the millenium as a time of both spiritual and material glory and power. In describing the Kingdom of Christ, the author of Glimpse poured upon the Saints a whole range of earthly glories, not just spiritual joys. They would have peace and happiness, he said, physical and spiritual strength, and would reign with a Christ who was personally present.19 With Goodwin, millenialism took a decidedly more present, material, and activist role in English thought. And it was precisely at this time that the

19 Ibid., pp. 13-29.
seeds of Fifth Monarchism were fertilized. Goodwin himself presided over their growth, surviving to write such definite Fifth Monarchist works as *A Sermon on the Fifth Monarchy* (London, 1654) and *The World to Come* (London, 1655).

A contemporary of Thomas Goodwin was John Archer (died 1642) who finally abandoned the attempt to equate the millenium with the Church. This allowed him to shift his emphasis from Revelation back to Daniel, and from the spiritualism of early millenarians to an overt statement of a materialistic millenium. Christ Himself would establish His Kingdom on earth and would "govern as earthly monarchs have done...in a worldly visible earthly glory...with honor, peace, riches." But Christ would only return to put His Kingdom into form. Then he would withdraw to Heaven, leaving his Saints to rule for a thousand years until he returned on the Judgment Day.

For the first time, Archer used the term Fifth Monarchy to describe the last of the series of historical earthly kingdoms—the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman empires. He saw the ten horns of the fourth beast as the kingdoms of the western part of the Roman Empire, and the fearful little horn that came up among them as the Papacy. Archer was naturally anxious to determine the date of Christ's Second Coming. He, too, dabbled in the "numbers game."

Turning to Revelation, he found two methods of reckoning the time.

---

Along with many other early millenarians, Archer thought that it was between 400 and 406 A.D. that the Bishop of Rome began to assume usurped powers. This signified the rise of the little horn. If one interpreted the 1260 days of woe prophesied in Daniel as years instead of days, and then added 1260 to 406, he came up with 1666 as the year of the millenium. Most millenarians and Fifth Monarchists accepted this as the true date for the inauguration of Christ’s Kingdom.

But there was another method for fixing the date. In Daniel, the conversion of the Jews was to precede the reign of the Saints. And according to Daniel this conversion was to be 1290 days after "the abomination that maketh desolate" (Daniel 12:2). Archer interpreted this as sometime during the reign of the Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate, 360 or 366 A.D. If 1290 (still interpreted as years) were added to 360 or 366, the dates 1650 and 1656 resulted. But from then onward, according to Daniel, the twelve tribes of Israel were to suffer troubles for 45 years until the millenium should begin. This put the eventual date somewhere around 1700.

Others had attempted to fix dates, but it was the temporal monarchical aspect of Archer’s millenium that was so striking. It would be worldwide in scope. It would be brought forth by military victory. It would destroy all present governments as parts of the

---

22 Ibid., pp. 47-50.
23 Ibid., pp. 50-53. Drawing from Archer, John Rogers in 1653 predicted the date to be 1700. But only a few months later he declared that the Fifth Monarchy would reach Rome by 1660 and envelop the whole world by 1666. John Rogers, Sagrir, or Doomesday Drawing Nigh (London, 1653), pp. 124-29.
fourth monarchy. It would be a time of material splendor and power, albeit primarily for the "spiritually pure" Saints.\textsuperscript{24}

The Judaic elements in his analysis were for Archer an incidental aspect of the coming Kingdom. But for others, like Robert Maton, the conversion of the Jews was the first step in the unfolding of the New Jerusalem. And Maton added a whole new dimension when he said the conversion was to be accompanied by a restoration of the Jews to the land of Israel itself.\textsuperscript{25} If this were the case, the millenium had not yet begun. If this were the case, the traditional age of redemption could not begin with Christ and his Church. And if this were the case, the millenium was certainly not entirely a spiritual phenomenon.

The early English millenarians like Brightman and Made tried to maintain ties with tradition and were content to offer only predictions of the beginning of Christ's Kingdom on earth. They taught men how to interpret various signs. Just before the Civil Wars, Goodwin, Archer, and Maton pushed millenial speculation beyond tradition, even to the point of redefining some age-old concepts of Christ. Two trends were emerging, a moderate and a more radical one. Both trends are found in the other two sources of Fifth Monarchism, Independency and Antinomianism. But as with millenialism, one must look to the radical trend to find the Fifth Monarchists.

\textsuperscript{24} Archer, \textit{The Personall Reigne}, pp. 14-30.

\textsuperscript{25} Robert Maton, \textit{Israel's Redemption} (London, 1642), pp. 5-16.
With the Civil Wars in England came the publication of more and more major millenial works. But perhaps the most crucial development of the time was the adoption and dissemination of millenial views by Puritan preachers. The speed with which these new ideas were assimilated suggests that millenialism was already widespread and was merely intensified by the Wars. Puritan fascination for Christ's Kingdom on earth stemmed from both spiritual and temporal concerns. In the first place, Puritans believed in a literal application of Scriptural texts. When they read Daniel and Revelation, it seemed only natural to identify the prophecies with their own earthly situation. Furthermore, they generally supported the Parliamentary cause against the King. The violent results of this conflict of which they were a part seemed to call for religious sanction. This sanction was obtained by identifying themselves with the Saints who were fighting Antichrist as found in Catholicism, Charles I, and the Anglican Church. Also the traditional Puritan concept of duty as a military struggle in spiritual warfare blended perfectly with the

26 B. S. Capp has scanned the catalogue of the Thomason Collection to compare the ministers in England who supported Parliament in the Civil War with those who published at least three books during the period 1640-1653. Of those ministers, some 70% can be identified as millenarians. Capp, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 38-39, 46-49.

27 Capp notes numerous instances of the appearance of pseudo-prophets as evidence of lay millenial excitement. He also cites diaries of several individuals which show the millenial wave had permeated almost all sectors of English society. Ibid., pp. 32-33, 38.

28 Radical Puritans had long been denouncing the Anglican as well as the Catholic Church as Antichristian. Brightman, Revelation of St. John, p. 124; John Cotton, The Pouring out of the Seven Vials (London, 1642), vial 5, p. 5.
idea that God's Saints were engaged in a struggle for the millenium in England. And finally, the Calvinist idea of an elect nation was nurtured by millenial doctrines. England was the only major Protestant state, and this fostered the belief that England was an elect nation destined to destroy Rome and to set up the New Kingdom.

The millenialism of Puritan preachers was very unlike that of Brightman and Mede. To achieve the establishment of Christ's Kingdom the preachers pushed a zealous prosecution of the War. Millenialism, the War, and the Cause of Christ all became the same struggle. From these Puritan preachers millenialism spread through two channels, the Army and the Independent churches. It is in the millenial attitude of the Army Chaplains that we pick up the second source of Fifth Monarchism.

Millenialism was part of the Chaplains' general theological view known as Antinomianism. By Antinomianism is meant the belief that the Elect, or the Saints, were able to achieve assurance of salvation solely by the free gift of God's grace and not by the assistance of human reason or good works. Antinomians were decidedly deterministic in nature thus allowing abrogation of the Laws of Moses. This resulted in Christian liberty, but not necessarily political liberty. Because free grace justified the sinner before he believed and then gave him faith after conversion, man had no role in gaining

\[29\] Solt, Saints in Arms, passim.

\[30\] Antinomians believed that since the Ten Commandments forbade sins already atoned for by Christ, there was no need to study or obey them. Here the Fifth Monarchists disagreed, however.
salvation. Consequently the Antinomians saw no reason why man should have a role in the governmental process. But for the sake of order, if any human being was to have a position of authority, it could only be a member of the Elect. And given the perfectability of the Elect, or the Saints, the Antinomians saw no reason for ordinances in either state or church. Realistically, this invitation to anarchy endangered political liberty. But this did not seem to bother the Antinomians precisely because they thought the nature of the Saints would preclude anything harmful. Founded largely on New Testament teachings, Antinomianism reflected the belief that the law from within, the law of love, was the ultimate, and by nature the most benificent authority.

Fifth Monarchists borrowed heavily from Antinomian theology. They accepted the idea of the millenium as imminent and temporal. They believed that the Elect would have real power in the coming Kingdom of Christ. And they were deterministic to the extent that they believed God had chosen the Saints through the free gift of His grace. Thus it was a combination of the Antinomian idea of free grace and rule of the Elect, of Puritan militancy, and of the not-so-traditional millenialism of Archer, Mede, and Goodwin that produced a generation of Fifth Monarchists in the 1650's. And it was this same combination in the New Model Army that produced the victories of Parliament over the King. Not only the ordinary soldiers, faced with the realization, later on, that order among men who were not all Saints required something more concrete than the law of love, the Fifth Monarchists departed from the Antinomians to ground their actions in the Old Testament Law of Moses. This partially accounts for their harshness and tendency toward authoritarianism.
but also the Army commanders (such as Rainborough, Harrison, Rich, Overton, Danvers, Goffe, and Oliver Cromwell himself) came to support and express millenial ideas.  

Even though the Army was one of the more influential segments of English society and thought in the 1640's, it was not the only source of Fifth Monarchist support. More than the Army, the Independent congregations in London supplied the mass support required to explain the prominence of the Fifth Monarchists in religion, politics, and society during the Interregnum.

Independents believed the true Church was a society of believers sanctified in Christ and separated literally from the world's false ways and worship. The Church had a plenary power within itself and was subordinate to none but Christ. Its members were freely and voluntarily assembled without outside compulsion. The visible Church was made up of visible Saints who were known to be united with Christ through his Spirit by evidence of soul-sanctifying grace. The Independent principles of sainthood and separation were the two wedges by which millenialism forced its way into the Independent conscience. Since millenial ideas turned on the assumption that there were identifiable Saints who would reign with Christ in the thousand years, millenialism and Independency could join hands with

---

32 For specific biographical information on these men see DNB or Capp, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 239-271.

33 This is John Rogers's own description of Independency, but it is as clear and succinct an appraisal as that of any contemporary author. Rogers, Otel or Bethshemesh, pp. 136-38.
little difficulty. The millenarian could lean on the Independent for assurance of salvation, and the Independent could look to the millenarian for the assurance that the eagerly awaited Zion would begin right here on earth.

In his study of Independents in the Civil Wars, George Yule notes that there were two general groups. The group, which Yule calls orthodox, held a position somewhere between the Presbyterian concept of a National Church and separatism. The other group, the radicals, stood for strict separation of the Saints from the world and tended to follow the non-traditional interpretations of the millenium first voiced by Archer and Maton. In the orthodox group there were some whose positions differed little from those of the Presbyterians. There were others, like Thomas Goodwin, who accepted the concept of an earthly redemptive age in the future, but who tended to emphasize the millenium as an age of internal bliss. And then there were those in the middle whose ideas were probably best expressed by John Owen, an unofficial polemicist for the Government during the Interregnum. Owen maintained that the basic qualities of the Kingdom of Christ were internal and spiritual. Yet this spiritual splendor was affected and aided by the temporal institutions of


35 In Apologetical Narration (London, 1643), p. 24, the "dissenting brethren" (Goodwin, Nye, Bridge, Burroughs, Simpson) described this as the "middle way."

was determined historically and was associated with a particular age. According to the Independents this age of the Spirit was the one which mankind was approaching in the 1640's and was distinct from all previous ages. Independents like John Saltmarsh and William Erbury saw history as a progression from age to age, but they talked of earthly ages and not of a spiritual age to come. These Independents were Antinomian in their belief in the indwelling Spirit; they were millenarian in their belief that the fullness of this Spirit would manifest itself in the Saints during the last earthly age.

Because this last age was an historical one, the radical Independents found it easier to apply their energies and ideas to actual political and historical events than the Antinomians did. They themselves were living in the transitional period when the great fullness was being manifested. Activity and not passivity was the key. They were actually witnesses to the historical struggle between the Saints and their enemies. The unfolding of contemporary political and military events, then, brought theoretical millenialism down to everyday life. William Erbury's defense of the Civil War and the New Model Army is an example.

During the War, many Puritans, Antinomians, and Independents sought a religious explanation for the upheaval in which they were involved. Erbury, in his Lord of Hosts (1648), announced that the New Model Army was indeed an Army of Saints. In the Army there were

"administration" and "government." The Kingdom of Christ was the culmination of man's earthly journey. 37 Using hindsight, we can see that Owen was equating the Kingdom of Christ with the triumph of Independency. For Owen the victory was possible through Cromwell's Government which was fulfilling its Godly function to protect the Church and its power. Moreover, while he admonished the Saints to strive for spiritual perfection, he advised them to take vengeance upon Christ's enemies through temporal institutions of government. 38

The millennial views of Owen resembled those of the pre-1640 theorists. He equated the millenium with the Church triumphant, albeit the Independent Church. He felt that the millenium was in the future, not already past. But the historical moment in which he wrote gave John Owen's ideas a more radical appearance than those of M.de or Archer. In fact, they seem very close to the opinions of Yule's second general group of Independents, the radicals.

The theological base from which the radical Independent millenarians grew was the doctrine of free grace. Puritan Antinomianism, which has already been described, was grounded in almost identical tenets of belief. But to the Antinomian emphasis on the indwelling Spirit, the radical Independents added the dynamic of temporal history. The full outpouring of the Spirit in the Saints


two elements, the spiritual and the physical. The physical element was justified and sustained by the Godly or spiritual nature of the mission. Of course, the spiritual element was the ultimate source of the Army's victories.40 Erbury also sought another justification for so carnal an instrument as an army in the mission of the millenium. As an Independent who saw history as a progression from age to age, he explained that the final age, or the millennium, would be a kind of church-state fusion of external and internal glories. "In this... dispensation," he wrote, "God in the Saints restores all things... spiritual and civil also, renews the forms of the Kingdoms of outward Governments and Order, as well as things in the Spirit in and by the Saints."41 So the New Model Army's rationale came not only from its "spirituality," but also from the fact that mankind was entering this final age of history. There was to be an external unfolding of the internal rebirth. This external unfolding included suppression and punishment by the sword of the former oppressors of the Saints.

One may account for Erbury's lapse into a less spiritual millenialism by the actual moment of history in which he wrote. The Puritan Revolution in England had reached a crisis in 1648. The King's duplicity in negotiations, the Second Civil War, the Presbyterian challenge, and Pride's Purge indicated that 1648 would usher in a new era of some kind. With such external political and military manifestations of the Spirit, Erbury, along with many others,

40 Erbury, Testimony, pp. 24-27.
41 Ibid., pp. 36-39.
probably found it difficult to maintain a strictly internal view of the millenium. Because of its critical transitional nature, this particular historical year certainly seemed to demand expedient measures. Because it was thought to be the beginning of a period in which temporal matters were again entering God's design more clearly, this historical moment seemed appropriate for temporal as well as spiritual action.

The effects of the political and religious upheaval of the Civil Wars were felt throughout English society. Traditional relationships between landlord and tenant, between employer and employee, between man and his religion were all disrupted without regard for rank or privilege. Millenial ideas about the beginning of a new age helped explain these disruptions. Inevitably these ideas passed down to, and were embraced by, common people in all areas of English society. Millenial enthusiasm was supported by the already present sense of Divine intervention in daily living. The two heresiographers, T. Edwards and E. Pagitt, both included the expectation of an earthly reign of the Saints as a popular heresy.\(^4\) Under such circumstances it should not seem surprising that more and more people began to attend Independent lectures and to frequent Independent churches to learn more of the New Jerusalem. And since London was the most concentrated area of Independent congregations, it was in London that religious Independency began to gather a mass

of "grass-roots" millenialists. To the churches of Independent preachers and lecturers like John Simpson, Christopher Peake, Peter Chamberlen, Edmund Chillenden, George Cockye, and John Rogers, flocked a civil "army" of millenarians who would eventually become the props of Fifth Monarchism.

By no means, of course, were all radical Independent millenarians destined to become Fifth Monarchists. While they were radical millenarians because they saw the millenium as a future earthly era of revolutionary proportions, the Fifth Monarchists were almost exclusively concerned with the temporal, mundane, material preparations for the thousand year reign of Christ and his Saints. They brought an activist, collectivist mentality to the solution of those religious, political, social, and economic problems that they saw as blocks to the fulfillment of the glorious age to come. The Fifth Monarchists became worldly reformers with spiritual goals. Everything was subordinate to the coming of Christ, however. And the Fifth Monarchists sought to justify all their actions by that one event. Many Independent millenarians could not agree with such a narrow approach.

The sect known as Fifth Monarchy Men borrowed and modified so much from other groups and ideologies that it failed to produce a theological doctrine of its own. Perhaps this lack of a definite foundation was at least partially responsible for the Fifth

\[43\]

It was also in London, the seat of the English government, that Independency began to take on a stronger national political role as well.
Monarchists' failure in their worldly efforts. Their millenialism was Biblical because it rested on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation. It was English because it rested in the interpretations given to those prophecies by men like John Archer, Joseph Mede, and Thomas Brightman. It was Antinomian because it was deterministic and exclusive. It was Independent because it was congregational. The Fifth Monarchists were none of these in particular, yet all of them in general. However, their emphasis on this world and its problems made them unique among millenarians.

By 1642, English nationalism, Protestant literalism, and Calvinist elitism combined to produce apocalyptic and millenial beliefs. The outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 intensified these beliefs. The growth of Antinomianism in the Army, and Independency in the churches continued and modified these beliefs. By 1649, England was not only ready for political, social, and economic change. She was also psychologically prepared for the return of Christ and the reign of his Saints on earth. Whether one was a theologian, a teacher, a carpenter, a shoemaker, a baker, a landlord, or a blacksmith, he knew that the New Jerusalem was a promise of better things. With the execution of King Charles I in January 1649, all seemed clear for the realization of a new age in England—the millenium. And with the execution of the King, the crystallization of all elements of Fifth Monarchism took a more distinct form.
CHAPTER III

THE MILLENIARIAN REFORMER

With the King of England in his grave and his sons in exile, it could hardly be doubted that a new order was at hand in England. The majority of the population was apprehensive. But those Independents, Antinomians, and millenarians who believed England would be the instrument by which Godly revolution would be carried to all lands saw in the execution of Charles I the signs of the end of the fourth monarchy and the beginning of the Fifth. From these three groups came loud denunciations of the "old system" and advice on

1. The "old system" was monarchy in general and Charles I in particular. Christopher Feake, vicar of Christ Church, Newgate, and later leader of the more radical Fifth Monarchists in London, taught that there was in monarchy "an enmity against Christ which he would destroy." Vavasor Powell, the Welsh millenarian and later Fifth Monarchist, took special aim at the late King, and justified his execution on the grounds that Charles I had broken all the Ten Commandments, that he practiced Papal idolatry, swearing, and filial disobedience. John Spittlehouse, assistant to the Marshall-General for military security, saw Charles as antichrist, along with the Pope. Mary Cary, the Fifth Monarchist prophetess, thought Charles was the little horn referred to in Daniel's prophecy. John Rogers discovered the same identification. John Canne summed up the whole episode by declaring, "Here began the Lord God Almighty to call Kings and Kingdoms to an account." Edwards, Gangraena, III, 148; Great Britain, Public Record Office, C.S.P.D. (1653-4), p. 305; John Spittlehouse, The First Addresses (London, 1653), p. 23; Mary Cary, The Little Horns Doom and Downfall (London, 1651), p. 6; Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 25; John Canne, A Voice from the Temple (London, 1653), pp. 14-15.
establishment of saintly government in England. The Fifth Monarchists threw themselves wholeheartedly into the effort to prepare the way for Christ's Kingdom on earth. In so doing, they created a program of religious, social, and political reform which was no less than revolutionary. Indeed, all the elements of revolution were present: a sense of grievance which gave form to their efforts, an ideology which rationalized their efforts, and the hope of success which spurred them on. Within the revolution that had already deposed and killed a King, the Fifth Monarchists attempted to establish, by violence if necessary, a completely new social and political order.

In the next two chapters, these elements of revolution will be discussed with special reference to John Rogers's association with them.

The first popular crystallization of the Fifth Monarchist ideals into a serious political proposition appeared in a petition subscribed by the Saints of the city of Norwich and county of Norfolk. It was presented to General Fairfax and the Council of War of the New Model Army on February 19, 1649. Certain Querries Humbly Presented by way of Petition (London, 1649) reflected nothing short of full scale revolution. In the best millenial style, the petitioners reminded the Army that its victories were part of God's design to end worldly government and to enthrone Christ as "Prince of the Kings of the Earth." But this Kingdom of Christ was not just spiritual or

---

2 Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men, p. 17.
within the souls of men. It was external and visible in the world.
"Christ says My Kingdom is not of this world," the petitioners pointed out, "but he did not say it shall not be upon the earth now while the earth remains." It was external and visible because Christ would rule the kingdoms of men as well as their hearts. 3

Toward the establishment of this Kingdom, the Saints called for their numbers to "associate together into several Church Societies and Corporation (according to the Congregational way) 'til being increased and multiplied they may combine in General Assemblies or Church Parliaments (according to the Presbyterian way) and then shall God give them authority and rule over the nations." 4 As a preliminary step, the petitioners called for the Government to stir up the Godly ministers and people throughout the land, to encourage and protect the Church Societies, and to see that "only such as be of approved Godliness may have the right hand of fellowship given to them." 5 With their insistence that the light of Scripture was a better law than any other, the Norfolk petitioners stepped into the realm of civil law. Naturally they sought a proper repository for civil authority, a repository which could comfortably combine both civil and spiritual righteousness. That repository was the Church, the individual Independent congregations of Godly men. In order that the reign of righteousness could begin immediately, the government of the

3 Certain Quaeries Humbly Presented by Way of Petition (London, 1649), pp. 3-5.
4 Ibid., pp. 6-7.
5 Ibid., p. 7.
country was to be handed over to a general assembly elected by those individual congregations. (In essence, this was the pattern that eventually produced the Barebones Parliament of 1653.) Upon reflection, the petitioners' conclusions were indeed revolutionary. There was a Kingdom which Christ would rule on earth. It would be external and visible and would be administered by laws and officers which Christ would appoint through his Church. It would put down all worldly authority. It would be erected by Christ and his Church. And it could be expected in the near future.

In a second petition from Norfolk in 1649, the Saints added to their skeletal plan of Godly government a list of grievances with which they expected the new Government to deal. Prominent among their complaints was the existence of scandalous and corrupt clergy, the oppression of tithes, and the existence of corrupt lawyers who grew rich off the labors of poor men. They also called for the abolition of excessive feudal fines, customs and excise taxes, and the general reestablishment of Godliness. Whether the Norfolk Saints realized it or not, they had set the tone of all subsequent Fifth Monarchist programs. In their pursuit of the millennium, these Saints sought to purge the clergy, abolish tithes, reduce taxes, and remove the privileges of the rich. Besides leading to a Godly society, these measures also would reform many of the abuses of the earthly society. Thus these millenarians were not of the traditional spiritualist

---

variety. They were the first of a new breed who believed they could hasten the advent of the New Jerusalem by engaging in and supporting reform of the existing society. As such, they were the first Fifth Monarchists.

With the grievances mentioned above, there was another, more basic grievance which spurred the Saints to action. This grievance was the evil and corrupt worldly governors of England that the Saints believed had long prevented a smooth transition to Christ's Kingdom on earth. If their hearts had been so inclined, these governors could have prevented heavy taxes, obscure laws, and corrupt lawyers from diverting men's minds from Godly pursuits. In the Declaration of Musselburgh of 1650, the common soldiers and junior officers involved in Cromwell's Scottish campaign saw Charles I as one of those type of governors. By removing him, they believed England had removed one of the prime obstructions to the New Jerusalem. These soldiers and officers declared Christ as their only King, and claimed to fight only for his Kingdom.

The Fifth Monarchists did have a deeply felt sense of grievance. But where the ordinary man might have seen the redress of

---

7 Scottish leaders were shocked and annoyed by the King's death. In February 1649, Scotland proclaimed Charles's son King of Scotland and the Scottish army prepared to invade England. But Cromwell and the New Model Army marched north before the Scots could cross the border. In 1650, Cromwell routed the Scots at Dunbar, and by the end of the year he occupied Edinburgh. In September 1651, he crushed the future Charles II and his Scottish troops at Worcester, forcing him to flee to France.

8 Declaration of the English Army in Scotland, To the People in Scotland (London, 1650), pp. 3-5.
grievances as an end in itself, the Fifth Monarchists saw it as a vital step toward the realization of the millenium. Their grievances were a result of the frustration of their cause. The very nature of that cause dictated an attack upon the source of the grievances. And they believed the wicked government of the fourth monarchy was no match for the infallible trinity of God, Christ, and the Bible.

The ideology upon which the Fifth Monarchists based their attacks on the evils of the fourth monarchy was a blend of various elements found in millenialism, Antinomianism, Puritanism, and Independency. From Biblical millenialism the Fifth Monarchists drew their concept of the imminent Kingdom of Christ. In Independency they found a system of church governance and a type of theology that accommodated a material and spiritual concept of the millenium. From Antinomianism they inherited a belief in the Elect, those best suited to carry out the redress of their grievances before the actual appearance of Christ. And in Puritanism, they found both a moral system that would help prepare this world for the Kingdom of Christ, and a modified Calvinistic rationale for the overthrow of corrupt governors. These components of Fifth Monarchist ideology have been discussed as they developed up to 1649. Between 1649 and 1653 these same components were moulded into a singularly distinctive ideology which was given life by the Barebones Parliament of 1653. Among the authors and publicizers of this ideology were Vavasor Powell, Mary Cary, and John Rogers.
Vavasor Powell was educated at Oxford and became a Chaplain in the Parliamentary Army. He was an itinerant Welsh preacher who developed and gave voice to Fifth Monarchist ideas but remained a quietist at heart. Powell believed in free grace, but he also believed that grace manifested itself in the moral ability or outward conduct of the believer. Man was enjoined to do good, like Christ. Thus Powell provided a rationale for the earthly reforming activities that the Fifth Monarchists envisioned. These beliefs, joined to his own insensibility to the mystical, put Powell among the ranks of the Fifth Monarchists, who demanded an external realization of Christ's Kingdom, rather than among the millenarians who adopted the Quaker view of complete internalization. However, his first definite millenial declaration was a moderate one. In Christ Exalted Powell divided the Kingdom of Christ into three parts—the Heavenly Kingdom, the Spiritual Kingdom, and the earthly Kingdom. He did not discuss the supernatural Heavenly Kingdom, but passed immediately to the Spiritual Kingdom. Essentially this was an allegory for the Church, a Kingdom in which Christ ruled by his Word through apostles, pastors, prophets, evangelists, and teachers. In the third Kingdom, the earthly one, Powell declared flatly that the Saints should rule. And although he believed that faith, prayers, and patience were the best tools the Saints could use in exercising their authority, he admitted

9 For more information on Powell and others of the Welsh contingent of Fifth Monarchists see Geoffrey Nuttall, The Welsh Saints (Cardiff, 1957).

"it is as true that the Saints may lawfully fight, for we read that they are to have a two-edged sword. (Psalm 148:6)."  

Powell saw Christ as an earthly Messiah, and this led him to earthly matters. If Christ had an earthly authority, there was no reason to assume that his lieutenants, the Saints, could not have civil and military as well as religious power themselves. And with that power they could attack worldly abuses along with spiritual ones. By comparing these ideas with those of William Erbury, we can see the progression towards outright Fifth Monarchism. Erbury sought the millenium by being quiet and still; Powell was prepared to sanction the use of the "two-edged sword." Erbury looked into his own soul for the glorious Kingdom; Powell looked to political fulfillment. For Erbury, Christ was the Holy Spirit; for Powell, Christ was King of Kings. Neither man could completely ignore spiritual or temporal matters to the utter exclusion of the other. But the change in emphasis pointed to a growing Fifth Monarchist orientation.

If Powell was somewhat cautious in writing of the Fifth Monarchy, Mary Cary, who had become a millenarian at the age of fifteen, presented the whole spectrum of ideas associated with Fifth Monarchism in bold and compelling terms. The essential message of Cary's Resurrection of the Witnesses (London, 1648) was that knowledge of God's promises, followed by the knowledge of their historical fulfillment, led to faith in all God's promises. One of those promises was the establishment of Christ's Kingdom, and Cary believed

11 Ibid., pp. 57-58.
that the essential quality of a Saint was his ability to accept this promise and work for its achievement with God. In other words, acceptance of God's promise of Christ's Kingdom made you a Saint. The consequence of this approach to Sainthood was an undermining of the exclusiveness associated with the theological doctrine of election. The possibility of Sainthood was opened up to more people. In this expansive approach to election, Cary created one of the potentially explosive elements of Fifth Monarchism—its approach and appeal as a broad movement, popular and undifferentiated. In Cary's system, Saints might be found anywhere, among Puritans, Independents, Brownists, Anabaptists, or even Presbyterians. All differences would be subordinated to the belief in the coming Kingdom of Christ. The practical consequence of this simple qualification for Sainthood would have been a considerable strengthening of the base of support for Saintly government in England. With such unity, and in such numbers, the Saints could have been a civil and religious force to be reckoned with. However, the Fifth Monarchists did not seem to grasp this for Cary's concept was not universally embraced by them.

Cary believed that as champions of Christ the Saints had to be prepared to fight and shed blood if necessary. They had to maintain themselves against the Beast and the forces of evil, and eventually they had to assume the offensive in order to win the world. Cary saw the English Civil Wars in exactly these terms. One consequence of her Resurrection of the Witnesses was the sanctification of future

Fifth Monarchist military and political activities. The "late defensive war," she said, had been instigated by the Pope and his representatives in England—Queen Henrietta, the Papal Nuncio, and clandestine Jesuits. But once into the struggle, Cromwell's Army of Saints had emerged victorious over the forces of Antichrist. And now Cary urged those Saints to use the political power gained from their victory to continue the fight against the Beast and for Christ. Under Cary's aegis, political activity became more hallowed, and the Fifth Monarchists were to enter into English politics as committed and dedicated partisans.

As other millenarians, Mary Cary also speculated on the chronology of the millenium. Taught by the unfolding of God's promises in history, she believed that the Fifth Monarchy had begun in 1645 and that Christ would come in person in 1701. This practice of citing two dates for the millenium was copied by many later Fifth Monarchists including John Rogers. It provided a period of preparation for the millenium in which the Saints would preside over the final destruction of the fourth monarchy. This was the period

---


14 Ibid., p. 175 and passim.

15 Cary's date for the beginning of the millenium was earlier than that of many other Fifth Monarchists. This was because she used 360 instead of 365 days to a year in her calculations. She gave no explanation for this except that this was how the Holy Ghost figured a year. She arrived at 1701 by using the same basic system that John Tillinghast borrowed from John Archer. Cary, *Little Horns Doom*, pp. 46-47; Cary, *Resurrection*, pp. 207-209; John Tillinghast, *Knowledge of the Times* (London, 1654), passim; Archer, *Personall Reign*, p. 3, 53ff.
of earthly reforms which would end with the actual appearance of Christ himself.

Although Mary Cary predicted such material benefits in the millenium as the elimination of infant mortality, the increase of the life span, a fruitful earth, good weather, adequate housing, and abundance of precious metals (which predictions made her a radical millenarian), she did not deny the spiritual elements of the New Jerusalem altogether. However, she believed the full realization of spiritual blessings would be deferred to sometime in the future (though within the thousand years). In the best spiritualist style, she stated that the Spirit was confined to no one class. Spiritual equality would prevail in the millenium, which for Cary meant that God would establish among those equals a form in which all should worship the Lord "with one mind, and one heart, in one way." In addition there would be social equality. All would grow and enjoy spiritual as well as material blessings together. The millenium, then, for Cary, would be an age of peace, of external ecclesiastical uniformity, and of internal theological unity.17

This egalitarianism might have proved beneficial to Mary Cary and the Fifth Monarchists who followed her example if they had not maintained a distinction between Saints and non-saints. Even though Sainthood was not as exclusive in Cary's system as the Antinomians believed it was, the greatest number of people at any one time would

17 Ibid., pp. 238, 308-11, 259.
not have been Saints convinced of Christ's earthly reign. Politically this implied that a period of power by the elite had to precede the final fulfillment of the glorious Kingdom. Although Cary thought that the unredeemed ought to be treated with justice and not oppressed, the non-saints could not help but be dissatisfied with their inferior position. Even Cary realized that the Devil could exploit their anger in order to disrupt the Saints' actions. ¹⁸ She had no answer to this problem other than to leave it to Christ's direction. With this concept Mary Cary laid the foundation for spiritual and material order in the millennium. But she also paved the way for discontent among those not in the elite who would always be of a greater number than the Elect. The distinction between Saints and non-saints probably discouraged many potential Fifth Monarchist supporters. This was especially the case later when Fifth Monarchist leaders tried to assert their divine authority with an iron hand. In fact, the Fifth Monarchists turned out to be one of the most intolerant religious sects spawned by a revolution that was to give birth to the ideal of religious toleration.

In the same year that the second edition of Mary Cary's Resurrection of the Witnesses appeared, John Rogers published his first book, Ohel or Bethshemesh, A Tabernacle for the Sun; or Irenicum Evangelicum, An Idea of Church Discipline. This was largely the work of an Independent millenarian rather than of a convinced Fifth Monarchist. Rogers's concern was to show that the Independent church

¹⁸Ibid., p. 318.
government was most like that sanctioned in the Bible. However, in his observations and instructions on how to gather such a church in any particular community, Rogers also presented his ideas and opinions on the religious situation of the times. Since millenialism and Fifth Monarchism influenced that situation, it is not surprising that Rogers commented rather extensively on their various doctrines. And because these comments were generally favorably, Ohel or Bethshemesh became another link in the growing chain of Fifth Monarchist propaganda. Since Rogers approached the subject in a scholarly manner, he helped to popularize some concepts that otherwise might have seemed extremely radical to many sectors of English society.

Ohel or Bethshemesh is composed of three general divisions—the various Epistles, the first book (entitled "Chathan") in which Rogers describes the true Church, and the second book (entitled "Challah") in which he advises how to set up such a Church. The two books "Chathan" and "Challah" are relatively cautious expressions of Independency. But the Dedicatory Epistles are manifestoes of nascent Fifth Monarchism. Ohel or Bethshemesh, then, represents John Rogers's progression from Independency to Fifth Monarchism. This transition was due to two things: personal experiences, both religious and political, and political changes in the

19 Ohel or Bethshemesh is a very well organized book. Ideas and arguments are presented point by point. The whole book is outlined for the reader at the end of Chapter Nine. Arguments are usually well thought out and are presented in a scholarly manner. Footnotes indicate that Rogers was familiar with a broad range of authors and works on church organization, theology, and millenialism.
structure of England itself. The two books of instruction in Ohel or Bethshemesh were composed in Dublin, when Rogers was still the Puritan turned Independent preacher. But as mentioned before, Rogers seemed to have a proclivity for alighting on unsettled districts. Besides the political upheaval resulting from Cromwell's victories at Drogheda and Wexford, the Irish also were faced with the growing influence of Anabaptism in Ireland. At Christ Church, Dublin, members of Rogers's congregation were continually harassed by one Mr. Thomas Patience, an Anabaptist preacher from Waterford. He urged that none be admitted to communion who allowed infant baptism. Rogers conceded much, but he never felt it was necessary to rebaptize those who had already been baptized as infants. This caused a schism in Rogers's congregation, and he thought it necessary to instruct his flock on the proper attitudes and methods of a true Church of Christ. "Chathan" and "Challah," then, were the works of Rogers the religious reformer, the Independent preacher trying to purify and simplify religion by removing the outward strictures of form, ceremony, and hierarchy. In order to create healthy religious souls, Rogers advised separation from all things that hindered Godly thoughts and behavior.

