

**A Study of Particular Baptist Origins
From 1633 to 1660**

A Study from the Original Documents showing the Origins of the

First Lasting Particular Baptist Churches in London,

**With their outreaches into: Wales, 1655; Abington, 1655; Ireland, 1648;
Scotland, 1652; the Midlands, 1648; Somerset, 1650;
and Early America, 1638;**

**With some interesting accounts of the ancient church at Olchon in Wales;
the ancient Church of the Hop Garden, near Abington;
and the ancient Hill Cliff Church, near the Hexham Church;**

and

John Spilsbury, William Kiffen and Hansard Knollys,

and

**of the First Seven Particular Baptist Churches gathered in London from
1633-1644.**

**Clearing John Spilsbury of the many false conclusions written about him,
and showing the constitutional oneness of John Spilsbury, William Kiffen
and the other rigid Anabaptist Separatists of the 1500s and 1600s.**

with

**The Kiffen Manuscript Vindicated, showing that Dipping did not originate
among the Baptists in 1641, being a refutation of Whitsittism and other
Downgrader concepts of Baptist Origins and Succession, from the original
writings of both Baptists (Anabaptists) and Pedobaptists of that period.**

Investigating:

**John Tombs, Henry Jessey, John Bunyan and the Origin of
Open Communion and Mixed Church Membership in England;**

By

**One who has a reason to hope he is walking with Christ
in His good, old baptized way.**

From Our Manse, near Gravenhurst, Ontario, Canada,

2008

Particular Baptist Origins

1633-1660

Way of Approach

In modern Baptist history, the old Particular Baptists have impacted us more than any other group. Almost all the American Baptist Churches, and many others as well in the English speaking world, can trace their origin, in some way or another, back to those old Baptists. Their faith and order has been one of continued debate since the early 1800s. It still is. However, in addition to their faith and order, the question of their origin continues to be contested hotly. Perhaps no origin in Baptist history has been as misunderstood or contested as hotly as these old Baptists. Of course, I am not including the Free Will or General Baptists

When we clear away the many different false conclusions and then go back into time and study them in their own words, concepts, and original documents, we can come to some safe conclusions. We must lay aside all our prejudices and escape the existentialist traps the modern Baptists have laid for the unsuspecting little children of God. The old brethren have an amazing story to tell. True, they didn't leave us with all the pieces necessary to put the entire puzzle into place, but they did leave us with enough to understand what they were all about, what they believed and where they came from. What they left us is enough to give us some very safe and solid conclusions.

The Traps

There are several such traps. I will share some with you now:

The Gould trap, this I so name from the efforts of George Gould in the 1850s and his successful lawsuit to steal the old Closed Communion Particular Baptist meeting house and property in Norwich, England from its rightful and historic ownership, the Closed Communion Particular Baptists. Gould argued his case before a court of law and afterward published his trial brief in a large work called *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich, Norwich 1860*. Gould's work went into America to Thomas Armitage, then to Norman Fox and then finally to William Whitsitt. Gould is the foundation for what is now called Whitsittism. Whitsittism rules the modern Baptist world. Briefly it is this, *Baptists are not of divine origin and have not have an unbroken succession from the days of Christ to the present. They are only Protestants, and most of the Dark Age's groups would not now be considered as Baptists if they were alive and present today.* Gould maintained that John Spilsbury was an open communion and mixed membership Baptist. He even went so far as to affirm that William Kiffen was the only true closed communion Baptist in the 1600s. Gould theorized that since Spilsbury came from a mixed membership church, he would not have any true succession in his baptism nor church order. The Particular Baptists just simply evolved over a period of years, from about 1633 to 1644. Some even place this later, 1650-1654. This began when a Pedobaptist minister, Praisegod Barebones, misunderstood some of Spilsbury's remarks and built a straw man argument in 1643-44. Then over two hundred years later, Gould carried it further. Gould used Barebones arguments and false conclusions. This was done in spite of Spilsbury's correcting what Barebones stated. Gould didn't consider Spilsbury's reply or explanations. Neither do the modern day Revisionists and Whitsittes.

Next came Norman Fox and William Whitsitt and their friends. They joined with Gould and then added their own theories. One is a remarkable argument from silence, it goes this way: in 1641 the Baptist published their first book defending baptism by dipping, before

that date the English Baptists did not dip, but only sprinkled. To them, the argument of silence is their final authority. Of course, they are wrong on this, as I shall show later. About their argument from silence, I would ask them to produce a work before 1641, which taught that either the English Particular or General Baptists believed in the VIRGIN BIRTH or sprinkling for baptism. For a good treatment of this see Ray's *Baptist Succession*.

Gould's Admission about William Kiffen and Benjamin Cox

Although Gould was very wrong, yet his admission does give us a starting place and a solid foundation upon which to build. According to Gould, William Kiffen stood almost alone as the most rigid and strict Particular Baptist during the 1600s. No one has ever accused Kiffen of starting baptism de novo, or for a church built on mixed membership, or for practicing open communion. The father of Whittsitism, George Gould, affirmed, incorrectly, that William Kiffen was the only closed communion Particular Baptist in England during the 1600s. Of course, he was wrong as the later Baptist Union historians show. The many original works from that era also show the false grounds upon which Gould and later, Fox and even William Whitsitt himself tried to build their false positions.

Some of Gould's remarks are so untrustworthy that we wonder if we can trust any of them. Here are some examples:

1. In 1644 Kiffen and his church were not closed communion, page cxxxi;
2. Kiffen pastored an open communion church in 1644 and then reorganized it in 1653 after he became a closed communionist, page cxxxii;
3. Kiffen's reorganized church of 1653 was the first closed church in England, page cxxxiii.
4. Later Gould recognizes his weak position and adds that Benjamin Cox was also a closed communion Baptist, page cxxxiii.

Cox was a closed communionist even when he was in the Anglican Church. His bishop ejected him in the early 1640s.

Gould quotes from John Spilsbury's *God's Ordinances*, issued in 1646. What Gould failed to report was that this was a joint work. Benjamin Cox, the admitted strict communionist, helped produce this work. At least two strict communion men, Cox and Kiffen assisted John Spilsbury. To say the least, this is strange company for a supposed open communion and mixed membership Baptist. What becomes even more compelling is that Paul Hobson and Thomas Goare were also very strict communion Baptists. This will be covered later. They joined with Mr. Greene and helped constitute the third Particular Baptist Church in 1638.

The Oneness of Spilsbury, Kiffen, Hobson, Goare and Cox

My main way of approach is to establish and show the oneness between William Kiffen, Benjamin Cox, Paul Hobson, Thomas Goare and John Spilsbury. Then, I will show their oneness with the Particular Baptist Churches throughout the United Kingdom and New England.

In these studies I will deal with the following concepts:

I will address the concept that John Spilsbury and the other Particular Baptists in London began as mixed communion and open membership churches. That is, they started out partly of baptized and partly of unbaptized persons and seemed to evolve into being real Baptists. This transition period started about 1633 and was not concluded until about 1644. In addition, while slowly evolving, they are supposed to have discovered that dipping is the only true way of baptism and this discovery is supposed to have taken place about 1641. None of these are true. This will disprove Whitsittism.

Whitsittism Misrepresents Spilsbury

I will address the false conclusion that John Spilsbury gathered a group together, and they were all unbaptized and then he proceeded to baptize them, as a new beginning, in a de novo revival of true baptism. In other words, *John Spilsbury is now being accused of doing what the Seekers did in general and Roger Williams did in particular. That would make Spilsbury one with the Seekers and Roger Williams on this question.* He was not, nor did he or any of the Seven Particular Baptist Churches in London do this. Many did, but these old Baptists did not, see Thomas Kilcop's *The Unlimited Authority of Christ's Disciples Cleared*, London; 1651.

Kilcop's work is very important because it answers the de novo charge against these Particular Baptists and totally denies it. Kilcop served the Petty France Church, gathered between 1641-1643, and received his baptism by means of Richard Blount efforts.

William Kiffen's *A Brief Remonstrance Of The REASONS and GROUNDS of those People commonly Called ANABAPTISTS, for their separation, &c.* London; 1645 is further evidence of the earlier and orderly origin of the London Particular Baptists. Kiffen affirms that the London Particular Baptist churches existed before the reformation in England just as they were then in 1645.