Rogers was in a very precarious position at Dublin. His views on infant baptism alienated half of his congregation, and his liberal views on religious toleration and the role of women in the Church alienated the other half. After less than a year at his post, he became so frustrated with these dissensions and the obstacles they

20 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 295-310.
presented to the important work of the Church in Dublin that he resigned his pastorate and returned to St. Thomas Apostle's in London. But he could not escape the controversies that surrounded him in Ireland; and recriminations continued to plague him in London. 21

Ohel or Bethshemesh thus became not only a book of instruction, but a rationalization for the course Rogers had followed in Dublin. It was a means to rescue what Rogers saw as a decaying reputation.

Between the time when he returned to London in March 1652 and the time when he wrote the Dedicatory Epistles to Ohel or Bethshemesh in 1653, John Rogers underwent a change in loyalties and an expansion of interest to include political as well as religious issues. In its religious sphere, Independency had a great champion in John Rogers. He had received preferment and position as an Independent preacher. And he was thoroughly convinced that the congregational way was the closest to Christ's intent. But by virtue of Cromwell's and the Army's triumph over the Long Parliament, Independency had a political sphere as well. In preaching and writing, Rogers entered that sphere when he began to defend the Independent elements in the Rump Parliament against the attacks of the Presbyterian lawyers and clergy.

Many of those who hoped for a Godly regime in England looked to the Rump Parliament for aid against the Presbyterians, the corrupt lawyers, and the recalcitrant clergy. So far as they went, Rogers applauded their actions in Parliament. However, it became clear soon enough that the Rump was but a cautious and worldly body, not at all

21 Ibid., pp. 43-54.
intent on religious or social revolution. Accordingly, many who
desired change began to transfer their hopes to Oliver Cromwell and
the Army. John Rogers was among those who found little positive
response to the more sweeping Independent proposals in the Parliament.
So he, too, began to develop a closer association with elements in the
Army. This association put him in contact with the Fifth Monarchists
in the Army, who by now had come to the conclusion that unless they
formed their own activist group to press for immediate religious and
political reforms, the millenium would be something less than they
hoped for. In this company John Rogers now began to develop the
ideas which first appear in the Dedicatory Epistles to Ohel or
Bethshemesh. In his search for the most powerful way to put his
religious reforms into practice, the Independent preacher joined
forces with the radical millenarians. When he did, he added to his
demands for religious reform the call for reforms proposed by all
Fifth Monarchists—abolition of the national church, tithes, lawyers,
and the cumbersome legal system in England. While he broadened his
concern for social problems, he also increased his chances for a
deeper involvement in political issues. For the Fifth Monarchists in
the Army were among those millenarians who considered political
activity sacred if aimed at the accomplishment of reforms preparative
to the millenium. The fact that Rogers never got around to writing
his promised third part of Ohel or Bethshemesh (on what to do after
establishing a true Church) indicates his preoccupation with Fifth
Monarchist reforms. He came to believe that the healthy religious
soul could not function efficiently where so many worldly cares distracted it. Therefore he threw himself into the Fifth Monarchist program, the success of which he thought would remove those worldly obstacles, if not eliminate the problem altogether.

John Rogers was definitely a millenarian by the time he published Ohel or Bethshemesh. Although he tended to emphasize the spiritual interpretation of the millenium in this, his first venture into the subject, elements of the material interpretation do appear. Perhaps the most obvious is Rogers's prediction on the chronology of the millenium. Like many Fifth Monarchists, he believed there were two phases to Christ's Kingdom. The first was an earthly Jerusalem which was but a preparation for the second, a heavenly Jerusalem which would come gradually as the world approached perfection. The preparatory period had begun in 1643 and Christ would appear around 1688. The double nature of the glorious Kingdom allowed the Fifth Monarchists to believe that God alone would set up the Kingdom, but that the Saints were needed to prepare the physical world for the actual advent of Christ. It also allowed them to speak about earthly

---

22Based on Revelation 12:14 which says that the Church is to continue in the wilderness for a time, times, and half a time, Rogers dated the beginning of the 1260 years (days) from 350 A.D. (He used the term "time" as 100 years, "times" as 200 years, and "half a time" as 50 years, dating all from the year 0.) To the total of 1610 he added, for some unspecified reason, the 33 years of Christ's life to end up with 1643 as the beginning of the preparatory period. Then quoting Daniel 12:13, that those who waited 45 years (days) would receive blessedness, Rogers added 45 to 1643 and got 1688 as the date of Christ's personal appearance. Allowing for errors, he decided the heavenly Jerusalem would arrive before 1700. Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 19-20, 24-25, 224.
aspects of the millenium as well as spiritual ones. Rogers, for
example, believed that in addition to spiritual perfection the Saints
would enjoy freedom from illness, the infirmities of age, weakness,
and even death. In so far as he was willing to elaborate on the
characteristics of an earthly Kingdom of Christ, John Rogers had
already become a Fifth Monarchist. 23

Rogers's concept of the two phases of the millenium came not
from Biblical prophecies, but from his belief in the dual nature of
Christ. Christ was King to all nations, he wrote, and Head to all
churches:

All power is given to him in heaven and earth, Church
and State (Matthew 28:18) to rule all...'til all shall
be under him (I Corinthians 15:25). He alone shall
reign over them in Zion and forever (Micah 2:17; Psalm
99:1,2; Isaiah 9:2,7; Psalm 22, 23) and is set up King
in Zion. He will be greatest in Zion (Revelation 2:26).
Yea, and rule the nations, too (Revelation 11, 15, 18;
Zachariah 4:9). The prophecies are full for Christ's
reign as Head and alone ruler in his Church especially
and most visibly in these latter days. 24

Thus the earthly and heavenly phases of the millenium were not

23 Ibid., pp. 538, 531, 529, 534, 36. The only Fifth
Monarchist who seriously tried to systematize all the various
prophecies was John Tillingast. He calculated the 1260 years (days
according to the Bible) in which the witnesses lay dead (Revelation
11:3) from the year 396 A.D. when the Popes began to assume greater
political power. The 1290 years (days) of the profanation of the
temple (Daniel 12:11) were dated from the destruction of the Temple
at Jerusalem in 366 A.D. Tillingast expected the collapse of the
fourth monarchy in 1656. But from there he took Daniel's reference
to the beginning of total perfection after 1335 years (days) (Daniel
12:12) to mean that Christ would not appear in person until 1701.
Tillingast, Knowledge of the Times, passim; Mr. Tillingast's

24 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 508-509, 24.
mutually exclusive. Rather one led to the other, and in both was the promise of better things. Presiding over both, plus the transition between them, was Christ, the Lord of the nations and the Lord of the Church, the ruler without and the ruler within, the universal Lord over all. As Christ was presently the Lord of the Church, so he would soon be the Lord of the nations, not figuratively, but in actual physical fact. "As Christ with his nobility arises bigward," Rogers concluded, "earthly kings with their nobilities do fall backward. This appears in parts of Europe already, and will over the world 'till not one be left. I am persuaded yet a king can never more reign in England."  

Rogers believed that the form of the earthly millenium was a visible Gospel Church-State. "Nothing is more clear out of the Word," he announced, "than that there is a Gospel-Discipline or Church-State for the Saints of divine institution and by divine instruction." As the spirit of the Lord poured forth upon all parts of the earth, the Church-State would grow more spiritually oriented and approach the ultimate glory of the New Jerusalem ruled by Christ in person. Rogers entrusted the rule of this Church-State, in its earthly form, 


26Ibid., p. 1.

27Among the Fifth Monarchists, Mary Cary agreed that Christ would appear and reign in person. William Aspinwall doubted that Christ would ever appear. John Archer, who cannot rightly be called a Fifth Monarchist, thought Christ would come at first and then withdraw. Cary, Little Horns Doom, p. 213; William Aspinwall, A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy (London, 1653), p. 4; Archer, Personall Reigne, pp. 16, 22.
to that body which he felt represented the true wishes of Christ, the Independent or Congregational Church. "Before we can enter Zion," he said, "we must pass through the gates which are the gathered Churches." It was no wonder, then, that he took such great pains in Ohel or Bethshemesh to set forth the principles and prerequisites for gathering and constituting a true Church of Christ.28

The individual gathered congregation was the foundation of Christ's Kingdom, Rogers believed, because the Saints were found in such congregations. According to the budding Fifth Monarchist, the Saints were "none else but such as shall be saved and whom the Lord hath received, to whom the Lord hath given saving grace and sound faith, and also unfained hearts to give themselves up to God in Gospel fellowship." Election was secret and mysterious, something from all eternity. As man alone could not discern what was done from eternity, he could not discern election on his own. But John Rogers saw election as a river. Even though "the Decree is secret, and kept hid, yet the springs break out in our vocations and holy obedience and conversation. Vocation is the way from predestination to glorification."29 In other words, God kept election secret, but He did reveal it in so far as the Elect exhibited special qualities, particularly in their vocations. As the Saint dutifully performed the tasks of his earthly vocation, he gave evidence of his election and glorified God at the same time. For John Rogers, this

28 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 209, 327.
29 Ibid., pp. 151, 67, 359.
preempted any idea that if one were saved he could live as he pleased, for, as he observed, "We will indeed, but it is God that works that will in us, both to will and to do." 30 Salvation was in the decree of election, and before sanctification. But in the execution of the decree, sanctification appeared both in vocation and life-style before salvation. Though decree is first, here on earth vocation is observed first. In typical Calvinist style, election became, for John Rogers, one's vocation.

The number of those on earth thought to be Saints depended on the Church's judgment of election. 31 To some extent, Rogers echoed Mary Cary in the belief that "by comparing providences and prophecies together, God's works with God's words" the Saints would "attain to much light." 32 But this was not necessarily evidence of Sainthood. Only the separate congregation could determine that, for the congregation had been given the "power of the keys" and not some Council, Presbyter, Pope, or other single individual. The local church alone could presume to know election, and that on charity rather than on certainty. It was only the effects, and not the cause, of election that the church could ever know.

30 Ibid., p. 261.

31 Only John Spittlehouse seems to have ventured a guess on the number of Saints. He thought they might constitute approximately one quarter of the population. John Spittlehouse, Rome Ruin'd by Whitehall (London, 1650), p. 250.

32 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 27. See above pp. 60-61.
As a Puritan, John Rogers believed that any candidate for church membership (and consequently for Sainthood) ought to give a public account of the experience of grace upon his heart. In relating his experience the candidate would tell how and when he abandoned sinful ways, and how his life had been changed by the supposed infusion of the Holy Spirit. This served to warn others to the effects of sinful practices, purposes, and persuasions. It taught people to suspend censure of others who were still in darkness. It provided specific examples of God's varied ways. And it taught others to trust God in times of trouble. But besides being a test for church membership, a spiritual aid to those who heard it, and a constant source of revitalization for the church, the public confession served to reassure the confessor himself. By bringing his experience to light, Rogers believed the individual examined his own assurance of salvation, "for assurance is a reflecting act of the soul, by which a Saint sees clearly he is in the state of grace and heir of glory."33 By an open declaration, the Saint fixed in his own mind assurances on which he could draw in times of adversity. He was emboldened and strengthened for the future. He created a storehouse of spiritual knowledge, and set his soul upon the further search for Christ.34

33 Ibid., p. 376. According to Rogers, the simplest sign of assurance was the single testimony of the individual's own spirit and conscience. A surer sign was the twin testimony which took two forms. Either the Holy Spirit set love and mercy upon the heart and the Spirit conversed with the soul, or the Word combined with the Spirit to give assurance to the soul.

34 Ibid., pp. 375-78.
In a typical Fifth Monarchist combination of seemingly contradictory ideas, Rogers reiterated Mary Cary's belief that even though the Saints had to fight spiritual evils with spiritual weapons in the earthly millenium, they had to be equally prepared to use the sword, if necessary, to help destroy the vestiges of the fourth monarchy and push the earthly millenium towards the heavenly one. The Saints were Christ's warriors and had to take concrete action—religious, political, and military—to insure present progress and future glory. Rogers described the Saints' duty as follows:

We must meet with trouble and wars without, yet in Spirit we shall exalt and triumph within, which Spirit of Christ in his Saints and Churches will be the downfall of Babylon and Antichrist's ruin, who must be destroyed in a spiritual manner, and by spiritual means, not by policies or powers or armies of men, or wars, or the like, though they may be preparative thereto.

In the last phrase "preparative thereto" we find Rogers's practical conclusion that although the spiritual fight might be most rewarding, the sword was also necessary. Though Rogers tended to play down this aspect, many Fifth Monarchists did not. The essential inconsistency here was the Saints' willingness to use the same violent methods of the Beast to destroy the fourth monarchy and usher in the Fifth. Yet somehow the use of earthly violence to establish a spiritual era did not bother the Fifth Monarchists. Perhaps this was because they saw the whole religious history of Europe since the Reformation as warfare between Christ's disciples and the Devil's advocates. In England, for

---

example, they saw the cause of Christ triumphant in the outcome of the Civil Wars. Activism was not a new idea. Neither was violence in support of religion. John Tillingast thought there was no excuse for the Saints "to sit still and do nothing...to the effecting these glorious things." And Mary Cary found it only reasonable for the Saints "to fight such as would murther and destroy them," as certainly the Beast would if given the chance.36

In the best tradition of spiritual millenialism, Rogers believed that the infusion of the Spirit was confined to no sex or class. Anyone could be a Saint who received divine grace. This applied to women as well as to men. All Saints were "one in Christ's account, in Christ's Kingdom, without respect of persons, opinions, sexes, or ages."37 Rogers's justification for this unorthodox view lay in his concept of the role of women in the whole church. Women held offices in the church, performed functions which enhanced the church's ability to serve Christ. Since power was given to the whole church by God, and not to individuals, women were entitled to participate in that power since they were members of the whole church. Besides, as Saints women had equal rights with men. And according to Rogers's own definition, the members of the church were Saints. Therefore, there could be no justification for excluding women in matters relating to the whole church.

36 John Tillinghast, Generation Work (London, 1654), Part 3, p. 221; Cary, Little Horns Doom, p. 125
37 Rogers, Oheil or Bethshemesh, pp. 471-472.
The Fifth Monarchists in general respected women who seemed to have divine inspiration. Mary Cary was a leading member of the sect, and Hannah Trappnel was a much revered Fifth Monarchist prophetess. Citing the examples of Mary, Mary Magdalene, and Deborah from the Bible, Rogers concluded that many women excelled men for piety and judgment. However, outside this religious sphere the Fifth Monarchists did not raise the general status of women above its usual levels. Inside the family, for example, a woman was still thought to be subject to her husband.

John Rogers looked to the millenium as an age when all Saints "although we differ in judgment, may be of one Body, one Spirit, one hope of our calling, having one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, above all, through all, and in all." The unity of the Spirit would create a true internal theological unity, and concurrently an involuntary external ecclesiastical uniformity, within which all Saints would be equals. There were two possible consequences of this concept of the millenium. One was the idea that such a high goal could best be attained by religious toleration. The various religions would eventually come together in the New Jerusalem under Christ's power and love. The other was the idea that the Saints had to lead the unregenerate, according to Scriptural laws, into the unity of the millenium. As a millenarian, Rogers subscribed to the first idea. But under the influence of his Fifth Monarchist

\[38\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 476-77.\]

\[39\textit{Ibid.}, p. 310.\]
associates he drifted into an acceptance of the second idea since it provided a religious rationale for the earthly social reforms which he now sought.

In Ohel or Bethshemesh, John Rogers exhibited a seemingly enlightened attitude on the subject of religious toleration. First, he taught that no one was to be compelled to join a church of Christ against his own will. "Such as are not yet called," he warned, "they are not to be tampered with or restrained by orders or traditions of men, but to be let alone." A civil power could not be expected to compel a man's conscience if Christ had not won his heart. "The will of man," Rogers thought, "is inclined and carried on into the way of Christ by an inward instinct and principle. All kinds of coaction or violent compulsion comes from without. Therefore it is a high absurdity...to call for compulsive powers to promote the ways of Christ or to bring in any man that way."

Then, in line with this reasoning, Rogers advocated what may be called, at this early point in his career, the separation of church and state. But given the fact that he believed in an earthly Gospel Church-State, these ideas might be more accurately termed Rogers's opinions as to the relative function of civil and ecclesiastical authority. He felt that civil order and security were conducive to the Saints' earthly mission of preparation for the heavenly Jerusalem. The proper function of the civil magistrates, then, was "to make provision for the Church of Christ and to improve their authority for

\[\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 262, 269.}\]
the preservation of Christ's Kingdom and God's Church and service.

In other words, the magistrates were to countenance and encourage the servants of Christ by giving them liberty to function in the spiritual sphere without restriction from the civil one. "Christ gives the law, and the magistrates the liberty," Rogers concluded. 41 In so far as the Saints were in the world, they were subject to worldly authority and government. But as the Saints were not of the world, Rogers believed the civil magistrates had no authority over them. This gave the Saints virtually a free hand to do anything they pleased, since they could always claim they were working for spiritual ends. With the Saints as the primary instrument, Rogers's separation of Church and state was primarily a call for the freedom to effect a religious and social revolution.

Finally, Rogers pleaded for toleration of differing opinions within the church itself. "None that are godly are to be put by though of differing opinions," he said, "but all are to be received." All that served Christ were acceptable to God, and should therefore be acceptable to man as well. All were one in Christ and the covenant of grace. Within this oneness no opinion could be intolerable. And besides, by discriminating against a brother for his opinions, one ran the risk of either turning him away or of weakening the fellowship of the Saints. God's mercy was wide, and many things were acceptable within His Law. Only Christ knew the full extent of that Law, and to castigate one who might be in the Law

41 Ibid., p. 128, 180.
yet of a different opinion, was an offense to both Father and Son. "We are not...so much to mind their judgments and apprehensions," Rogers concluded, "as their lives and conversations."\(^{42}\)

Had the Fifth Monarchists followed Rogers's general spirit of toleration and universalism, they might have found popular support for their cause. Not only did they hold out the promise of relief from religious persecution, they also sanctioned a political and social utopia with a virtual guarantee of spiritual salvation. But within the Fifth Monarchist ideology there was a fatal flaw that made this impossible. This was the doctrine of the Elect. In the Fifth Monarchist interpretation of the millenium there was a basic division between the Godly and the ungodly. Because of this basic division, the Fifth Monarchists considered it essential that the Saints take a position of superiority in order to lead the unregenerate masses into the New Jerusalem. Although the Fifth Monarchists might employ the terminology of toleration and equality, they applied those terms narrowly. Spiritual equality in the millenium meant equality among the Saints. Civil liberty meant liberty for the Saints. Toleration of ideas meant toleration of the ideas of the Saints. Because he supported the Fifth Monarchist program for accomplishing his own goals of religious and social reform, John Rogers acquiesced in this narrow interpretation of toleration and equality. Many who supported the Fifth Monarchists at first probably did not fully comprehend the distinction. But as time passed, its effects became only too clear.

\(^{42}\)Ibid., pp. 311, 313-14.
In addition to this narrow concept, John Rogers's practical application of religious toleration was limited in other ways. He believed in Christian liberty, but he also believed that liberty was limited by the laws of Christ and the Word of God. Opposing ideas on things indifferent (not absolute or essential), on things doubtful (not mentioned in the Scriptures), or on things unnecessary (not commanded by the Scriptures) could be tolerated. But absolutes or essentials, those things either specifically commanded or forbidden in the Scriptures, were beyond the questioning by mere mortals. As if this limit to toleration were not enough, Rogers went on to add:

Those things which are neither...commanded nor countermanded by Scripture...in some cases must be opposed by our preaching; especially when pernicious errors do attend their practice; as to instance, when they are cried up as things not only pleasing but as if without them the worship of God were displeasing to him;...when things indifferent are cried up for and dignified with the title of things very necessary...men make religion odious, the Church a mere external policy.

Obviously this whole line of reasoning was very subjective. If a Fifth Monarchist saw any religious practice or idea that he considered a pernicious error, he could attack it as non-essential, or cried up for and dignified with the title of a thing very necessary. The possible consequences of such intolerance were endless.

It is possible that Rogers saw a mitigation of these consequences in the general Fifth Monarchist concept of the relation between Christ and his Saints with respect to power. Obviously

\[\text{\textsuperscript{43}}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 451-52.}\]
Christ was all powerful. He was the final authority, the King above all. Just as Kings had their ministers and officials, so Christ had his Saints. As King, Christ made law. The Saints enforced that law and administered it. By its very nature, the law would be merciful and just. And by their very nature, Christ's Saints would be equally as merciful and just in administering the law. Whether it be in the earthly or heavenly phase of the millennium, rule would be by the Godly as operatives of Christ. Since this rule was Christ-controlled, Rogers probably had little trouble in accepting the Fifth Monarchist idea of the Saints leading the unregenerate masses, and the attendant strictures on complete equality and toleration that went with it.

John Rogers's attitudes towards toleration, ceremony, and uniformity were products of Fifth Monarchist ideology. Uniformity would not be necessary in the millenium, but it would be there as a natural result of the Saints' internal unity of the Spirit. Along with the Fifth Monarchists, Rogers attacked ceremony because he believed it obscured the attainment of spiritual unity. (Yet if conformity in absolutes or essentials, what others might call ceremony, helped lead to spiritual unity, Rogers supported it!)

Unfortunately, the consideration of essentials was put on a very subjective basis. What one man might consider essential, another might not. The idea of toleration was really academic since the Saints believed they had a better knowledge of things essential than anyone else. They attacked the Antinomians for their lack of Biblical literalism. They rejected the Quakers because they tended to
allegorize the millenium. Likewise they condemned Ranters, Familiasts, and Socinians. Canne wanted to abolish the episcopal ministry. Feake and Spittlehouse called for the purge of those who favored episcopal or Presbyterian church government. And John Rogers was equally adamant against the Presbyterians and the Papists. The real question became: Who was left for the Fifth Monarchists to tolerate?

John Rogers placed himself among the ranks of the Fifth Monarchists largely because they saw the millenium as a social revolution. To them, the whole social order of the fourth monarchy reflected the importance of material power and privilege and the worship of earthly titles. This had to be changed. The Fifth Monarchists could have merely disregarded the existing social hierarchy, leaving its abolition to Christ himself. But in order to give the Saints the social authority they needed to prepare the world for the heavenly millenium, the Fifth Monarchists proposed a virtual destruction of the English social order. Rogers saw the existing social order as the cause of many of the worldly cares that hindered the spiritual growth of men's souls. Therefore, he, too,

---


looked for change. But rather than destruction, he seemed to favor reform and modification.

Most Fifth Monarchists saw the administration and organization of English law as the basis of social inequality. Change in the law was thus one of their first goals in the earthly millennium. John Rogers provided a rationale for such change in his own theory of law set forward in Ohel or Bethshemesh. Rogers believed that as men grow greater in purified and enlightened reason, they refine, mend, and purify their laws accordingly. However, in England he thought that lust, will, custom, and pride had come to characterize the laws instead of reason. He attributed this largely to the influence of lawyers. Lawyers kept up the organization and administration of a body of law that sent "many a precious soul and family a begging against all honest Christianity." For this transgression, which impinged upon men's spiritual growth and also might hinder the advent of the heavenly Jerusalem, Rogers branded all lawyers as the worst sinners, guilty of blood, theft, oppression, injustice, hatred, fraud, cozenage, covetousness, rebellion, and perjury. Of the whole profession Rogers complained:

One may in the sight of God be as lawfully tolerated to live in drunkenness, swearing, whoredom, and to get money by it and to make a trade of it as to live by, take money for, and make a trade of lying, oppressing the fatherless and widows, cheating the nation, eating up the bread of the poor, turning out Godly, putting in ungodly and wicked debauched whoremongers, adulterers, drunkards or the like.  

46 For details of Rogers's theory see below pp. 111-113.  

47 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, p. 221.
But relief would be coming "...as I doubt not but it will be within forty five years," Rogers proclaimed, "then woe be to the lawyers and to all such persons and personal interests! the form tumbles! customs fall! Wills of men shall no longer be law!" Rogers did not spell out the methods of reform in the meantime, but he believed they would be pervasive and drastic. The Fifth Monarchists saw such change as an aid to the Saints in the destruction of the fourth monarchy, but Rogers realized it could benefit many different types of people.

To his opponents, Rogers's hatred of lawyers seemed to stem not from high principles, but from personal animosities. There may have been some truth in this. After Rogers returned from Dublin, his parishioners at Purleigh sued him for non-residence and won the case. One Mr. Serjeant Maynard acted as counsel against Rogers in the matter. Furthermore, this same Mr. Maynard had earlier been

---


49 Projected reforms in law, land tenure, and treatment of the poor applied to all people, not just the Saints. By attacking the aristocracy and the gentry, the Fifth Monarchists did advocate a particular kind of social equality and social justice. But there was never any doubt that the Saints saw themselves as a social elite as well as a political and religious one. Although details of the social structure of the millenium were never complete, it is obvious that society as well as government would not have been egalitarian. Yet Fifth Monarchism was a popular idea. The cause was probably in the nature of the idea itself. Whatever an individual disliked, he could believe it would be resolved or removed in the Kingdom of Christ. The implied, and sometimes explicit, guarantee of happiness and freedom from taxes, tithes, and customs naturally attracted a following.

50 T. B. Macaulay describes Serjeant Maynard as "the most subtle and most learned of English jurists." T. B. Macaulay, *History of England* (New York, 1858), IV, 32.
instrumental in obstructing a preferment for Rogers. Now John Rogers had a keen sense of any injustice or indignity cast upon himself. He lost at least one lucrative living at the hands of English law and lawyers, and he had suffered what he considered public ridicule. It was understandable that he might lash out at the profession which he considered primarily responsible for those misfortunes. But it must be remembered that Rogers was talking about reforms that included more than just law reform. He was talking about social revolution. It is hard to imagine that Sergeant Maynard alone could have caused Rogers's basic convictions about the nature of law.

Ohel or Bethshemesh had its critics, even among the Fifth Monarchists themselves. The more radical Fifth Monarchists at St. Anne's, Blackfriars, led by Christopher Feake, thought Rogers's opinions and advice were all too cautious. The Blackfriars group wanted an immediate change in the social order. They saw no reason why the Saints should not rule immediately. John Rogers admired the Blackfriars meetings as "an unparalleled exercise." He even tried to copy them at St. Thomas Apostle's. But Feake and his friends spurned Rogers's attempts. They even barred him from attending their own meetings. This prompted Rogers to accuse the Blackfriars leaders of "self-conceit" and "self-seeking." It seems that Rogers's publication of Ohel or Bethshemesh served to deepen the divisions between the moderate and radical wings of the sect.

---

51 Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 220-223.

52 Feake, Beam of Light, pp. 43-46; Rogers, Ohel or Bethshemesh, pp. 69-70, Epistle to the Churches pp. 1-14.
The Presbyterian response to Chel or Bethshemesh has descended to posterity in the form of Zachary Crofton's Bethshemesh Clouded (London, 1653). Again personal interests were involved, for Crofton wrote the book largely as a defense against what he considered aspersions on his character by John Rogers. When Rogers attempted to set up his "exercises" at St. Thomas Apostle's, he was attacked openly in an anonymous pamphlet entitled "A Taste of the Doctrine at St. Thomas Apostle's." Because Crofton had been overheard to say that he intended to break this "exercise," and because two phrases appeared in the pamphlet which he had been known to employ in his sermons, it was assumed by many, including Rogers, that Crofton was indeed the author of the offensive pamphlet. Although Crofton denied this, he took great pains in Bethshemesh Clouded to compose a "just and necessary defense" of the pamphlet and its author.

The tone of this defense is characteristic of the whole work. Personality and opinion overshadow any serious discussion of theology or doctrine. Criticisms usually descend to personal attacks, minute and pedantic in nature. The largest part of the defense centers on a comparison of Rogers's ideas of toleration and his outright attack on the author of "A Taste of the Doctrine at St. Thomas Apostle's."

53 These exercises probably lasted less than a month since Rogers was boycotted by the Blackfriars Fifth Monarchists, and attacked by the Presbyterians. Zachary Crofton, Bethshemesh Clouded (London, 1653), p. 217.

54 The phrases were "faith of assurance" and "faith of adherence," Ibid., p. 218.

Crofton complains that Rogers can only guess that he wrote the pamphlet, and yet Rogers has attacked him in print, and has attempted to gather damaging testimony against him. "The book is not libel," Crofton reminded his readers, "only dissatisfaction." The only theological opposition Crofton offered in his defense of the pamphlet is his accusation that Rogers allowed unordained persons to preach, which was true. But he does not pursue this point, preferring instead to engage in a battle of semantics over the relation of works to salvation. This was a fruitless battle, for Crofton and Rogers basically agreed that works were signs of assurance of faith and not the grounds of assurance.

Crofton began the main body of Bethshemesh Clouded with reflections on the size, price, and title page of Ohel or Bethshemesh. By laborious degrees he worked his way through the Dedicatory Epistles, picking out grammatical errors, obscure phraseology, and incorrect spelling. He attacked not only Rogers's religious and political opinions, but also the weakness of his constitution and the color of his face! Crofton proved himself willing and able to answer Rogers in kind when he wrote:

\[
\text{In a great high-flown furious fancy he falls on all to clear himself; whilst he doth but more fully manifest his ignorance, imprudence, imbecility, impertinencies and what not, that may proclaim a} \]

56 Ibid., pp. 219-220. Crofton had been relieved of a position he held in Cheshire. Rogers tried to find out why. Crofton believed Rogers had sought depositions against him before the Committee for "plundered" Ministers. In answer, Crofton produced letters of recommendation from various preachers in Cheshire testifying to his personal and spiritual worth.
man swelling with pride to boil over in passion... so that the very foam and froth he disgorgeth in his epistle is sufficient to render his tabernacle distasteful to any civil, modest, ingenious, rational man, though of his own judgment. 57

As a Presbyterian, Crofton was anxious to defend his church and to attack Independency at the same time. He claimed that the Presbyterians urged the utility of synods but never believed them necessary, as did the Papists. Nor did the Presbyterians formally declare a two-fold headship of the Church. Elders prevented the clergy from assuming total control, and were themselves a proof that there was no great distinction between lay and clergy. However, in his anxiety to refute Rogers's accusation, Crofton misunderstood and often redefined Rogers's argument. For example, Rogers argued that Presbyterian synods and classes constituted a supreme earthly authority in the church akin to the earthly authority of the Pope. Thus, in practice, both Papists and Presbyterians created an earthly headship of the church along with a heavenly one. Crofton replied that since the Presbyterians found no formal necessity in synods, they could not be considered as an earthly head of the church as the Papal Councils were. But this was not the point of Rogers's accusation. Whether such synods were a formal necessity was immaterial. They were still there, exercising supreme authority over the earthly Presbyterian church. To Rogers's Independent mind, this was unchristian since it put an authority other than the direct authority of Christ over the earthly church. Likewise Rogers argued that the Presbyterians, like the

57Ibid., p. 12.
Papists, worshipped form in their religion rather than spirit. Crofton took form to mean baptism, the Lord's Supper, public prayer and preaching. And he rightly pointed out that these forms of worship were certainly different from the Papists' worship of images. But by form Rogers did not mean baptism or preaching or the Lord's Supper. He meant synods, classes, assemblies, and Presbyterians. Crofton merely redefined the term in the Presbyterian interest.  

This difference in definition was also the basis of Crofton's attack on Independency. For him, "church" meant denomination, not the individual congregation. Crofton agreed with Rogers that Christ had given religious authority collectively. But for Rogers the collective was the individual congregation, and for Crofton the collective was the denomination. Likewise the two men agreed that one church had no authority over another. But for Rogers that meant one congregation over another, and for Crofton the one denomination over another. Crofton's primary objection to Independency was a practical one. "Independency of congregations," he told his readers, "is clear confusion; not only men differing in judgment and practice, walking at a distance, but ready to excommunicate one another for such differences....Is it not here like to be confusion indeed where all shall reign and none be subject?"  

---


59 Crofton, Bethshemesh Clouded, pp. 156, 60.
Bethshemesh Clouded also contained an attack on millenialism in general. When it came to the interpretation of the books of Daniel and Revelation, Zachary Crofton was a traditional Augustinian. He believed that the Kingdom of Christ was in His Church (Presbyterian, of course) and not of the world; that it was spiritual and not carnal. The millenium could never be earthly, for the Church on earth was a mixture of good and bad, and would remain so to the end of the world. The individual Christian could never be pure but always had to live under the Cross. Since Crofton believed that Christ had already been reigning for over 1600 years, he disagreed with the basic premise that a visible millenium was approaching.

Given this background, Crofton proceeded to pose several questions which seemed to involve contradictions and inconsistencies that he found in Rogers's thought. How, he asked, could Rogers believe in a spiritual overthrow of the fourth monarchy and then praise the New Model Army for pursuing Antichrist? How could violence and spirituality fit together logically? How could Rogers call for unity in Spirit and yet support a system that would result in outward religious conformity and possibly in the tyranny of enforced godliness? "True Christians," Crofton warned, "will be ruled by the known outward laws of the Word of God and cannot admit an arbitrary power, though pretended to be of the Spirit, over them. This is a principle fitter

60 Ibid., p. 9. Crofton echoed the characteristic Presbyterian response to millenialism. For further examples of the paradoxes the Presbyterians found in the concept of an earthly Kingdom of Christ see The Revelation Unrevealed (London, 1650), pp. 114-157.
for a John of Leyden's reign over Zion than Christ's over his Church."\(^{61}\) How could Rogers advocate toleration and then attack Presbyterians and Papists? To attack things indifferent was no defense, for in a skeptical age there was much that was considered indifferent. Anyone could decide the indifferency or necessity of a certain issue according to his own mind.\(^ {62}\)

When he exhausted his attack on Rogers's inconsistencies, Crofton turned to attack him as an unconscionable radical who wanted to destroy the very fabric of English society. As has been shown, this was not necessarily true. All Fifth Monarchists suffered this reputation, largely because in their search for the millenium they proposed social revolution as well as religious perfection. But Rogers was basically attuned to reform and not total destruction. On the other hand he appeared radical to Crofton who saw no problem with tithes, the legal system, or the social hierarchy. This reputation was to follow Rogers all his life whether he deserved it or not.

In *Bethshemesh Clouded*, Zachary Crofton attacked John Rogers's ideas and concepts, but he did not answer them. He continually cited other authors who disagreed with some of Rogers's thoughts, but he never demonstrated the reasoning behind these opposing arguments. *Bethshemesh Clouded* is largely a book of counter-assertions with no commanding or persuasive proofs. There are probably two reasons for this. First, Crofton was primarily concerned with rescuing his own

---


reputation, not with writing a scholarly refutation of Fifth Monarchism or even millennialism. Personal animosity often took over reasoned argument. Secondly, Crofton wrote at a time when there were almost no frontal attacks on millennialism. Oliver Cromwell's own brief flirtation with the idea had given it a measure of respectability and acceptance. The country itself, as evidenced by the variety of millennial works that appeared, seemed to take up a belief in a visible Kingdom of Christ. Thus Crofton's attack was ill-timed for immediate results. However, he did help prepare the way for the eventual repudiation of Fifth Monarchism after the fall of Barebones Parliament.

All Fifth Monarchists suffered from inconsistencies in their proposals. This was largely due to their basic belief that all would be resolved to satisfaction when Christ returned, so there was little need for precision. Because John Rogers attached his work for religious and social reform to Fifth Monarchism, he, too, was attacked for inconsistency. Despite these attacks, and buoyed up by a very real possibility of success, Rogers continued to work within the general Fifth Monarchist program.
The Fifth Monarchists had a sense of grievance that impelled them to action. They also had an ideology to justify taking action, an ideology set before the public by writers like Vavasor Powell, Mary Cary, and John Rogers. But a sense of grievance and a justifying ideology are not enough alone to drive men to revolutionary action. They must also have reason to hope for success. The Fifth Monarchists gained this sense of hope from the course of political events in Commonwealth England between 1649 and 1653. Events in those years diminished much opposition to Fifth Monarchist ideas. A growing sense of self-confidence allowed the Fifth Monarchists to push their religious, social, and political program to realization in the Barebones Parliament of 1653.

Foreign troubles plagued the government of the Commonwealth. There was little time to deal with domestic problems such as reform in law or religion. Ireland and Scotland balked at recognizing the new governors in England. Scotland even proclaimed the future Charles II as King of Scotland. And the Dutch refused any type of detente with the Commonwealth. The Rump Parliament's response to these troubles was usually a military one, which in turn drained the energies and
enthusiasm of leaders who might have pushed for social and religious reform. Recognizing this neglect of domestic issues, many Independents urged the members of the Rump to dissolve Parliament. For they believed only then could there be a new permanent settlement in church and state. Among these Independents were many of the future supporters of Fifth Monarchism. Although they had welcomed the rule of the Rump in 1649, these men had seen no effort made thereafter to prepare for Christ's Kingdom on earth. In the autumn of 1651, according to the Fifth Monarchist Christopher Feake, "divers Officers and members of several Congregations" urged Oliver Cromwell to "press forward in promoting that glorious cause... and particularly to quicken the Parliament to do some honest and honorable works." Later these same men met together at Allhallows the Great in Thames Street "to pray for a new Representative, and to preach somewhat against the old." They sought the removal of ungodly ministers and magistrates, the healing of divisions, and the fulfillment of promises made by both Parliament and the Army.¹ This was the beginning of the political activities of the Fifth Monarchists. However, their demands fell on deaf ears. They were chided as rebels by the Government, the Army, and other Independents.

Nevertheless, the Parliament's continued inaction on promised domestic reforms drove the Army, the Independents, and the Fifth Monarchists to a common search for alternative methods to accomplish religious, social, and now political, change. Many saw in Oliver

¹Feake, Beam of Light, pp. 39-43.
Cromwell a solution to the Rump's inaction. In order to further its own reforms, the Army was only too willing to support Cromwell against Parliament. Independents tended to go along since Cromwell was known to favor a religious settlement guaranteeing freedom of worship. The Lord General's seeming regard for the leading Fifth Monarchist in the Army, Major-General Harrison, persuaded many Fifth Monarchists that Cromwell was receptive to the idea of Godly government in England. Cromwell, himself, was as disillusioned with the Rump as were these three groups, and he was well aware of the support he could command if he decided to move against Parliament. The disaffections of the Lord General, the Army, the Independents, and the Fifth Monarchists came to a head in April, 1653. Displeasure turned to a corporate sense of anger and fear when the Rump Parliament made ready to pass a bill that would have increased its membership through by-elections rather than a general appeal to public opinion. On April 20, 1653, Cromwell, with the help of Harrison and his own troop of guards.

2Feake and the Blackfriars group of more radical Fifth Monarchists never trusted Cromwell, however. They felt he could do no better than the Rump. They even called for his dismissal from the Army. When the Barebones Parliament finally became a reality, Feake's group provided some of its most determined opposition. C. H. Firth, "Cromwell and the Expulsion of the Long Parliament," English Historical Review VIII (1893), pp. 528-29; Feake, Beam of Light, pp. 48, 50.

3Actually a system of recruiting would have been created whereby the members of the Rump Parliament already sitting would have retained their seats and gained the power to reject any new member they wished. S. R. Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1660 (London, 1894-1903) II, 177.
forcibly dismissed the Rump. Civil constitutional government in England was superseded by nothing more legitimate than military might.

The day after the dissolution, Cromwell convened a meeting of the chief Officers of the Army at Whitehall. During the next ten days he and his Council were "busy in consultation to find out a new Government or Governor for their Commonwealth." The creation of a Council of State was the first difficulty. Major-General Lambert favored the idea of entrusting supreme power to only ten or twelve persons. Major-General Harrison, on the other hand, wanted a number of about seventy, which was the size of the Jewish ruling body, or Sanhedrin, in ancient Israel. Advice from outside the Army was not lacking either. Expressions of satisfaction at the Army's action against the Parliament were widespread. They were especially strong among the Fifth Monarchists.

The disbandment of the Rump greatly encouraged the Fifth Monarchists' hope of success. Addresses and petitions from the Saints poured into Cromwell and his Council. All expressed the opinion that Christ's Kingdom was at hand. Most looked to Cromwell as the great deliverer of his people. And many contained suggestions for the establishment of a government by Godly men. But if the Fifth Monarchists agreed on the desirability of such a government, they did

---


5 Bulstrode Whitelocke, Memorials of the English Affairs (London, 1682), III, 555.

6 Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 462.
not agree on the way to implement it. The first two sets of proposals published by men associated with the Fifth Monarchist program will serve as examples.

John Spittlehouse, a member of Dr. Peter Chamberlen's congregation at Lothbury Square, did not believe that the time had yet come for the rule of the Saints. Thus in his proposal the Army was to assume civil authority and act as the Saints' protectors temporarily. The Saints were to stand clear of any direct involvement in civil power, at least for the time being. If the Godly transgressed into the forbidden area of civil power they would "take unto themselves the grand mark or character of the Beast of Rome." At this particular point, Spittlehouse aimed solely at having those people in power who were friendly to the church. This was the Army. He called for a temporary government by an Assembly made up of two representatives from each Army regiment, elected strictly by commissioned Officers. All offices were to be held by commissioned Army Officers who, along with members of the Assembly, would be paid their regular Army salaries.

7A typical petition from one gathered church asked that Cromwell "whom we look upon as our Moses" take care to "advance the Scepter of our Lord Jesus." Army Officers wrote from Scotland that they expected Cromwell to prepare for the Kingdom of Christ. Several Proceedings in Parliament, 167 (April 21-28, 1653), p. 2954; Mercurius Politicus, 153 (May 26-June 2, 1653), pp. 2477-78. For a brief review of some of the schemes for Godly government see Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 29-30.

This did not mean that Spittlehouse completely ignored the idea of rule by the Saints. By giving power to the Army for a time, the Saints would be wholly set apart to propagate the Gospel in all places where their brethren of the Army either hath, or by Providence may yet conquer, and so by gradation, until the Kingdom and Dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heavens, shall be given to the people of the Saints of the most high, whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, whom all Dominion shall serve and obey.  

Here the old medieval system was called back to life whereby the Army was the secular arm of the Church and aided in the spread of the Gospel. When Christ's message had finally reached all corners of the earth, then, and only then, would the Saints be given civil power.

Spittlehouse's reliance on Cromwell was not unusual. But many Fifth Monarchists did not want to entrust total civil authority to the Army. The proposals of John Rogers, published only two days after those of Spittlehouse, reflected this opinion. In typical form, Rogers addressed himself to His Excellency the Lord General, "the great Deliverer of his people (through God's grace) out of the House of Egypt." And in his advice we see Rogers, the Independent author of Ohel or Bethshemesh, well on his way toward becoming Rogers, the Fifth Monarchist political activist.

In Rogers's scheme, Cromwell would choose the men who would govern the country. A Sanhedrin, or Parliament of seventy persons, would be the highest authority in the land, with a second body, or

\[\text{Ibid., p. 7.}\]
Senate, consisting of twenty-three members, which would conduct daily business. Rogers conceded, "But if the present juncture of affairs requires a quicker dispatch," Rogers conceded, "in the interim twelve Worthies may be chosen as present governors." Rogers did not specify who would do the choosing, but he did state that the men chosen to govern would have to be "Men fearing God..., lovers of Truth and Justice..., hating all bribes and covetousness..., wise (though not politic) and understanding in the times and seasons..., able active men in the things of God, and at all seasons ready to hear and help the oppressed..., easers of the people, they must govern all for God." These were the most concrete products of John Rogers's early Fifth Monarchist political thought; and they were probably the most explicit instructions for choosing the right kind of men to govern England that Cromwell received. Rogers's moderation was shown in his admonition that all those of the Rump who were among the righteous ought to be honored. But it was evident that he expected a new order. The bases of that new order were the Saints. Therefore, Rogers concluded, "consult with the Saints and send to all discerning spirited men for their proposals."

---

10 Rogers pointed out to Cromwell that as Moses, Joshua, Gideon, and Nehemiah, who were victorious in the Word, had chosen able men to be rulers, so should the Lord General. Although he called for a Sanhedrin of seventy, he also agreed that a body composed of one nominated member from each county might also be functional. His number of 23 members for the Senate corresponded to the size of the Senate in the governmental structure of ancient Israel which was Rogers's model. John Rogers, To His Excellency the Lord General Cromwell (London, 1653), brs.

11 Ibid.
Either John Rogers's opinions were held in extremely high regard by the Council of Officers (a suggestion for which there is no certain proof), or he had some foreknowledge of the Lord General's intentions. For a few days later it was announced that the form of the new government had been decided upon, and the form matched Rogers's system almost perfectly. The new Council of State would consist of Cromwell, eight Army Officers, and four civilians. Ministers in various parts of the country, on whom Cromwell and the Council could rely, would nominate men whom they judged qualified to participate in a Godly government. From these nominations, Cromwell and the Council would choose the new Parliament. The only point in which Rogers's program was not followed concerned the size of the governmental bodies. The Council of State would consist of thirteen members instead of twelve; and the Parliament would have 140 members instead of seventy.\(^\text{12}\)

It is interesting to note that John Spittlehouse dutifully modified his ideas to coincide with the nature of the new government as Cromwell constructed it. By accepting Cromwell as a Moses figure, Spittlehouse could accept an immediate rule of the Saints. Cromwell held the ultimate power and only invited the Saints to participate. Spittlehouse could still believe that the separation of church and

\(^{12}\)Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, II, 280ff. Although much has been made of Cromwell's system of "nomination" to the Godly Parliament, Austin Woolrych has shown that requests for nominations from the various congregations were probably never issued. Those that did submit nominations did not mention having a formal invitation to do so. Nor did Cromwell and his Council seem to heed the nominations that were made. Rather they called whomsoever they wished to the Parliament. Austin Woolrych, "The Calling of the Barebones Parliament" *English Historical Review* LXXX (1965), pp. 492-513.
state, of Saints and civil power, would be maintained, and that the Saints would be ultimately absolved from civil responsibility. The new Parliament would simply function as a temporary instrument of Oliver Cromwell. Authority stemmed from Cromwell. If things went wrong in the new government, Spittlehouse could easily look outside the Parliament of Saints itself for the cause.

However, for John Rogers, who saw authority in the very Sainthood of the members of the Parliament themselves, it would seem that any possible failure of the Parliament of Saints could only be an admission of false authority or of no authority at all. But Rogers did not face this dilemma because he did not see the new Parliament as the immediate establishment of the Fifth Monarchy. Only Christ could accomplish the final establishment of the New Jerusalem. It was simply not the work of the Parliament of Saints. Their work was preparation for the Fifth Monarchy by eliminating the barriers to it in the corruption and evil of the fourth. However, because he believed that the Saintly government would be an indication of what was to come in the glorious Kingdom, he saw the new Parliament as an instrument of reform as well as one of destruction. The radical Fifth Monarchists, on the other hand, saw it chiefly as one of destruction. They left the rebuilding to Christ when he came. Perhaps this explains Rogers's position in relation to the whole Fifth Monarchist ideology. While most Saints wanted to tear down, Rogers wanted to begin the reconstruction of society on earth before

Christ appeared. Many other Fifth Monarchists may have been reformers but they were not necessarily rebuilders.

Throughout the year 1653, Fifth Monarchist hopes for social, religious, and political change in England grew stronger. The easing of government censorship of the press made it possible for authors such as Vavasor Powell, Mary Cary, and John Rogers to popularize the Fifth Monarchist program. Army Officers such as Major-General Harrison and Colonel Rainborough openly espoused Fifth Monarchist ideas. Even Oliver Cromwell appeared to favor a stronger religious base for government, although this certainly did not make him a Fifth Monarchist. In addition, there seemed to be no other group operating within accepted legal limits to which Englishmen could attach their hopes for reform. The Rump Parliament had proved itself little disposed to sweeping changes. And the Levellers, who might have provided an outlet for such hopes, had been practically outlawed by the Commonwealth government. Even Oliver Cromwell appeared to favor a stronger religious base for government, although this certainly did not make him a Fifth Monarchist. In addition, there seemed to be no other group operating within accepted legal limits to which Englishmen could attach their hopes for reform. The Rump Parliament had proved itself little disposed to sweeping changes. And the Levellers, who might have provided an outlet for such hopes, had been practically outlawed by the Commonwealth government. Even Oliver Cromwell appeared to favor a stronger religious base for government, although this certainly did not make him a Fifth Monarchist. In addition, there seemed to be no other group operating within accepted legal limits to which Englishmen could attach their hopes for reform. The Rump Parliament had proved itself little disposed to sweeping changes. And the Levellers, who might have provided an outlet for such hopes, had been practically outlawed by the Commonwealth government.

---

14 In his zeal, the Levellers' leader, John Lilburne, had attacked both the Council of State and the higher military Officers as men who prevented direct government by elected representatives of the people. Ordinary soldiers picked up this cry. They launched furious attacks against Cromwell for preventing them from sharing equally with the Officers in the determination of the Army's political actions. All of this prompted the Council of State, with Cromwell's urging, to imprison Lilburne and other Leveller leaders in March 1649. New treason and licensing laws silenced further Leveller overtures to public opinion. C. H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England* (London, 1909), p. 248; S. R. Gardiner, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* (2nd ed.; London, 1900), pp. 388–91; Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, pp. 193, 21.
structure, and the governmental system attracted many disenchanted Englishmen who had no other hope of political, social, or religious change. In addition, the appeal of rule by the Saints went beyond millenialism itself to include men who merely felt that a government run by Godly men was bound to produce better results than one based on natural law or English tradition. And because of their concern with temporal and civil matters, the Fifth Monarchists were prepared with a specific program, which other groups lacked, for the establishment of a new order. It should not be surprising that the new government created by Cromwell in 1653 was based on the idea of rule by the Godly.

Although the new Council of State met for the first time on April 29, 1653, it was nine weeks before the new Parliament assembled. During that time, John Rogers penned another epistle to Oliver Cromwell offering further advice on various aspects of the new regime. If anyone doubted that Rogers was a reformer who used religious language in the political arena, his doubts should have been dismissed by this epistle. Rogers began with the usual exhortations to work for Christ's Kingdom. He promised the everlasting support of the Saints in such endeavors. Then he got down to practical matters. He urged Cromwell to use the power that the Fifth Monarchists helped him obtain to relieve the oppressions that beset many Englishmen.


In particular, Rogers singled out corrupt lawyers who "squeeze out the very hearts of thousands." He also denounced the "Babylonian brazen yoke of tithes," the Presbyterian Church, "soul-tyrannizing advowsons," and ungodly ministers. To secure the abolition of these evils, Rogers proposed the yearly election of officers in greatest power and trust in the Government, lest they should assume an absoluteness and become oppressors themselves. And to insure success, he suggested that the Congregational churches be the civil and military bases of the Government. Rogers may have respected Oliver Cromwell, but he did not like the idea of all power vested in one man. Therefore he proposed a broader base for government because he believed a broad base fostered broad reforms, and provided somewhat of a balance.

Such calls for reform were justified in many respects. The legal system was cumbersome, expensive, and slow-moving. Long delays and numerous "fees" insured that for the poor there was no equality before the law. Harsh and cruel punishments were still the order of the day. Imprisonment for debt seemed a self-defeating measure, but it was still used. In the ecclesiastical sphere, tithes and advowsons pressed heavily on the pocketbooks and consciences of many people. Taxes, customs duties, and excises were high. John Rogers saw these hardships as obstacles to optimum spiritual growth. For the Fifth Monarchists these were all elements of the fourth monarchy and fair game for attack. For the common man these were terrible

17Rogers, Oheil or Bethshemesh, pp. 1-17.
impediments to his very ability to sustain life. But for all, the goal was the same: change the existing system. It is no wonder, then, that the Fifth Monarchists began to enjoy a popularity among ordinary Englishmen not only for their millenialism, but also for their promises of reform.18

The Barebones Parliament met for the first time on July 4, 1653.19 Its first order of business was the establishment of committees on tithes, law reform, the Army, the condition of the poor, and foreign policy. The reform of the law and the church were two problems the Fifth Monarchists thought most important. Since the Fifth Monarchist members of the Parliament had obtained places on most of the committees, these were the two issues with which the Parliament first dealt.20 On July 15, 1653, it was proposed that no tithes be paid as maintenance for preachers after November 3, 1653. The motion was defeated, but the proposal was referred back to the

18 The Fifth Monarchist program appealed to its rank and file supporters for a number of reasons: dissatisfaction with their social position, the possibility of exercising vengeance on their social superiors, the hope for an end to economic oppression, and a general vision of future happiness. For a detailed analysis of the composition and distribution of the Fifth Monarchists see Capp, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 76-98.

19 "Barebones," "Nominated," and "Little" all referred to Cromwell's Parliament of Saints of 1653. The term "Barebones" came from one of the members of the Parliament, Praise-God Barbon, a leatherseller from London. "Nominated" referred to the fact that members of the Parliament were supposedly nominated by preachers in England. "Little" was applied after the Parliament was dissolved in December 1653, having sat for only six months, and having had no more than 144 nominal members.

committee for further consideration. On the issue of law reform, the House voted the abolition of the Court of Chancery on August 5 and ordered a Bill to carry out this resolution. The action was not an unpopular one because abuses in Chancery were infamous. It was reported that some 23,000 cases of from five to thirty years' standing were still unresolved in that Court. However, other legal reforms did not command such unanimity. Proposals for a complete new codification of laws, for example, were referred to committee, but by mid-October nothing more had been heard of them. Even the Bill for abolition of Chancery did not reappear. The impatient Thomas Harrison introduced his own bill which would have suspended Chancery for only one month, but it was defeated. To many Saints, the work of the Parliament seemed hamstrung by forces of the fourth monarchy.

Among others, John Rogers was extremely upset by the inaction of the Parliament of Saints. His anxiety for law reform has already been noted. He felt so strongly about tithes that he went in person to give testimony against them before the Parliamentary Committee. Yet nothing happened. So Rogers again took up his pen to convince Parliament, and the country, that reform was essential, especially in

---

21Great Britain, Parliament, Journals of the House of Commons, VII, 285-86; Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, II, 277; Rogers, Fifth Monarchy Men, pp. 36-37. Later on the House did vote to abolish lay patronage, but the new system proposed in its place was rejected because it, too, rested on tithes as maintenance for clergy.

the matter of law. The result was Rogers's second major work, Sagrîr or Doomsday Drawing Nigh with Thunder and Lightning to Lawyers in an Alarum for New Laws, and the Peoples' Liberties from the Norman and Babylonian Yokes (London, 1653). Rogers's first book, Ohole or Bethshemesh, had established him as a Puritan, an Independent theologian of sorts, and a moderate millenarian. But since the time he had written the major portion of Ohole or Bethshemesh Rogers had progressed from a narrow concern for religious perfection alone to a call for broad reforms in all areas of society. Along the way he had discovered that political activism was the best way to accomplish such reforms quickly. And finally, he had attached himself to a group that combined religion with political activism. Sagrîr, then, represents John Rogers, the Fifth Monarchist reformer.

For Rogers, there seemed to be two vital props of the existing social order (that which the Fifth Monarchists would call the structure of the fourth monarchy) that had to be eliminated or at least changed before anything else could be successfully undertaken—lawyers and tithes. Rogers wrote:

There is little likelihood of state-reformation as long as the corrupt, cruel, oppressing, cursed crew of lawyers be accounted the pillars of the state. Now as the downfall of the corrupt clergy with their canons was the fatal blow to all Church tyrants and soul oppressors, so will the downfall of the corrupt lawyers and their terms be destructive and irregoverable to all state-tyrants and body oppressors.

He characterized the lawyers' trade as one of oppression, perjury.

---

23 Rogers, Sagrîr, p. 2.
lying, false-swearing, cheating, and beggering many honest Godly souls. And if the lawyers themselves were not bad enough, Rogers found they had "none to execute their writs but the most cursed graceless villains" they could find. By this means, men were abused by "bloody villains, drunken sots!"²⁴

Rogers laid the blame for the existence of lawyers to William the Conqueror. In his establishment of the administration of Norman Law at Westminster, William had created a system in which the ordinary man was forced to hire someone who knew the intricacies of Norman Law and who could afford to travel to London for the appointed court terms. The ordinary man could not easily obtain justice for himself. With the establishment of the Inns of Court later on, lawyers became more exclusive and more expensive. They began to promote themselves. And worse yet, they began to manipulate contentiousness among Englishmen. Since justice could not be obtained except through lawyers, the lawyers had figuratively enslaved England.

But lawyers were guilty of more heinous crimes according to Rogers. They all had, sometime in their careers, broken nearly all of the Ten Commandments. Lawyers pleaded both sides of a court case. But only one side could be based on truth, so lawyers continually promoted lies. Since plaintiff and defendant gave testimony under the oath of God, lawyers encouraged untruthful clients to take the name of the Lord in vain. Lawyers were indirectly guilty of murder when innocent men were executed. In delaying cases so long that the

²⁴Ibid., pp. 6, 14, 26.
accused died in prison, lawyers were guilty of manslaughter. By charging exhorbitant fees and accepting bribes, lawyers stole from their clients. And their self-pride was but another idol put before the worship of God. \(^25\)

Rogers's solution to the problem of lawyers reflected Fifth Monarchist, Independent, and his own particular thoughts on law. He demanded for all Englishmen "justice and plain honest law...at their own doors and in their own streets in every county and Hundred in England." In other words, decentralization was the answer to corruption. Judges were to be elected in every city, and each shire would choose six men to settle causes over land, trespass, or assault, before a jury. All legal fees would be abolished, and every layman would have the right to plead his own case. To reduce litigation, Rogers suggested a land register in each county to record land transactions and mortgages. All existing law courts would be abolished and the legal profession would cease to exist. Among others, John Spittlehouse and Peter Chamberlen seconded Rogers's call for such reforms. William Medley proposed his own system of town and

\(^{25}\) *Ibid.*, pp. 76-83, 70. But the lawyers would soon get their due. In an interesting bit of Scriptural manipulation, Rogers compared the plague of lawyers to one of locusts. And according to Numbers 14:30, this plague was to last 150 days. Using the millenial arithmetic of one Biblical day to one earthly year, Rogers predicted the lawyers' fall by 1654. He had found that their influence had grown steadily to the year 1504. In that year a law was passed which ordered some corporations not to make laws that were not first approved by royal jurists at Westminster. Rogers took this law as the beginning of the great plague of lawyers. And since that plague was to last 150 years, he added 150 to 1504 and came up with 1654 as the year of reckoning for all lawyers. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
county courts that would meet monthly and quarterly respectively, with a supreme court to handle all appeals. 26

Obviously some of these proposals were unworkable. But unlike most Fifth Monarchists, John Rogers at least faced up to the problem of law and order. He understood that law was necessary for order, and order was necessary for the accomplishment of reform as well as for the Saints' successful preparation for the Kingdom of Christ. Of course, only certain laws based on certain values were appropriate and worthy of obedience. All laws, Rogers maintained, are drawn out of the light of nature and the principle of reason. The light of nature is reason, the intellectual lamp in every soul. To obey right reason, and to be persuaded by it, is to obey and be persuaded by God himself. However, by nature human reason is imperfect and must be supplemented and instructed by Divine Reason. As the ages progress, human reason absorbs a greater measure of Divine Reason. Mankind becomes progressively wiser, or at least his reasoning powers are greatly strengthened. Honest and acceptable laws are based on reason. But just as human reason does not partake to the full of Divine Reason, so human laws are fallible. Nevertheless, as human reason progresses toward Divine Reason in every age, so human laws progress toward eternal and fundamental law. Rogers equated this law with Divine Reason. Thus the mind of God became the center of all

honest laws. Those human laws that are more just and honest than others are closer to eternal and fundamental law or Divine Reason.

Since human laws are based on ever increasing human reason, they must be flexible in order to be corrected or amended when defects are seen or times change. But the proper content and end of law, the safety and freedom of the people, never changes. Honest human laws are the people's shield. And for the most part, Rogers saw law as a shield against the tyranny and oppression of great rulers and their accomplices. He felt that no Governor should be above the law. All rulers or Governors are bound to execute their offices and authority for the public good, or the safety and freedom of the people, according to the law. For even human law has something of Divine Reason in it, and to disobey honest human law is to disobey God.

On the other hand, some laws are entirely unjust and not worthy of acceptance. Such laws are contrary to the safety and freedom of the people, tend to private good and self-interest, and are thus contrary to eternal or fundamental law. Rogers believed there were laws like this in England. Even though they appeared fair and honest in the letter, they had been "twisted up with craft and cruelty to take away the lives of faithful Commonwealthmen if they once call for their rights and liberties." Predictably, Rogers accused William the Conqueror of confiscating the liberties which Englishmen enjoyed by birthright. Since the Norman conquest, laws had not been able to fulfill the function of curbing great men. The fourth monarchy had

---

27 Rogers, Sagrir, pp. 32-42 passim, 105-107.
proved unwilling, or unable, to amend and correct the law in line with increased understanding of Divine Reason.

A true Fifth Monarchist could not see this situation happening again, especially with a Parliament of Saints already in session in England. But John Rogers was not an ordinary Fifth Monarchist, so he provided a solution for any future problems. The people were to

mildly declare against the misgovernment, to admonish the offenders, to petition to Parliament
...until the Godly people have their rights of free choice of another representative in their stead, that will do better and more righteous things for the people; and this privilege the people may freely seek by peaceable means to enjoy and challenge as their right.

He even sanctioned disobedience if the people were held by a government in continual slavery to laws against the public good.

In a political sense, these were advanced ideas on the nature of law and government. They show that Rogers was deeply involved in the matter of social reform. If he had been solely concerned with the Kingdom of Christ on earth, to the exclusion of all else, he would not have bothered constructing a theory of law at all. But Rogers's concepts were broader. In 1653, his suggestions were clothed in millenialism. But when he spoke of the "people," he did not say the "Saints." For these Saints were not the only ones involved in the function and meaning of government. Rogers was not a democrat, either. He agreed that the source of law is in the people, but by the people

\[28\text{Ibid., p. 100}\]
\[29\text{Ibid., pp. 115, 120-22.}\]
he meant "the rational honest people, rightly principled." Although this was a limitation, it did not exclude all but the Saints. Obviously Rogers was an advocate of the rule of law. But he was working in a period when the popular idea was rule by Godly men. So he attempted to combine the two, opting for both Godly men and Godly laws. Unfortunately, most other Fifth Monarchists stressed the former claiming that acceptance and administration of the latter would come automatically. It could not, and did not, because what Fifth Monarchists considered Godly laws were not the practical, traditional, everyday laws by which Englishmen lived. Though they might hope for reform in some of the law's abuses, the ordinary man could not completely discard what little security the law might give for something as nebulous and general as "Godly laws." John Rogers saw this dilemma, and proposed a transition whereby "human laws" would eventually become "Godly laws," that is, laws which secured the safety and freedom of the people. He was the only Fifth Monarchist, in the matter of law, to attempt to find a reasonable combination of present conditions and future goals. He expected new laws and a new regime, but he seemed willing to wait for the complete transition.  

---

30 Ibid., pp. 46-47, 119.

31 Rogers did not find it difficult to combine calls for political liberty and Saintly government in Sagrir. Political liberty was simply the sign that the oppression of the fourth monarchy was ending and the Fifth Monarchy was about to begin. For Rogers, the two concepts were complementary, not mutually exclusive, as most historians have written.
This is not to say that John Rogers did not join other Fifth Monarchists in calling for guidelines by Godly laws. He did. The two guidelines he proposed were the Mosaic law and Christ's law. Rogers believed in applying them equally. He had no trouble assimilating the two sets of laws, for he believed they were similar. Moses and Christ were both prophets. Christ's law was only a higher and more viable one, since Christ served as the link between God and man, being both God and man himself. Rogers believed in applying them equally. He had no trouble assimilating the two sets of laws, for he believed they were similar. Moses and Christ were both prophets. Christ's law was only a higher and more viable one, since Christ served as the link between God and man, being both God and man himself. However, on this point of guidelines, Rogers again did not reflect the usual Fifth Monarchist pattern of thought. Given the Saints' task of ruling over the unregenerate masses in the earthly millennium, most Fifth Monarchists considered rigid control a necessity. The Mosaic code was the best Biblical answer they could find. Christian compassion seemed to them to be incompatible with the destruction of the fourth monarchy. They came to stress the strictness of the Mosaic law, even to the exclusion of Christian compassion.

The Mosaic code actually had three component parts. The moral law consisted of the Ten Commandments given on Mt. Sinai. Almost everyone in seventeenth century England accepted these commandments and admonitions as a moral guide. The ceremonial law of Moses embraced the rules and statutes of Aaron which governed the

---

32 Rogers, OHEL or Bethshemesh, p. 351. Rogers seemed to dwell less and less on the theme of Christian love and principles between 1654 and 1658. This was probably due to the influence of other Fifth Monarchists who stressed the rigidity of the Mosaic law as a basis for civil as well as moral order. It was to these Fifth Monarchists that Rogers looked for support and guidance when he was imprisoned by Oliver Cromwell.
Jewish Church, its rituals and feasts. With the coming of Christ and his Church, these laws had been superseded. The judicial law of Moses contained the sanctions for breaking the moral commandments. As with the ceremonial law, most people believed the judicial law applied only to ancient Israel. But the majority of the Fifth Monarchist leaders thought they should substitute the judicial law of Moses for the civil law of England. However, the Mosaic law was not the all-inclusive law required in seventeenth century England. For example, in disputes over property or commercial matters it was inadequate. John Rogers alone was able to rise above such limitations. He saw the Mosaic law as only a guide and not a strict regimen. When this law carried him no further into the practical world, he, like the Puritans, turned to human law, particularly to English common law. Whereas other Fifth Monarchists could only hope that Christ would fill in the voids of the Mosaic law, Rogers expanded the basis of this law to include English common law, in so far as it partook of eternal or fundamental law. Rogers was able to advocate such laws as that for a land register (which outwardly seemed to have no connection with the Mosaic law) because they were in accord with Mosaic principles, if

33 A few Fifth Monarchists made unoriginal attempts to flesh out a system of law based on the Mosaic code. William Aspinwall published a list of crimes and their Biblical penalties, but this was taken largely from John Cotton's law code for Massachusetts. Most were content to refer to the works of John Brayne (who was not a Fifth Monarchist) which spelled out the Mosaic commands, statutes, and judgments. William Aspinwall, A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy (London, 1653), p. 9; William Aspinwall, The Legislative Power is Christ's Peculiar Prerogative (London, 1656), pp. 30-32; John Cotton, An Abstract of Laws and Government (London, 1655), passim; Spittlehouse, Royal Advocate, p. 29.
not actually found in the law itself. If other Fifth Monarchists had
adopted such a compromise in their thought, they might have had better
success.

Most Fifth Monarchists, to some extent or another, relied on
the Mosaic code for several reasons. It was concrete and left little
room for interpretation by the ungodly. God himself had commanded
the law and had never revoked that command. In a land where precedent
was the basis of law, there seemed to be no precedent older than the
laws of Moses. In addition, the institutions and laws of the first
chosen people, the Jews, appealed to the builders of a New Jerusalem.
Because of the belief in a chosen people and the general apocalyptic
mood of the times, there was a widespread interest in the Jews anyway.
Many believed that the conversion and restoration of the Jews would
signal the beginning of the millennium. The Fifth Monarchists
believed that the adoption of the Mosaic code would hasten that
restoration.

34 Peter Chamberlen, Legislative Power in Problems (London,
1659), pp. 2, 3, 5. Spittlehouse was sure the Saints were supposed
to reestablish the laws of Moses in the New Jerusalem. He insisted
that law came only from God, and the judicial laws He gave Moses
were eternal. Spittlehouse, The Royal Advocate, p. 5; Spittlehouse,
First Addresses, p. 23.

35 Mary Cary looked to the conversion of the Jews as soon as
Popery was removed from Christianity. William Aspinwall believed the
Jews would have a leading role in setting up the New Jerusalem itself.
John Rogers and John Spittlehouse also expected their conversion and
return. Cary, Little Horns Doom, pp. 140-44; Aspinwall, The Legisla-
tive Power, sig. A2v; John Rogers, A Reviving Word from the Quick
and the Dead (London, 1657), pp. 17-18; John Spittlehouse, Certain
Queries Propounded (London, 1654), p. 11.
The Mosaic code proved attractive to the Fifth Monarchists for yet another reason. Some of its principles fit well with pressure for reform from humanitarians. Taking their cue from the Old Testament, the Fifth Monarchists called for the repayment of debts or the restitution of stolen goods, rather than imprisonment or execution for debt and theft. John Rogers, for example, thought that debtors ought to be free, so that "by their liberty and industry in their calling they might by degrees make money to pay their debts off which would be to the honor and enriching of the nation." Likewise he declared that hanging for mere theft was "cruel, absurd, and opposite to the Laws of God." He suggested that thieves be sold into hard labor, or at least be put to work so that they might make some restitution. Such proposals had a social, humanitarian, and an economic basis. The relief of debtors meant greater security for creditors; and the useful labor of convicted thieves meant the return of the value of the stolen goods. Humanitarianism seemed to coincide with the protection of property. This fact, combined with the Fifth Monarchists' obvious omission of the Mosaic law's condemnation of usury, leads one to believe that the Fifth Monarchist program was as economically attractive to small producers as it was humane to the captured criminal. At any rate, the Fifth Monarchists were not the

---

36 Rogers, Sagrir, pp. 81, 109. Likewise William Medley specified that thieves should be set to work to make restitution. Peter Chamberlen called for debtors to be freed and set to work to pay off their debts. John Spittlehouse believed the damnation of the thieves was unjust. Medley, A Standard Set Up, p. 15; Chamberlen, Legislative Power, p. 3; Spittlehouse, First Addresses, p. 17.
wild radicals, out to destroy property, that the moderates in the Barebones Parliament thought they were. Their proposals were not unlike those put forward by their contemporaries. What was unique was the justification they put forward to defend their proposals.