Hansard Knollys also shows that the conclusions of Gould-Whitsittism are incorrect. See Knolly's remarks in his

A MODERATE ANSWER UNTO Dr. BASTWICKS BOOK CALLED,

Independence not God's Ordinance Wherein, Is declared the manner how some churches in this city were gathered, and upon what terms their members were admitted; That so both the Doctor and the Reader may judge, how near some believers who walk together in the Fellowship of the gospel, do come in their practice to these apostolic Rules which are propounded by the Doctor as God's method in gathering Churches And admitting members, LONDON; PRINTED IANE COE. 1645

Method of Travel

I will start in Wales and then work toward London. In doing this, I will use mostly the original works and historical notes and studies from the very persons and churches in question. I will rely in part upon the very accurate historical publications of B. R. White and the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. None of these later writers were or are church successionists.

I will introduce and quote from the histories of some older churches in question, examples, Spilsbury's old church at Wapping, the church in the Hop Garden, the Hill Cliff

Church, and in Wales, the old Olchon church. I feel that these churches in question should be allowed to speak and tell their own history and testify to us about their origins and their history.

I am not a neo Landmark Baptist; therefore, I am not trying to justify a vote on baptisms nor church voting a church into existence practice, the begotten church concept. I am however an old school Particular Baptist who is trying to walk in the old landmarks of the historic Baptist faith and order. Many of our American Baptist churches came through the old Welsh Particular Baptist Church in Olchon, Wales. Many of the early American Baptist Churches owe their origin to the Welsh Baptists who came into being from the ministry of John Myles and Thomas Proud in the mid 1650s. These men came into Wales from the old Glass House Church in London. That church was constituted in the early 1640s through the revival of historic baptism in England known as the Blount mission.

The Blount Mission Introduced

Several believers left Jessey's Pedobaptist church in 1640 and set out to secure a traceable succession in their baptism. These believers sent Richard Blount over to Holland where he secured baptism from the old Anabaptist-Albigenses-Waldenses known in the mid 1600s as the Collegians. Upon his return, he baptized at least one other preacher and they in turn baptized about 50 others. From this revival, several Particular Baptist Churches sprang up in London. They joined with the already formed churches around John Spilsbury, William Kiffen and Paul Hobson. These three older churches were gathered in 1633, 1638 and 1639. This came about because these newer brethren then did not know of any baptized Particular Baptists already in London, see my studies on *The Kiffen Manuscript*.

Two Different Methods of Church Origins

Here is the difference between the two ways of gathering those old churches: the first church Spilsbury gathered seemed to come into being without any formal church connection. During those days the Laud led Anglicans persecuted the Anabaptists heavily and scattered their churches. The old brethren did not believe that it was necessary to come from a mother church directly, to form a new church. They did, however, believe that true baptism, a confession of the true faith and order of Christ, was necessary. They did believe in receiving baptism from one already baptized and commissioned by a gospel church. These older Both Hansard Knollys and William Kiffen prove this as did Thomas Kilcop. The Laud persecutions scattered many Baptist churches in the country. Some of these ministers and members fled into hiding in London. Others went into Holland or New England.

While the Anglicans scattered the *London* Particular Baptists, John Spilsbury was still there. He was already known as an Anabaptist Re-baptizer who baptized in Anabaptist fashion and ordained other ministers. This much Taylor, the Anglican historian, tells us. He began to gather a people in 1633 or before. The result was the existence of three Particular Baptist Churches in the London area by 1639 with a probability of other outreaches elsewhere. These three later joined with the Blount churches and made up the Seven Churches in London that issued the First London Confession of Faith.

Spilsbury and Kiffen Never Divided

The last false concept I will correct is that John Spilsbury and William Kiffen divided over pulpit affiliation. Thomas Crosby began to circulate this false report. Even J. R. Graves adopted this view and promoted it. *It was not so*. You will see that when Kiffen and

Spilsbury parted it was due to Spilsbury's leaving London because of persecution and his moving into the country where he took over the charge of a new church with a large membership. The two churches separated in their meeting due to persecution. Kiffen and Spilsbury remained one until their respective deaths.

Centuries later, the Whitsittes would claim the same about J. M. Pendleton and J. R. Graves. Modern Southern Baptists and others claim that these old men of God parted ways in the early 1860s over the issue of Old Landmarkism, Pendleton abandoned Graves and Old Landmarkism. This is not true either. Pendleton was a Northern and a Federalist. He and Graves parted company over the American Civil War. In Pendleton's own final work, *Reminiscences of a Long Life*, written just three months before he died, he affirms to the end his stand in favor of Old Landmarkism. Here are some of John Spilsbury's personal beliefs:

1. He believed in the true and proper deity of Jesus Christ, and affirmed particular redemption in opposition to general redemption;
2. He did not believe in the universal, invisible church; but held that all particular or gospel churches made up the one Mt. Sion or the general church. This was made up not of individuals but of churches;
3. He believed that the Papal church and her daughters, all Pedobaptists churches, were from Babylonian;
4. He believed that the general Baptist ministers were of Satan as well as all others who taught Arminianism;
5. He believed that a gospel or particular church was made up of baptized believers, and that following baptism, then persons were to be admitted to the Lord's Supper;
6. He believed in the continued succession of the true gospel, the true ministry, the true baptism and the true church and all other gospel ordinances;
7. He held to the ordinance of hearing, that is, the saints should only hear the true ministers of the gospel, those of their faith and order, and all others should not be heard;
8. He held to the congregation order of a gospel church and affirmed that believers in a gospel church could rightly choose out from among themselves one to be their minister or pastor;

He strongly believed these as well as other Biblical points. Here is his personal confession of faith:

JOHN SPILSBURY'S PERSONAL CONFESSION OF FAITH

1. I do believe that there is only one God, who is distinguished in 3 persons; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; yet but one in nature, or essence, without divisions, and incommunicable, who made the world, and all things therein, by the word of his power, & governs them by his wise providence.

2. I believe that God made man in his own Image, an upright and perfect creature, consisting of soul and body: which body God framed of the earth, and breathed into the same the breath of life, and man became a living soul. To whom

God gave a law, upon his keeping of which depends all his happiness, and upon the contrary attended his misery, which took effect; for he breaking that law, he fell under the curse, and wrath of God lay upon him and all his posterity. By which fall man lost the knowledge of God, and utterly disabled himself of all ability ever to recover the same again.

3. I believe God out of the counsel of his will, did, before he made the world, elect and choose some certain number of his foreseen fallen creatures, and appointed them to eternal life in his Son, for the glory of his grace: which number so elected shall be saved, come to glory, & the rest left in sin to glorify his justice.

4. I believe that God in the fullness of his own time, did send his son, the 2d. person, who in the womb of the virgin Mary, assumed mans nature, and in the same he suffered death upon the cross, only as he was man, to satisfy his Fathers justice, for the sins of his elect, & that he lay 3 days and 3 nights in his grave, from whence he arose the third day by the power of his Godhead, for the justification of all for whole sins he dyed, and that in the same body Christ dyed, he arose from the death, and afterwards ascended into heaven, the place of glory, where he was before, and there to remain until he comes at the last day to judge the world in righteousness.

5. I believe that God of his grace, in his own time, effectually calls such as shall be saved to the knowledge of the truth, who is said, of his own will to beget us by the word of truth: in which work of grace, nature is as passive, as a child in the parents begetting of it; and so God by His Spirit works faith in the hearts of all such to believe in Christ, and his righteousness, only for justification. And thus they are made righteous before God in Christ, and so conformable to the will of God the Father through the Son; and also made holy through the work of regeneration, and the holy Spirit of grace dwelling in them; yet all such have still, as long as they live here in the flesh, remaining in them, an old man, that original corruption, the flesh that wars against the spirit, which hinders them in their obedience both to God and to man, and many times draws them to that which is evil, and contrary to their intentions; yet all of them shall through Christ overcome, and safely be brought to glory at last.

6. I believe the holy Scriptures to be the word of God, and have the only authority to bind the conscience to the obedience of all therein contained, and are the all sufficient rule, by the Spirit of God to guide a man in all his obedience both to God and man.

7. As for the absence of original sin, and power in the will to receive and refuse grace and salvation being generally offered by the Gospel, and Christ dying for all persons universally, to take away sin that stood between then and salvation, and so laid down his life for a ransom for all without exception, and for such as have been one in God's love, so as approved of by him in Christ for salvation, and in the Covenant of Grace, and for such to fall so as to be damned eternally, and all of the like nature, *I do believe is a doctrine from beneath, and not from above, and the teachers of it from Satan, and not from God, and to be rejected as such that oppose Christ and his Gospel.*

8. I do believe the resurrection of the dead, that all shall rise and come to judgment, and every one give account of himself to God, and receive according to

the things done in their bodies, whether they be good or bad; therefore no conscience ought to be forced in the matters of Religion, because no man can bear out another in his account to God, if in case he should cause him to sin.