If John Rogers's ideas on law had been accepted, a practical plan for law reform in England might have been produced by the Barebones Parliament. But Rogers was not a member of that Parliament. Nor did his ideas appeal to its members. His compromise and caution offended the more zealous, while his attacks on lawyers alienated the moderates and the vested interests. Lawyers were a powerful group, and they could have been expected to oppose any system which eliminated their position or privileges. Even Oliver Cromwell was heard to lament, "We cannot mention the reform of the law but they presently cry out, we design to destroy property." 37

A second prop to the corruption of the fourth monarchy was tithes. John Rogers saw tithes as both an economic oppression and the main support for the existence of an intolerable national church and clergy. "Tithes," he said, "keep up idolatry, superstition, the Service-book, and hence lies, drunkenness, malignancy and Popery." But Rogers had come to understand that Englishmen were often reluctant to abolish anything unless it could be proved illegal. Therefore, in his testimony before the Committee on Tithes of the Barebones Parliament in July 1653, he went beyond the usual Fifth Monarchist position and attempted to give a practical and legal argument against

37Ludlow, Memoirs, I, 246.
tithes. Rogers argued that tithes had originally been given a legal foundation by Catholic Canon Law. Later, English common law also established them. However, common law in all religious matters was subordinate to and derived from Canon Law. Now the Canon Law concerning tithes had been obliterated when the Papists lost control of the Church in England. Therefore, all common law on the subject of tithes had lost authority and was null and void. Tithes had been, and were still, illegal in England. Furthermore, their continued presence fostered Popery.\(^38\) Albeit simplistic and unfounded, these arguments might have given the Fifth Monarchists a more sophisticated attack on tithes than the mere assertion that tithes burdened the consciences of the Saints or destroyed the independence of ministers.\(^39\)

Although his methods may have differed from the "mainstream" of Fifth Monarchism, John Rogers was enough of a material millenarian to be considered a Fifth Monarchist. Sagrir was Rogers's declaration to the world that he did indeed believe in a Kingdom of Christ on earth:

That there is such a Kingdom to come is obvious to all intelligent men by abundance of Scriptures... and it is for this Fifth Monarchy (which must remain forever) that all other Kings and Kingdoms, powers and policies, Laws and lawyers in the fourth monarchy must be shaken and broken into fitters and shivers like potsheards. That there is such a mighty Monarchy coming which must be universal all over the World is

\(^{38}\) Rogers, Sagrir, sig. b3-c2.

without doubt....As to the time, though men be of
divers minds as to the precise time, yet all concur
in the nighness and swiftness of its coming upon us.
...Within this seven years, by one thousand six
hundred sixty, the work will get as far as Rome, and
by one thousand six hundred sixty six, this Monarchy
must be visible in all the earth; but in the meantime
it must have a gradual entrance...and this will be to
the ruin of those laws and lawyers which as yet stand
to oppress the people. 40

Along with other Fifth Monarchists, Rogers believed the Fifth
Monarchy would redeem the people of England from ecclesiastical and
civil bondage. The fourth monarchy was most assuredly doomed, for
Christ alone had been given supreme absolute authority by God in
Heaven and on earth.

These pronouncements put John Rogers in the ranks of the
Fifth Monarchists. He looked to the actual physical establishment of
the Kingdom of Christ on earth. That he had changed his prediction
of the date of the millennium from 1688 to 1666 shows the increasing
influence on his mind of other Fifth Monarchists such as John Canne
and John Tillinghast. 41 That he had become more interested in prophecy
is shown by his unique interpretation of Daniel's dream. To most
other Fifth Monarchists the fearful "little horn" in Daniel had been
the Pope. But Rogers believed the little horn was none other than
William the Conquerer and the "entire line of Norman Kings." Both
William and the little horn had arisen by force, not by general
choice or election. Both were illegitimate. And both usurped the

40 Rogers, Sagrira, pp. 124-25, 129.
41 Ibid., p. 125, Epistle to the Reader p. 27.
power they possessed. After the demise of this little horn, which Rogers believed occurred with the death of Charles I in 1649, the other horns (the Kings and Kingdoms of Europe) would have a brief respite. But inexorably the Fifth Monarchy would come, and all the other horns of the fourth beast would be likewise doomed.

Rogers's Fifth Monarchism was unorthodox. For this reason the ambiguities and inconsistencies which beset the whole movement began to plague him more and more as he became more deeply involved. Basically the Fifth Monarchists believed that God and Christ would direct, lead, and solve all the problems of the Kingdom of Christ on earth. But at the same time, they involved themselves in worldly matters that should have been inconsequential in the millennium. They depended on Christ, but they seemed to depend just as heavily on their own earthly abilities. John Rogers advocated practical earthly action more vigorously than many other Fifth Monarchists. But as he came to depend more and more on the chiliastic vehicle of reform, his advocacy of earthly activity seemed more and more inconsistent. A case in point was his attitude on foreign policy.

Naturally the Fifth Monarchists expected Christ's Kingdom to be worldwide. But instead of leaving this accomplishment to Christ, they began to involve themselves in foreign affairs in order to prepare the whole world for the destruction of the fourth monarchy and the beginning of the Fifth. Rogers warned the Army that it could not rest

\[42\text{Ibid., pp. 125-27; Canne, A Voice from the Temple, p. 12.}\]
until all the work of the Lord in the world had been accomplished.
The Kingdom of God could not be secure in England until it had been established throughout the world. This was a curious statement indeed.
It almost deprecated the power of Christ to protect his own Kingdom.

Nevertheless, Rogers wrote:

...We are bound by the law of God to help our neighbors...and so to aid the subjects of other Princes that are persecuted for true religion or oppressed under tyranny. Are there no Protestants in France or Germany even now under persecution? And do not the subjects of France that be under the Iron Yoke of tyranny send and seek and sue us for assistance? Well, woe be to us if we help not the Lord against the mighty. For it is the Lord hath sent for us thither, and calls for a part of our Army, at least, into France or Holland....And let not men dispute so much whether it be lawful to defend or strike in for another's liberty and deliverance....If we love Christ in our own nation, why not in another? and if justice, and peace, and piety, and righteousness among ourselves, why not among others? ⁴³

The first objective of the worldwide crusade for Christ was the relief of oppressed Protestants. The second was the destruction of the Popish powers of antichrist. This would pave the way for the Kingdom of Christ throughout the world. ⁴⁴ The logical ally for England in such a crusade would have been Holland. Not only was she Protestant, but she also had great naval resources, and she seemed to

⁴³Rogers, Sagrir, pp. 14, 18.

⁴⁴Rogers even called for an alliance with Venice against the Pope or the Hapsburgs. In addition, Christopher Peake, John Tillinghast, and Hannah Trapnel all called for the Saints' army to subdue the Turks, the Pope, the Hapsburgs, and France. Rogers, Sagrir, pp. 14, 134; Edwards, Gangraena, III, 147-48; Tillinghast, Generation Work, 2nd part, pp. 38-41, 57, 69-70, 81-82; Trapnel, Untitled Book, p. 153.
be the best landing place for an English invasion of the Continent. However, partly due to the growing commercial rivalry, the Dutch were not interested in such a crusade with the English. So instead of conciliating their potential allies, the Fifth Monarchists supported Cromwell's war against the Dutch in 1652-1654. 45 John Rogers was caught up in this ridiculous predicament. His rationale for such a war reflected the confused, and seemingly naïve thinking of the Fifth Monarchists. The war had to be prosecuted, he said, so that a peace might be made "upon the account of Christ to engage against antichrist, Rome, Prelates." 46 In other words, the Fifth Monarchists hoped to beat the Dutch into submission, and then force them into a brotherly alliance that would destroy France and the Pope! Christ may have been able to overcome all, but it is difficult to believe that the Fifth Monarchists could have achieved a holy alliance with the Dutch after destroying their trade and their military power.

This situation only serves to show what self-defeating and hypocritical attitudes the Fifth Monarchists had. For people who were supposed to be Saints ushering in the Kingdom of Christ, this militant millenialism seemed all too violent to many Englishmen. Scriptural justifications meant little to Englishmen who, within the short span of ten years, had witnessed political and military revolution plus the execution of a King. Yet to Fifth Monarchists

45 Cary, Resurrection, p. 133; Edwards, Gangraena, III, 147.
46 Rogers, Ohol or Bethshemesh, Introduction p. 12.
foreign aggression and military might were simply additional means of destroying the fourth monarchy. It seemed only natural that since they were involved with a political regime that had been established and was supported by military power, they should depend on it to achieve worldwide as well as national goals. It must be noted, also, that Christ's Kingdom was not the only goal of military millenialism. A successful conclusion to the Dutch war, for example, meant great benefits to the English clothworkers who constituted much of the Fifth Monarchist "grass roots" support. England stood to gain a monopoly on the sale of finished cloth to Spain and, at the least, to end the Dutch monopoly in the Baltic. Further, military millenialism would put the Fifth Monarchists under Oliver Cromwell's everlasting protection. As Macaulay writes:

There was nothing which Cromwell had for his own sake and that of his family so much reason to desire as a general religious war in Europe. In such a war he must have been the Captain of the Protestant armies. The heart of England would have been with him. His victories would have been hailed with an unanimous enthusiasm unknown in the country since the rout of the Armada. 47

Such enthusiasm the Fifth Monarchists hoped to muster behind their cause. In the process they hoped to retrieve some souls not fully convinced of the desirability of the rule of the Saints. If they could not convince Englishmen to fight for Christ's Kingdom solely on religious grounds, they hoped to play on English nationalism after the Civil Wars. To paint England as the new Israel would serve to unite

Englishmen and channel their conceptions of England as the chosen land toward the Fifth Monarchists' own goals.

Interestingly enough, while the Fifth Monarchists hoped to unite all Englishmen in their support, they could not even do so with the members of the Barebones Parliament. Deep divisions inside the House had stalled even basic legal and ecclesiastical reforms. Because each member acted more or less on his own conscience, and not according to some particular party platform, no specific measure could ever enjoy the guaranteed support of the majority of members. The particular issue which brought matters to a head was the abolition of tithes.

On December 2, 1653, the Tithes Committee finally reported its findings. Although the Committee recommended the retention of tithes, those members opposed to retention forced a debate lasting six days. In that period, the tide seemed to be turning against the moderates who supported the Committee's recommendation. Nevertheless, no matter what was said, there was a feeling, both inside and outside Parliament, that a vote against tithes was an attack on property. Since Englishmen saw tithes and lay patronage as forms of property, the attack on them was bound to be resisted. A deadlock was imminent in Parliament.

Whether Oliver Cromwell would have stepped in on his own to resolve the question will never be known for sure. He was saved from that dilemma by what J. R. Tanner calls "the suicide of the Assembly."

---

On December 12, 1653, the moderates came to the House early. Before the opposition was fully assembled, they passed a motion to resign the power of the Parliament back into the hands of Oliver Cromwell. By the end of the day, eighty members had signed the abdication, a clear majority of the Barebones Parliament. 49

The crisis that led to the abandonment of the "noble experiment" was precipitated by the impending success of one part of the program to destroy the remaining trappings of the fourth monarchy, and not by the principles on which the experiment had been established. Too many people had vested interests in those remnants to quietly acquiesce in the demise of the fourth monarchy. Even if the members of the Barebones Parliament had passed legislation to thoroughly reform church and law, their efforts would have failed for they had made too many enemies to allow successful implementation of that legislation. Besides lawyers, clergy, and lay appropriators, the Parliament had also alienated the Army by its reluctance to renew the assessment by which the Army salaries were financed. 51 And without the Army, enforcement of legislation would have been impossible. Thus, even though many might not dispute the principle of a Kingdom of Christ, they could not accept some of the programs designed to


50 An Answer to a Paper, p. 2.

51 Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, II, 313.
prepare England for the establishment of such a glorious Kingdom on earth.

Many radical ideas were voiced in the Barebones Parliament along with the more moderate ones. In a generation that had already experienced Civil War and regicide, the radical ideas were magnified by fear more than anything else. Perhaps, too, the members of Barebones failed to realize that a regime based largely on military power alone, with little reference to popular sanction, could not indefinitely command the allegiance of the people. Many links with tradition and legality had been destroyed. And along with those links went the Englishman's regard for the assembly of Saints. The Fifth Monarchists were inextricably tied to the radical ideas of the "noble experiment." They would all now be subject to accusations of fanaticism and even treason.
CHAPTER V

THE SUFFERING SAINT

With the abrupt demise of the Barebones Parliament, the Fifth Monarchists found themselves in a new political situation. The civil and military arms of the state had repudiated them. Almost to a man they were forced into unwavering opposition. Oliver Cromwell was the main object of their attacks. In accepting the resignation of the Barebones Parliament, he might have thwarted the immediate attack on law and property. But in the eyes of the Fifth Monarchists he had disrupted the work of the Saints. This apostasy called for action.

After the dissolution of the Parliament, Cromwell convened another council of his Army Officers to establish a new government. They worked for four days and finally constructed a system based on England's first, last, and only written constitution, The Instrument of Government. The essential feature of this Government was its reversion to a strong executive at the expense of the powers of a representative assembly. Oliver Cromwell was chosen the first "Lord Protector," a somewhat limited and restricted type of king. As a constitutional check on the Lord Protector, a Council of State of

1Printed in Gardiner, Documents, pp. 405-17.
twenty-one members who held office for life was also created. In truth, the Protector-in-Council wielded great power. He was authorized to make ordinances which had the force of law until Parliament could act on them. Other features of the Instrument included triennial Parliaments, the union of England, Ireland, and Scotland, and the redistribution of Parliamentary seats according to population.

Oliver Cromwell was installed as Lord Protector on December 16, 1653. Since the first triennial Parliament was not scheduled to meet until September 3, 1654, Cromwell was to have nearly nine months of almost single-handed control of English affairs. In the approximately eighty ordinances passed during those nine months, Cromwell carried on some of the policies initiated by the Barebones Parliament. However in the matters which had divided the Parliament of Saints, he proceeded more cautiously. For example, the Court of Chancery was not abolished, but its jurisdiction was limited and regulated. Legal fees were not abolished, but only reduced and put on a fixed scale. Tithes were retained, but Cromwell moved to restrict their use. A Commission of "Triers" was established to whom all persons appointed to benefices had to submit for approval. In addition, local commissions of "Ejectors" were created to remove unfit clergy and teachers from the benefices they already held. In truth, a sort of religious liberty emerged in the first days of the Protectorate, excluding Catholics and Anglicans of course.

---


The new Government of the Protectorate met opposition from two groups. The extreme republicans were very dissatisfied with the permanent executive's authority, which was largely independent of Parliament. They charged that the representatives of the people had been relegated to third place, a place behind both a Protector and a Council of State. This sentiment was shared by the religious radicals who feared a retreat from the high ideals upon which the previous Government had supposedly been founded. The Fifth Monarchists were particularly upset since they felt that Cromwell had usurped the position of sole power which rightfully belonged to Christ alone. They were concerned that England might be led into sin and perdition, away from the favored position in which they believed God had placed her among nations. Consequently the Fifth Monarchists lost no time in voicing their opinions about the Government, and especially about Oliver Cromwell.

As there were moderate and extreme Fifth Monarchists, so there was variety in their expressions of displeasure. In general, the Fifth Monarchists in the Army found it hard to regard Cromwell as the agent of antichrist, since they had seen him as hero and Saint for so many years. Major-General Overton expressed his personal dismay at Cromwell's rule, but promised to continue serving against the Royalists in Scotland. Both Colonel Rich and Hugh Courtney reflected the discontent of the "people of God," but they, too, remained in the Army. However, Major-General Harrison was relieved of his commission on December 21, 1653, and later ordered to his house in Staffordshire.
Not all Army Officers were so easily managed. Colonel Danvers, for example, urged all the London churches to join an attack against Cromwell. His propaganda failed to produce results.4

The most vocal opposition to the new regime among the Fifth Monarchists came from their London preachers. Two days after the Protectorate was proclaimed, Christopher Feake and Vavasor Powell denounced Cromwell as "the most dissembling perjured villain in the world." Feake announced that, upon reflection, he had found that the little horn spoken of in Daniel had not been Charles I. By implication he pointed to Oliver Cromwell instead. Powell predicted that the reign of Cromwell would be a short one. Three days after these statements were made, the Government arrested Feake and Powell and banned the Fifth Monarchist exercises at Blackfriars. However, the Government released the two men shortly, and Powell returned to his pulpit to denounce Cromwell in even stronger terms. Again warrants were issued, but Powell escaped to his native Wales. Feake was captured and remanded to custody along with John Simpson who had made the mistake of predicting Cromwell's fall within six months.5

John Rogers was not idle either. Although he had supported Cromwell's leadership in the initiation of reform, he distrusted the Lord Protector's blatant assumption of absolute power in England. At this point, Rogers held nothing against Cromwell as a person, but he


did fear the rule of single person because it was too much like
monarchy. His own examination of history convinced him that liberty
usually suffered at the hands of unbridled authority, especially when
that authority was exercised primarily by one person. Using William
the Conqueror as an example, Rogers found that absolute power tended
to corrupt its user. Accordingly, on December 21, 1653, only five
days after the Protectorate was proclaimed, and on the same day Feake
and Powell were first arrested, Rogers sent a private letter to
Cromwell advising him what to do in his present situation. At the
same time he addressed to Cromwell a public set of "Humble Cautionary
Proposals."6

Unlike his Fifth Monarchist brethren, John Rogers was not yet
convinced that Cromwell would discontinue the reforming work of the
Saints. But he thought the need for safeguards against the rule of a
single person other than Christ were more critical than ever.
Therefore he warned Cromwell against protecting the evil institutions
of the fourth monarchy, which must surely fall and take their
"protectors" with them. He advised the adoption of Christian prin-
ciples to offset men's laws of "tyranny, oppression, perjury, cheating,
injustice, and persecution." He reiterated the call for guidance by
the laws of Moses, to be made "republic laws in these latter days."
With the example of William the Conqueror still in his mind, Rogers

6 B. L., Rawlinson MSS, A47, fos. 32-35, J. Rogers to
Cromwell; John Rogers, To His Highnesse the Lord General Cromwell,
Lord Protector, etc., The Humble Cautionary Proposals (London,
1653), brs.
warned Cromwell to "take heed of carnal councillors" who would seek their own interests. He pleaded for a just esteem of those members of the late Parliament who had proved "faithful to Christ and against Antichrist and his cause." And ever the Independent, Rogers advised Cromwell not to countenance the "carnal Antichristian National Clergy" or the Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Papists. "Thus the worldly clergy do ever fly to worldly powers for protection (having none from God) and for this end," he observed, "it is they flatter Great men to engage them to their ruin."

Rogers was apprehensive about the future of reform in England. But he allowed judgment on Cromwell to wait on further events. This was characteristic of Rogers's moderation. Though many saw Cromwell as an apostate, Rogers saw him as a man subject to possible corruption. Rogers's pronouncements in Saggir on law and government show him to be close to Cromwell's goals in many ways. Both felt religious guidelines presented the best way to reform. In December 1653 Rogers thought Cromwell might still be able to effect such reforms, even though he had discarded the mantle and language of radical millenialism. But every precaution had to be taken. Politics and religion went hand in hand. When one sacrificed Christian principles to the exigencies of politics, the result was both religious

7Ibid. Newspapers of the day carried a miniscule account of Rogers's first four proposals, but they printed the attack in full that Rogers made upon the national clergy. This might have been done to increase the antipathy of the Presbyterian Divines against Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists. The Weekly Intelligencer (December 27-January 3, 1653).
and political tyranny. In Rogers's mind, Christian principles were inextricably tied to the reforms which he had proposed, with the Fifth Monarchists, during the term of the Barebones Parliament. If Cromwell abandoned these (and Rogers evidently considered this a distinct possibility), not only would he suppress reform but he would also pave the way for antichristian persecution. Thus Rogers ended his **Humble Cautionary Proposals** with a strong warning to Cromwell:

> If you will freely oblige for Christ and his interest, the faith and prayers of the Saints (which were never higher than now) shall protect you sufficiently in all emergencies; but if you will engage for Antichrist and his interests, the loud-crying faith and incessant high-spirited prayers of the Saints will all engage against you, ...for He [God] hath used you as a most glorious instrument in the three nations (by faith and prayers of His people) to make way for this work; which if you reject, will reject you, and be the infallible forerunner of your fall....Take heed what you do! 8

Rogers did not have to wait long to discover the Government's attitude towards the Fifth Monarchists. On January 19, 1654, the Council passed an ordinance making it a treasonable offense to write, print, teach, or preach that the Protector's authority was tyrannical, usurped, or unlawful. It also declared it to be treason to raise forces against the Government, to deny that the chief exercise of magistracy was centered in the Protector, to plot the death of the Lord Protector, or to promote any posterity of Charles I as King or Chief Magistrate. Under the authority of this ordinance, the Government committed Christopher Feake and John Simpson to

8Rogers, To His Highness, brs.
imprisonment in Windsor Castle. Consequently, and in spite of the ordinance, Rogers began to preach against the Government. In January he implied that Cromwell was a dissembler. In February he accused the Lord Protector of breaking former declarations. In March, miraculously still at liberty, he held a "service of humiliation" at St. Thomas Apostle's to protest the dissolution of the Barebones Parliament and the manner in which the Protectorate had been created. Rogers also designed the service to protest the new treason laws, to revive the flagging spirits of the Saints in the face of such laws, and to seek unity against oppression. With an obvious nod to Cromwell, Rogers also declared that the service was to protest the apostasy of "eminent persons" from their former pronouncements.

The "service of humiliation" was infiltrated by Thurloe's spies who reported to Thurloe that Rogers preached and prayed against both Cromwell and the Council of State. His prayer was said to have included the following sentiments:

9Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 831; Whitelocke, Memorials, p. 580. In truth Cromwell had reason to take measures for the security of his Government and for his own life. Plots were reported involving both Royalists and Fifth Monarchists. Rumors flew. For example, in February 1654 one Ellen Aske made a statement to John Thurloe implicating Major-General Harrison, Christopher Feake, and John Rogers in an alleged plot to raise forces against the Government. As a result of the subsequent investigations, Harrison was ordered to his house in Staffordshire. Thurloe, State Papers, III, 160.

10William Erbury, An Olive Leaf (London, 1654), p. 2; Certain Passages 5 (February 10-17, 1654), p. 38; The Declarations were those of the Army in 1647 and 1648-49 against the rule of any single person and supportive of religious and political liberty in England.

11Thurloe, State Papers, II, 196.
Hasten the time when all absolute power shall be
devoided into the hand of Christ, when we shall
have no Lord Protector but our Lord Jesus, the
only true Protector and Defender of the Faith.
\ldots\ Look in mercy upon thy Saints at Windsor that
are imprisoned for the truth and testimony of
Jesus; remember thy handmaid who is brought to
town and threatened by the worldly who crucify
Christ Jesus in the spirit every day. Hear the
blasphemies of the Court, and regard their
ridiculous pomp and vanity. 12

In his sermon that day Rogers attempted to prove that the "apostate
professors" of the age had openly broken all Ten Commandments. His
reference to Cromwell and the Council, albeit implied, is
unmistakeable:

Oh, thou black Whitehall! thou black Whitehall!
fa\-fh! fa\-fh! it stinks of the brimstone of Sodom and
the smoke of the bottomless pit! The flying roll
of God's curses shall overtake the family of the
great thief there--he that robbed us of the benefit
of our prayers, of our tears, of our blood; \ldots\ In
sun, my dear friends, you may shortly expect a new
book of martyrs. The Saints are worse dealt with
by the powers of this age than they were by the
heathens of old. 13

This evidence was preserved, but it was not immediately acted
upon. Evidently Cromwell was not yet convinced that Rogers was as
dangerous as Peake, Powell, or Simpson. Probably this was because
Rogers had supported the Lord General, or because Rogers had not
yet openly called for the overthrow of the Protector in so many

12Ibid., III, 483. The handmaid referred to was probably
Hannah Trapnel who had been arrested in Cornwall because of her
"visions," and was then brought to London. Hannah Trapnel's
Report and Plea (London, 1654), pp. 1-10; C. S. P. D. (1654), pp. 86,
134, 486; Mercurius Politicus 201 (March 13-20, 1654), pp. 3429-30.

words. Besides, Rogers still seemed content with the role of
suffering Saint, still content to offer advice, to preach and to pray.
However, on April 7, 1654, Rogers's house was illegally searched by
Thurloe's agents, and his books and papers were seized for examination.
Rogers felt that Cromwell had now prostituted whatever Christian prin-
ciples he might have had in favor of political security. Cromwell had
already dealt summarily with Feake and Simpson, but arbitrary
government struck home when Rogers's own liberty and integrity were at
stake. Rogers's answer was his fifth and final epistle to Cromwell,
_Mene, Tekel, Perez, or a Little Appearance of the Handwriting (In a
Glance of Light) Against the Powers and Apostates of the Times_.

There was little evidence of radical millenialism in this
book. Biblical references were noticeably reduced. Rogers seemed
to be more interested in the "public interest of the nation to Common
Right and Freedom (which has been the chief subject of our contest)
and in opposition to Tyranny and Injustice of Kings" than in
speculation on God's judgment of Cromwell at the millenium. But

14 The words were those written on the wall of Belshazzar's
palace. Literally they meant "numbered," "weighed," "divided." In
Daniel's dream they were interpreted as follows:
_Mene:_ God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it.
_Tekel:_ Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting.
_Perez:_ Thy kingdom is divided.
Rogers at first did not intend this epistle to be published. But as
he explains in his "Word to the Reader," he found it difficult to get
a private letter safely delivered to Cromwell. Knowing he was being
watched by Thurloe's spies, he figured the best way to get his message
to Cromwell was to have it published. Someone would surely take it
to the Lord Protector as evidence against its author!

15 _John Rogers, Mene, Tekel, Perez_ (London, 1654), p. 3.
Rogers used decidedly stronger language in Mene, Tekel, Perez than he had heretofore employed. If Cromwell had not grasped the message before, he could not fail to have done so now. Yet Rogers's approach was the same. He reminded Cromwell of his previous commitments, and then suggested a path of return to those ideals for both the Lord Protector and his Government.

Despite all that had happened, Rogers still believed Cromwell's intentions and principles might be honorable. But the very actions that he had warned against in his Humble Cautionary Proposals had now occurred. Cromwell had been ensnared by evil councillors, "parasites, flatterers, and deceivers" who sought their own interests. This could lead to further abuses of power. To remedy this situation, Rogers urged Cromwell to consider the present state of his Government, and then compare its conduct to principles to which he had subscribed as General of the Army—principles which guaranteed the people's just rights and liberties against all arbitrary power, violence, and oppression. He reminded Cromwell that as General he had been opposed to investing absolute power in a single person, that he had supported the power of a representative government, that he had fought for the Kingdom of Christ, and that he had supported the principles of law reform and impartial justice. For the Barebones Parliament, which had attempted to realize these principles, to be dissolved and broken, Rogers complained, "seems strange to us indeed, and the more dissatisfies us, for that we see this power [the Protectorate] succeed for the support and upholding of those things which that Parliament voted down;
and which the Army and good people had so often declared props of Antichrist; this makes the rise of it more grievous to the souls of some of the Saints than in that the people's choice was not in it."

To drive home his point, Rogers urged Cromwell to observe how closely his new government came to that of Charles I, especially in the matter of censorship, the searching of houses, and arbitrary arrests. Already the Fifth Monarchists were hindered in preaching and printing. Already they had been prevented from gathering at Blackfriars. Several had been imprisoned. Most of the rest were threatened either by the Government or by ordinary people who believed the propaganda circulated by the Government against the Fifth Monarchists. From his own bitter experience, Rogers observed:

Whilst we desire no other weapons (the Lord knoweth) for warfare, but the Word of Truth (which shall be our defense!) yet we are not suffered to print, but plundered of our notes and writings, whiles all manner of lies, slanders, and injurious reports are printed and divulged of us....yet (to hinder truth) it is now made Treason to print or preach it; so that we are forced to conceal truth from the world. ...We know the common and old plea is necessity; ...but there is no necessity to sin, but against it, and the Saints' necessity in a civil reference (as well as a spiritual) is to exalt Christ and his Kingdom.  

John Rogers may have been content with the role of suffering Saint for the moment. But he did try to allay the sufferings of his fellow Fifth Monarchists. He did this principally by offering

\[16\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 6.}\]
\[17\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 7-8.}\]
Cromwell further advice on how to return to the ways of Christ in the civil state. First, Cromwell was to consult with his Christ about his former "promises." Then he was to proclaim a day of fast and humiliation for the sins and errors of the past. The "Lord's Prisoners," Feake and Simpson, were to be released. Finally, the liberty of publishing and preaching was to be restored. The last proposal was extremely important to Rogers, for it seemed the only practical and legal way of defending the principles for which he and other Fifth Monarchists had fought. His plea was:

Let our brethren or any that will oppose us, convince or conquer all they can with the good Word of God, and we shall be satisfied to try it out with them so; but not with the weapons of the world, as they have them (now) all on their side, to imprison, persecute, or to put to death, etc., for that is Antichrist's (not Christ's) way of warfare. 18

If Cromwell could sanction liberty for Baptists, Presbyterians, and Independents (which he did), Rogers could see no reason why the Fifth Monarchists could not also enjoy such God-given, as well as English, liberties. He realized that these required concomitant responsibilities. "If we stir up people to risings, tumults, or carnal warfare, as men falsely charge us," he promised Cromwell, "then punish us as you please, for it is contrary to our principles so to do." Rogers sincerely believed in the freedom to speak, especially for the Saints. And so he warned Cromwell; "If you will yet go on...after our bleeding entreaties...then my Lord our souls shall mourn in secret for

18 Ibid., p. 10.
you as one desperately lost indeed! and we shall proceed to bear
our testimony against the sin of the times.19

The Triers and Ejectors seem to have overlooked Mene, Tekel,
Perez, at least for the moment. John Rogers remained at liberty. The
Fifth Monarchists already had two imprisoned "heroes" (Feake and
Simpson) around which to rally. Cromwell was not anxious to give them
one more reason to protest by arresting John Rogers. Indeed, Rogers's
arrest might have been the spark needed to ignite a conflagration. In
addition, Rogers seemed all too willing to be a martyr. As earlier in
his life, so now Rogers seemed to believe that martyrdom might
further the goals for which he strove. It would surely bring him
sympathy, and perhaps even a following. His spirit was marching in
this direction in The Humble Cautionary Proposals when he wrote:

I have freely exposed myself (in this my Master's
service) by whose spirit I am full of power to all
the sharp censures, reproaches, revilings and hard
measures that I meet with, from men or Devils,
choosing rather to have my peace within me than
without me, and to suffer with his afflicted Saints
than to sin with the World. 20

In Mene, Tekel, Perez, this grew into the words, "Welcome Cross of
Christ!...The more men rage, the more resolute we hope to be,...up
to the death for the Truth;...I had rather, the Lord knows I think,
leap into a bonfire than willfully commit wickedness or sin against
God."21 Cromwell realized he had to be careful with John Rogers.

19 Ibid., pp. 10, 12.
20 Rogers, To His Highness, brs.
21 Rogers, Mene, Tekel, Perez, Word to the Reader p. 12.
However, Cromwell did not wield final or complete authority in the matter. The Council of State had the power to check his decisions. Since the Council members held office for life, they were nearly independent of the Lord Protector. Cromwell had to rely on influence and not force alone in dealing with them. For a time his tolerance of Rogers was condoned by the Council. But the progress of events in 1654 changed that. The Protectorate Parliament was scheduled to convene on September 3, 1654. During the summer a general feeling of malevolence had grown against the Government. In addition to the Fifth Monarchists, the disaffected clergy and the extreme republicans in London expressed objections to the concentration of power in the executive. Faced with this growing opposition, the Council of State decided to try to frustrate their enemies as much as possible before the Parliament met. With Simpson, Feake, and Powell out of the way, John Rogers had become the center of Fifth Monarchist activity. Therefore, the Council of State, with Cromwell present, ordered the arrest of Rogers on July 25, 1654. A committee was appointed to question him intensively on information gathered by Thurloe's spies. 22

Until the twenty-fifth of July, Rogers had enjoyed an unusual immunity, an immunity which must be attributed to the influence of the Lord Protector. But the accumulating evidence against Rogers, joined to the political situation in London, forced the Government to act. His Humble Cautionary Proposals contained indirect aspersions on the

22 P. R. O., S.P. 25/75, f. 443.
legality of the Protectorate. His sermons in January and February against the regime had prompted even William Erbury to reply. Ellen Aske's testimony in March implicated Rogers in an alleged plot against the Lord Protector. In his "service of humiliation," Rogers had implied the downfall of the Government when he prayed for no protector but Christ. And in Mene, Tekel, Perez he had compared the Protectorate and its probable fate with the reign of Charles I. 23

All of this constituted treason by the new laws of the Protectorate. Rogers, the once cautious Fifth Monarchist, had set his course with such increased vigor and determination that the Council felt compelled to act. On July 27, agents of the Government roused Rogers out of his bed and took him and his wife to Lambeth Palace which had been converted into a house of detention. Here he was to remain for thirty-five weeks. 24

Cromwell's apprehension about Rogers's desire for martyrdom appears to have been well founded. When he was arrested, he was reported to have said that he much desired to be in prison. 25 And once there, he began to make the most of his confinement. He quickly

23Rogers, To His Highnesse, brs; Erbury, An Olive Leaf, passim; Thurloe, State Papers, III, 160, II, 196, III, 483; Rogers, Mene, Tekel, Perez, p. 8.

24Severall Proceedings 253 (July 27-August 3, 1654), p. 4003; John Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha (London, 1657), Introduction p. 6. (John Rogers wrote an account of his experiences at Lambeth under the title Prison-Born Morning Beams. However, only the Introduction to that work survived. It was printed as an Introduction to Rogers's Jegar-Sahadutha which is an account of his imprisonment in 1653-1656.)

caused trouble both inside and outside the walls of Lambeth. "We
will," proclaimed Rogers, "sooner have our tongues cleave to the roof
of our mouths, our eyes shrink into our heads with waiting, yea, and
our bodies rot in the Dungeon than relinquish this glorious
controversy now up for the Lamb against the Beast (for which we are
now in prison) or yield an inch of ground to our enemies."26 The
moderate reformer was now the indignant prisoner of Oliver Cromwell.
And as his confinement dragged on, Rogers's original Puritan
Independent zeal for religious and social reform turned into a
religious and political fanaticism that rivaled that of any radical
Fifth Monarchist.

Because Rogers took his wife and children to prison with him,
the master jailer of Lambeth, Serjeant Dendy, demanded prison fees of
£6 per week.27 Rogers claimed he could not pay. So Dendy began a
long campaign of harassment against him and his family. Rogers
alleged that he was deprived of air and exercise; that the rest of
the prison rabble were allowed to come and go as they pleased while he
was confined to a few rooms; that he was allowed no visitors; and that
he was hindered from preaching or praying publicly within the castle
grounds. (He got around this, however, by preaching through his
prison window to members of his congregation and others who came to

26Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha, Introduction p. 34.

27Dendy was the nephew of Rogers's wife. In view of this
relationship, it might be assumed that the Rogerses' deprivations
and sufferings at Lambeth were not as severe as John maintained.
hear him.) He complained that all the jailers were instructed to report anything they heard about him, whether the information was true or not. Other prisoners were also recruited as informers. "Cavaliers, Ranters, and Blasphemers...plot against me for my life," Rogers wrote. They fabricated articles against him, Rogers charged, "from what they overheard or invented, from my praying and preaching, or singing of hymns, writing all down they could make for their purpose." 28

Several reports of Rogers's complaints reached Whitehall. Perhaps the most interesting was Dendy's. For understandable reasons Dendy was as anxious to get rid of Rogers as Rogers was to leave. Therefore Deny suggested a course of action which must have appealed to Cromwell, too. He advised the Lord Protector to consider whether it would not be best yet a little longer, by gentleness and meekness, to heap up coals of fire upon his head; and if he turn not at such reproof...then certainly the Lord hath not called your highness to bear the sword in vain; and yet if he persist in the forwardness of his heart, I hope when the Parliament sits, they will call him to an account; which I confess I would rather they should do than your highness. 29

Cromwell might have been able to persuade the Council of State to follow this course had it not been for other reports about Rogers's conduct at Lambeth. The prisoner was supposed to have predicted that "the great man at Whitehall must suddenly be confounded and destroyed" and that the "Antichrist, the Babylon, the great Dragon, or the man of

28 Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha, Introduction pp. 19, 8-27, passim.
29 Thurloe, State Papers, III, 485.
Sin, Oliver Cromwell, at Whitehall, must be pulled down." Rogers was reportedly overheard talking with a man who expressed the belief that faith and prayer alone would not free the Saint at Windsor (Feake) nor destroy Babylon. In addition, Rogers was supposed to have received a letter from Vavasor Powell promising to send 20,000 armed men from Wales who were ready to defend the cause. If true, these charges made Rogers an accessory to sedition, rebellion, and treason. Even if Cromwell had wanted to release him, the Council of State, for their own safety, dared not establish the precedent of setting such a man at liberty. For besides Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists, the Government had now managed to alienate the republican elements in the new Protectorate Parliament. The time was all too ripe for the rebellion of which Rogers was supposed to be a central part.

In theory, the Protectorate Parliament did not owe its existence or its authority to English tradition and custom. Nevertheless, its members seemed to consider themselves guardians of Parliamentary power. They refused to recognize the binding force of the Instrument of Government, claiming that the government should be settled in Parliament alone. They questioned the right of Army Officers to impose on the nation a constitution not written by the representatives of the whole people. Cromwell therefore agreed to accept an amended constitution as long as four fundamentals were guaranteed: government by a single person and Parliament, no perpetual Parliaments, liberty of conscience in religion, and joint

---

30 Ibid., III, 136.
control of the power of the sword between Protector and Parliament. The more extreme republicans refused to abide by such dictates. Other members seemed willing to accept the first two fundamentals, but they sought to modify the last two. Endless debates failed to produce a ratification of the Instrument in its entirety. Even though it had been in operation for over a year, the authority of the Constitution continued to rest solely on military authority and power. This alone was enough to stimulate increased opposition to the regime, not only from the republicans, but also from Levellers, Commonwealthmen, and the Fifth Monarchists. However, in an attempt to hasten the formal adoption of the Instrument by Parliament, Cromwell caused some ninety of its more extreme republicans to be purged. This brought even greater criticism of his authority. Rumors of plots and risings were increasing at a rapid rate. In this atmosphere, Cromwell

31 Despite the fact that their four most vociferous leaders were either exiled or imprisoned, the Fifth Monarchists maintained their militancy. This was due in large part to the fact that Feake, Simpson, and Rogers managed to steer the movement from their prison cells. Feake and Simpson smuggled letters to their congregations. Feake's congregation published these letters calling on the faithful to mind the apostasy of great men and to be ready to join a standing army for the King of Saints. Rogers contributed a fiery preface to Edward Lane's *Image of Our Reforming Times* in which he declared that the millenium was near, and urged the Saints to suffer for Christ, even as he had suffered. Though the tone of these pronouncements may have varied, they all served to keep the Saints active and their hopes alive. Christopher Feake, *The New Non-conformist* (London, 1654), passim and sig. A3; The Old Leaven Purged Out (London, 1658), p. 9; Edward Lane, *An Image of Our Reforming Times* (London, 1654), p. 17.


thought it best to remove the rallying point of the discontent. And since the Parliament was miles away from adopting the Instrument in the form he wanted, Cromwell saw no reason why that body should continue. Therefore, on January 22, 1655, he dissolved the first Protectorate Parliament. 34

Given this situation, Cromwell began to search for means to lessen tensions. The possibility of an opportunity to do so presented itself in late January 1655 when several members of John Rogers's congregation petitioned the Lord Protector to release Rogers. Although he refused immediate liberty for Rogers, Cromwell did agree to meet with him to discuss their differences. Cromwell had nothing to lose by such a move. He had everything to gain if he could persuade Rogers that they both sought the same goals for England. Indeed, he had tried the same tactic of "persuasion" before. In September and December 1654 he thought he had succeeded with Major-General Harrison, but constant rumors of plots involving Harrison seemed to cloud the success. In December 1654 he had met with John Simpson, but that confrontation produced no results other than a feeling of frustration and discontent on both sides. Undeterred, Cromwell again tried reasoning with his opponents, this time with Christopher Feake. Feake had been a prisoner for over a year when he published a book in which he accepted Cromwell as de facto but not necessarily de jure ruler of England. Cromwell thought this was a wedge by which he might at least gain Feake's pledge not to print or

34 Carlyle, Letters and Speeches, Part VIII, 94.
stir up sedition against the Government. But Feake had been an enemy for too long. Again the "persuasion" proved sterile. Feake had been returned to prison.35

John Rogers, however, was another case entirely. Cromwell knew Rogers had once been his champion. While Feake, Simpson, and Powell had been immovable opponents, Rogers had always exhibited a positive, or at least a "wait-and-see," attitude. He had reserved condemnation in the early days of the Protectorate. Cromwell now counted on this sense of the politic to persuade Rogers to give up his opposition. This in turn would lead to the end of his imprisonment, an imprisonment which served as a focal point of discontent for other Fifth Monarchists. Of all the Fifth Monarchists, Rogers seemed the most likely to be moved. And if Cromwell could accomplish this, perhaps he could lessen the opposition of Feake, Simpson, Powell, Spittlehouse, Harrison, Rich, and Overton. Once the Fifth Monarchist threat was eliminated, Cromwell could attend to his other enemies and to the business of government. John Rogers, then, became an important part of Oliver Cromwell's strategy in early 1655.

However, seven months of imprisonment on no specific charge, especially with the privations imposed by Serjeant Dendy at Lambeth, had produced a drastic change in Rogers's attitude. Cromwell did not expect this. Rogers's sense of martyrdom and self-suffering had risen to new heights. Removed from the world of religious and

political action, and constrained in a world where one's very
existence was the prime interest, Rogers quite naturally abandoned
cautions and moderation. He began to concentrate on ways to attack
or embarrass the person he believed was responsible for his miserable
state, Oliver Cromwell. The Lord Protector discovered this only too
quickly once the interview with Rogers began.

On the appointed day, February 6, 1655, several of Rogers's
congregation came to pray with him in the morning. At about 3:30 in
the afternoon they accompanied Rogers and his wife and Serjeant Dendy
from Lambeth across the Thames to Whitehall. Of some 250 people that
made this journey, only Rogers and the twelve men who had petitioned
for his release in January were allowed into the Lord Protector's
chamber. Cromwell himself was surrounded by sixty courtiers. This
was to be the only "trial court" before which John Rogers ever
appeared. 36

The interview centered largely on the question of Rogers's
imprisonment. The twelve petitioners from Rogers's congregation had
first wanted to know with what crimes Rogers was charged. Since the
Lord Protector produced no formal charge, the petitioners accused him
of imprisoning Rogers because he served Christ, and this was no

36 The Faithful Narrative of the Late Testimony and Demand
(London, 1655), p. 8. The twelve men who were allowed to accompany
Rogers into the Lord Protector's chamber took notes on the debate.
Subsequently they published these notes under the above title.
Although probably slanted to the Fifth Monarchist position, this
pamphlet gives a fairly good indication of the ideas and concerns
of both Cromwell and Rogers.
legal basis for imprisonment. Cromwell replied that Rogers had been kept in custody because he was a railer, a busybody, and a stirrer of sedition, and not because of his religious views. He reiterated this to Rogers's face saying:

"You suffer not for the testimony of Jesus Christ; God is my witness, I know it that no man in England does suffer for the testimony of Jesus,...but some words are actions, and words are conjugal with actions, for actions and words are as sharp as swords, and such things I charge you with." 37

This fine line between ideas and words, and the actions they might produce, was completely foreign to Rogers's thinking. It seemed to him that he was indirectly being charged for treason by words alone. To his mind this was illegal. As early as 1653 in Sagrir Rogers had written that "matters of fact are the proper object of the law's cognizance" and not men's opinions. 38 In addition, since the ideas that he and other Fifth Monarchists preached were in the cause of Christ, he believed they could never be considered seditious. If Cromwell found them so, then his was obviously not a rightly principled Christian Government. Rogers replied to Cromwell, then, that no law of God made him an offender. only Cromwell's law which was "worse than the Roman law and tyranny, that makes a man a traitor for words." Cromwell interrupted, "Who calls you a traitor? I call you not; see, I believe you speak many things according to the Gospel; but you suffer for evil-doing." 39

37Ibid., p. 9.

38 Rogers, Sagrir, p. 99.

39 The Faithfull Narrative, p. 12.
The Lord Protector then produced several documents as "evidence" against Rogers. He read from reports on Rogers's conduct and complaints at Lambeth, which included the allegation that the prisoner had publicly preached that Oliver Cromwell was the great Dragon at Whitehall who must be pulled down. Rogers denied that he had ever used such language. But he declined to answer the substance of the allegation saying that it was not worth answering anyway. 40

Other documents were then read concerning Rogers's "service of humiliation" on March 28, 1654. Still more depositions were produced which implicated him in various plots. To many of these accusations Rogers could offer no adequate defense. So he took the offensive retorting:

I looked to have a fair trial or a Christian debate, but this is otherwise, seeing that men are hired or any other ways falsely suborned to inform against me: as for them out of prison, it is a sign that your cause is not very good that needs such informers.

Besides, Rogers continued, even if such information could prove him an evil-speaker (which he doubted), it could not prove him an evil-doer in matters of fact. 41

Cromwell became irritated at Rogers's persistence and declared that speaking evil of authority and raising false accusations were matters of fact. Rogers had begun to realize that his pronouncements against the Government's restrictions of civil rights and political liberties was being weakened by a defense on religious grounds alone.

40 Ibid., p. 19.

41 Ibid., p. 14.
So he switched to a civil or constitutional stance against the Lord Protector. This was not inconsistent in Rogers's mind, since he believed that right religious principles went hand in hand with political liberties and civil rights. Indeed he was living in an age when religion and politics were very closely tied together. And a great part of his disagreement with Cromwell centered on the Lord Protector's attempt to separate the two. But at the moment Rogers had found a legal base and he was not about to be pushed away from it:

If you will read the Articles you may yet expect not a word of answer from me, unless it be in an open and legal court before a competent and fit judge, which you are not (my Lord) nor those about you, but those things which are my due right granted, I am ready to answer them in Westminster Hall where I believe the Lord's remnant who are one with me in this cause will stand by me....Therefore let me have a fair hearing in a legal court,...but yet I tell you my Lord I fear not anything that you can lay against me justly and honestly...nor will I be tried in hugger-mugger, but if I have offended it is fit I should have open justice.

Even more angered, Cromwell demanded, "Who tries you? and who says it is a charge? who calls it a charge? I say not so."\(^{42}\)

Oliver Cromwell had been very cautious and patient with Rogers. To satisfy the Council of State he had agreed to Rogers's imprisonment. But it was probably his influence that kept Rogers from coming to a trial that would have meant certain death. This was a special case for Cromwell. He hinted at his motives when he told Rogers, "You know the time was, there was no great difference betwixt you and me; I had you in my eye, and did think of you for employment (and

\(^{42}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 18-19.} \)
preferment) you know it well enough." Although Rogers probably hoped this was true, he had not received assurance of it until this moment. But rather than humble him, or diminish his opposition to the Lord Protector, Rogers was only strengthened in his resolve by Cromwell's admission. If Cromwell once held him in such regard, he might now be willing to concede Rogers's legal point. Unfortunately, seven months of imprisonment had eroded Rogers's spirit of compromise. He continued to press his legal point saying:

The case is altered indeed; but I pray consider who it is is changed; surely it must be conscience that makes me suffer then, through so many temptations as I have met with; and I have often said, let me be convinced by good words that I am an evil-doer, as you said; and I would lay my neck under your feet for mercy; but 'til then, I must keep my conscience.

Both men made conciliatory gestures towards each other. Neither stood to gain by mutual animosity. But both were strong men, and each seemed to believe that he had to win one point in order to concede another. Cromwell tried to convince Rogers that he had overstepped the bounds of simple religious toleration. Rogers tried to instruct the Lord Protector in English law. Each thought the other incompetent in that particular area.

Rogers now turned to the theme of apostasy, accusing the Lord Protector of betraying the cause of Christ. But apostasy depended on one's point of view, and Cromwell retorted sharply, "Look you to your conscience and I will look to mine." Rogers was not deterred, and pointed out that Cromwell had once subscribed to the proposition that

43 Ibid., p. 20.
power vested in a single person, other than Christ, was antichristian.
"And who? Hear me: Who?" shouted Cromwell, "Who I say hath broken
that? Where is such an arbitrary or absolute power? (Nay hear me)
Where is such a power?"

"Is not the long-sword such?" Rogers answered, "Is not your
power with the armies absolute, to break up Parliaments and do what
you will?"

Frustrated by this exchange, Rogers declared that he now saw
the essence of the controversy most plainly. It was not between man
and man, or government and government, but between Cromwell and
Christ. In Cromwell's mind this was not the controversy at all.
Rogers had merely changed the subject. The problem was Rogers's
actions. But as long as the conversation had turned to principles,
Cromwell decided to make the most of it. Angered at Rogers's
obstinancy, the Lord Protector answered sarcastically, "Ha! I heard
indeed it is some of your principles to be at it; you long to be at
it; you want but an opportunity."

Rogers could not answer this either. So he again turned the
conversation in another direction, this time to an area he knew the
Lord Protector disliked. "The Remnant of the Woman's Seed must be at
it when they have the call. For I beseech you my Lord, consider how
near it is to the End of the Beast's dominion, the forty-two months,
and what time of day it is now."

\[ ^{44} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 23, 34, 35. \]

\[ ^{45} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 35. \]
"Talk not of that," Cromwell interrupted sharply, "for I must tell you plainly, they are things I understand not."

"It seems so, my Lord," Rogers replied smugly, "else surely you durst not lay violent hands upon us for the testimony and truth of the day, as you do." 46

Another brief exchange occurred, in which Rogers accused Cromwell of establishing a worldly national clergy through his Triers and Ejectors. The Lord Protector then lost all patience, saying, "I tell you there wants brotherly love, and the several sorts of forms [Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchists] would cut the throats of one another should I not keep the peace....It is fit to keep all these forms out of the Power." 47

Rogers immediately demanded to know who had made the Lord Protector a judge of Christian principles. And irritated further by Cromwell's patronizing attitude, Rogers announced that for himself, he was ready "to side with just principles...whether it be by preaching, praying or fighting." This statement sealed Rogers's fate. He probably would have preferred to avoid such an open display of hostility, but the anger of the moment added to months of imprisonment on no specific charge, finally overcame any caution he might have had left. Many were astounded to hear him utter such words. One courtier

46 Ibid.

asked incredulously, "Said you not 'fighting?'" "Yes," Rogers answered, "in the spirit of the Lord."\(^{48}\)

Oliver Cromwell had had enough. The dialogue seemed unsalvageable. After he refused one last plea from Rogers's brethren to set Rogers free, he turned to go. But Rogers had the last word. As the Lord Protector stormed out of the room, Rogers shouted after him that the day of Judgment was near. On that day all would be judged, and both he (Rogers) and Feake would be proven true prophets.\(^{49}\)

In the heat of confrontation, John Rogers had shown his true nature. Only a brave and sincere man would have told Cromwell that his laws were tyrannical. But it was also a foolish act, for legally such an accusation amounted to treason. The basic area of difference between the two men centered on the relationship of civil authority and religious principles. Both Cromwell and Rogers had once worked on the premise that the two were intertwined. Both believed that a civil authority based on Christian principles was the best possible kind of government. However, the vision of the two men differed. Even though Rogers was a moderate Fifth Monarchist, he looked into the future toward the ultimate society, where religious principles would govern all. He could not help but believe that even in the immediate society in which he was living, Christian principles should take precedence over political exigencies. Cromwell, as he was thrust deeper into the practical politics of earthly power, narrowed his

\(^{48}\text{Ibid.}, pp. 34-35.\)

\(^{49}\text{Ibid.}, p. 39.\)
vision to the immediate necessities of civil security and order. This did not mean he abandoned religious scruples as a general guideline for governmental programs. But in the everyday business of maintaining civil order, the security of government came first. Politically, Cromwell had become a practical, worldly administrator. Unfortunately, Rogers ran afoul of the security Cromwell sought. Although their goals may have been very close, Cromwell and Rogers came to an impasse over the means to those goals. Rogers simply refused to recognize the separation between religion and government that Cromwell had been forced to acknowledge because of worldly needs.

Because Cromwell refused to charge Rogers with treason, Rogers was forced to emphasize his constitutional rights rather than his religious principles. If he could not prove that he suffered for religion, he believed he could prove that he had been denied his civil rights. This was not inconsistent in Rogers's mind since religious and civil liberty were inseparable in the fight to establish the New Jerusalem. If one was denied, the other was negated. Cromwell appeared to have attacked both. For Rogers, the cause in England narrowed itself to opposition to the Lord Protector. Rogers believed he could not lose whether it be on religious or civil grounds. And since Cromwell insisted on contending in the worldly sphere, Rogers obliged. Unfortunately, this also brought Rogers to declare his unalterable opposition to Cromwell, even if it came to actual fighting. In the worldly sphere, however, the two men were far from equal. Cromwell possessed all power and authority. Rogers was not
dismayed, however, for he believed that ultimate authority lay with his cause alone. Seven months of imprisonment, working on his spirit of martyrdom, had convinced him of this.

Could either Cromwell or Rogers have acted differently in this situation? Cromwell could have formally charged Rogers and had him bound over for trial. Since the Protectorate Parliament had already been dissolved, and the Court which tried cases of alleged treason was a creation of the Council of State, Rogers probably would have been convicted. This could have frightened the rest of the Fifth Monarchists into silence, or inflamed them to even greater opposition. For all Cromwell knew, the rest of the sect had the same martyr complex Rogers had, and executions would only bring more violence. On the other hand, he could have freed Rogers and even given him a government post. Since Rogers would have been discredited in the eyes of the other Fifth Monarchists, he would have ceased to be a danger to the Protectorate. But if Cromwell were to do this, he would face continuing opposition until all Fifth Monarchists were freed. If Feake and Simpson and Powell were pardoned, they could have become the source of plots against the Government. Thus, Cromwell would have to face a hostile Council of State if he freed Rogers, and perhaps a Civil War from two different sides. Since Fifth Monarchist ideas had permeated the Army, Cromwell could not be sure of military support to put down plots or rebellions led by the Fifth Monarchists. In addition, Cromwell was still enough of an idealist to want reforms. And neither tyranny nor anarchy were conducive to reform of a more
permanent nature. If the Fifth Monarchists were allowed to go on with their activities, either as they had or more vigorously, the resulting confusion would have allowed the Royalists to attempt a restoration. And a Royalist restoration would have killed all chances for reform. If Cromwell could have persuaded Rogers to admit he caused disruption, he might have been able to accomplish some sort of reconciliation with him. This, in turn, he hoped would reduce the threat from the other Fifth Monarchists.

Rogers could have admitted that he stirred up sedition. But such an admission meant that he had not been championing Godly principles all along. For by their nature, the principles for which he stood could only be understood as seditious to antichrist. Since he believed political and religious principles were of the same mold in a Godly society, all his previous calls for reform would have been negated if he admitted error in his political ideas. If he had been freed, or even accepted preferment from Cromwell, the Council of State could always have condemned him for his former opinions at his first indiscretion. Furthermore, the Fifth Monarchists would probably have condemned him as an apostate, thus removing any trace of the security which he had so desperately sought since childhood. Rogers was enough of a millenarian to be convinced of the nearness of the Kingdom, and he wanted to avoid the taint of apostasy. Besides, Rogers believed he had little to lose by standing on his principles, both religious and political. He was already a prisoner. He had already suffered, and by that suffering made converts to his cause.
He knew from experience that Cromwell would hesitate to make him more of a martyr. From Lilburne to Feake, Cromwell's policy had been to silence his opponents by imprisonment or exile, not by execution. If by some chance Rogers could convince Cromwell of the errors of his ways, then total victory might be accomplished.

Up to 1654 Rogers had been known as a moderate. He had not been in the mainstream of radical Fifth Monarchism. It was precisely because of this that Cromwell took such pains to persuade him. But by attacking him personally, by allowing his imprisonment and his ill-treatment at Lambeth, Oliver Cromwell converted John Rogers into a radical Fifth Monarchist. Cromwell drove a potential ally into the ranks of Fifth Monarchist leadership. For now Rogers became one of the most fanatic commanders of the Saints. But it should be noted that the prime source of his fanaticism was hatred of the Lord Protector, not zeal for the immediate material establishment of Christ's Kingdom on earth, to the exclusion of all else. When that source of fanaticism was removed by death in 1658, Rogers would change, too. But for the present he was as much a fanatic as Feake or Powell. Along with these men, Rogers turned his attention and his efforts to the immediate goal of eliminating Oliver Cromwell. In the process, his religious fanaticism increased in direct proportion to his engagement in political subversion.

Rogers was recommitted to Lambeth Palace. He continued to be a nuisance for Sergeant Dendy, and an embarrassment to the Government. Lambeth now became the center of Fifth Monarchist activity in London.
In view of this development, the Council of State decided to move Rogers out of London. On March 30, 1655, the Council ordered him to be transferred to Windsor Castle. This was the worst decision the Council could have made. For imprisoned at Windsor was one of the most radical opponents of the Protectorate, Oliver Cromwell, and the Council of State—Christopher Feake. To bring these two Fifth Monarchists together was a virtual guarantee of trouble. Each could strengthen and support the other's contempt for Cromwell and his whole regime. A new age of militancy was beginning, and the Government itself helped build one of its centers at Windsor.

CHAPTER VI

THE MILITANT SAINT

With the dissolution of the first Protectorate Parliament in January 1655, anger at the failure to settle England's constitutional problems mounted. There were numerous rumors of plots against the Government. In this atmosphere, Oliver Cromwell undertook his "persuasion" of John Rogers. The failure to conciliate the Fifth Monarchists through Rogers, joined to the momentary success of a Royalist uprising led by John Penruddock in March 1655,\(^1\) convinced Cromwell that closer control of the country was essential. Therefore, he divided the kingdom into eleven military districts, each under the command of a Major-General aided by a local militia of about 500 men. This was meant to provide the local magistrates with a more effective police force. But the Major-Generals had a broad commission. Their authority quickly intruded into most spheres of private as well as public life.\(^2\) The imposition of this rule provoked the Fifth Monarchists who were still at liberty to resume, with a new vigor, the


cause of Christ. They sought alliances with other discontented groups. They took more militant stands against the Government. They finally resorted to open rebellion.

In an attempt to bolster their numbers, the Fifth Monarchists sought a coalition with the Commonwealthmen. The Commonwealthmen were unalterably opposed to the Protectorate and to Cromwell, but principally because they favored strict republicanism and democratically elected Parliaments. However, they also sought the abolition of tithes and an established church, and they worked for reform in the administration of laws. Several conferences between the two groups took place. Thurloe began to take serious notice of their meetings in early July 1656. The Commonwealthmen were represented by Vice-Admiral Lawson, Captain Lyons, and Colonel Okey. The Fifth Monarchists seem to have been led by a London winecooper and onetime employee of the Tower of London, Thomas Venner, assisted by Arthur Squibb and Clement Ireton. 3

The conferences in July focused on Henry Vane's A Healing Question Propounded which was published in 1656. Vane, who believed in the sovereignty of elected Parliaments, was also a millenarian. His Healing Question was an attempt to bring together all those who professed loyalty to the "Good Old Cause" of a Commonwealth without King, Protector, or House of Lords and based on Christian principles of morality and justice. Vane proposed a constituent assembly elected

3 Being observed as a "fellow of desperate and bloody spirit," Venner had been dismissed from the Tower for plotting to blow it up. Thurloe, State Papers, V, 197, VI, 185.
by all the adherents of the Cause that would unite them into one
movement. He did not go beyond this into the details of how a new
government might be organized. To the Fifth Monarchists, this seemed
a workable proposal since the details could be left to the direction
of God. But the Commonwealthmen wanted to settle such mundane items
as the method of choosing representatives, the delegation of powers,
and the composition of a new government, before the venture began. In
addition, they wanted to include some forty members of the Long
Parliament in any new assembly in order to give it an appearance of
legality. Although they might agree to a government of mixed
republican and theocratic elements, the emphasis had to be republican.
They did not want an assembly of holy men, but a Parliament
representative of the people. Venner and his cohorts refused to
consider such sentiments, let alone the question of the legality and
scope of the power that the new government should enjoy. Thus the
alliance between the Fifth Monarchists and the Commonwealthmen never
produced any concrete results.

Nevertheless, the Fifth Monarchist attempt to unify some of
the opposition to the Government greatly disturbed Oliver Cromwell.
Due to a lack of funds with which to fight his war against Spain, he
had been forced to call another Parliament for September 1656.
Conditions in the country were bad enough. If a new Parliament were
infiltrated or badgered by the Fifth Monarchists, or worse yet, a
Fifth Monarchist alliance, Cromwell feared the same lack of
cooperation as he had met with in the first Protectorate Parliament.
Therefore, he sought to silence the Fifth Monarchists, or at least diminish their influence, by forceful and thorough means. The leaders of the Fifth Monarchist-Commonwealthmen detente were arrested. Since Lawson, Okey, and Lyons were all military men, their arrests served to discourage the influence of rebellious designs in the armed forces, at least temporarily. Colonel Rich, who had been freed in March 1656 from imprisonment for earlier plots against the regime, had not actually participated in the talks with the Commonwealthmen. But he was sent off to Windsor Castle in August anyway. Likewise Major-General Harrison, who had also boycotted the talks, was committed to Pendennis Castle for good measure. And John Canne was removed from his post at Hull where Fifth Monarchist ideas had crept into the fleet and the garrison.4

Despite these efforts, a number of Cromwell's enemies were returned to the second Protectorate Parliament. But by using a clause of the Instrument of Government which allowed the Council of State to peruse the returns and exclude any person not of known integrity (in other words, trouble-makers for the Government), the Lord Protector managed to exclude most of his opponents anyway. Of 460 members, about 100 were removed by this method. Approximately sixty more refused to participate in these new sessions as a protest.

---

4Thurloe, State Papers, IV, 191, V, 197, 248, 407, VI, 185-86; Clarke Papers, III, 68-69; C. S. P. D. (1656-57), pp. 71, 112, 581, 431; Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha, p. 113; Henry Vane, the author of A Healing Question, which was supposed to bring the Fifth Monarchists and the Commonwealthmen together, was arrested and sent to Carisbrooke Castle. Here he met John Rogers, and the two became close in ideas and friendship.
against such arbitrary action.\textsuperscript{5} Cromwell got what he hoped would be a cooperative Parliament. In truth, the exclusion of so many elected members only created deeper discontent with the Protectorate.

A few days after the expulsion, representatives of Fifth Monarchist congregations met at Abingdon to consider the future action of the Saints. Cromwell had actually accomplished what many Fifth Monarchist leaders had not been able to accomplish. He had brought the Fifth Monarchists together in a unified effort. After two days of debate, the representatives decided that God's Saints could and must be a "bloody people" for the cause of the Kingdom of Christ. Although the meetings were quickly broken up by Thurloe's agents and by a contingent of soldiers,\textsuperscript{6} the Fifth Monarchists had already set down some resolutions for publication. On September 24, 1656, these militant resolutions appeared in London under the title The Banner of Truth Displayed; or a Testimony for Christ and Against Anti-Christ. If there was any tract published during the whole history of the Fifth Monarchists to which the majority could subscribe, this was it. But this was only because resolutions in The Banner were general, negative statements against Cromwell and his Government.

The authors reiterated the belief that the Saints had a commission to destroy the fourth monarchy, and especially Oliver Cromwell, as

\textsuperscript{5}C. H. Firth, The Last Years of the Protectorate 1656-1659 (London, 1909), I, 16.

\textsuperscript{6}The Complaining Testimony of...Sion's Children (London, 1656), passim; Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 185. The occasion of the meetings at Abingdon was the death and funeral of John Pendarves, a Baptist, and later Fifth Monarchist, preacher.
agents of antichrist. Praising the work of John of Leyden, the Fifth Monarchists now described their work as "a smiting work, or a work wherein the Saints employed shall visible appear in a military posture for Christ."\(^7\) The call for direct, violent action was obviously more overt than any so far voiced by the Fifth Monarchists. Their intent and state of mind was clear. Though they had made menacing threats before, they had not been ready for action. Now they were. The Fifth Monarchists had, indeed, become a very real threat to the security of the country.

The possible consequences of a successful Fifth Monarchist revolt were brought into perspective in January 1657 when Thurloe exposed and destroyed Sindercombe's plot to assassinate Oliver Cromwell. Had the Lord Protector been eliminated, without any accepted method of replacing him, intrigue, anarchy, and civil war were the probable results.\(^8\) Therefore, a new constitution was drawn up in which Cromwell was invited to assume the office and title of King. This would guarantee the transfer of power from him to his successor. The proposal was favorably received by the moderates in Parliament. Cromwell had proved to be a man of practical judgment, and a barrier against the political extremes of both Royalists and

\(^7\)The Banner of Truth Displayed (London, 1656), passim and especially pp. 26-28.

\(^8\)Firth, Last Years, I, 119. This problem had been raised before. It was suggested several times that to avoid anarchy, the Protector should be given the power to nominate his successor. Some even proposed that the office of Lord Protector be made hereditary instead of elective. Sindercombe's plot and rumors of a large Fifth Monarchist uprising led to a new suggestion that the Protector should be made King.
republicans. His foreign policy allowed England to command the fear and respect of other nations. English trade had increased under better naval protection. And many were simply tired of military government by the Major-Generals. The title of King carried with it a tie to the traditional unwritten constitution of England. But more importantly it implied known and accepted limitations to the powers of government. On March 25, 1657, the Parliament voted to ask the Lord Protector to become King. 9

Not the least of those who objected to this offer of kingship were the Fifth Monarchists. Because the proposal to reestablish the kingship involved Oliver Cromwell, whom they regarded as an agent of antichrist, the Fifth Monarchists doubled their efforts against the Government. This came to include that violence against which the Government tried to guard in the new constitution itself.

Already in the spring of 1657, Thomas Venner planned an insurrection. When it looked as if Oliver Cromwell might become King of England, Venner gathered an increasing number of Fifth Monarchists to his cause. A central committee of ten had overall direction of the uprising. 10 In London, a secret organization of five cells, with twenty-five members in each cell, obtained arms and information, noted


10 A complete journal concerning the preparations, conversations, deliberations, and decisions surrounding the plot, probably kept by Venner himself, was recovered and printed by the Government after the conclusion of the attempted coup. It is reproduced by Champlin Burraga in *The English Historical Review* XXV (London, 1910), pp. 722-747.
caches of government weapons and ammunition, and studied the deployment of government troops. Three military Captains were chosen to direct the actual fighting. Venner was made the Chief Captain in charge of the actual insurrection. To justify and publicize their actions, the rebels printed a declaration entitled A Standard Set Up which was to be distributed as soon as the revolt had actually begun. This tract, which carried the name of William Medley as its author, contained the usual attacks upon Cromwell. But the unusual conclusion was drawn that since Cromwell was a tyrant, an apostate, a traitor, and a murderer, the Saints were absolved from any obedience to him or his Government, just as the Army had been under Charles I. The Saints could "proceed against the said O. C. by like forces and means as against the late King and his party." There was little doubt what means the Fifth Monarchists had in mind.

After much preparation, the committee of ten finally decided on the night of Thursday April 9, 1657, for the revolt. Since the printed declaration was to be proclaimed in the market place at Chelmsford on April 10, the point of rendezvous was that part of Epping forest closest to Chelmsford. The plan was to capture as many

---


12 William Medley, A Standard Set Up (London, 1657), pp. 7, 22, 9-10. Not only were these means different from those advocated by the early Fifth Monarchists. The whole concern of the Vennerites seemed to concentrate solely on the reform of the English government. Their proposals covered the mundane matters of earthly power and its use. The materialism of the proposals may have led many Saints to disavow the rebellion.
horses and supplies as they could, and then to march into Suffolk and Norfolk, where they hoped to pick up more support. During the last few days before April 9, Venner and his Saints arranged to have horses, arms, and ammunition at various prearranged points throughout the City, from which the rebels would come to Epping forest on the appointed night.

Despite this careful organization and planning, three things doomed the insurrection to failure. The most decisive was the infiltration of Venner's last few meetings by Thurloe's spies. Acting on information supplied by these spies, the Government sent troops to the house in Shoreditch where some of the rebels had assembled in the early evening of April 9. Twenty of the rebels were arrested, including Venner. Arms and ammunition were confiscated, as well as copies of A Standard Set Up. The other depots where the plotters were to meet on that night, prior to assembling as one large body, were also raided. More arms and ammunition were recovered. The plot was summarily terminated.\textsuperscript{13}

The second reason for the failure of the revolt was the defection of some of Venner's supporters at the last minute. Dissensions broke out at the meeting on April 5, and many Saints refused to go on with the venture. Venner's fanaticism, however, drove him on. He seemed to expect that the Saints had only to make

\textsuperscript{13}The Venetian Ambassador claimed that the plotters had arms for 25,000 men, but this was highly exaggerated. Great Britain, P. R.O. C. S. P. V. (1657-59), pp. 45-46.
their stand, and the Godly people would flock to their banner. In the end, only about eighty people actually participated in the revolt.  

The third reason for the failure was the general lack of support given by the Fifth Monarchist leaders in London. Christopher Feake, who had been released from prison in December 1656, took part in the early planning, but seems to have dropped out, probably because his advice was not followed. Major-General Harrison and John Carew were solicited by Venner, but they refused to join the venture, saying the Vennerites were "not of a Gospel Spirit." Baptist leaders were also contacted, but they believed the time was not ripe for revolt. John Rogers refused to sanction the revolt for the same reason. Rogers had been released from prison about the same time as Feake. Although he had returned to preaching against the Government, he felt the Vennerites were not properly prepared, either Scripturally or materially, to carry out a successful campaign. Basically this attitude seemed to be grounded in Rogers's interpretation of the forty-two months' rule of the Beast, as mentioned in Revelation 11:2. Rogers, along with other Fifth Monarchists, dated this "time in the wilderness" from the beginning of the Protectorate in December 1653. The forty-two months, then, would not end until June 1657. According to Scripture, the Beast would be destroyed at this time, and the Saints would take the Kingdom. Until that time, many Fifth Monarchists,

including Rogers, believed that any effort to overthrow the Beast would be premature and disasterous. 15

The fiasco of Venner's revolt serves to illustrate the ineffectiveness of the Fifth Monarchists as either fighting or suffering Saints. As suffering Saints, they were not able to raise enough sympathy or support to effect a successful revolt. As fighting Saints, they were not able to act decisively or concertedly when political conditions were ripe for upheaval. This was largely due to the anarchic individualism that characterized the sect. That they failed as both fighting and suffering Saints diminished their religious credibility and exaggerated their political impotency. This, in turn, eventually branded them with the taint of treason.