9. I do believe the powers that are, as the civil Magistrates, and so, are of God, to whom God hath committed the Sword of justice, for the punishing of evil doers, and for the good of such as do well, in which respect they ought to be honored, obeyed, and assisted by all men, and of Christians especially, and that out of conscience to God, whose ordinance and ministers they are, and bear not the sword in vain, Rom. 13, I Pet. 2, Tit. 3.

And lastly, I do believe that there is an holy and blessed communion of Saints, that God of his grace calls such as belong to life by election, unto the fellowship of his Son by the Gospel, of which matter, God by his word and Spirit joins them together in his Covenant of grace, and so constitutes his Church, as I have before showed: And as God hath thus built for himself an holy habitation of such pure matter, and also after so holy a manner, even so hath he provided a way of preservation and safety for the same; as Isa. 26:1. We have a strong City, salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks: which City is said to have a wall both great and high, and built upon twelve foundations; great, that none shall break through, and high, that none shall overtop or get over, and strong in the foundation, that nothing shall shake it, and God hath said, that he will be a wall of fire round about, and the glory in the midst of it, and that he will keep it, and watch over it by night and by day, that nothing shall hurt it; and as God hath built himself a house after his own mind, and is a guard to the same; even so he is also said to beautify the same with salvation, and to make the place of his feet glorious, and that he will lay all her stones with fair colors, and her foundations with Sapphires, and her windows of Agars, and her gates of Carbuncles, and all her boarders of pleasant stones, and all her children taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of her children. And as Christ does thus signify unto us the nature of his church both in respect of her matter, her form, her grace, and comely order in him her head; even so he holds forth his love to her, and delight in her, by these and the like expressions of comfort and solace. The Lord hath chosen Zion, &c. Pas. 132.13,14; pH. 2:21,23. Pas. 87.2,3; Gal. 4:26,31. Isa. 2.2; Isa. 62. 1,12, Ezek. 48:35. Rev. 21. 12,14, Zech. 2.5, Isa. 26.3, Isa. 4. 11,12,13. Rev. 21. 11,18,21, Cant. 4.7, Psal. 45.13.

FINISH

Taken from John Spilsbury's Treatise of Baptism; pps. 73, 74; our edition..

If he were alive today, where would we place him?

The Early Particular Baptist Groupings

In the 1630s and 1640s, the old brethren could be grouped into three classifications. What is interesting about this is that, there were essential differences between these churches, still, if the minister or some of the members were judged to have proper baptism, then these differences were not a bar to personal fellowship. In other words, Powell, in Wales was a mixed communion minister. The churches that walked with him and his friends were not allowed among the old order of Baptists, those in fellowship with the old Church at Olchon and those gathered under John Myles. Yet, the older brethren received Powell and

his preaching, because he was a baptized believer preaching the old gospel. The same is true later in England involving men like Jessey and Tombs.

Davis, in his *History of the Welsh Baptist*, stated:

As this denomination had always existed in the country, from the year 63, and had been so often and so severely persecuted, it was by this time an old thing. But the men who left the popish establishment were the chief objects of their rage; particularly as they boldly and publicly headed that sect that is everywhere spoken against, and planted, and reorganized Baptist churches throughout the country, like the men who were charged with turning the world upside down. The vale of Olchon, also, is situated between mountains almost inaccessible. How many hundreds years it had been inhabited by Baptists before William Erbury ever visited the place, we cannot tell. We have no account of him, or any other person baptizing there before the time we know that there was a Baptist church there; that is, in 1633. It is a fact that cannot be controverted, that there were Baptists here at the commencement of the Reformation; and no man upon earth can tell when the church was formed, and who began to baptize in this little Piedmont. Whence came these Baptists? It is universally believed that it (Olchon REP) is the oldest church, but how old none can tell. We know that, at the Reformation (that is when Laud was put down and Cromwell began, REP), in the reign of Charles the First, they had a minister named Howell Vaughan, quite a different sort of a Baptist from Erbury, Wroth, Vavasor Power and others, who were the great reformers, but had not reformed as far as they ought to have done, in the opinion of the Olchon Baptists. And this was not to be wondered at; for they had dissented from the church of England, and probably brought some of her corruptions with them, but the mountain Baptists were not dissenters from that establishment. We know that the reformers were for mixed communion, but the Olchon Baptists received no such practices. In short, these were plain, strict, apostolic Baptists. They would have order and no confusion- the word of God their only rule. The reformers, or the reformed Baptists whom they found on the mountains of Wales were no advocates for it. As the Baptists of Piedmont were much disappointed in the reformation of Luther; so these on the mountains of the Principality were, in some degree, disappointed in the reformation of their Baptist brethren in Wales. For the Olchon Baptists were like those Baptists that would not compromise matters with Austin. Indeed, they were so much like them, in many things too numerous to be mentioned, that they must have been a separate people, maintaining the order of the New Testament in every age, maintaining, the order of the New Testament in every age and generation, from the year 63 to the present time.

The Closed Membership Baptists

These Baptists maintained that a gospel church was made up of baptized saints only. They held *to in church officers and in church ordinances*. These Baptists form the main line of the older Particular Baptists during the 1600s.

The “Renegade” Baptists

These are so named by James Culross, in his *Hansard Knollys, A Minister and Witness of Jesus Christ*: London, 1895; page 66. For a time, some Baptist ministers received state pay for their preaching. In due time the churches disowned them and they were not allowed among the main line Particular Baptists. One example was Christopher Blackwood. The government, during the 1640s-1660s, paid some of these men to preach in areas where there were no established ministers or churches. The main body of Particular Baptists dealt with these as offenders and they were disowned or excluded. See for example, B. R. White's *Associational Records of the Particular Baptists 1650 to 1660*, pages 40, 41, 42, 214 and 215. Note especially Benjamin Cox's letter to Major General Richard Harrison. General Harrison was later executed for his political activities. We still have his personal confession made to the people just before his death. It is a remarkable testimony about his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and his convictions about the correctness of his life and work. The old Abington Association led the way in dealing with disorderly ministers.

The Open Membership Baptists

B. R. White so named these, see his *Particular Baptist Records*, pages 40-42. They were those few Baptists who denied that baptism was essential to the constitution of a gospel church. They also admitted the unbaptized to the Lord's Supper. In the 1630s Powell and his friends seem to have been of this sort. Later in the 1640-1680s, Henry Jessey, John Tombs and John Bunyan were of this sort. During their lifetime they made up a small minority and their followers were very few. Jessey and Bunyan were dissenters while Tombs never left the established church. He tried to reform the established church as a Baptist minister from the inside. The older brethren did not recognize his church yet they did not reject Tombs' baptisms administered nor his ministry. Nor did they reject Jessey's.

With these classifications understood, we can now move on.

Introduction to the 1630s

After the armies of the Living God overthrew Laud and his reign of terror, great revivals of pure religion appeared in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. During the days following the disfranchisement of Episcopacy, 1641-1660 the Baptist cause grew and multiplied. Later these revivals found their way even into Scotland. This does not mean, however, there were no true Christians or churches in those areas before the Cromwell Protectorate beginning near 1641. With the disfranchisement of Episcopacy, tolerance gave the dissenters the opportunity they needed to exercise some of their true and proper liberty. The Particular Baptists were among these dissenters. These revivals were not like modern Arminian revivals. The Holy Spirit caused and used the aggressive outreach of the gospel ministers and gospel churches. The Particular Baptist churches sent ministers everywhere. See my work *Vindication of the Old Paths*.

As we dig deeply into the pedobaptist writers, we find several bits and pieces of some value from Gangraea or Thomas Edwards, Presbyterian. In his *Gangraena*, volume 1, London 1646, he stated:

They (the Anabaptists-REP) send forth into several Countries of this Kingdom from their Churches in London, as Church acts, several Emissaries, members of their Churches, to preach, and spread their errors, to dip, to gather and settle Churches. They are not content with their own meetings on Lord's days, week days, keeping constant Lectures in set places for all to come to that will, thereby poisoning many in the City. They endeavor the leavening of all the Counties, as I might give instances of Lam, (Lamb, the General Baptist, REP) Kiffen, with many others sent abroad, yea are some sent into the North as far as York. Page 65.