The reaction to the Fifth Monarchist plot in the country was mixed. Predictably it brought abuse from the Government and its supporters. Cromwell condemned the fanatics in Parliament and reiterated his warning that all such groups were only trying to bring the country to disaster and to ruin. For its part, the Parliament reacted to the plot by again pressing on Cromwell the title of King. Evidently the shock of Venner's rebellion persuaded Cromwell to accept the title. But on hearing that Desbrough, Fleetwood, and Lambert all intended to resign if he did, he again declined the offer on May 8, 1657. However, Parliament was adamant on the need for a constitutional

15 This was the same forty-two months or 1260 days which the Saints had earlier converted into years in order to calculate the date of the millenium. Such manipulation of Scripture was characteristic of the Fifth Monarchists. Chester, John Rogers, p. 285; P. R. O., S.P. 25/114, f. 53.
settlement. On May 25 they resubmitted the proposal to the Lord Protector, but merely deleted the title of King. Cromwell accepted it without hesitation. 16

The Fifth Monarchists were in the vanguard of those who objected loudly to the re-installation of the Lord Protector on June 26, 1657. 17 John Canne published a tract in which he urged the Saints to rise up again and destroy Cromwell. Christopher Feake contributed an introductory epistle to the same tract comparing Cromwell to Barabbas. John Rogers wrote a preface to Canne's tract in which he intimated that Venner's cause had been good, but ill-timed. All three men believed that the forty-two months of the Beast's domination was at an end, and that any action of the Saints against the Government would now be successful. Reports circulated that Harrison, Feake, Canne, and Rogers were actually plotting against the regime. 18

The indecision, the disunity, and the lack of cohesion displayed in April 1657, joined to the discovery and destruction of their plans, effectively negated any widespread influence the Fifth Monarchists might have hoped to have later on. The call for action by Feake, Canne, and Rogers in the summer of 1657 must have seemed to

16 W. C. Abbott, Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), IV, 489; Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 222.

17 The ceremony itself came close to a coronation with Cromwell adorned in purple velvet and white ermine, and carrying a golden scepter of authority. Firth, Last Years, I, 200.

many a hypocritical and desperate attempt to salvage a revolution
to which they had helped deliver the death blow in the spring of 1657.
Accusations of self-seeking and glorification might well have been
applied to these men, much as they had accused their adversaries.
But besides possible distrust of the leaders of a new rebellion,
other problems made immediate regrouping an insurmountable task.
Dissensions within the ranks produced a deterioration in morale. The
spirit of militancy was undermined. Even John Thurloe noted a drop in
the actual number of Fifth Monarchists. This was due to several
things besides the Venner fiasco. For several months, John Simpson
(whose loyalty had been questionable since 1654) had been making anti-
Fifth Monarchist speeches. He condemned rebellion, and even
suggested obedience to the Protectorate Government. No doubt, some
of his congregation followed his admonitions. William Aspinwall,
though not a popular or charismatic figure, told his readers that the
Fifth Monarchists could even hold offices in the fourth monarchy.
Morgan Llwyd, Vavasor Powell's colleague in Wales, began to turn to
the idea of a spiritual Kingdom within. He finally deserted the Fifth
Monarchists and accepted a Government salary. This weakened one of
the strongest centers of the whole sect. Combined with the disillusion
of many over the failures of the Saints' expectations, these
developments created among the Fifth Monarchists a "coldness,
cowardliness, and carelessness" which John Rogers found incredible. 19

19 C. S. P. D. (1654), p. 438; Thurloe, State Papers, IV, 545,
629; Aspinwall, The Legislative Power, pp. 36-37; C. S. P. D. (1656-
1657), pp. 132, 167; Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha, p. 3.
During the time that Rogers was imprisoned, July 1654 through December 1656, he had little chance personally to influence the direction of Fifth Monarchist ideas or activities. After Venner's revolt, however, he thought he had found a way to reestablish his leadership of the sect, to confirm his loyalty to the cause, and to rekindle the militancy of the Saints in one step. During his imprisonment, he had kept a diary of his actions, thoughts, and observations. In July 1657 he published his diary under the title Jegar-Sahadutha: An Oyled Pillar Set Up for Posterity. By recounting his own "sufferings" for Christ and his cause, by explaining the faith and hope that kept him going, and by appropriate exhortations to be "up and doing," Rogers hoped to bolster the courage and raise the expectations of the Fifth Monarchists. At the same time, he both provided a history of his own life during those two and a half years and gave insight into how he thought and reacted under duress. It was a story of persecutions and beatings, slanders and deprivations, all calculated to arouse in other Fifth Monarchists a hatred for Oliver Cromwell.

After his interview of "persuasion" with Cromwell in February 1655, Rogers had been transferred from Lambeth Palace to Windsor Castle. He and a fellow Fifth Monarchist prisoner, Christopher Feake, were allowed the liberty of the Castle grounds and had access to each other's chambers. But both of them continued what seemed to be a

---

20Jegar-Sahadutha means "cairn of witnesses," being the name given to the cairn of stones set up by Jacob as a testimony to the covenant which he and Laban had made. Genesis 31:47.
fanatical obsession with preaching against Cromwell and the
Protectorate to anyone who would listen. They were confined to the
Castle, then to their rooms, then kept from each other, then sent to
the dungeon, all to no avail. Rogers told his captors:

With the grace of my God, I will preach for my Christ
against Cromwell, or any other that oppose Christ,
though I die for it!...If I have but a peeping hole
or a hole to breathe out at, I shall preach.

Feake proved to be of the same indomitable spirit. One day he
managed to seize the chapel pulpit and began deriding the Protector as
an apostate, usurper, tyrant, and persecutor. The Governor of the
Castle ordered him pulled down. Rogers, who was in the chapel, threw
himself in front of the soldiers. Both he and Feake were beaten and
dragged to their cells. But Feake soon began to preach in the same
vein out his prison window. Rogers, who heard him, began to preach
back. In order to drown out the two men, the Governor ordered his
donmers to beat their drums. Feake and Rogers stopped until the
donmers got tired, then resumed their preaching. The Governor then
ordered his troops to beat the recalcitrants into submission, and the
soldiers again laid hands on the two prisoners. Rogers' martyr
spirit had reached its glory, for he later wrote of this episode,"While
they were beating, bouncing, tearing, and thumping me, I said, "Yea,
stike on, strike on, for thus did the soldiers deal with Christ my

21 Roper was only hardened by this treatment, and adopted
a fatalistic attitude. "All they can do to us," he declared,"is
but to drive us to our God and Father." Rogers, Jagar-Sahadutha,
pp. 6, 7-8, 12.
Their beds were taken away. They lived in constant fear of violence. But they were more resolved than ever to denounce Cromwell whenever, wherever, and however they could.

The two men did not stop their preaching because of their beatings. Indeed, they took every chance to annoy the Governor of the Castle. By the same token, the Governor was just as indignant over what he considered their attempts to stir the garrison to sedition and mutiny against their officers and government. So loud were the complaints that an investigating commission was dispatched from Whitehall to probe into the situation. Both Rogers and Feake thought they saw in this investigating commission the seeds of a plot to gather evidence upon which they could be charged by the Government with a specific crime. So they refused to accept the authority of the commissioners, and declined to answer any questions about their imprisonment. In the end, all were heard except the two principal complainers themselves. "They went home with a flea in their ear," Rogers observed of the commissioners, "but well fraught with informations against us to their master." 22

Under the constant pressure of the castle jailers and the emotional strain of imprisonment, John Rogers grew more fanatical. He openly advocated the overthrow of the Government. Any misgivings Cromwell might have had about imprisoning Rogers must have been completely assuaged. In any case, the treatment of the two Fifth Monarchists grew worse. In October 1655 they were moved farther from

---

London to Sandham Castle on the Isle of Wight. Conditions there were so bad that they had to sleep on the floor, and Rogers developed a high fever. After only two weeks they were moved to a private dwelling, Afton House, and finally in December 1655 to Carisbrooke Castle where Courtney, Carew, and Harrison had been imprisoned for nearly a year. 23

Although he had made some feeble attempts at preaching at Sandham and Afton House, the presence and support of his fellow Fifth Monarchist prisoners at Carisbrooke encouraged Rogers to begin his tirades against Cromwell with new vigor. The pattern was the same as it had been at Windsor. His preaching irritated the head jailer, Bull, who accused Rogers of treason and confined him to his room. Rogers preached out his window and was summarily beaten for his audacity. He suffered physical illness. All aid was denied him. He was allowed no visitors. His bed was taken away. He was threatened continually. "I was told," he wrote, "they had intended to taste of my blood. But we sought the Lord about it and (for all the danger) did conclude we had a call and it was my duty to preach." Dragged to the dungeon, Rogers invited abuse saying, "Strike on Sirs, strike, strike, strike, for my Lord Jesus Christ takes these blows (for his sake) well at my hands." 24


24 Rogers, Jegar-Sahadutha, pp. 119, 38, 47-50.
Recourse to religion as a justification and a type of security is often an escape of desperate men. For John Rogers, already a religious man, it provided a sort of divine arrogance that allowed him a position above his captors, at least in his own mind. "This is an honor so high to suffer thus," he wrote, "The more savage they are, the more sweetly hath my soul obtained wings to soar aloft, above them all." He declared that to be beaten and buffeted for Christ was a teaching dispensation. In truth, it seems his spirit could not be broken. Rogers wrote later:

To say that we are not sufferers or are not persecuted is absolute folly, for we are put into the worst prisons, beaten, starved, and ruled by the sword....Some may think us somewhat obstinate not to engage or subscribe unto them rather than be starved or so used as we are to this day, but indeed it is a comfortable obstinacy then, and for Christ only, whose cause I cannot with a good conscience betray upon a composition with his enemies. 25

This was the spirit that Rogers hoped to impart to his fellow Fifth Monarchists in 1657. There was a struggle going on in England. No one could deny that. Many saw the struggle in political or civil terms. Rogers appealed to them warning that if the Protectorate were allowed to continue, all were liable to be "imprisoned, persecuted, plundered, banished, and thus barbarously used upon meer will, lust and arbitrary power, and tyranny," without the least implication of a law, a crime, or justice. Nor could any have the "liberties of conscience, law, justice, or process." 26 Others saw the struggle in

25Ibid., pp. 55ff.
26Ibid., p. 4.
religious terms. To attract them, Rogers attached the cause of Christ to the overthrow of the Protectorate. Anything less than the elimination of Cromwell and his regime was a victory for the devil. To weaken in the struggle, whether one saw it in civil or religious terms, was disastrous.

Rogers guessed that the Government must have been weary of the Fifth Monarchists. In the face of possible annihilation, he urged a new offensive by the Saints. "The less they have to show of passive obedience," he warned, "the more they are to show of active, and the greater faithfulness, constancy, and courage in the present trials." Besides, he believed the time was right for insurrection. The forty-two months were nearly at an end, and Rogers was quick to point out that all the "apostatic interests of Councils, Courts, Triers, Clergy, Academies, and Armies whom the Lord is departed from" could nought but fall once the Saints raised their standard. "Therefore," demanded Rogers, "let us stand to it like hearts of oak without warping in the least!...take the alarm my brethren, be up and ready,...Awake, awake yea rouse up (O Saints)...for the Lord's sake Sirs be valiant! like Daniel's worthies! yea, King Solomon's men! who all hold swords being expert in war!" This was strong language, but in his emotional appeal to the Fifth Monarchists Rogers went even further toward sanctioning violence:

Be of good cheer Harrison, Rich, Courtney, Carew, Overton....Up, Up O Concaptives and Coexiles, if ever now with courage, Sirs, be ready and look about you, for I tell you truly after our forty-two monthed voyage, we may see the land....For the Lord's sake, make haste and march up, yea sally out
most fiercely, O ye men of courage, upon this apostate and perfidious enemy... Come, Come, Sirs, prepare your companies for King Jesus. ...His magazines and artillery be ready; we wait only for the word from on High to fall on... 'til there be such a trembling, shaking, and consternation, yea, and over-turning that the beast's government may never have a being more in England, neither in civils, ecclesiastics, nor militaries.... Therefore, Up O ye Saints, to take the Kingdom and possess it forever. 27

These were not the words of a cautious, suffering Saint, but of a militant one bent on violence and destruction. What changed Rogers? In his campaign for reform based on chiliastic visions, he had come upon an unexpected obstacle. No matter what he did, Rogers found it impossible to circumvent Oliver Cromwell. Persuasion, advice, exhortation, and warnings only ushered John Rogers in and out of prison cells for two and a half years. He did not doubt himself or his cause. But he did finally despair of accomplishing his ultimate goals of religious and civil reform against the opposition of the Lord Protector. So he turned his attention and his efforts to the immediate goal of eliminating that opposition. As he did so, he seemed to lose his perspective. Lofty principles and ideals were temporarily eclipsed by an almost fanatic zeal against evil and corruption centered in one man. "We have held it our duty," he admitted, "to begin at the root of this grand apostasy in England which is at White-Hall (or White-Hell) in this matter which hath occasioned so horrible and subtile a persecution." Continued imprisonment narrowed Rogers's concern even

27 Ibid., pp. 52, 136-49 passim.
more. Fear, anger, and perhaps revenge, became his guiding considerations. He was hardened into an attitude exemplified by his final warning to Cromwell:

Wherefore either deliver us quickly quit of these dens, . . . or else I say unto thee by the AUTHORITY of the Lord committed to me, that thou shalt DIE like a BEAST, yea more miserably than in a DEN or DUNGEON. 28

This was a desperate position. John Rogers stood against Cromwell and the power of the Government and the military. The strain of such a position was evident in Jegar-Sahadutha. Rogers's style was unlike anything he had written before. It was rambling, discordant, disorganized, repetitious, and subjectively emotional. Indeed there was a sense of pathos in it. Rogers had taken a stand against all hope of success, yet he seemed to want to hold out hope, and even encouragement, to his compatriots. Perhaps Rogers counted on this to help win the flagging spirits of the Fifth Monarchists in 1657. Perhaps he counted on his suffering to reestablish his reputation among the Saints after he had appeared to desert them in Venner's revolt. There is no doubt that he sought to demonstrate by example that it was possible to remain steadfast in extreme adversity. There is no doubt that he meant to stir discontent with Oliver Cromwell to the point of violent confrontation. There is no doubt that he tried to convince his readers of the righteousness of the Fifth Monarchist program. His sincerity was genuine, but coming immediately after the failure of Venner's campaign, his approach was

28 Ibid., pp. 146, 151.
too radical, too much in the shadow of the earlier failure. Militancy had miscarried once. Without some sure sign from Heaven, the Saints were not anxious to try it again. Rogers's accounts of his sufferings, his attacks on Cromwell and the Government, and his predictions of Godly favor did not fulfill the Fifth Monarchists' need for an assurance of success. The end of the forty-two months passed without the action Rogers hoped to engender.

That John Rogers was a practical man, too, is shown by his reaction to this failure. In his musings during the summer of 1657, he came to the realization that in their zeal against the Protectorate, the Fifth Monarchists had strayed far from their appeal to the public in general. By adopting a policy of violence to accomplish their ends, they had become a religious clique, even more so than in 1653. For his own part, Rogers had depended almost exclusively on Fifth Monarchist support to achieve his immediate goal of eliminating Oliver Cromwell. He had tried to rekindle their hatred rather than their faith or their principles. And so he resolved to begin afresh, to return to moderation and the principles first stated in Ohel or Bethshemesh. To publicize his ideas and efforts, he produced in October 1657 a declaration entitled *A Reviving Word From the Quick and the Dead*.\(^{29}\)

\(^{29}\)This tract was published anonymously. Rogers's name appeared only as one of the 120 who signed the declaration from the churches of Venner, Chamberlen, Simpson, Barbone, and his own. However, Rogers admitted his authorship of *A Reviving Word* in one of his later works, *A Christian Concertation* (London, 1659), p. 26.
This did not mean that Rogers had abandoned his goal of eliminating Cromwell and the Protectorate. But he did realize that he needed a broader base of support than that of the narrow Fifth Monarchist clique of the Saints. And after Venner's revolt, he also realized that a negative political approach alienated many religious people who might otherwise have been willing to join against the Government. As the first step in rebuilding a viable religious opposition to Cromwell, Rogers invited the Presbyterians, Baptists, Independents, Seekers, and Seventh Day Sabbatarians to join the Fifth Monarchists in one large loosely tied religious body. The members of this body were to have the "free, full, and entire exercise of their different judgments and practices in their own particular... congregations...with as great freedom of their ordinances" as they had always enjoyed. They were to be knit together only by the power of Godliness, gathered and governed in a Gospel Order. Rogers even abandoned the exclusivity of the Fifth Monarchist Saint to admit any disciple of Christ into this one ecumenical body, whether he was a member of a particular church or not. To promote harmony, Rogers advised that the guiding principle of the new body ought to be the "New Commandment of Brotherly Love." In fact, he referred to his concept as the Philadelphian Church of Christ.30

30John Rogers, A Reviving Word from the Quick and the Dead (London, 1657), pp. 22-26. Disciples were defined as faithful followers of the Lamb, cleaving to the cause of Christ, weak, strong, bond and free, more or less honorable. "We could no more be without the Presbyterian Saint," Rogers wrote, "than without the Independent, nor the Independent without the Seekers...nor without the seeking and inward waiting Saint than without the Baptists." Ibid., p. 31.
Rogers wrote little of the Fifth Monarchy or of the Saints' role in it. He played down the aspect of violence, referring only generally to the duty of the disciples of Christ in adversity. In fact, many Fifth Monarchist tenets were modified in this tract. Rogers abandoned his own earlier requirement that the Saints be members of a gathered church. The Saints were no longer confined to one church in particular, although Rogers excluded Papists and Anglicans from his list of disciples. The New Testament principle of brotherly love replaced the strict law of Moses as a basis for Godly society. The disciples were to wait for the Second Coming, but also to engage in a "joint-striving...by doing or suffering for the truth, faith, purity, power of Godliness, light, life, liberty, privileges, and Kingdom of Christ Jesus." Rogers declined to specify whether the Second Coming was to be spiritual or material. In the meantime, the disciples were to work toward perfection in unity and harmony, but never achieving it completely.31

In A Reviving Word, Rogers resumed his dispassionate scholarly approach aimed at a wide, moderate audience. His grounds for proposing his united Philadelphian Church were laid down in twenty-four precise points upon which all Christians could probably agree. He covered the gamut from the Scriptural and historic justifications for such work to the practical need of guaranteeing the exercise of justice and righteousness in laws and government. There were few overt references to specific political goals, but obviously part of

31 Rogers, A Reviving Word, pp. 6-7, 18, 32.
the necessity of unification involved civil as well as religious
liberty and harmony. Rogers continually stressed the point that
through divisions, factions, and animosities the particular churches
were made vulnerable to the attacks of hypocrites, apostates, and
self-seekers. Given his convictions on who the hypocrites, apostates,
and self-seekers were, it was obvious that he had not abandoned his
campaign against Cromwell and the Government. 32

Rogers may have tempered his approach. He may have chosen
his words with more care. But his goals were the same, and his
feelings as intense as ever as he wrote:

If you think it not matter to see your brethren's
blood in the streets, and their bodies broiling and
frying at the stake (again)... if you dare to keep
up the bone of contention and the reproach upon the
Ways of God by suffering the world or any (without
remorse) to brand it for dissembling, delusion, most
hideous hypocrisy, men's state policy and baseness
...we doubt not but the voice of JEHOVAH (or the
Lord) himself will ere long speak so roaringly out
of SION...as will make your hearts to ache! and
your ears to tingle, your knees to tremble!

Certainly there was no implication of violence on the Saints' part
here. Unity was now the primary task, but action was still needed:

Awake! arise! and rouse up upon your feet in this
work without delay (whether in churches or out)...or
what can stay the spirit of persecution, or oppression
upon our consciences!...What else can keep out the
crafty combination that is made against us from
destroying us!...And what else can repress and repel
the usurping power from entering a foot (if not a
head) amongst us on purpose to keep out the
prerogative of Christ. 33

32 Bid., p. 6.
33 Bid., pp. 62-63, 63-64.
The aim of these exhortations was not very different from Rogers's earlier ones. He still worked for the overthrow of Oliver Cromwell and the Protectorate. However, he had changed his method of attack to fit the situation in which he was operating. Rogers's goals had involved political principles for a long time. During the Commonwealth and early Protectorate, his political principles were inseparably tied to his religious goals. Oliver Cromwell had forced him to separate the two in the spring of 1655. Since the grounds upon which Cromwell continued to oppose Rogers were ostensibly civil or political, Rogers had concentrated more and more on this one aspect of Fifth Monarchist thought. However, after Venner's failure, the political side of Fifth Monarchism lost its effect. Its adherents were branded as traitors. So John Rogers, of necessity, changed with the situation.

Rogers, though inconsistent in his tactics, held ever true to the goal of reform. He was once for Cromwell, then against him; he was once elitist, then comprehensive. But this should be seen as a change in the tactics required to secure reform, and not a change in Rogers's desire for reform. He sacrificed the exclusiveness of Saint-hood, the requirement of church membership, and the unalterable duty of establishing the Kingdom of Christ on earth, to the obvious need for unity in the face of powerful opposition. From a purely negative attack on Cromwell, he reverted to a positive call for a unified Christian society which, by its nature, would oppose evil and corruption, including Oliver Cromwell and his Government. Rogers had
redefined the nature of the struggle, but he maintained the ultimate goals. *A Reviving Word* is but another sign that John Rogers was a pragmatic seeker of religious, social, and political reform, not just a fanatical Fifth Monarchist.
CHAPTER VII

THE CONVERTED SAINT

Despite the subversive implications of Jegar-Sahadutha, John Rogers was left at liberty for several months after its publication. He was again imprisoned, however, on February 3, 1658, this time in the Tower. And yet he was not imprisoned because of his printed attacks on the Lord Protector, but rather because of Oliver Cromwell's quarrel with Parliament. The second Protectorate Parliament assembled for its second session on January 20, 1658. Under the authority of the new Constitution (called the Humble Petition and Advice), Parliament regained the hundred or so members who had been purged by the Council of State during the first session. Also under the terms of the Constitution, some thirty of Cromwell's staunchest supporters were appointed to a newly created Second House. But by reinstating the purged members and by promoting his own allies to the Second House, Cromwell literally handed over the leadership and majority in the original House to the republicans.

These republicans soon began to call for the reestablishment of Parliament composed of a single chamber and possessing supreme
authority. They drew up a petition expressing their discontents which they intended to present to the whole of the original House on February 6, 1658.2 Cromwell realized that such a document could well become a focus for all opposition to him and government by the Protectorate. Therefore, he determined to negate its influence by eliminating its intended recipients. But the dissolution of Parliament, barely two weeks after it had reconvened, was a guarantee of trouble. So to confuse and disrupt an almost certain center of opposition to such action, Cromwell, on February 3, 1658, ordered Sir John Barkstead, the Lieutenant of the Tower, to seize every Fifth Monarchist leader he could find in London, but especially Harrison, Courtney, Carew, Portman, and Rogers. A formal warrant was issued the same day accusing these men of having taken "all means to disturb the public peace, raise seditions and commotions, seeking to distract and exasperate the hearts and spirits of the people so that thereby they might bring the nation into blood." By nightfall, all were securely lodged in the Tower of London.3 John Rogers was once more a prisoner of Oliver Cromwell.

Having thus protected himself, Cromwell went down to Westminster on the morning of February 4, 1658. He addressed both Houses of Parliament in joint session. But his remarks were meant largely for the original House. He reminded them that their function

2Whitelocke, Memorials, II, 30-34, 36-37.

3Somers Tracts, VI, 482; Thurloe, State Papers, VI, 775; Mercurius Politicus 402 (February 4-11, 1658), p. 298.
was to interpret and operate the Constitution, not to question the authority and principles of the Government. The whole Parliament was to work on behalf of the Commonwealth. Finally, in a move that all expected, he dissolved the body saying, "If this be the the end of your sitting and this be your carriage, I think it high time that an end be put to your sitting. And I do dissolve this Parliament. And let God be the judge between you and me."

Once the Parliament was dissolved, the threat of insurrection seemed to diminish. At least Oliver Cromwell must have thought so, for on April 16, 1658, he released Rogers from the Tower. But growing discontent with a Government whose authority was still based primarily on military might spawned new rumors of plots and subversion throughout the summer. An acceptable constitutional solution to England's problems had not yet been found when Oliver Cromwell died on September 3, 1658. Nominated by his father on his death bed, Richard Cromwell succeeded to the office of Lord Protector without any apparent opposition. However, Richard Cromwell's position was not secure for long. As soon as a new Parliament met in January 1659, both old and new voices called out for an alternative to the Government of the Protectorate.

The death of Oliver Cromwell was a major turning point for the Fifth Monarchists. What little unity they had stemmed from their opposition to Oliver, whom they regarded as an apostate agent of

5Abbott, Writings and Speeches, IV, 731-32.
antichrist. When that common enemy was removed, the latent, and sometimes overt, disunity inherent in the Fifth Monarchist ranks produced a serious split. Given their long-standing hatred of rule by a single person, all Fifth Monarchists continued their opposition to the Protectorate. However, when it came to proposals for an alternative, two different schools of thought appeared. One group, led by Christopher Feake and Peter Chamberlen, pressed for a return to rule by Godly men. Some junior Officers of the Army and a few Saints called for a new Sanhedrin of seventy. But one experience with "Godly rule" had been enough for most Englishmen, and the proposals of these orthodox Fifth Monarchists went largely unheeded. The other group, led by Henry Vane and John Rogers, supported in place of a government by Godly men a modified worldly government which would guarantee both civil and religious liberty.

Vane, the republican, and Rogers, the unorthodox Fifth Monarchist reformer, had several things in common. Both opposed an all powerful monarchy. Both believed in Parliamentary government. Although Rogers's concept of that government was at first extremely limited (to the Saints), he eventually broadened his views when the Parliament of Saints proved politically unworkable. Both opposed a Stuart restoration. Both opposed Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate. Both came to believe that rule by a single person, whether he be King or Lord Protector, was an evil form of government. Both had their roots in Independency. And both were driven to action by Oliver Cromwell. Vane and the republicans were distressed by Cromwell's
expulsion of the Long Parliament in 1653 and his establishment of a military dictatorship. Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists decried
Cromwell's subversion of preparations for the Fifth Monarchy by his expulsion of the Parliament of Saints and by his assumption of supreme power. To both men, the Protectorate made a sham of the causes for which England had suffered a Civil War. With the accession of a new and weaker Lord Protector, both saw an opportunity for the achievement of their reforms. Vane and the republicans stood on the generally acceptable grounds of civil liberty and Parliamentary supremacy. But Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists had sought political and social reform through religious ideas, ideas which were discredited by the failure of the Parliament of the Saints. If he wanted to succeed, John Rogers knew he would have to change his tactics again. So he joined Vane in a combined call for liberty, both civil and religious. This was not an uneasy alliance for Rogers, for he had called for civil and religious liberty in the Protectorate.

A man of compromise, Rogers saw in 1657 that the Fifth Monarchists needed a new approach if they were to achieve success. His plan at that time was for a united religious body that would oppose Oliver Cromwell. But when Cromwell died, Rogers' source of fanaticism was eliminated, along with his narrow religious focus. Since radical Fifth Monarchism had failed to carry to fruition his ideas for reform in law, the court system, tithes, land tenures, taxes, monarchical government, and a national clergy, Rogers now decided to deal with those ideas on a primarily political level. The only viable
political alternative he found to monarchy or anarchy was republicanism. Thus he came to support Vane's "Good Old Cause" which was a Commonwealth without Protector, King, or Second House. His concern for reform remained intact. But again, conditions had dictated a change in method, and Rogers was prepared to make that change.

Rogers published his modified ideas on government in March 1659 in a tract entitled The Plain Case of the Commonweal. Again he called for unity, but this time the express purpose was to save the ship of state, the Commonwealth. The common cause was to be the defense of "the privileges of Parliament, interest of Christ, and liberties of the people, both civil and religious." All who held faithful to the "public good, safety, and welfare of the Commonwealth" and those who had "maintained and asserted the common cause of right and freedom from tyranny and oppression" were invited to support the new work of salvation. Obviously Rogers had broadened his views. The cause was no longer primarily a religious one. He no longer spoke of "Saints," or even of "disciples." Those who were to carry on the good work included all who opposed the rule of a single person, whether on religious or political grounds.

6 John Rogers, The Plain Case of the Commonweal. (London, 1659), pp. 4-5. Because of the political confusion of the time, and because Richard Cromwell's government was still in power, Rogers did not affix his name to this tract. However, when his own political position improved, he admitted his authorship of Plain Case. See Rogers, A Christian Concertation, pp. 10, 69.
The Commonwealth to which Rogers referred, of course, was the only one England had known before, the one in force between 1649 and 1653. Rogers's theory was that the foundations of the Commonwealth (Parliamentary government, common right and safety, and freedom) were still intact despite the interposition of the Protectorate. He pointed out that Acts of Parliament in 1648 and 1649 abolishing the monarchy and the House of Lords were unrepealed. He advised the leaders of the renewed Commonwealth to allow no false imprisonments, to impose no taxes or levies not approved by Parliament, and to relieve oppression and injustice. He also proposed a concerted effort to rejuvenate English trade. Only lastly did he suggest that for the relief of "Godly, able...ministers of the Gospel" the Triers should be abolished. The nature and order of these concerns shows Rogers's new approach to reform. In fact, his whole interpretation of government and its role seemed now to be closer to the ideals and goals for which the English Civil War had been fought. "Let the government be such as may set up laws, not lusts, to rule over us and our estates," he pleaded, "that we may not be imprisoned, taxed, banished and destroyed...at men's will and pleasure, without evidence or charge of crime, or due process in law." Rogers had moved from the ideal of government by Godly men to government by those elected to Parliament, from religious eschatology to political reality. With this change, he placed himself more in the mainstream of contemporary thought. That this change in emphasis occurred is not surprising. Rogers had already developed and

7Rogers, Plain Case, p. 15.
publicized a theory of law. To apply that theory to a Commonwealth required only the deletion of its chiliastic terminology.

There was one thing that marred the high ideals and goals which Rogers professed in his new position. In calling for the restoration of the Commonwealth, he also called for the restoration of the Parliament of the Commonwealth—the same Rump Parliament for which he had had so little use in 1653. The Rump was anything but republican or democratic. Any government in which it was included could have been nothing more than oligarchic. Now an oligarchy is not necessarily evil, depending on the beneficence of those in power. But Englishmen had fought a Civil War and killed a King in order to secure themselves and their representatives from domination by a few powerful men. So in order to minimize the oligarchic tendencies which the Rump must have signified, Rogers attached the terminology of republicanism to his proposal for the Rump's return. But it must be noted that Rogers was definitely not a democratic republican.

Neither was Henry Vane, from whom John Rogers borrowed most of his new ideas on government. Vane first met Rogers in Carisbrooke Castle where Vane had been imprisoned in September 1656 for publishing his Healing Question Propounded. During their three or four months together, Vane seems to have introduced Rogers to the basic principles of supremacy of Parliament and liberty of conscience, principles which Vane first called the "Good Old Cause." For Rogers,

---

Vane's main attraction was his proposal for an alternative to the monarchy and the Protectorate. Vane was not a strict republican in the mold of James Harrington, but he did provide a constitutional arrangement that some republicans could accept. He believed that if participation in a new Commonwealth government were granted to all people (as Harrington suggested), there was a distinct possibility of a Stuart restoration. To restore Parliamentary government safely, Vane suggested a special assembly chosen by the adherents of the "Good Old Cause" which would construct a new constitution guaranteeing the privileges of Parliament and liberty of conscience. In confining this assembly to the adherents of the Good Old Cause, Vane was also oligarchic. But he, too, attached the terminology of republicanism to his ideas. Since Rogers got many of his ideas from Vane, this is probably the source of his own oligarchic "republicanism."

In the early months of 1659, Vane's republicans searched for allies and found them in those Officers in the Army, led by General Fleetwood, who resented the investment of the highest military authority in the land in a particularly unmilitary Lord Protector. Oliver Cromwell had commanded the respect and allegiance of the Army, for he was a capable and efficient General. Indeed, he had become Protector largely because he had been the Lord General. On the other hand, Richard Cromwell was Protector because he had succeeded to the office. He was Lord General for the same reason. To gain the loyalty of the Army and to command authority, he needed to prove his ability

---

9Vane, *Healing Question*, pp. 2-8.
by deeds. Given his nature, Richard was ill-prepared for such a test.

Oliver Cromwell's Army was a professional military organization. Its Officers were accustomed to security of tenure, a tenure based on loyalty and professional performance. But after Richard's succession, Officers were removed or reassigned for economic or political, rather than military, reasons. As a result, some of the senior Officers petitioned Richard to appoint a professional military Commander-in-chief who could name inferior Officers. They also proposed that no Officer be dismissed except by court martial. In effect, they sought to remove the power of the sword from the civil authority. Obviously Richard was not about to surrender such power or to put his Generals in a position above himself. Fearing military domination, the strict Harringtonian republicans in Parliament supported Richard. A confrontation seemed inevitable. When it came, military might again won the day. On April 22, 1659, Fleetwood, Desbrough, and Lambert, accompanied by a deputation of Officers, forced Richard to dissolve his Parliament. A few weeks later, rather than start another Civil War, Richard Cromwell abdicated the office of Lord Protector. 11

Once more England was without a settled government. Proposals for the restoration of the Good Old Cause poured in from a number of

10 Firth, Cromwell's Army, pp. 376-77; Thurloe, State Papers, VII, 434-36.

sources. Vane's republicans rejoiced at the end of the Protectorate, but the new situation proved to be a mixed blessing. They could not ignore the possibility that the Army might assume complete control. Therefore, they urged the Officers to establish quickly a civil constitutional assembly which would then set up a permanent civil government. Another danger presented itself in the form of the Royalists, who now seized upon Henry Vane's popular phrase and called for the restoration of their own Good Old Cause, which they redefined as government by King, Lords, and Commons. Vane's proposal for a constituent assembly limited to the adherents of his Good Old Cause of a Commonwealth provided an immediate solution to the Royalist problem, however oligarchic that solution was. But the Royalists were not that easily dismissed. William Prynne, the barrister who had lost both ears as punishment for allegedly libelling the wife of Charles I, was by far the boldest exponent of this type of Presbyterian Royalist propaganda. In a series of pamphlets published throughout 1659, Prynne contended that the Good Old Cause for which the Long Parliament had first taken up arms in 1642 was the defense and maintenance of Protestantism, the King's royal person and authority, the privileges and rights of Parliament, the laws of the land, the liberty and property of the subject, and the peace and safety of the Kingdom. With the skill of an accomplished lawyer, Prynne laid the foundation of his arguments on the declarations and statutes of the 1640's, and then drew the Royalist conclusions from them.
The original purpose of the Good Old Cause, according to Prynne, was the preservation of the authority of the King and Parliament against the designs of the King's evil councillors. The pernicious effect of these councillors was made evident to all in Charles's invasion of Parliament in January 1642. But in declaring against this traitorous design, Prynne claimed that Parliament had opposed Charles and his councillors, not King in Parliament. The Commonwealth, on the other hand, did indeed subvert this traditional authority. Prynne pointed out that the Commonwealth existed upon the authority of the sword. He compared its founders to those men involved in the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. But lest the odium of regicide fall upon the Presbyterians, too, he insisted that the destruction of the monarchy and the establishment of the Commonwealth had been a conspiracy of Papists and Jesuits. By evoking the memory of the late King and his death, Prynne hoped to cast such opprobrium on the whole republican idea that the Army and the people would completely cast down Commonwealth principles and restore what he saw as the object of the original conflict—a limited monarchy.

Such language was bound to arouse Vane's supporters to a defense of the principles of the Commonwealth. John Rogers, whom

12 William Prynne, The True Good Old Cause Rightly Stated (London, 1659), passim; William Prynne, A True and Perfect Narrative (London, 1659), pp. 1-8, 14-16, 20, 38-40; William Prynne, A Brief Necessary Vindication (London, 1659), pp. 2-47 passim. Prynne was not the only author to put forth such ideas. Richard Baxter in his Key for Catholics (London, 1659) also supported the restoration of a limited monarchy. Like Prynne he attributed the foundation of the Commonwealth to a Jesuit conspiracy.
Prynne himself called the "Grand Champion for the Good Old Cause and Commonwealth," immediately took up his pen to refute the Royalists. In Mr. Prynne's Good Old Cause Stated and Stunted 10 Years Ago Rogers gave the moderate republican position its most succinct and persuasive rationale. His basic premise, of course, was that the Good Old Cause signified the establishment, maintenance, and defense of a Parliamentary Commonwealth, without King, Protector, or House of Lords. The true adherents of the Cause had indeed worked to preserve the authority of King and Parliament, to maintain Protestantism, and to guarantee the laws and liberties of the land, so far as these goals were consistent. But in the face of a King who would not govern with Parliament, that was extremely difficult. When it became impossible, "then their work was to maintain what they could of it, viz., the liberties of the people and their representatives." The struggle, after all, had not been against Charles's councillors, but against Charles himself. The real Cause of the contest was the safety and the liberty of the people. By opposing the King, the supporters of the Commonwealth remained true to the principles of Parliamentary authority. For by its own resolves, when the King made war on the Parliament, it tended to the dissolution of kingly government. The adherents of the Good Old Cause of a Commonwealth were not apostates, but they would become so if, "after all this blood and treasure spent," England should "recede again to King, Lords, and Commons so

13Prynne, A Brief Necessary Vindication, p. 59.
nobly laid aside by the people, the Army, and their famous representatives."

Rogers denied that the Commonwealth was based on a conspiracy of Jesuits. To assume that there had been no Protestants in the Army, or on the High Court of Justice, or in the Long Parliament was nonsense. Rogers then turned the tables on his opponents and asked by what reasoning the liberties and rights of Englishmen had to be predicated on the existence of a King or House of Lords. He provided the answer himself and shifted the odium of Papism to the Royalists in one short observation, "This form of government (by King, Lords and Commons) was laid in the thick of Popery by King Henry I for the Pope's interest as well as his own." The abolition of kingship simply cleared the way for England to return to its ancient right of being governed by its own representatives. This was the true Good Old Cause. "And if Mr. Prynne, or Mr. Baxter, can make it appear this was plotted by Jesuits (as we can theirs by Papists)," Rogers declared, "I shall become their proselyte in the state of the case."?

Rogers considered the attempt to revive Royalism by exploiting Charles's death as a desperate effort to arouse the enemies of the Commonwealth. "Now what means all this ransacking in the tombs of the dead," he asked, "but to raise up evil spirits?"?

---

14 John Rogers, Mr. Prynne's Good Old Cause Stated and Stunted 10 Years Ago (London, 1659), pp. 6 (misprint for 8), 12.

15 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

16 Ibid., p. 13.
All such attempts were doomed to failure, he thought, because the Commonwealth stood on unassailable grounds: upon the Law of God and nature, upon the "fundamental rights and reason" of the nation, upon the liberties of the people, and upon the privileges of Parliament.

The actions and inclinations of the Army Officers were of immediate concern to all of Vane's republicans. In March 1659, before the dissolution of the Protectorate Parliament, Rogers had expressed a cautious confidence in the loyalty of the Army to the Commonwealth principle. But in May 1659, when the Army held the future of civil government in England in its power, he thought it important that the Officers be completely persuaded of the desirability of recalling the purged Rump Parliament as a link between the Commonwealth of 1649-1653 and the new one. This had been the only government in England that even remotely resembled republican form, so naturally the republicans turned to it as a model. Rogers hastened to point out to the Army a few practical considerations surrounding the re-establishment of the Commonwealth. In order to guarantee effective resistance to all foes of the state, a permanent civil authority was essential. There was also a need to heal internal divisions in the Army, in the government, and among the people in general. And there was a need for that stability conducive to raising money on which the Army and the State operated. Rogers contended that the Army could provide for all these needs by re-establishing the Commonwealth government and a "free-state" rather than Kingly government. 17

17 Ibid., p. 15.
Rogers also expressed the belief that the Army should be more zealous for the Commonwealth precisely because the Army had been misled and misused in the Protectorate. Again he voiced his confidence in the constancy of the Army's Commonwealth sympathies. "The truth is," he wrote, "that Parliament was interrupted (we do not say dissolved) by a sudden recoil, we say not a total or intentional alienation, of the militia." This was a teaching experience. By it the Army was "the more sensible of those malign influences and effects that Interposition had." Rogers predicted that the whole experience would make the Army "a thousand times the more to welcome and value the lustre and blessing of their restored light and liberty, and as liberally to compensate it by their very faithful return to their good old trust and proper stations so as to preserve the Parliament (for future) from the like proreption or perpetration of any." He termed the destruction of the Protectorate by the Army as a "victory over themselves." 18

Until the recent discovery of Rogers's Mr. Prynne's Good Old Cause, John Rogers's relationship to the principles behind the English Civil Wars was never completely clear. As an Independent, he had placed himself in opposition to the religious practices both of the Anglicans and the Presbyterians. As a millenarian, he viewed the Civil Wars as the beginning of the end for the evil fourth monarchy. As a political Independent, he supported the establishment of the Commonwealth in 1649. As a Fifth Monarchist, he opposed the rule of

---

18 Ibid., pp. 15, 18.
any single person other than Christ. As a Vanist, he supported the supremacy of Parliament. But as a Fifth Monarchist, he had also supported a government based on the premise that a few chosen Saints were the only ones fit to rule. And this oligarchy of holy men was certainly not one of the ends for which the Civil Wars had been fought. What were Rogers's true feelings about civil and religious liberty? His zeal for reform had led him into a system that had the possibility of negating traditional English civil and religious rights, even of destroying English common law. Only, then, in his Mr. Prynne's Good Old Cause do we find that fundamentally John Rogers supported the fight for the guarantee of English law and liberties. The ends of the basic reforms in law, the courts, the government, and the national church which he sought were in accord with greater civil and religious liberty. Unfortunately, the methods he was forced to employ sometimes were not. This cast a pall over his whole career. But Rogers was a part of seventeenth century thought and not merely a religious aberration.

In the face of growing unsettlement, caused in part by rumors of Fifth Monarchist plots, the Army did yield to republican pressures and recalled the members of the purged Rump Parliament. On May 7, 1649, forty-two members, led by Speaker Lenthall, took their seats. They soon declared that the government of England should be a

19 I owe the lead to this pamphlet to B. S. Capp.

20 Prynne, A True and Perfect Narrative, p. 35; C. H. Firth, The House of Lords During the Civil War, p. 260.
Commonwealth, without Protector, King, or Upper House. The Army created a Council of State, and a Committee of Public Safety, and named Henry Vane to both bodies. Indeed, many Fifth Monarchists found positions of influence and importance in the new government. As enemies of the Protectorate, they were all regarded as friends of the Commonwealth. John Canne, for example, was made editor of the two government newspapers, Mercurius Politicus and The Public Intelligencer. Many of the Fifth Monarchist military men returned to their regiments or became Commissioners of the Militia.

But a Parliament of republicans and regicides, restored by the Army and supported by the Fifth Monarchists, was not readily acceptable to the country as a whole. Without a Protector, an Upper House, or a written constitution, the new government rested solely on the arbitrary power of a single house composed of no more than eighty members. There was no semblance of true representation of the people. Thus we see the actual result of Vane's and Rogers's

---

21 Commons Journals, VII, 652, 758; C. S. P. D. (1659-60), pp. 13, 16, 45, 47, 50, 93; Firth and Rait, Acts and Ordinances, II, 1324-28, 1334-35. The orthodox Fifth Monarchists seem to have ignored Rogers's conversion to Vanism. Or at least they did not consider it apostasy. No attacks on Rogers issued from their pens. In truth, the Fifth Monarchists were searching for allies in 1659, and the Vanists held no doctrines completely irreconcilable to Fifth Monarchism. They probably considered Rogers and Vane as moderate Fifth Monarchists.

22 After the initial session on May 7, Speaker Lenthall addressed letters of invitation to all survivors of the Long Parliament who had sat since 1648, and who had taken the Engagement to be faithful to the Commonwealth. The response to these letters is unknown, but the greatest number reported to have sat on any one day was 78 on May 14. Davies, Restoration, p. 97.
oligarchic "republicanism." Even more, the success of the Fifth Monarchists in gaining posts of considerable authority in the Government provided renewed fears of another coup by holy fanatics. Thus on June 3, 1659, Major Wood wrote to Edward Hyde that he found the whole country to be in a turmoil. A rumored rally of 5000 Fifth Monarchists in Sussex led Wood to report that "two or three thousand of them are well-armed, and officers appointed to every thousand and every hundred." Harrison was supposed to be their General, and Vane their "Chancellor." "We daily expect a massacre," Wood warned. Later a broadsheet circulated in London advising the citizens that the Fifth Monarchists were "armed, officered, and every way in a readiness, upon the word given them, to surprise and suppress the Army, to fire the City, and to massacre considerable people of all sorts." Feake was listed as propagator of the revolt, and Vane was alleged to have been the chief designer. John Thurloe heard reports of a list of 7000 Fifth Monarchists supposedly preparing for action. And one anonymous pamphleteer warned that the Fifth Monarchists were ready to deprive Englishmen forcibly of their laws, their liberties, and their very lives.

Given their past history, the Fifth Monarchists could never have carried such a rising to success. In fact, it never materialized.

---


24 An Alarum to the City and Soldiery (London, 1659), brs; Thurloe, State Papers, VII, 687; The Londoners' Last Warning (London, 1659), passim.
But there was a real basis for discontent which the Fifth Monarchists shared with many other people. The Rump Parliament had again proven unwilling or unable to consider seriously reform of the law or the church. Fifth Monarchist pamphleteers openly expressed their opposition and their indignation. In one anonymous tract, which contained reprints of The Declaration of Musselburgh, of Oliver Cromwell's first address to the Barebones Parliament, and of several letters by Army Officers in support of a Commonwealth, the Fifth Monarchist editor condemned the Rump for its lethargy, and blamed this inactivity on the Protectorate men who were still in office.\textsuperscript{25} Naturally with sentiments such as these publicly announced, the Fifth Monarchists were the object of speculation about plots to remove the Rump. In addition to these general complaints, the Fifth Monarchists were also known to have resented the Rump's treatment of several of its more well-recognized, and more radical, members. Major-General Harrison, for example, was purposely kept from any office. Christopher Feake was denied his living at Christ Church. John Simpson was not restored to St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate. In August, John Canne was removed from the editorship of the two government newspapers. And if Edmund Ludlow is to be believed, it was only with the greatest reluctance that the Rump had returned the Fifth Monarchists to their military positions at all.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25}The Fifth Monarchy or Kingdom of Christ, in Opposition to the Beast's, Asserted (London, 1659), pp. 51-52 and passim.

\textsuperscript{26}A Faithful Searching Home Word (London, 1659), pp. 8-10; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 32, 95.
It is easy to understand why Henry Vane's name was continually linked with alleged Fifth Monarchist plots. However indirectly, he had been associated with the Fifth Monarchists during a period of their greatest fanaticism. His Healing Question had been accepted by the radical Thomas Venner as a basis for a Fifth Monarchist-Commonwealthmen coalition against Oliver Cromwell. Vane himself could even be called a millenarian. So it was only natural that both Army and Parliament looked upon Vane's position and ideas with caution. It is likely that he was concerned with the Rump's lack of reforming activity, although he left no written comments on the subject. But in view of the alternatives he saw to the Rump's immediate rule (return of the monarchy, anarchy, or military dictatorship), Vane's sympathies could have been fairly accurately predicted.

The same seems to have been the case with John Rogers. He had called for the return of the Rump in view of the alternatives to its rule. Following Vane's lead, he had placed great emphasis on the

---

27 Shortly after the broadside circulated in London warning the citizens of impending massacre by the Fifth Monarchists and accusing Henry Vane of being its chief designer, a small anonymous twenty page pamphlet appeared entitled A Vindication of That Honorable and Prudent Knight Sir Henry Vane. The pamphlet was largely a defense of Vane's religious principles against Richard Baxter's accusations that Vane was a Papist and a regicide. There was much speculation as to the author of this pamphlet. Since John Rogers was known to be Vane's disciple, many assumed that he had taken up the defense. Rogers never admitted or denied it. However, the internal evidence points to Rogers as the author. Terms and phraseology appear throughout the pamphlet that appeared in Rogers's other works. Since many knew Rogers supported Vane there was no apparent reason for him not to sign Vindication if indeed he wrote it. The pamphlet still lacks a self-admitted author.
Rump as a link between the Commonwealth of 1649-1653 and the new Commonwealth. For Rogers, the Rump was a means to an end. Its inability to achieve the high ideals Rogers looked for in a Commonwealth must have been disappointing as well as embarrassing to him. If Rogers once failed to realize that an oligarchic body could not function popularly in England in 1659, he should have realized it now. For these very reasons, the Rump knew it had to treat Rogers with caution.

The Council of State seems to have been willing to reward Rogers for his zeal. But the preferment they offered him suggests that they hoped to remove him as well as reward him. For in July 1659 the Council asked that Rogers return to Ireland as a preacher of the Gospel. It furnished him with £50 and suggested that the Commissioners for Ireland provide him with "like encouragement" in his work. Such a mission must have had little attraction for Rogers. It would remove him from the center of religious, social, and political affairs in England. It would remove him from his position of influence. It would diminish his chances of securing the reforms he had sought for so long. And it would send Rogers back to a country where he had already met disastrous failure. On the other hand, he seemed acutely aware that in the political confusion and uncertainty of the summer of 1659, his position might quickly turn from one of favor to one of disadvantage. Therefore, despite misgivings, Rogers accepted the assignment.

However, this "exile" never materialized. A few days before Rogers was to depart for Ireland, reports reached London of a Royalist insurrection in Cheshire led by Sir George Booth. The Council of State ordered troops out, commissioned Officers, and dispatched to Cheshire an army under Major-General Lambert. Among the regiments that were raised was that of Charles Fairfax. And among the commissioned Officers of that regiment was John Rogers, Regimental Chaplain. Instead of exiling Rogers to Ireland, the Government pressed him into service against a common enemy. Rogers complied willingly.  

Many people feared that Booth's rebellion might provide the right opportunity for an alliance of Fifth Monarchist malcontents and Royalists. The opposite occurred. Many Fifth Monarchists cooperated with Parliament in the face of common danger to the Commonwealth. While Major-General Lambert dealt with Booth in Cheshire, three volunteer reserve regiments were organized under the command of Sir Henry Vane. Parliament accepted the services of these volunteers, many of whom were anti-Royalist Fifth Monarchists and republicans.  

The Army put down Booth's rebellion within six weeks. When it marched back from Cheshire, John Rogers came back, too. He did not know what to expect from the Council of State when he returned to London, but evidently his service in the field convinced them of his sympathy with the Rump Parliament. For he was soon relieved of his

---

29 P. R. O., S.P. 25/127, p. 84.

30 Whitelocke, Memorials, 682.
mission to Ireland. However, the Government's success against Booth did not provide better conditions for permanent political security. The Officers of the Army were still disenchanted with the Rump's sole possession of authority. Arrears of pay were far from being redeemed, and the possibility of paying off the soldiers seemed impossible as long as the Rump refused to impose more taxes. The Army was flushed with its recent victory in Cheshire. Many of its Officers, including Lambert, Desbrough, Ashfield, Cobbett, Creed, and Packer, sought to pressure the Rump into recognizing the Army as at least an equal in the governance of the State. At a time when the Rump should have been united against such pressure, it was plagued with factionalism within itself. A small group favored the ideas of Harringtonian republicanism. A larger body led by Sir Arthur Haselrig supported a unicameral government without the restrictions of a written constitution or of an interpreting body (the Second House of the Protectorate,). These two groups were both determined to browbeat the Army into unquestioning obedience to the civil authority. And then there were Vane's moderate oligarchic republicans who moved from issue to issue, changing sides whenever they saw a chance to further the Good Old Cause.

In the face of the obvious inadequacy of the Rump, John Rogers felt constrained to offer a further defense of the Commonwealth idea.

32 Davies, Restoration, pp. 144-48.
But by proposing a new assembly as the Parliament of the Commonwealth, he hoped to divorce himself from the unpopularity and the failure of the Rump. However, in the reactionary atmosphere which prevailed in England in the fall of 1659, Rogers's attempt to rescue his reputation by advocating even a limited republicanism was doomed.
On September 20, 1659, John Rogers's last major political work appeared in London. Entitled A Christian Concertation, it took the form of a defense of the Commonwealth principle against the ideas of William Prynne, Richard Baxter, and James Harrington. It was a crystallization of Rogers's proposals for an alternative to the monarchical system of government. As such, it reflected his overriding concern that monarchy not be re-established in England. It also reflected his concern for the basic principles of religious and civil liberty. And it reflected Rogers's desire for a government based on public good and Christian principles instead of one based on the interests of the mighty and reason of state. However, because of the willingness of many Englishmen to return to monarchy for the sake of political and social order, Rogers was forced to exclude the majority of his countrymen from participation in his proposed Commonwealth. Democracy, of course, was not a viable idea in 1659. But to restrict the government to the minority who favored the Good Old Cause of a Commonwealth was too close to the Godly oligarchy of 1653 to be widely acceptable. Though possessed of high reform ideals, Rogers was unable to find a workable system by which
those ideals could be realized. Though his ideals may have been acceptable, his methods were out of step with the time.

Rogers had already published his major rebuttals to Prynne's concept of the Good Old Cause. His brief comments on Prynne in *A Christian Concertation* were largely restatements of his earlier arguments. However, his engagement with Richard Baxter was more lengthy. For Rogers, Baxter's "scandalum magnatum" was his attempt to fasten the odium of Popery on the Commonwealth and all its adherents. Rogers had spoken to this charge before, and in *A Christian Concertation* he again approached the subject, this time by way of a defense of Henry Vane from such accusations. He contended that Vane was not a Papist since he did not acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as the universal visible head of the Church. Rather than lead people away from religion, Vane strengthened them in it, his constant theme being "to the power and principles of Godliness." Rogers observed that there was not an essential of Christianity that Vane did not possess. Nor had he ever attempted to subvert Protestantism. The leading exponent of the Commonwealth was not a Papist, and certainly did not support a movement incorporating Romish doctrines.\(^1\)

In the political sphere, Rogers's reply to Baxter took the form of a reaffirmation of ideas found in Henry Vane's *Healing Question Propounded*. Along with Vane, Rogers placed the foundations of the Commonwealth in Parliamentary government, and in matters of religion, a freedom concerning the service and worship of God. Baxter

\(^1\)Rogers, *Christian Concertation*, pp. 17, 18, 21.
had attempted to discredit these concepts by saying that they were not in line with the original issues of the Civil Wars, which he saw as a struggle to establish only a limited monarchy and not to give Parliament supremacy as Vane intended. Rogers tried to answer these criticisms in *A Christian Concertation*, but the very nature of Baxter's observations really made them unanswerable. For example, to Baxter's claim that the free choice of Parliaments was not the goal for which the Civil Wars had been fought, Rogers could only say that the privileges of Parliament and the people's rights were part of the Good Old Cause. Presumably he included the free choice of Parliaments in this general category. But it was true that such a goal had not been directly voiced or widely accepted in 1642. Baxter also claimed that the assertion of the people's sovereignty, or their right to choose a House of Commons to exercise that sovereignty, had not been part of the original struggle against the King. Again Rogers could only answer that by fighting for the privileges and power of Parliament, the people attempted to assert their rights through their representatives. Among these rights he must have included sovereignty. Finally, Baxter contended that the Wars had not been fought with an eye to completely destroying the monarchical form of government. Rogers agreed, but then he pointed out that a basic alteration of the constitution came as an effect rather than a cause.⁴

Baxter's observations were irrelevant. He tried to attribute to Vane and Rogers a belief in a Commonwealth without King, Protector,

⁴Ibid., pp. 45, 46.
or House of Lords at a time before political events would have allowed them to be considered. In stating the obvious, he somehow hoped to divorce the Commonwealth from the publicly accepted goals behind the Parliament's original opposition to the King. It would have to be admitted that the free choice of Parliaments, the sovereignty of the people in choosing their representatives, or the abolition of the monarchy were not in the minds of those men who originally took up arms in 1642. Rather the changes then sought were intended to insure the privileges of Parliament and the liberties of the subject (against such abuses of power as High Commission Courts, royal prerogative, monopolies, arbitrary arrests and imprisonment, and extra-Parliamentary taxation) within the political system then in operation. And yet the conditions for achievement of further changes were made possible, and even encouraged, by the outcome of the Wars. To attribute serious proposals for the adoption of commonwealth or republican principles to any popular group before 1648 was ridiculous. General political opinion of the time would not have tolerated them. Even during the Protectorate the principle of the sovereignty of the people through freely elected Parliaments was not operative. That such principles were not part of the causes of the Civil Wars was obvious. Rogers's reply was to project the original causes into the new principles made possible by the successful conclusion of the Civil Wars. He made civil and religious liberty extensions of the fight for the privileges of Parliament and security of the subjects' traditional English rights. By this process, Rogers hoped
he could place himself and Vane's republicans in a seemingly natural progression of political ideals.

Concerning religious freedom, Rogers fared better in his answers to Baxter. The call for liberty of conscience was interpreted by Baxter to mean that the magistrate should have no authority at all in religious affairs. Rogers pointed out that both he and Vane believed the magistrate ought not to meddle in matters of faith and conscience, or the worship of God, except as these things came under civil consideration. Rogers now reiterated the thoughts he first expressed in 1653 in Ohel or Bethshemesh, that "the civil power may (as a thing civil) require men to be civil and to come under the call or outward tender of the Gospel, but it cannot compel them or force their conscience by any other means." Despite the interposition of Fifth Monarchism, with its implications of intolerance, Rogers maintained a faith in religious liberty. The application of that liberty had once been narrowed by his chiliastic zeal, but the fact that he supported religious freedom as a vital prop of the Commonwealth in 1659 proves that he never rejected the basic principle.

Both Rogers and Vane characterized the civil and religious freedoms they advocated as natural rights, "due to the whole body of the people for whose safety good government itself is ordained." However, behind their particular kind of republicanism was the theory that natural rights could be forfeited. As a man's natural right to

---

3 Ibid., p. 57.
4 Ibid., p. 42.
life and liberty could be forfeited by the conviction for murder or treason, so his natural right to civil and religious freedom could be forfeited by engaging against the institutions or forces that tried to secure and maintain those freedoms. Therefore, when Rogers or Vane spoke of restoring natural rights in "civils and spirituals," they limited the civil freedoms to those who had not worked or were not working against a Commonwealth without King, Protector, or House of Lords. Royalists, Presbyterians, and Cromwellians were excluded, for the time being, until the Commonwealth was more firmly established. There was the implication that these people might someday be restored to their rights, especially if they demonstrated loyalty to the Cause. But even if they did not, Rogers believed that once the Commonwealth was firmly rooted, it could encompass all opponents.  

Rogers's terminology here was republican; that is, he envisioned a system in which the people were sovereign, with their representatives translating their public will into laws for the public good. However, by restricting the people in this system to those possessed of their natural rights, or the supporters of a Commonwealth, Rogers probably eliminated at least three-quarters of the English people. This was the result of his desperate efforts to prevent the restitution of monarchy. As a result he had proposed a system in which the representation of the whole people was little better, or perhaps worse, than under the Stuart monarchy itself. Rogers's thoughts were republican. But his fear of kingship led him to apply those thoughts in an oligarchic frame.  

5Ibid., p. 60.
The obvious limitations of this interpretation brought Rogers into conflict with the foremost exponent of classical republicanism in the Interregnum, James Harrington. In his Commonwealth of Oceana, published in 1656, Harrington laid down the political principles of an English free-state, a state designed to withstand the changes of time and to last forever. From his study of history, Harrington found that the decisive factor in the stability of any political system was the distribution of property. He believed that those who possessed the balance of property in a state would soon gain sovereignty. If one person held the largest amount of land, the government would become a monarchy. If a few great men possessed the land, the government would become a limited monarchy or an aristocracy. If the land were dispersed among the people, the government would become a commonwealth. Economics ruled political development. When the form of government did not conform to the balance of property, there was likely to be an upheaval. Harrington believed that such an imbalance caused the English Civil Wars. Though the balance of property passed to the yeomen, gentry, and merchants, the monarchy tried to maintain its absolute power. As a result, the middle classes sought to seize power by force.

Harrington believed that a commonwealth or republican government was the only form compatible with the new balance of

---


7Ibid., pp. 47-51.
property in England. In addition, he believed that a republic best served the interests of the whole people since its laws necessarily reflected a common interest. Justice would not prevail, he argued, if only a minority of the people made them. Harrington's conclusion was that Royalists, Presbyterians, and Cromwellians ought to be granted their full participatory rights in the political system immediately. Although these people had supported the rule of a single person in the past, Harrington believed their basic security would be guaranteed in the new state, and they would have no reason to revert to their former allegiances. 8

John Rogers disagreed with this last observation. "How ill they would found the Commonwealth," he complained, "that take so little notice of the distinction that is made between delinquents and adherents." Although he agreed that justice and equity could best be obtained in a republic, he did not believe that justice and equity would prevail if Royalists, Presbyterians, and Cromwellians were allowed to threaten the government with a restoration of rule by a single person. In the state of flux he believed would plague the Commonwealth at first, he feared that the system might be in greater danger from subversion than from open attack. Rogers warned against the open enemy and the clandestine enemy, but he advised special vigilance against the enemy that pretended to preserve the government while he was in reality working for its downfall. In this last category, Rogers placed Harrington, for he believed that in the

8Ibid., pp. 20-23, 55-56.
Commonwealth's susceptibility to change, Harrington's proposals would eventually lead to the reestablishment of rule by a single person. This was Rogers's overriding fear. From his own experience he had found that when men with vested interests in the status quo were in control, there was little chance for thorough reform in religion, politics, or society. Because restoration of the monarchy meant a return to power of such men in England, Rogers believed his proposed reforms in law, the Courts, the administration of justice, tithes, taxes, land tenures, the national clergy, and Parliamentary government would be totally lost. To prevent this, he was ready to deny political rights to those who supported the rule of a single person in the past. "Not only the little delinquents or offenders in small things," he warned, "but the very great offenders and greatest enemies in the nation will be ever and anon doing mischief, and most capable of it, do what we can." Rogers thought it both practical and proper that the defenders of the Commonwealth should have full authority. This put a very great stricture on popular government, but Rogers felt his system held out the promise of better things which the monarchy did not. Rogers did not propose a democratic republic, but then neither did anyone else in 1659.

Rogers must certainly have been aware that his proposals appeared oligarchic. But republicanism was a radical idea in the mid-seventeenth century, and to make it work, he allowed modifications. It must be pointed out that Rogers had always been concerned with the

9Ibid., pp. 119, 74, 76.
proper function of law, which he saw as a protection against the vested interests of great men. Part of his objection to a limited monarchy was that it served the desires of a few at the expense of the public good. The very nature of a Commonwealth, he believed, prevented its legislators from acting against the public good. In defense of this idea, Rogers suggested that oligarchy was not necessarily rule by the few, but tyranny by one faction in its own interest without respect for the common weal. One's definition of tyranny, of course, could depend on whether he was in accord with the principles Rogers proposed. But Rogers, himself, believed that no tyranny was possible in a Commonwealth. He need only have looked to the implications of the Parliament of Saints for a refutation. But his position is understandable if one accepts the premise that the rule of a few men committed to the public good was preferable to monarchy, military dictatorship, or the rule of the mob.

The main governmental organs of James Harrington's republican polity were to be an elected popular assembly, a senate, and an executive magistracy. Parliament was to be composed of the popular assembly and the senate. It was to hold sovereign power. Harrington reserved to the senate, the higher body, the sole right of debating matters of state. The senate would consider a particular measure, and if it were adopted, would send it to the assembly. There it was to be voted upon without discussion, and if accepted, it became the law of the land. Presumably nothing would be proposed by the senate against

---

10 Harrington, Oceana, pp. 19, 24-29, 32, 103-104, 116-17, 143.
the people's interest. But even if it were, the sovereignty of the people was maintained through the representatives in the popular assembly who could reject any such proposal. The executive magistracy was to be elected by the senate and would include military, financial, domestic, and foreign experts at the head of a system of councils. In emergencies, a special commission with dictatorial powers could be named by the senate. In all bodies, rotation of office was prescribed so that there could be equal access to power by all parties. In this way oligarchy would be avoided. 11

In A Christian Concertation, John Rogers took exception to the creation of a second house, and to the method of rotation in office. Again he feared the possible subversion of the government under such a system. Suppose, he contended, that the senate falsely persuaded a majority of the members of the assembly that something was in the general interest when it really was not. Or suppose the senate and the assembly came to such an impasse that the government ceased to function. Emergency powers could be assumed by the special commission with the distinct possibility that the most influential or powerful party or person in that commission might seize dominance. This could lead to a negation of all rights in civils and spirituals. 12 Rogers did not oppose the principle of rotation in office. Indeed, he had proposed a regular replacement of officials to Oliver Cromwell in 1653. Such a practice, he believed, prevented officials from assuming

11 Ibid., pp. 105-112, 127.

12 Rogers, Christian Concertation, pp. 71-72.
an absoluteness in their actions.\textsuperscript{13} But in Harrington's system, with open subversives allowed to participate, Rogers feared that rotation would at some point allow Royalists, Presbyterians, and Cromwellians to join together in a majority of offices to force a dissolution of the Commonwealth. Harrington's proposal that it be made treason for any members of Parliament to move or suggest the restitution of Kingly government, or government by any single person, in the senate or the popular assembly did not assuage Rogers's fears. Little else in the political sphere was to be made treason. All risings, rebellions, and other acts in support of the King were tacitly allowed by omission. In addition, the proposition of Kingly government was made treason only when it was proposed in either Parliamentary body. In any other setting this same proposition was not to come under legal restriction.\textsuperscript{14}

Harrington's ecclesiastical arrangements also annoyed Rogers. Harrington was convinced that besides military force, there was nothing so dangerous as a powerful clergy. Therefore, he proposed an established church under state control, but with toleration of all Christian dissenters. Without toleration, of course, the liberty for which republicanism stood would be incomplete. Parliament would determine the national form of worship, and religious matters were to be administered through a Council on Religion within the executive magistracy. Ministers were to be elected by their parish and were prohibited from holding any state office. It was to be treason for

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{13}Rogers, \textit{Ohele or Bethshemesh}, Epistle to Cromwell, p. 6.  \\
\textsuperscript{14}Rogers, \textit{Christian Concertation}, pp. 80–81.
\end{flushleft}
any member of Parliament to propose infringement of freedom of worship or protection of persons of different religious persuasions.\textsuperscript{15}

Rogers found these proposals far from guaranteeing equality and liberty in religion. "Those that fall in with the national worship \textsuperscript{[will]} be maintained," he observed, "but others (accounted sectaries) must only be protected from bodily violence (or tolerated); and is this equal or to all alike?" Besides, Rogers charged, by tolerating all religions not contrary to Christianity, and then leaving the definition of Christianity up to Parliament, Harrington left England open to Popery, prelacy, the old hierarchy, or anything the Parliament chose to call Christianity.\textsuperscript{16} From the above statements, it appears that Rogers feared two things in Harrington's proposals, the reestablishment of monarchy and the reintroduction of Popery or prelacy.

There were some similarities between Rogers and Harrington, too, despite these differences in their ideas. Both were in favor of republicanism, but neither was a pure democrat. Rogers wanted, on political grounds, to exclude Presbyterians, Royalists, and Cromwellians from participation in the government. Harrington wanted to exclude those whom he called "servants" (those dependent on others for their living) in order to preserve the balance of property and power. In addition, those "freemen" left could only sit in the lower house of Parliament. Although all freemen could vote, only those


with annual incomes of more than £100 could sit in the senate, and of those elected to the popular assembly, three-sevenths had to be in this upper economic bracket. Thus Harrington's approach to republicanism was limited, too. His system would have consolidated the political and social influence of the gentry, and it may have proved to be as oligarchic as Rogers's. Harrington's approach to republicanism (and his system's limitations) were economic in kind. Rogers's were political. Rogers spoke to the reality of immediate political problems. Harrington proposed a utopia. But if one were to measure the republicanism of the two men in terms of the numbers of people they would allow to participate in government, Rogers's system was less representative of the whole people.

While Rogers continued to express his belief in the Commonwealth principle, he realized that he had erred in supporting the Rump Parliament as a part of any English Commonwealth. Therefore, he attempted to salvage his reputation by explaining that the Rump had not succeeded completely because it was founded on the single basis of political principle. To be effective, Rogers concluded, the Commonwealth also had to be based on Christian principles. Thus, he proposed not just a Commonwealth, but a Theocratic Commonwealth. In so doing, Rogers placed himself completely out of step with the times. For in the last months of 1659 most Englishmen were monarchists. And they were definitely against any system that appeared to be a reincarnation of rule by righteous men.

17 Harrington, *Oceana*, pp. 64-65, 80-81, 127.
For Rogers, a Theocratic Commonwealth was a Christian government based on reason, the Spirit of God, and the wisdom of Englishmen. He believed such a government would fulfill his long search for a religiously oriented, politically acceptable system of governance. According to Rogers's theory, Christ was the absolute sovereign in a Theocratic Commonwealth. No human being could claim sole authority. But just as the Apostles had possessed power over their own affairs, under the direction and influence of Christ, so the whole body of the people of Christ possessed like power. As authority and power had been delegated to the Apostles, and by the Apostles to the body of the early Church, so the whole body of the people of Christ possessed power over their own affairs (under Christ) and could delegate this power to their deputies and representatives.

This was the basis of Rogers's republicanism. But when he came to apply those ideas to the political situation in England in 1659, he found it necessary to limit the definition of the whole body of the people to those who would not, by supporting the rule of a single person, subvert the absolute sovereignty of Christ, and who would not endanger civil or religious liberty. Although sovereignty lay in the people, Rogers's definition of the people who could exercise that sovereignty made his system not republican, but oligarchic.