Trying to make the Anabaptists look like the Jesuits, Edwards stated:

As the Jesuits are famous for sending out Emissaries into several Countries, to corrupt, not contenting themselves to do mischief at home, so do our Sectaries send forth their members into all Counties and places of this Kingdom. They lay hands upon, and send them as a church act to preach such and such errors, to rebaptize ect. Pages 45, 46.

He makes this interesting statement:

. . . these men were sent down from the Church as a Church Act unto the country of Esses to make Disciples and propage their way, and indeed into most counties of England (where these men can do with safety) some Emissaries out of the Sectaries Churches are sent to infect and poison the counties, some out of Lamb's, some out of Kiffen's, some out of others. About September last one Kiffen, an Anabaptist, went his progress in Kent, and did a great deal of hurt; and I have been informed from good hands, by the means of some that are acquainted and intimate with them, that not only Emissaries from London go into these nigher counties, as Esses, Kent, Suffolk, Harford, Cambridge, &c., but into Yorkshire and those Northern parts (since reduced to the Parliament) and no doubt also into the West; and several Sectaries went early to Bristol and those parts, as one Mr. Bacon, Sumonds, &c., and into Wales, also, so that we are like to have Sectarisme

like a universal Leprosy over-spread this whole Kingdom. I pray God keeps it out of Ireland; and I hope Scotland by God's mercy, and the benefit of the Presbyterian Government will keep it out there. Page 93.

They soon gained great numbers, formed churches in London, and afterwards went into other areas. Associations developed and gospel outreach and success alarmed both the Presbyterians and the disfranchised Episcopalians. Later, in about 1660, Episcopacy again became established and religious freedom ceased up until William of Orange brought it into the United Kingdom in 1689. By that time the Particular Baptists already had a stronghold that no persecution would destroy.

The question is where did these older Particular Baptists come from? How did they get such a strong start in England, especially in London? There are three basic answers to this question:

1. The successionist view, that the Particular Baptists, in some way came into being through a type of succession from the older Anabaptists on the Continent.
2. The Seeker view, that certain Particular Baptists formed themselves into unbaptized churches and then appointed one to baptism them, that is, they started dipping de novo.
3. The Whitsitt view, that no Baptists before 1641 practiced dipping for baptism, but certain of these Particular Baptists revived dipping and re-instituted it in England. They had no connection with any dippers before this was done.

During the times in question, and up to about the early 1800s, the first view dominated Baptist thought. Then, up to about the middle and late 1800s, may held to the second view. Following the 1890s to this present time, most Baptists hold to the third view. This is known as Whitsittism. It dominates the established downgrader historians. Even among some conservative Baptist groups, this view is maintained.

The first view is correct. How do I know, by checking into the original sources and writings of those who were involved during those times. If we let them speak, and believe them, which I do, then the first view is demonstrated. Why are most trying to promote either the second or third view? Because they who do this are part of the Protestant concept, that is, they hold to the universal, invisible church view. Therefore, there is no need for a true succession of gospel churches, ordinances and administrators. In addition, most who hold to the second or third views also deny many other Biblical fundamentals.

To summarize, because they also deny certain other Biblical fundamentals, they also deny the Divine origin and unbroken succession of Baptist Churches. Please take the time to read and study well my work on *Some Critical Lectures on Baptist Succession*. I examine the different concepts of succession and the different historians. This is a true conclusion: *Those Baptist historians who hold to verbal inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures and the Substitutionary Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, also held to the Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession of Baptist Churches. Those who did not, did not hold to Baptist Succession either.* Most Baptists who hold either the second or third views are Fullerites and involved in the new school legions of human inventions. They have little regard for the true and proper House of Christ and its furnishing.

My Thesis

My THESIS is, those who revived adult baptism by dipping into England in the 1630-1640s era, first received it from the old Albigenses-Waldensian-Anabaptists. This I can demonstrate by historic testimony. I will show there was an unbroken succession connecting the Particular Baptists with the older Albigenseian-Waldensian-Anabaptists.

Succession from the ancient Albigenses-Waldenses and Anabaptists in Holland

The personal links in this succession differ and have their connection with two different groups, one in Holland the other in the South of France. The names, dates and places are different because there were two different origins or connections with the already existing succession. Though they did it differently, either way, the succession is there. The first few know today. But there is enough evidence from the 1600s and early 1700s to show this connection.

The point is that the Particular Baptists in the 1600s-1700s believed that they came from the ancient Albigenses-Waldenses. This is where they placed their succession when they debated with the Pedobaptists. They were much closer to these events than we are today. Should we believe them or were they merely deceived and claiming falsehoods? See D'Anvers on [The French Connection](#) and my work on [The French Connection](#).

Richard Blount

Richard Blount went into Holland in the early 1640s. These two separate connections with the true succession laid the baptismal foundation for the Particular Baptist Churches that soon followed. They spread into New England in the late 1630s. They reached out into all parts of England in the 1640s, and also went into Wales, Ireland and Scotland in the late 1640s and early 1650s.

B. W. Carr stated on behalf of the deacons at the laying of the foundation stone for The Metropolitan Tabernacle:

By immersion, the converts to Jesus in Apostolic times made their public profession. In Godly and pious communities of the one church of Christ, the Primitive ordinance of discipleship has been practiced through an UNBROKEN SUCCESSION. The MTP, 1860, p. 347.

Our Thesis Summarized

Our thesis, there is an unbroken succession of baptism, properly administered, between the old Waldenses-Anabaptists and the English Particular Baptists. We are not talking about any church voting on baptisms, or churches voting other churches into existence, nor members being carried back to a mother church and then given authority to organize into a new mission or church. These, I feel, are all extra scriptural practices. Nor am I talking about a minister going back to receive a vote on new baptisms, nor new church constitutions. I am talking about the baptismal succession between the Particular Baptists and the old Waldensian-Anabaptists.

Testimony from Baptist Enemies as to Baptist Succession

Mosheim, the Lutheran historian of the 1700s, stated:

The origin of the sect, who from their repetition of baptism received in other communities, are called Anabaptists, but who are also denominated Mennonites, from the celebrated man to whom they owe a large share of their present prosperity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity. For they suddenly started up, in various countries of Europe, under the influence of leaders of dissimilar character and views; and at a time when the first contests with the Catholics so engrossed the attention of all, that they scarcely noticed any other passing occurrences. The modern Mennonites affirm, that their predecessors were the descendants of those Waldenses, who were oppressed by the tyranny of the Papists; and that they were of a most pure offspring, and most averse from any inclinations towards sedition, as well as all fanatical views.

In the first place I believe the Mennonites are not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from these Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled witnesses for the truth before Luther. Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, very many persons in those minds were deeply rooted that principle which the Waldenses, Wyclifites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly and others more openly; namely, that the kingdom which Christ set upon on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of holy persons; and ought therefore to be entirely free from not only ungodly persons and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation which was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the Mennonites; and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved some centuries before Luther's time, by those who had such views of the Church of Christ. Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 3, page 200.

Sir Isaac Newton stated:

The Baptists were the only Christians who had not symbolized with Rome. William Whiston, Memorials of Sir Isaac Newton, page 201.

Alexander Campbell, the founder of the so-called Church of Christ and Christian Church, stated:

I would engage to show that baptism as viewed and practiced by the Baptists, had its advocates in every century up to the Christian era. . . and independent of whose existence (the German Anabaptists), clouds of witnesses attest the fact, that before the Reformation, from popery, and from the apostolic age, to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists, and the practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced. The Campbell-MaCalla Debate on Baptism, Buffalo, 1824; pages 378, 379.

Robert Barclay, Quaker, stated:

We shall afterwards show the rise of the Anabaptists took place prior to the Reformation of the Church of England, and there are also reasons for believing that on the Continent of Europe small hidden Christian societies, who have held many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have existed from the times of the Apostles. In the sense of the direct transmission of Divine Truth, and the true nature of spiritual religion, it seems probable that these churches have a lineage or succession more ancient than that of the Roman Church. The Inner Life of the Societies of the Commonwealth, London; 1876: pages 11, 12.

Cardinal Hosius, a member of the Council of Trent, stated in 1560:

If the truth of religion were to be judged by the readiness and boldness of which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists since there have been none for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more generally punished or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to the most cruel sorts of punishment than these people. Hosius, Letters Apud Opera, 112-113; Baptist Magazine, CVIII, May, 1826.

Hosius stated again:

The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect. Of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem to have been, although some of them lately, as they testify in their apology, declare that they will no longer re-baptize, as was their former custom; nevertheless, it is certain that many of them retain their custom, and have united with the Anabaptists. Works of the Heresies of our Times, 1584 Book I page 431.

Luther said on one occasion:

The Anabaptists have been for a long time spreading in Germany. Michelet, Life of Luther; page 99.

Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer, said:

The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for three hundred years has caused great disturbance in the church, and has acquired such strength that the attempt in this age to contend with it appears futile for a time. Christian, Op., cit.,, p. 86

Linborch, the historian of the Inquisition, stated:

To speak my mind freely, if their opinion and custom were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that among all of the modern sects of Christians, they had the greatest resemblance to that of the Mennonites or Dutch Baptists. The History of the Inquisition, London; 1731: Vol. 1, page 57.

He was speaking of the identity of the Waldenses with the old Anabaptists.

Van Oosterzee stated:

They (Baptists) are peculiar to the Netherlands and are older than the Reformation, and must, therefore, by no means be confounded with the Protestantism of the sixteenth century, for it can be shown that the origin of the Baptists reaches further back and is more venerable. Herzog, Real Encyclopedia, IX. page 346.

I could go on and on, but must conclude these remarks with these statements from Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology in Gronigen and Rev. J. J. Dermount, Chaplain to the King of the Netherlands, when they stated to him:

The Mennonites are descended from the tolerable pure evangelical Waldenses, who were driven by persecution into various countries; and who during the latter part of the twelfth century fled into Flanders; and into the province of Holland and Zealand,

where they lived simple and exemplary lives, in the villages as farmers, in the towns by trades, free from the charge of any gross immoralities, and professing the most pure and simple principles, which they exemplified in a holy conversation. They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church of the Netherlands.

We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary, and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their denomination is the most ancient. Christian, Op., Cit., pages 95, 96.

John Spilsbury, (called by Baptist Union Historians) the First Particular Baptist re-baptizer stated:

Either Come All the Way to Baptism or Return Back to Rome

I must here conclude and say, that either such must go forward to baptism, or else turn back again from whence they came; for there is no middle way, not the least light in the word of God to bear up the same, but the contrary.

You shall not do whatsoever is right in your own eyes, for you are not as yet come to your rest, and to the inheritance which the Lord your God gives you, Deut. 12:8, 9. Arise and depart, for this is not your rest, because it is polluted, Micah 2:10, I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believes on me, shall not abide in darkness, John 12:46. And now why tarry ye, arise and be baptized, and wash away your (antichristian) sins, calling on the name of the Lord, Acts 22:16. They resisted the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him, Luke 7:30. Arise therefore and obey the Lord, and think not within yourselves, we are baptized already, and that by Antichrist, for I tell you, that you are never able to prove yourselves to be under the Lords holy ordinance of baptism, by all the light in Scripture, and art in nature, in that way you go, namely to deny the state as false and Antichristian, and yet retain your baptism there administered by the same power as the Lord's ordinance, and assume a Church to yourselves upon the same baptism. I speak in subjection, I think THE LAST CHURCH OR CHURCHES, THAT IS, ALL THE REFORMED CHURCHES, STILL RETAINING INFANT'S BAPTISM, ARE AS MUCH AGAINST THE RULES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS THE FORMER. *A Treatise of Baptism*, London, 1652; our reprint, 1993; page 64.

Again, when dealing with some Protestants (Praisegod Barebones in particular) who claimed that God placed His ordinances in the Whore of Babylon, the Roman Catholic Church, until the Reformation, Spilsbury stated:

Again, Secondly, God is said in the Scriptures to give or to send the vessels of His House to Babylon, as 2 Chron. 36:17, 18, 21; Jer. 27:21, 22; Dan. 1:2. Now let the like be showed, wherever God is said to give or send His ordinance of baptism unto Antichrist, until then the vessels of God's house remaining His ordinance in Babylon, shall make nothing for them to prove Antichrist's sprinkling of water on the face of

an infant, to be God's ordinance of Baptism, and for her being the MOTHER OF HARLOTS IS TRUE, Rev. 17.5 WHO HAS ALL FOR HER DAUGHTERS THAT DERIVE HER BAPTISM FROM HER, AS DO ALL THAT UPHOLD HER DOCTRINE OF INFANT-BAPTISM. Ibid., page 62.

My Outline in the Following Work

I will do the following:

1. Supply a large amount of material on the three oldest Particular Baptist Churches in the United Kingdom, the Olchon church at Wales, getting the most attention.
2. Then I will move into England and present the old church at Abingdon, which John Pendervars pastored in the 1650s, the Church in the Hop Garden.
3. Then the old Church at Hill Cliff.
4. Then I will supply a list of some of the oldest Baptist Churches in England, irrespective of their theological beliefs. Many of these date back into the 1500s.
5. The reason I am doing this is to demonstrate by documented evidence that Baptists existed in the United Kingdom and New England before 1641.
6. I will show the oneness of these old churches with John Spilsbury, William Kiffen Benjamin Cox, and the other Particular Baptist ministers and churches which issued what is called The First London Confession of Faith.

Part I

The Ancient Welsh Baptist Churches.

According to Mosheim, the origin of the Anabaptists is hidden in the remote depths of antiquity and is therefore difficult to ascertain. Cardinal Hossius stated in the 1500s that the Anabaptists have caused trouble to the Church for about 1200 years. Various historians have placed the origin of the English and Welsh Baptists in the first Century. Those who first planted the gospel there are affirmed to have come from the Apostle Paul and his Roman ministry. I find no reason to deny these statements.

Wales

In Wales, Christ's witnesses found hiding places during times of severe persecutions. Often when persecution raged on the Continent or in England, Wales became the hiding place. When persecution came into Wales, which was not as often as elsewhere, old Olchon became the mountain hid away.

There is little direct and plain evidence about many of the old Baptists in Wales during the pre-1600s. This does not mean they did not exist, but simply that the evidence about them is difficult to come by. However, we do have evidence about the old Baptist Church at Olchon. I will now quote from the South Wales Argus, the Hereford Times, and from Mrs. W. J. Jones of Olchon Court, Llanveynoe, Herefordshire Ha 2 onl, and then from John Howells, about 1875, a Welsh Baptist historian and minister. Mrs. W. L. Jones, an elderly

lady, supplied these documents to some members of the Welsh Tract Baptist Church in the late 1980s.

From the South Wales Argus, July 11, 1968, Sketchbook No. 781 entitled:

**In the Longtown Valley part 2: to Olchon Court
Written and illustrated by Fred J. Hando**

Originally a water-splash, the ford is now a concreted caseway, and I assure you that the challenging incline ahead is of good surface and leads to a heavenly track between the Hatterall and the "Cat's Back." Ultimately we pause to take the prospect of a dip and a rise in the road, surmounted by a very ancient homestead-Olchon Court.

In the read courtyard of Olchon Court, Mrs. N. I. Jones greets me. For the next hour I am conducted around the house and instructed in its lore. "The old name of this place was Court Walter. It was the fifteen-century home of Walter Brut, who called himself a 'Christian of the Britons.' Sir John Oldcaste, Lord Cobham, took refuge here during the persecution of the Lollards.

Strange to connect Sir John the Lollard with the Sir John who helped to (cannot make out the next few words) for the Duke of Burgundy in 1411, and who was probably Shakespeare's prototype for Falstaff! His work for the Lollards was the cause of his excommunication and barbarous execution in 1413.

"And the date on our beam," said my hostess, "is 1419." Mrs. Jones and her family have renovated the house with still and reverent care. It seems clear that, like our Welsh longhouses, Olchon Court, housed residents and cows, separated of course by a passage which contained a bread-oven projection and a draw-bolt-one of many. The "bull-cote." Now a kitchen, had mangers and over its five beamed ceiling, a granary. Oak timbers throughout were massive and solid. After months of painstaking treatment they shine like mirrors and add greatly to the charm of the Court. Unexpected constructions abounded, and I must include in my brief description the five floorboards which could be slid out when five pegs were removed and gave entrance by a loft-ladder to a bedroom with no door. I was shown that in a dining which contained a stone shelf 4 ft. high and 9ft. long and a fireplace with a lintel 7ft. 6in. (This ends the article. REP)

Next is from the Hereford Times by a Merthyr Pilgrim, August, 1873.