The assertion that the people, under Christ, had supreme power in their own governance made Rogers's system of government one established by the ordinance of man. However, his concept of the

---

nature and necessity of law in that government made it one also established by the ordinance of God. This is where theocracy came in. The strength of law, Rogers taught, stemmed from its foundation in reason. And reason was the rule of righteousness since right reason was Divinely inspired. Indeed, in every man there was the seed of Divine reason, and thus of righteousness. As man used that reason in making laws for society, righteousness took on an outward form in laws as well as an inward form in spirit. The hallmark of a Theocratic Commonwealth was the harmony between inward and outward righteousness. As in every man there was some spark of Divine reason, so in every just law there was some of Divine or Fundamental Law which was the reason of God. In so far as the magistrates and representatives in a Theocratic Commonwealth promulgated and enforced laws partaking of reason, and thus of Divine or Fundamental Law, they were ministers of God. The government of a Theocratic Commonwealth was thus established by the ordinance of God as well as by the ordinance of man. In Rogers's definition this was a theocracy. 19

Rogers had hopes for the success of such a Commonwealth in 1659 for several reasons. The Army had declared itself against government by King or House of Lords. And by recalling the Rump Parliament it had given tacit approval to Commonwealth principles. Rogers expected it to support a government that embodied those principles. Then the Parliament itself had pledged to uphold the rights and liberties of the people, both as Englishmen and as

19 Ibid., pp. 64, 68.
Therefore it could be expected to support a government which Rogers felt best guaranteed those rights and liberties. Though he might seem naive in his hopes for a governmental system somewhere between a supernatural Fifth Monarchy and a democratic republic, John Rogers was completely sincere in his belief that a Theocratic Commonwealth was the answer to England's political emergency. In his own words, "If this cause should miscarry, Christ, the Gospel, and good people of the Commonwealth would all suffer slavery." For Rogers, the reign of Christ on earth had been transformed into a Theocratic Commonwealth. This is not as incomprehensible as it might appear. Rogers had supported the Fifth Monarchist program because he thought it offered the possibility of social, political, and religious reform. It comprised a system of governance based on Christian morality and principles, unity, and law. It represented a reformation in both spirit and institutional forms. Although a Theocratic Commonwealth had none of the Fifth Monarchist trappings of elected Saints, the personal appearance of Christ, and the impending millennium, it did carry reform ideas and was, in Rogers's opinion, popular enough to achieve acceptance. He could not have been more wrong. For Rogers failed to read the times correctly. He reverted to a governmental system in which religion was dominant. Oliver Cromwell had found this unworkable in a period that had been much more receptive to it. Rogers evidently had not profitted from that example.

Ibid., p. 91.
The ideas expressed in Rogers's *Christian Concertation* apparently elicited only one published reply, although Rogers himself mentioned a plethora of criticism. The one published reply came from James Harrington under the title *A Parallel of the Spirit of the People with the Spirit of Mr. Rogers*. The essence of Harrington's reproach was that Rogers tried to force his Theocratic Commonwealth upon the people of England without discerning whether the spirit of the people was ready to accept it. "There are but too many," Harrington chided, "who...boast their spirit for righteousness, Godliness, and justice above that of the people." If the spirit of the people be disposed to kingly government or to the rule of Lords, then that must be the government. Harrington accused Rogers of taking no notion of the spirit of the people. He simply told the people they must not live under such systems. In the confusion of the times, Rogers had taken advantage of the support of the Army to force his Theocratic Commonwealth ideas upon England.

This was the sole, yet devastating, point that Harrington made in his little seven page pamphlet. He attempted no substantive attack on specific points of Rogers's republicanism, nor did he defend the details of his own system as found in *Oceana*. This is more understandable when we realize that although both Rogers and Harrington appeared to be working for a republican commonwealth,  

---


Harrington believed that the Commonwealth would come because of the economic balance of land in England whether he defended it or not. A republican Commonwealth was inevitable whether it came in his lifetime or not. For Rogers, on the other hand, the Commonwealth had to be the immediate alternative to monarchy. And in order to assure its immediate realization (at least in form if not in substance) he allowed the prostitution of some of its basic principles. This led Harrington to ask his reader to judge "whether the spirit of the people, excluding no man, or the spirit of Mr. Rogers and such like, which is that which he would have, excluding the people, be the fitter to be trusted with government."^23

Rogers took this rejoinder from Harrington as a compliment, since it had come from so eminent a political thinker. But he could not refrain from answering Harrington either. The nature of commonwealth republicanism was the general point of disagreement. "We both desire a commonwealth! an excellent! wise! and popular one! and equal and just one!" Rogers observed, "but the rule to effect it is hard to adhere to." So where the platforms of a commonwealth were many, Rogers naturally pleaded, "let us keep to that which is most worthy in its gender, nature, cause, and number."^24 Of course that which was most worthy was the Theocratic Commonwealth. Rogers really felt he could give stability to the commonwealth idea in its infancy through theocratic principles that would prevent tyranny and injustice.

^23 Ibid., p. 6.

^24 Rogers, M. Harrington's Parallel, pp. 10, 6.
In M. Harrington's Parallel Unparalleled Rogers capsulized his argument for a Theocratic Commonwealth. He did not specifically answer Harrington's accusation that he wanted to force such a system on England. But in response to Harrington's general call for participation by all freemen in the government, Rogers reiterated his reliance on what he called "equality." This was not equality of opportunity or of position. It was more in the nature of equality of thought. For Rogers believed that to add those people who were avowed enemies of republicanism to those who supported it was inequality, which was dangerous to the civil and religious freedom of all. Well might Harrington have objected to this rationalization, for in truth it was discrimination, not equality. To insure in the seventeenth century the success of a government founded on the radical political idea of republicanism, Rogers proposed a system limited to those people whom he believed could make it work. He partook of the political experience of Oliver Cromwell in that he, Rogers, was determined not to commit those mistakes of the Lord Protector that had allowed the reincarnation of the King in another form. By becoming Lord Protector, Cromwell was less than a true republican. Yet by limiting the participants of a theocratic Commonwealth to those who had not or would not support the rule of a single person, Rogers himself became less than a true republican. The times made the man. Had he not feared the imminent restoration of the monarchy, Rogers may not have been forced into being an anachronism in his own time.
Harrington's criticism, coming after those of William Prynne and Richard Baxter, had a deleterious effect on John Rogers. Since 1653, he had been part of a contentious political scene in England. He was beginning to tire of it. Although he had supported the Parliament in 1659, he felt he had been ill-handled by the Council of State. His Christian Concertation evidently brought what he considered uncalled-for condemnations, and there was no defense from the Government. In a postscript to the "judicious reader" of Harrington's Parallel, Rogers announced his retirement from the thankless rigors of political activism:

As the necessities and complexities of the times have put me (for want of a better) upon this subject...so I shall determine...to recede in silence until we can be warmed with the better influence of a more benign G______ and warranted or invited by a friendlier countenance from authority.

And yet he confessed, "I am ready and devoted to pay all I owe to the public by service or by silence."25.

The "warmth" and "friendlier countenance from authority" that Rogers hoped for never came from the Rump Parliament. It had other problems. Tension had been building between the Parliament and the Army ever since the successful suppression of Booth's rebellion. These tensions erupted when Parliament attempted to revoke the commissions of several Officers who were among its most vociferous critics. On October 13, 1659, Major-General Lambert and his fellow Officers replied to this action by forcing the expulsion of the

25Ibid., p. 12.
Parliament. Once again the civil authority of England had fallen to the power of the sword.  

Although Parliament was expelled on October 13, the Council of State did meet at Whitehall on that day to conduct business. And one of their last official orders concerned John Rogers. Acting on a petition from the parishioners of St. Julian in Shrewsbury, the Council appointed Rogers as a public preacher in Shrewsbury. He was given use of all the facilities in the parish and guaranteed a salary of £150 per year. How or why Rogers came to the attention of the citizens of that particular town and parish is unknown. Perhaps the Council had arranged it as another "reward" for Rogers's support of the Commonwealth. In any case, it must not have been a wholly acceptable gesture to Rogers for it would have removed him from London. Although he had expressed his discomfort in the political arena, he still did not want to be removed from the center of all religious and political power. And even though the more simplified duties of a parish preacher might have appealed to Rogers, he could not be secure in such a career as long as there was contention over political superiority. But at least this time he had not been "exiled" to Ireland.

The military interim that began on October 13 produced confusion in which nothing constructive was accomplished. Some factions remained loyal to the Rump. Others supported the Army Officers. Still

---


others opposed both Army and Rump and called for a free state with a completely new Parliament chosen in totally unfettered elections. To add to the confusion, the Army found itself weakened by internal conflicts. Because Lambert was in London at the center of the struggle, he and his Officers wielded immediate authority. But other Officers were known to have opposed the military domination of civil authorities. Perhaps the most powerful of these was General George Monk. Monk had been in Scotland since 1654. Of all the regiments in Britain, his was the most unified, devoted, and regularly paid. By eliminating Officers and men who disagreed with his political or military ideas, and by seeing that arrears in pay did not occur (sometimes at his own expense), Monk had created a disciplined force of 10,000 men. He had supported Oliver Cromwell. And respect for the Lord General kept him loyal to Richard Cromwell. But he disagreed with the decision to recall the Rump because he had witnessed the deleterious effects of a continual rule by the sword. Therefore, when Lambert and his Officers disposed of the Rump in October 1659, Monk announced for the liberty and authority of Parliament against Lambert. He did not believe what little liberty had been saved by the Rump for England had been endangered by that body's attempted revocation of the several Officers's commissions. At this point it would be impossible to declare whether Monk consciously wanted to pave the way for the restoration of Charles II. He was primarily concerned lest the civil authority in England be permanently disabled by Army's interference.

28 Firth, *Cromwell's Army*, p. 384; Davies, *Restoration*, pp. 185-86.
To forestall the invasion to which Monk had committed himself, the Committee of Safety, which the Army had created, sent General Lambert north toward Scotland. In Lambert's absence, the regiments in London became insubordinate. The harried Officers were faced with division within their troops and with extremely hostile public opinion in London. They finally agreed to allow the Rump to reassemble on December 26, 1659.\(^29\) Without the immediate opposition of the Army, the Parliament could have been in a very strong position. But support for the Rump had largely been enforced by the sword. When the basis of that support was lessened by the absence of Lambert's troops, the Rump no longer appeared indispensable. In the general cry for a free Parliament in the early months of 1660, the Rump became as distasteful as the Army rule had been.\(^30\)

Monk crossed the Tweed on January 2, 1660. Infiltrating and routing Lambert's troops along the way, he entered London on February 3, 1660. Parliament was powerless to resist him. Not only did he command the immediate situation, he also held the future of English government within his control. In alliance with the Presbyterian City of London, Monk demanded and enforced the restoration to Parliament of the victims of Pride's purge. The replenished body announced they would dissolve the present Parliament, call a new one for April 20, 1660, appoint a new Council of State, and

\(^29\)Commons Journals, VII, 799; Whitelocke, Memorials, 380-84; Ludlow, Memoirs, II, 190; Davies, Restoration, pp. 187-89.

\(^30\)Davies, Restoration, pp. 258-59, 263.
settle the governance of the Army. Monk was named Commander-in-Chief of all land forces in England, Ireland, and Scotland. The new Council of State was filled with his supporters. In accordance with their pledge, the members of the Rump dissolved themselves on March 16, having already provided for the election of a Convention Parliament. 31

Under the political pressures of the Protectorate, many Presbyterians had become Royalists. They had become Royalists in order to rid the country of military rule and yet not turn it over to republicans. As might have been expected in these circumstances, the Convention Parliament was largely Royalist. As a result, both the House of Commons and the House of Lords returned to Westminster in April 1660. By May 1 they had replied favorably to the proposals of the Declaration from Charles II at Breda. Charles triumphantly entered London on May 29, 1660. Government by King, Lords, and Commons had been restored to England. 32

The details of Rogers's activities during these tumultuous months are very incomplete and can only be sketched with imprecision. With the expulsion of the Rump Parliament in October 1660, Rogers was plagued once more with both personal and political insecurity. Because he had supported the Rump Parliament in the face of military dominance, he did not know what to expect from the


Army Officers. Without the steadying hand of Oliver Cromwell, the Army's actions towards him as a Commonwealth republican and a Fifth Monarchist must have caused him fear. Without the Rump, which itself had not proved overly protective of him, Rogers had no public authority to which he could appeal for support.

Whether Rogers ever got to Shrewsbury is doubtful. In an attempt to seek safety and security in anonymity, he went instead to Dublin. But his reputation followed him, and he was imprisoned there for a few weeks under the orders of the Army leaders. When it regained its temporary ascendancy, the Rump instructed the Commissioners in Ireland to release Rogers in late January 1660. But Rogers seems to have seen the inevitability of the restoration in Monk's march towards London. Rather than cast his lot with the thoroughly discredited Rump in its third reincarnation, Rogers took the opportunity of his regained liberty to flee Britain for Holland.33 Along with many others, John Rogers became one of those whom the restoration of Charles II made exiles or martyrs.

CHAPTER IX

THE EXILE

For those who had been connected with Fifth Monarchism in any way, Charles II's triumphal entry into London in May 1660 was the beginning of the end. In a way the Fifth Monarchists had sealed their own fate. Their activism and their fanaticism had produced a never-ending succession of rumored rebellions and assassinations. This engendered a belief that a settled order could not be realized until the King returned. And when he did return, the persecution of the Fifth Monarchists was thorough and severe. With censorship renewed on an even stricter basis, no one remotely associated with the Fifth Monarchists could publish any political tracts in England. Because of a general ban on religious conventicles, most Fifth Monarchists were forced underground. Both ministerial and lay leaders disappeared, having either fled the country or succumbed to the Government executioner.

By themselves, the Fifth Monarchists presented no serious threat to the Government. But their reputation was such that both London and Westminster officials feared that the Fifth Monarchists could attract other disaffected groups and accomplish an uprising or even an assassination. In some cases, the authorities were
actually aware that congregations of Presbyterians, Anabaptists, and Fifth Monarchists had met together for mutual encouragement. Quite understandably, these were thought to be the source of Fifth Monarchist plots against the Government.\(^1\) But in truth, most of the proposals alleged to have come from such assemblies did not reflect the traditional Fifth Monarchist political goals. Rather they were expressions of all the sects' general opposition to the established religious order.\(^2\) Nevertheless, the authorities still stigmatized all signs of unrest with the Fifth Monarchist name, whether that unrest was a result of political or of religious opposition to the established order.

The Fifth Monarchists were also potentially dangerous to the Government because, it was feared, they were in a position to support a Dutch invasion of England. Persecuted by the Protectorate and then the restored monarchy, the Fifth Monarchists turned their earlier animosity toward the Dutch into a desire for Protestant, anti-monarchical solidarity. Indeed, after the Restoration the free cities of Holland became the refuge for many Englishmen tainted with a

\(^1\)As late as December 1662 it was reported that the combined sects under Fifth Monarchist leadership had agreed upon proposals to fight against the King. P. R. O., S.P. 29/65, f. 20.

\(^2\)For example, Captain Pestell wrote to Secretary Nicholas that the Fifth Monarchists had preached and visited with the Presbyterians and urged their people to withstand the Common Prayer and to resist the idolatry of the Court. William Williamson observed that the sects were resolved to stand against episcopacy. But political motives were not evident to these two reporters. It would seem that the political goals of the Fifth Monarchists were couched in religious goals more acceptable to their Presbyterian and Anabaptist friends. P. R. O., S.P. 29/42, f. 38; P. R. O., S.P.29/34, f. 2.
reputation of Fifth Monarchism. The Fifth Monarchists were said to have at least one ship that made regular trips between Holland and England. Dissidents were brought from Holland, where propaganda against Charles II was formulated, to London, where such propaganda was disseminated. Then they were carried back when persecutions became too heavy. In view of the continually strained relations between England and the Dutch which led to two major wars in the 1650's and 1660's, the Fifth Monarchists' actions were of concern to the Government of Charles II. This was but another reason for strict control over anyone associated with Fifth Monarchist ideas.

Of those leading figures of the Commonwealth, John Rogers was probably the most famous exile to Holland. As such, it might be expected that he participated in the Dutch supported efforts against the English monarchy in the 1660's. Evidently this was not the case. Given his advocacy of a Theocratic Commonwealth, it is safe to assume that he took opportunities to further the cause against the political principles of monarchy and the religious principles of prelacy. He was reported preaching in London in 1661, and Captain Pestell noted that Rogers traveled from county to county encouraging resistance to the Common Prayer.3 Because he carried the reputation of a Fifth Monarchist, his presence in England only confirmed the suspicions that the Fifth Monarchists aimed at undermining the Government from Dutch bases. However, there is no evidence to prove that Rogers preached

3P. R. O., S.P. 29/47, f. 107; P. R. O., S.P. 29/42, f. 38; P. R. O., S.P. 29/44, f. 267. (Captain Pestell was a former Fifth Monarchist turned Government spy.)
rebellion against the Government itself, but only that he preached against what he feared was the introduction of Popery. The authorities must have realized this, too, for they never issued warrants for his arrest or attempted to detain him. Although Rogers certainly disapproved of government by a single person, he had seen the failure of numerous efforts of mere mortals to set up an alternative political system in England. Since he believed in Providence, as most seventeenth century Englishmen did, he accepted the political fact of the Restoration as a teaching tool of God, much as he had reconciled his own sufferings under Oliver Cromwell. This did not mean he abandoned his desire for the reforms in law, the Courts, the church, the administration of justice, tithes, and taxes which he had sought for so long. But in the face of insurmountable opposition, Rogers bowed to reality. He knew he was not the only Englishman who wanted greater civil and religious liberty. As a realist, he relinquished the advocacy of such liberty to those who might have better success in the new political environment.

In the meantime, Rogers looked to other problems. He was now thirty-three years old, with a wife and children to support. But he had no home, no property, and no acceptable profession by which to make a living. At Cambridge, before he had turned to preaching and religion, he had begun the study of medicine. In Holland, after the Restoration, he resumed his medical studies at the Universities of Leyden and Utrecht. Despite his reported visits to England in 1661,
he worked hard enough at Utrecht to obtain the degree of Doctor of Medicine in October 1662. He now had a respectable profession, and at this particular point in his life that profession was important.

Rogers had felt the insecurity of exile from the very beginning. He realized he had no support or defense from any earthly political or religious authority. Because he was English and because he did not preach open rebellion against Charles II's government, he was tolerated but not warmly embraced by the Dutch. And because he had been associated with Fifth Monarchist fanaticism he was not popular with either the English authorities or the majority of English people. In addition, Rogers's hope that the Royal Government might eventually relax its persecution of anyone ever connected with Fifth Monarchism was completely destroyed when the authorities finally executed Sir Henry Vane in June 1662 after having kept him in prison for two years. Vane's death had a deep impact on Rogers. It brought home the realization that any support of ideas or actions anathema to the Government was both futile and dangerous. Such support would probably bring death instead of a sympathetic following. Charles II executed his enemies rather than imprison them.

So, because Rogers desired some sort of settled order for himself
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5William Cobbett, Complete Collection of State Trials (London, 1810), VI, 195-98; The Tryal of Sir Henry Vane (London, 1662), passim.
and his family, and because he disliked the idea of always being a
foreigner amongst the Dutch, he petitioned the English authorities
in the autumn of 1662 to allow him to return permanently to his
native land.

The Government found it had little reason to deny this
petition. Ever since the Restoration, the authorities had kept
Rogers under semi-surveillance. He seemed to have discarded the
outward signs of political radicalism. He had not been involved in
any of the known Fifth Monarchist plots against the monarchy since
1660. He had not published any political or religious tracts since
1659. Besides, the Government of Charles II had already made its
position clear on political radicalism by exiling or executing
leading Fifth Monarchists and republicans. The successful
repatriation of a man who once held both ideas but appeared now to
have renounced them could be of tremendous propaganda value. In
addition, Rogers now had a very respectable and responsible
profession in medicine. He had credentials from two of the better
medical schools in Europe. Therefore, with the promise that he would
engage in no future political or religious activities against the
Government, John Rogers was permitted to return to England.

Before the end of 1662, Rogers settled in Bermondsey in
Surrey. The Herald's Visitation of Surrey in that year reported
him as a Doctor and the minister of the parish of St. Mary
Magdalen in Bermondsey. He appears to have renounced his radical
activities completely. At least there is no record of his being
detained, questioned, or arrested. As he had once thrown himself deeply and sincerely into his political and religious activities, he now devoted his energies to excellence in the practice of medicine. In 1664 he was admitted to an *ad eundem* degree of Doctor of Medicine at Oxford University. And in the same year he published a second edition of his medical treatises first composed in Utrecht. In fact his only published political reference after 1659 was found in the dedication of this tract to the Earl of Clarendon.

The plague hit England with tremendous ferocity in 1665. John Rogers worked diligently against its devastation. Advertisements in the *Intelligencer* and the *News* announced an "Alixterial and Anti-pestilential Medicine, and admirable and experimental preservative from the Plague" "made up by the order of J. R., M.D." In their pretensions and phraseology such advertisements point to the work of John Rogers. But if this was our John Rogers, it was the last printed word ever heard from him. Despite the miraculous properties of his own medicine, he may have perished in the Great Plague. It is hard to imagine that such an active and prodigious writer could have been silenced except by illness or death. But no further publications issued from his pen, not even a medical treatise. He may have lived on until 1670. For an entry in the register of St. Mary
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7D. N. B., Rogers.
Magdalen's parish, Rogers's last known ministerial charge, lists the burial of one John Rogers on July 22, 1670. But, in truth, the date of his death is completely uncertain.
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8Chester, John Rogers, p. 287; Complete Baronetage 1665-1707 (Exeter, 1904), IV, 287.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

The career of John Rogers mirrors the effects of the hope of success engendered by the Puritan Revolution in those radical Independents who wished to create a new and better society in mid-seventeenth century England. He is an example of many men who were part of the on-going transition from a world dominated by religion to one in which political systems took precedence. Rogers tried to participate in both worlds by fusing some of the principles of the two into an earthly government based on heavenly precepts. He is illustrative of a way of thought characteristic of the times in which he lived. Rogers believed that the cause of God justified the overturning of political systems which denied the full operation of Christian principles. For Rogers, such a system was that in which a single person (whether he be King, Lord General, or Lord Protector) exercised sole authority. In his campaign against such absolute government, Rogers came to the brink of religious toleration and republicanism. But always behind these seemingly progressive political principles was Rogers's conviction that only those people who believed in non-monarchical government based primarily on Christian principles should participate in the political arena. This
made him a religious and political elitist. This position was acceptable as long as Puritan military force made it so. But when that support disintegrated in a general desire for a return to the settled order and traditional relationships of the English monarchy, John Rogers became a man out of step with his time.

Seventeenth century English millenarians believed they had found in the books of Daniel and Revelation the symbolic ascent of mankind towards the perfect society. In preparation for the millenium, God had provided for an ever-increasing improvement in all things affecting the human condition. Providence came to be seen as God's design for progress for mankind. Millenialism helped enshrine progress as an integral part of the Protestant faith. It lifted human advancement from the realm of possibility that it occupied in the Renaissance thought to the realm of inevitability as part of God's design.

Of all the groups whose members held millenial ideas, the Fifth Monarchists attempted the broadest application of those ideas. If they held any view in common it was that Providence, by the success of the English Civil War against the established order, dictated that preparations for the millenium could and should involve more than just spiritual development. Improvement in social, economic, political, and cultural conditions also seemed to be part of God's Divine Plan. Besides ardent millenarins, such broad interpretations also attracted English religious reformers, social reformers, and political reformers. Such a man was John Rogers.
Rogers began his public career as a Puritan. He believed that the forms, the ceremonies, and the hierarchies of the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches detracted from the spiritual development of one's soul. But in the radical new environment created by the outcome of the Civil Wars, he did not remain a passive Puritan. He was convinced that the system of church governance closest to that which Christ intended was Independency, the individual autonomy of each gathered congregation. Therefore, he began an active campaign to reform the religious life of England in accordance with this concept. He looked for support in this campaign to the political Independents, those men whom Oliver Cromwell had helped place in power by his victory over the Presbyterian Parliament. As a result, Rogers, the Independent preacher, entered the arena of seventeenth century English politics.

Political Independency put Rogers in closer contact with some of the civil and political issues over which the Civil Wars had been fought. To his calls for abolition of the clerical hierarchy and of tithes, he added the demands for reform in the law, in the administration of justice, in the system of land tenures, and in taxation. In the hope of realizing this broadened program of reforms, Rogers now allied himself with the real power behind Independency, the Army. This brought him into association with the Fifth Monarchists. In their belief that they were to help prepare the world for the millennium, the Fifth Monarchists also sought changes in English law, government, the Court system, land tenures, taxes, and tithes.
Since these paralleled his own increasing concern for social and political, as well as religious, reforms, Rogers was naturally attracted to the Fifth Monarchist ideology.

John Rogers was a Fifth Monarchist, then, because in 1653 he judged Fifth Monarchism to be the best vehicle for the realization of the social, political, and religious reforms he was seeking. He was a moderate Fifth Monarchist, even an unorthodox one. He did not believe in religious coercion. He did not believe that the Law of Moses could replace English Common Law. He did not seem to distrust human reason. He did not leave the solution to all problems of earthly government to the eventual direction of Christ. He did not believe that violence would be used to usher in the millennium. Why, then, was Rogers considered one of the Fifth Monarchists’ leaders? The answer lies on the actions of Oliver Cromwell.

When Cromwell called the Parliament of Saints in 1653, Rogers believed him to be the champion of reform. When Cromwell accepted the resignation of that same body nine months later, Rogers feared that the promise of reform had been destroyed. He was convinced of it when Cromwell assumed dictatorial powers in the Protectorate. Consequently, he assumed the Fifth Monarchist leadership to attack Cromwell for destroying the progress of reform much as he had first adopted the Fifth Monarchist ideology as a vehicle of that reform. But by participating in the Fifth Monarchists’ fanatical denunciations of Cromwell, Rogers was branded as a dangerous radical bent on the destruction of English society, politics, and religion. He
came to represent the worst Fifth Monarchist radicalism rather than the beneficence of its reforms in society.

Rogers must have realized the negative value of such a reputation. For when the source of his particular kind of fanaticism was removed by death in 1658, he abandoned the chiliastic approach to progress and based his renewed demands for reform on the republicanism of Sir Henry Vane. In the civil and religious liberty that Vane's republican Commonwealth without Protector, King, or House of Lords seemed to offer, Rogers believed he could revive the impetus to reform and change that Cromwell had suppressed in the Protectorate. Partly because of his experience with Cromwell, Rogers had come to fear and distrust a governmental system in which one person held supreme power. Such a system, he believed, fostered private interests at the expense of public good. Therefore, he was quite sincere when he took up the advocacy of a Commonwealth in which the people held ultimate authority.

However, by the time Rogers came to this position, the attitude of most Englishmen had changed from a desire for reform to a desire for order and a settled way of life, even if that meant a return to monarchy. Consequently, in order to make his republican Commonwealth work, and because he feared that his reforms in law, government, and the church could never be realized in the restored Stuart monarchy, Rogers was forced to limit the participants in the powers of that Commonwealth (at least, immediately) to those who did not support the rule of a single person. In so doing, he reverted to the elitism
and oligarchism inherent in Fifth Monarchist ideology. For the rule of the Saints, Rogers substituted the rule of Commonwealth republicans. As the Saints were egalitarian within their own ranks but dictatorial outside of them, so the Commonwealth men would have been republican within their own ranks but oligarchic with respect to the whole society. Rogers tried to assuage the criticism of such a system by basing his Commonwealth on Christian principles which, by their nature, would promote the common good. But this only harkened back to the righteous society proposed by the Fifth Monarchists. If his ideals were commendable (reform of law, government, Courts, taxes, tithes, and land tenure), and his republican principles progressive, the fact still remains that the methods Rogers felt compelled to employ would have forced upon England a system of government which the majority of her people did not want in 1659. His disregard for the opinions of the majority and his belief that a Theocratic Commonwealth would solve all of England's problems were typical of the Godly reformers of the 1650's.

Although John Rogers was not an orthodox Fifth Monarchist, he failed in his campaign for religious, social, and political reforms for many of the same reasons the revolutionary Fifth Monarchists failed to build a new society in England. First, the grievances that led John Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists to call for reforms were partially answered by Charles II in the Restoration Settlement of 1660, especially in the political sphere. The abuse of power in the infringement of civil liberties by royal prerogative courts was
eliminated when those courts were abolished. The oppression of arbitrary taxation was lifted when Parliament voted the King a fixed revenue. The integrity of the people's representatives in Parliament was maintained by a provision for triennial Parliaments. The representatives' voice in executive affairs was encompassed in Parliament's right to impeach the King's ministers. And the threat of dominance by the sword was reduced by the abolition of a standing army. These revisions, of course, did not approach the pervasive reforms envisioned by Rogers or the Fifth Monarchists. There was no simplification of the law, nor guarantees of equality in the Courts. Taxes and tithes remained heavy. Religious liberty was non-existent. But the sense of grievance held by reformers such as Rogers had come to be overshadowed by two things. There was a general disaffection of the people and the authorities with the reformers' methods for dealing with religious, social, and political abuses. And by 1659 there was a greater concern for security and order (which both Rogers and the Fifth Monarchists were accused of helping to destroy) than there was with improving on the traditional unwritten English constitution. As a leading reformer, and a Fifth Monarchist, John Rogers felt the pressure of discontent with his ideas severely.

However alluring the results of their programs might have been, the ideologies of Rogers and of the Fifth Monarchists were never totally acceptable to the majority of Englishmen. The Fifth Monarchists' separation of the Godly and the ungodly made goodness exclusive, rigid, presumptuous, and prejudicial. Rogers's republicanism carried
the same stigmas. Both ideologies were idealistic. But both reflected
the opinions of a minority, a minority who believed in forcing their
ideas on the majority because they were working in God's cause or for
the common good. And both ideologies were revolutionary in a time
when the majority of Englishmen had no other hold on security and
order except tradition. As the Fifth Monarchist ideology was attacked
in the Protectorate, so the Commonwealth idea was suppressed in the
restored monarchy. John Rogers found that he had no acceptable
ideological framework left on which to build his religious, social,
and political reforms.

Finally, the hope of success that Rogers and the Fifth
Monarchists once held was destroyed by the Restoration. Cromwell's
opposition during the Protectorate weakened the unity of the Fifth
Monarchists, but Venner's rebellion in 1657 proves that he did not
eliminate them. While Cromwell imprisoned the Fifth Monarchists, he
did not stop the spread of their ideas. He did not eliminate the
sources of Fifth Monarchist ideas, only those who attempted to act
upon them. Cromwell must be accredited with the spread of Fifth
Monarchy ideas in so far as he allowed them to exist at all. We must
conclude that his toleration of dissent was greater than, and in sharp
contrast to, that of the Government of Charles II. For Charles
reduced the spread of Fifth Monarchist ideas by executing both those
who put them forth and those who followed them. He followed the same
pattern in dealing with republicanism. In the face of unilateral
censorship and control by Governmental authorities, the hope of success
for both Fifth Monarchism and republicanism virtually disintegrated.

So did John Rogers's public career as an activist reformer.

John Rogers was a victim of the Puritan Revolution. He was a victim not in the same sense as his Anglican father, but in a more subtle and indirect sense. He was a Puritan religious reformer in a time which invited and even encouraged activism if one was a Puritan, an Independent, or especially a Fifth Monarchist. He was the product of an era in English history that encompassed many drastic and sometimes sudden alterations in the established order. To maintain one's complete equanimity (and safety) between 1642 and 1662, an Englishman would have had to involve himself in virtually no social, religious, economic, intellectual, or political activities. For Rogers, this was impossible. Turned out of his Anglican family home at the age of fifteen because of his Puritan beliefs, Rogers became deeply involved in Puritan social consciousness. He adopted goals of reform in English law, government, justice, land tenure, taxes, tithes, and the national clergy. And because the political environment of England in the early 1650's encouraged it, he turned to political activism to further his religious, social, and political goals. But that activist approach had to be modified with each political change during the Interregnum. The result was that by the Restoration, Rogers had taken many different, and sometimes contradictory, positions. This discredited his original ideals of reform. Because his political position was contrary to that of both the Government and the people in 1660, and because his religious ideas were inextricably tied to his political
position, John Rogers was finally forced to submit to the public suppression of both.
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ABBREVIATED GENEALOGY OF THE ROGERS FAMILY

John Rogers, 1500?-1555
Executed by order of Queen Mary Tudor
(M. Adrienne Pratt)

Daniel, 1538-1591  John, 1540-1603?  6 sons, 3 daughters

Rev. John of Chacombe
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1610-1680

Rev. Timothy of Old Jewry
1660-1729

Vincent of Stratford Bow
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(M. Dorcas Young)
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(M. M. Collingwood)
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d. 1654 1655-?
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(II) Sir John, d. 1744

(III) Sir John, d. 1773

(IV) Sir Frederick,
d. 1777

(V) Sir Frederick
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(VI) Sir John
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(VII) Sir Frederick
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(VIII) Sir Frederick Rogers (IX) Sir John C. Rogers (X) Sir Edward
Baron Blachford 1818-1894
Rogers, d. 1895
1811-1889
(no direct heirs)
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APPENDIX II

BIBLICAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT*

The Book of Daniel, Chapter 7:

1 In the first year of Belshazzar, King of Babylon, Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters.

2 Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea.

3 And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another.

4 The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.

5 And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.

6 After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a foul: the beast had also four

*All passages are quoted from the King James version
heads; and dominion was given to it.

7 After this I saw in the night visions, and beheld a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.

8 I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.

9 I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.

10 A fiery stream issued and came forth from him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.

11 I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame.

12 As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.

13 I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days,
and they brought him near before him.

14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me.

16 I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things.

17 These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.

18 But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even for ever and ever.

19 Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet;

20 And of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.

21 I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them:
22 Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

23 Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.

24 And the ten horns of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings.

25 And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given unto his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

26 But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

27 And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

28 Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart.
The Book of Daniel, Chapter 12:

1 And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

2 And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

3 And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.

4 But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

5 Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the river.

6 And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?

7 And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth forever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to
scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.

8 And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?

9 And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

10 Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

11 And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

12 Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days.

13 But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Chapter 11:

1 And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein.

2 But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months.
3 And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth.

4 These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.

5 And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurth them, he must in this manner be killed.

6 These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will.

7 And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them.

8 And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.

9 And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves.

10 And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth.

11 And after three days and an half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet: and great fear fell upon them which saw them.
12 And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

13 And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were afraid, and gave glory to the God of heaven.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Chapter 12:

1 And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars:

2 And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.

3 And there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.

4 And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.

5 And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.
6 And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.

7 And there was a war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels,

8 And prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.

9 And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.

10 And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.

11 And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto death.

12 Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitors of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.

13 And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child.

14 And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.
15 And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.

16 And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.

17 And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Chapter 13:

1 And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy.

2 And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth was as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.

3 And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.

4 And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?
5 And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.

6 And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

7 And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.

8 And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

9 If any man have an ear, let him hear.

10 He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and faith of the saints.

11 And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.

12 And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.

13 And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fore come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.

14 And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image
to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.

15 And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

16 And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads:

17 And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

18 Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Chapter 20:

1 And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.

2 And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years.

3 And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

4 And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for
the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not
worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark
upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned
with Christ a thousand years.

5 But the rest of the dead lived not again until the
thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.

6 Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first
resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall
be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand
years.

7 And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be
loosed out of his prison,

8 And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the
four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to
battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.

9 And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed
the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down
from God out of heaven, and devoured them.

10 And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake
of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and
shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.

11 And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it,
from whose face the earth and heaven fled away; and there was found no
place for them.
12 And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.

13 And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.

14 And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.

15 And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.
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