This is becoming once more an age of Pilgrimages, linages in France, and Canterbury in Britain, have been lately visited by itinerant devotees to their far-famed Shrines. The humble writer of these lines likewise lately has made a Pilgrimage to a sacred spot, and that is to these of thousands in England, and especially in Wales, a Holy Place.

The locality visited is Olchon, and Olchon Court in the County of Hereford. It is situated nearly at the head of the narrow but picturesque glen that leads up from the Pandy Station on the Great Western line via Hereford, passing by Oldcastle and Longtown to the very foot of the Black Mountains.

The Narrow vale beneath is very fruitful and luxuriant, and looks now in the autumn-tide very beautiful and bewitching. Full of cornfields laden with yellow grain, and

orchards wealthy with fruits of various kinds. To this place, viz. Olchon, there came about the year 1624 or 1625, two gentlemen from the South of Pembrokeshire named respectively the Rev. W. Jones, rector of Kilmaenllwyd, in Carmathenshire, and Mr. Griffiths Howells, freehold farmer of Rhydsiaccer farm near the little but lovely town of Narbeth. They felt convinced, from a careful perusal of the New Testament, that the forms and principles of true religion had been corrupted. After much inquiry about a people whose worship was simple and pure, they heard that there were a few people at a spot named Olchon, who, in loneliness and seclusion and remoteness, through fear of being molested in their religious services, here in this romantic gorge worshipped God in spirit and in truth. They-the few people of Olchon-were visited occasionally by those of the same faith and practice as themselves from London, and, amongst others, the well-known John Cann, and the Boanerges of his day and age, Vavasor Powell.

Olchon Court is a little above the place where the ruins of the old Chapel stand, where lived in the 14th and 15th centuries Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, the Lollard (one of the many names of the sect of Baptists) who, have escaped here from his persecutors was brought back and executed in the Tower of London for treason and heresy.

The name Olchon signifies in Welsh, "washing", and was doubtless given to the persons in this remote and romantic glen because of their peculiar method introducing their members of their fellowship, viz., by the rite of immersion.

Below here are the David crags, where, as rural tradition informs us, ages ago the Primitive Christians worshipped God in purity and simplicity, drawing branches of trees and boughs of holy and thrones after them to conceal their tracks from their lurking persecutors.

The whole glen is full of striking reminiscences of enduring Christianity in the times of intolerance and oppression.

Here at Olchon the two Pembrokeshire visitors and enquirers were welcomed and immersed in the crystal stream hard by, and then ordained by the laying on of the hands of the grace presbytery, the one to be a Bishop or Pastor, the other to be an Elder to form a Church far away in the end of Pembrokeshire. They returned, and were successful. Mr. Jones, for his heresy, was sent for a while to Hanefordwest Castle Goal.

In the course of time Jones and Howells and their followers built two Chapels, and from these have sprung the hundreds of Baptist Chapels, and tens of thousands of members in South Wales and Monmluthshire.

The Old Chapel is now in ruins, but it is likely to be rebuilt shortly. Preaching is occasionally conducted hard by in a farmhouse by Mr. Howells, Baptist minister of Longtown, who peregrinates much around to preach the Gospel to the people. On Wednesday, the 15th inst., it was resolved to conduct a commemoration service in the farfold near the walls of the Old Chapel. A large number of people came together. In the afternoon, it was believed that full 500 were present. At 11 a.m. the Rev. Jones of Llanwerarth, and Mr. Pritchard of Capel-y-ffin, conducted the service. Afternoon service introduced by Mr. Cable of Bristol. The Rev. E. Probert of Pandy, J. Jones of Llanwerarth, and Thomas D. Mathias of Merthyr addressed the congregation. Mr. Mathias spoke about the early history of the Baptists, and how

from small beginnings, after ages of oppression and persecutions, they now numbered by scores of thousands in the Principality of Wales alone, besides England and Scotland. After this was held the prayer meeting, in which the Rev. Mr. Lewis (Chapel-y-ffin), T. D. Mathis, and John Howells (Longtown) took part. The farmers of the locality showed great hospitality to the visitors, and Mr. Howells of Longtown deserves great praise for his conduct and management of the services. In bidding adieu to this well-loved and heart revered shrine of pure Protestantism, I cannot help offering the following suggestions to my intelligent and impartial readers, viz., that in the imitation of the Rector from Kilmaenllwyd and the Yoman Howells, lies the only remedy for Ritualism and fond Superstition. They risked all for the pure unadulterated Gospel. We may, without risk of hardship in these sunny days, be the faithful and consistent followers of those who trod in the footsteps of the Apostles and primitive Christians. The axe, the thumbscrew, and the stake cannot henceforth injure or destroy us. Freedom, both civil and religious, is now our blest and holy possession. Many, if not most of my readers have never before heard or read of Olchon and its memories, and to such I would say in conclusion:

Let not ambition mock their useful toil, their homely worth, nor destiny obscure.

Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile, the short and simple annals of the poor.

Olchon Court

Olchon Court was formerly known as Court Wwol, or Court Nicol. It is a farm building with substantial walls of masonry. A notable feature is its 14th century porch and doorway. One room on the ground floor has a window that retains its original antiquity. This same room has a recess like an aumbry, or ambry, suggesting a possible ecclesiastical use.

A window in a room above is traditionally held to be the one through which John Oldcastle escaped from his pursuer. However, this was structurally altered and restored between the time of his period and 1897.

Locally known as Court Walter, Olchon Court is supposedly the home of Walter Brute, one of Herefordshire's earliest Lollards, and a man of considerable talent and learning. He was cited to appear before Trevenant, the Bishop of Hereford, in 1591, on a charge of heresy. It is thought that he was put to death at Bodenham.

One the side of the Black Mountain, Great Daren, may still be traced, by vestiges of the foundations, the outline of a small Lollard chapel. Tombstones bearing the date 1387 have been dug up in its burial ground. An interesting tradition underlining the secrecy of the sect states that the worshippers drew branches of holly behind them to obliterate their feet marks in the snow.

Observers and visitors have noticed the "Tranquility of Order" of Olchon Court, with its old porch, the large kitchen, the stone parlor, the carved oak chest, and the inlaid chest of drawers with its engraved brass locks and handles.

Sir John Oldcastle

Born in the year 1360 at Oldcastle in Almeley, probably. In his youth was a favorite of Henry V, before the latter's accession to the throne. Sir John later became Lord Cobham.

In 1413, his activities caused him to be charged with a breach of the Statute for his encouragement of the Lollards, particularly in the Dioceses of London, Rochester and Hereford. It was alleged that he was sending out "unlicensed preachers" and himself attending their meetings. He was thus committed to the Tower of London. However, he managed to escape from the Tower, and a rising of the Lollards occurred around London.

Sir John then fled into Wales. At that time there was a reward of 1,000 marks offered for his capture, dead or alive. Because of his friendship with the Brute family, it is believed that he spent his four years of freedom in the Olchon Valley. He escaped from his pursuers who had traced him to Olchon Court, by leaving the house via an upstairs window. However, he was soon captured because a Llanyeyno girl in a field knocked him down across the road from the house. A variation in this story is that a woman to whom he had shown 'many kindnesses' in the past threw something at him, thus breaking his leg. This led to his capture and arrest.

He was eventually hanged in chains and burned over a slow fire while hanging, in 13/December/1417: hanged as a traitor; burned as a heretic; betrayed by followers of the Earl of Pwll, he had been taken prisoner at Broniarth, Montgomeryshire.

John Howells' A Brief Sketch of the Old Baptist Church at Olchon

Mrs. W. J. Jones stated to some of us in a personal letter:

Some pages from a book written by the Baptist minister John Howells who was in the district in about 1875. The book was found by a strange coincidence in tatters miles away from here with pages missing. There is so much to talk about, I know John Howells somewhere in his book says there were Christian believers in this valley when some of the apostles were still living.

I do not have a complete copy of this history, only those pages supplied by Mrs. Jones. I will now place these before you.

A Brief Sketch of the Old Baptist Church at Olchon

OLCHON is on the Welsh border. It is situated in the County of Hereford. The ruins of the oldest Chapel belonging to the Primitive Baptists stands on the banks of the swift-flowing stream from which the narrow and romantic Valley of the Olchon takes its name. There is another old Baptist Chapel in a state of rapid decay at Ilston, in the peninsula of Gower, in the County of Glamorgan. But the Mother Church doubtless was this one at the Gellis, as the old historians called it, from the woods that fringe the steep hill-sides between here and the picturesque little town familiarly known as the Welsh Hay. Near to the old ruin in the which now more than three hundred years ago our Baptist forefathers worshipped, on the hill above it, to the westward, is Capel-y-ffln, or the boundary Chapel, so named because of the junction at this singular place of the three Counties of Brecknock, Monmouth, and Hereford; also the three Dioceses of Llandaff, St. David's and Hereford. In the dark ages of persecuting notoriety the Lollards, Waldenses, and Mennonites here found a little-known, concealed and secure asylum from the heresy hunting, gospel crushing; and havoc-making minions of the Antichristian and unspiritual 'Prelates of the a6renamed state-subsidized: and 'secularly supported Dioceses. Amid those wild solitude's, remote recesses, and secure fastness the pure word of God's lively

oracles was preserved undiluted and uncontaminated. Not far from the gradually crumbling and rapidly decaying Ancient Sanctuary stands another renowned and remarkable ruin, namely, the Herefordshire 'County Seat' of Sir John Oldcastle, styled also as lord Cobham. Sir John Oldcastle in all probability was baptized in the Rivulet that rushes contiguously by the aforesaid rustin, secluded, and venerable old chapel, in which afterwards he would be admitted by the Holy Elders and 'pious brethren into the Christian fellowship of, the only true and scripturally constituted Apostolic Church.

Sir John owned a large estate in and around this valley. He was an especial favorite of Harry of Monmouth, the son and heir of Henry the 4th, in the fifteenth century. On the death of the old King he settled in London, so as to be near to the person of the new young King. Some suppose that he was the original of Falstaff of Shakespeare's fat and foolish knight Previous to his conversion he may have indulged rudely and dissolutely along with other young noblemen in the, licentious' us. and disreputable. sports of the r.oysterirng youthful heir apparent. Whether the foregoing surmise, be true or false, I feel historically assured of this, to wit, that he was highly esteemed, and. greatly beloved of the frolicksome, young royal Prince. at one time. His espousal of the tenets, and practices of the Lollards, somewhat estranged him from the favor and affection of the Kingly court of St. James's, and Windsor Castle, Arundel, the, Archbishop of Canterbury, aided and abetted by the other Popish, Prelates, hunted his, life to destroy it. They poisoned the mind and the heart of the young episcopally subservient monarch' against him. He sought, to acquaint his quondam friend with, the true state of affairs, but the creatures of the Archbishop prevented all personal communication between him and the Monarch. Instigated by the false charges and lying allegations, of the cruel, crafty and unchristian church dignitaries, Sir, John was foiled in all his, efforts at getting an interview with his. former friend and confidential companion. Henry was made to believe that he defied him and meditated his dethronement. State-ecclesiastics have ever been infamous for both their evasion and. perversion of the truth. A warrant was issued for the apprehension of the Lollard Peer and the Baptist Lord Baron (he prudently hastened down, to his mansion, Olchon Court, until he could obtain an interview with his sovereign liege, the fickle-minded fifth Henry. Here, in his sylvan home, he was by a warrant from the archiepiscopal church at Lambeth, discovered, captured, and taken to London. Some' historians mistakenly say that he was apprehended, in North Wales, and removed from thence to the Tower of London. The tradition of his apprehension at his own mansion, in this sequestered wood-shaded, glen, is as fresh today in the current traditions of the locality as if the occurrence had taken place less than fifty years ago. Conveyed to the metropolis, he was again arraigned before the Privy Council, with the Archbishop at their head, and tried, condemned, and sentenced to death. He was an uncompromising believer in the baptism of adults, on a personal profession of their faith by immersion. For a more detailed and complete sketch of the life and martyrdom of this great Christian hero, the reader is referred to another section of this book. Wickliffe, and his poor preachers" also, were thorough Baptists, as his translation of the Bible plainly shows in his faithful version of the inspired page. Before Wickliffe, was Dr. Bradwardine, who flourished somewhere in the thirteenth century. He was one of the greatest scholars of his age. His principles were evangelical and scriptural. Bradwardine obtained his enlightened views and apostolic faith from "the poor men of...(Here are pages missing . The meaning is, the Poor men of Lyons, or the Waldenses, REP)

Powel were baptized. Hither came the Rev. William Jones, the rector of Cilmaenllwyd in Caermarthenshire, and Mr. Griffith Howells, the freehold yeoman of Rhydsiacer, near Narberth, and were immersed in the crystalline waters hard by. From here, as from a fresh fountain of spiritual life reissued forth the pure river of the water of life, to renew the face of the habitable earth on the subsidence of the overwhelming deluge of pseudo catholic - superstition that had inundated the churches of saints, and swept nearly all away the doctrines of grace and the discipline of pristine Christianity from the Island of Great Britain, the Continent of Europe, and the whole of the wide, wide World.

The precious records of' this unconsumably burning bush have been unfortunately lost. The Rev. Joshua Thomas, of Leominster, the Baptist historian of above a century ago, failed to find a single scrap, or the smallest fragment, though he carefully and diligently sought for them, - of the archives of this illustrious golden candlestick.

It has been God's goodwill to leave us in impervious gloom regarding is ancient date and its checkered career, excepting a faint gleam here and there, such as I have striven to collect from all available tradition and from written history. Previous to the erection of the old chapel whose walls, blackened with the long lapse of the numerous centuries, as already stated, are still standing, the unbackslidden night~watchmen of an incorruptible and imperishable New Testament community, worshipped in the caves 'of the hills and the clefts of the' rocks at the Daran goch and the Daran fawr.

A busy and an active imagination recreates, and a discursive, though reverential fancy reproduces, the antique forms and the celestially vivacious visages of the martyr heroes of primitive times, who would' not yield to' the infernal foe, nor succumb to the satanic myrmidons of either the Pagan Priesthood of ancient or the apostate sacerdotalists of modern Rome and of an effete and emasculated Christianity. Roman Consuls, Saxon Dane, Danish Viking, Norman Magnate, Plantagenet Prince, Tudor Tyrant, and Stuart Despot, have tried in vain to destroy and stamp out the intrepid loyal lieges of Prince Immanuel, our sole master our high-exalted king, our anointed high priest, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. The undying passion of those forefathers-above referred to for His adorable person, His crimson cross, His immutable truth, His faithful promises, His unimpeachable principles, His uncreated splendors, His ineffable charms, His peerless excellencies, His unsullied glories-carried them victorious through every trial, hardship, temptation, and suffering, which they were called upon to endure for His name's sake. . Nothing could shake their confidence in His truth, beauty, and goodness; nothing could daunt their ardor in His cause, their fidelity to His royal commands, their flaming fervor in 'His service, their glorying in His changeless perfections. " They counted not their lives dear unto themselves that they finish their course with joy."

During the time they were conserving and perpetuating the form of sound doctrine amid those rugged recesses and pastoral wilds, amid the bleating of the free-roving mountain sheep, the hoarse 'cry of the bittern in the marshy and reedy pools, the plaintive cry of the curlew, the shrill whistle of the plover, the harsh croak of the dusky raven, the gusty clamors of the raving tempest, and the monotonous roar of the flood-swollen torrents, the rest of the. more thickly- inhabited localities of England and Wales were immured in cimmerian darkness, and enwrapped in the gloomy folds of a base and well nigh Christless superstition. Pilgrimages were

being made triennially to the tomb' of St. David on the shores of the Irish Sea. St. Winifred's Pool at Holywell was frequented by thousands who flocked thither to bathe their diseased bodies, amid the incantations of mercenary Priests, and the fond and foolish ceremonies of a paganised ritual, uttered in an alien tongue, and performed with postures and grimaces borrowed from the false worship of Heathen gods and goddesses. Here the Lord's Day was celebrated along with the simple and 'sedate observance of the Lords Supper; hymn, 'and prayer, and sermon were' gone through with the same' pious routine which had prevailed from the memorable season when the upper room at Jerusalem was visited,' by "the powers of the world to come." It was a day of calm, devotional repose, from dawn to dewy eve, wherein they worshipped the Father in spirit and in truth. The Welshman's candle of pious Vicar Prichard was lit from the lambent flame that unquenchably blazed on the hallowed Altar of Olchon Sanctuary. It was from "this Mountain of the Lord " that the saintly rector of Llanddowror drew the inspiration that fed the fervid longings of his soul, for a fresh and a fuller consecration of Cambria to the pure service and acceptable worship of God. Yes I Here amid the hanging woods, rugged rocks, and sylvan solitudes of the vale below, and frequently mistwreathed mountains above, the Ark of the Lord was kept from utter destruction. What Noah's Ark was' to the new world of a restored generation , What the Shepherd colony of Goshen was to the degenerated nations of' the earth in the' days of the ancient Pharaohs, and the worship of the slimy reptiles of the Nile-What the Tabernacle of Shiloh was in the days of Samuel the prophet-What the Temple on Salem's radiant hills was to the ancient Monarchies of the East, and their nature worship - What the later glories of the Jewish Theocracy were to the barbaric devotions and sensuous religions of Greece and Rome- such was the lowly edifice and its pious assembly at this divinely selected and sacredly sequestered spot. From here old Hengoed Church took its rise, Llanharan, Iston too, I believe, Rhydwylym, Molleston, and Liangloffan. Here has been the perennial mountain; the temple threshold, from beneath which has rippled forth the crystal~healing streams which to day lave the lovely vales and flow over the lofty hills our peerless principality. Let Olchon not be forgotten then, but held in everlasting remembrance by the baptized believers in particular of our various commission churches. What Mecca is to the Mussulman, St. Peter's at Rome to the Papist, Benares to the Hindoo, the grave of Carfucius to the Chinaman, Thibet to the Buddhist, the Kremlin of Moscow to the Russian, such and mote is, or ought to be, the venerable shade of old Olchon Chapel ruin, to the obedient and loyal - believers of innumerable Apostolical ecclesiastics.

A memorial of' permanent continuance ought to be erected here in the enclosed burying grounds of the New Chapel recently erected. A marble pillar with a suitable inscription should be placed before the New Temple, in loving memory and grateful recognition of our indebtedness to the heroic forefathers who, in this remote and classic region, kept undimmed the lamps of the christian tabernacle, and have been blessed and honored to hand down to us, their descendants, "the faith once delivered to the saints."

The friends of pure and undefiled religion at this romantic place deserve well of our faithful and flourishing churches, both in England and in Wales. They are 'but humble, homely shepherds, whose fleecy charges are pastured upon the short and meagre herbage upon the bleak and wild moorlands of the continuous black mountains. I hope the wealth-endowed Philemais, Chusans, Nicodemusses, Gamsses, and the Marys and Marthas of our churches, will open their hearts and their purses to bestow of their silver and of their gold to liquidate the remaining liabilities of the good and worthy folk already referred to.

I cannot avoid thinking that some may cavil contentiously at the statements I have made, and capaciously require of me more historic proof and stronger authentic evidence than what I have added, for the bold, fearless, and, uncompromising assertions which I have made. I can assure my cautious, circumspect, and critical reader that for many years I have read all that has been published on the matters in question, regarding the origin, antiquity, and chequered fortunes of this ancient mother church, of most of the Welsh Baptist churches, and some of the Congregational assemblies as well. I have forgotten the names of several of my authorities, but I have retained the substance of the information oh, tamed from them. 'Likewise, it has been my favorite habit to collect all the available traditional lore which I could come by, from old hoary-headed men and women, gifted with retentive memories, and fond of communicating all the information they could collect regarding ancient times, persons, events, and circumstances.

What I have written, and yet may write, is the sum and substance therefore of much and most valuable traditional lore. On the wild, unfenced, moory mountain above Olchon farm, Olchon stream, and Olchon dilapidated, crumbling, ecclesiastical shrine, is situated the boundary of the three counties already mentioned and of the three dioceses of Llandaff; St. David's, and Hereford, so that it became for numerous centuries the alsatia or common resort of the persecuted 'saints of the Waldensian and Lyonnese churches in Great Britain. It, was the woman's hiding place, as spoken of in the 12th chapter of the Revelation of John the Divine, the Patmos exile. I should not omit mentioning that, whilst all other Protestant bodies of Christians date their origin back, directly or indirectly, to Luther, Zuinguis, Calvin, Knox, and the other leading spirits of the sixteenth century Reformation, the Baptists alone can trace their unbroken, uninterrupted descent from' the Parent Church, not of Rome, but of Jerusalem. Not from the reign of Constantine, or Henry' the Eighth, and the Nicene or the Puritan Fathers, but from the Apostles and primitive Teachers, Pastors, and Evangelists of the first century of the Christian era. They never broke away from the Apostate Latin Church, but it schismatically and degeneratively broke away from them, To this day the Papal Church in her Church History and in the decretals of her arrogant and flagitious Pontiffs declares that there is no argument to be held, or discussion 'maintained with the incorrigible Waldenses and Albigenses, the putative forefathers of the modern Baptists, save the argumentative debate of fire and sword. I have read it myself in a Papal Church History, lent me some years ago now, by a friendly Roman Catholic Clergyman belonging to the Order of "My Lady of Mount Carmel." We, as Scriptural Baptists, dwell alone amongst our own people, "the friends of all and the enemies of none." The tongue of, slander and the pen of calumny has been busy frequently with our names; lying tales and baseless libels have been repeatedly published by nearly all bodies of nominal Christians, in order to defame our reputation, blacken and vilify our characters. Rome and her minions, the Prelatical Hierarchy of State churchianity in all countries, and some Protestant dissenting writers even have been most industrious in forging lying legends regarding our fellowship, " a Sect everywhere spoken against" from the reign of Constantine, or Henry' the Eighth,' and the Nicene or the Puritan Fathers, but from the Apostles and primitive Teachers, Pastors, and Evangelists of the first century of the Christian era. They never broke away from the Apostate Latin Church, hut it schismatically and degeneratively broke away from them. To this day the Papal Church in her Church History and in the decretals of her arrogant and flagitious Pontiffs declares that there is no argument to be held, or discussion maintained with the incorrigible, Waldenses and Albigences, the' putative forefathers of the modern Baptists, save

the argumentative debate of fire and sword. I have read it myself in a Papal Church History, lent me some years ago now, by a friendly Roman Catholic Clergyman belonging to the Order of "My Lady of Mount Carmel." We, as Scriptural Baptists, dwell alone amongst our own people, "the friends of all and the enemies of none." The tongue of, slander and the pen of calumny has been busy frequently with our names; lying tales and baseless libels have been repeatedly published by nearly all bodies of nominal Christians, in order to defame our reputation, blacken and vilify our characters. Rome and her minions, the Prelatical Hierarchy of State churchianity in all countries, and some Protestant dissenting writers even, have been most industrious in forging lying legends regarding our fellowship, " a Sect everywhere spoken against," as for instance the nudity of the Munster, Matthias, Knipperdoller and their followers, both in Holland and in Germany. Luther, I grieve to state, 'detested us and encouraged the persecutions of the Dutch and other Baptists. Fox's Book of Martyrs is chiefly filled with the names and sufferings of baptized believers who refused to desecrate their infants with the unauthorized and unwarranted aspersion of apostolically unprescribed water. Fox, true somewhat to his name, has not had the candor and frankness to inform his readers that the great majority of his registered martyrs belonged to the despised and disparaged fraternity whose head quarters for ages was situate in the Valley of the Olchon. The scarlet, thread that helps us to trace our gapless lineage backwards to the primitive Christians of earliest times, is the fact of their refusal to immerse any but professed personal believers in the Divine Verities. They made no compromise with apostasy. Their immutable motto was "No surrender" to any fond inventions or traditions of men. Their battle cry was "'Y gwir yn erbyn y byd," that is, "the truth against the world." The word of God revealed in the Holy Scriptures was their rule of faith and code of discipline. Like the angels spoken of, in the 103rd Psalm, "they did God's commandments, hearkening to the voice of His word." I have dwelt the longer upon this, because this was the reason they were brow-beaten, maligned, abhorred, and persecuted by all sects and parties of alas! well nigh universally corrupted Christianity. Not that they believed there was any saving ~ efficacy in believers' baptism by immersion, or that none other would be admitted to heaven except the members of Baptist communities. They presumed not-like the Pontifical churches-the Ultramohtane adherents of "the Sacred College "- " The Latin Curia," to doom all outside the pale of their own communions to the covenanted mercies and retributive wrath of God. They conceded that liberty to others which they claimed for themselves. They ~ were no bigots, neither were they fanatics; they taught the liberty of Gospel Faith, and left equity and judgment to the Omniscient searcher of hearts. They taught and believed in the sole infallibility of God's revealed word, and if others put another interpretation upon it than what they put upon it, they left the decision in the hands of a God of infinite righteousness, and illimitable knowledge. They taught the principles of civil and religious liberty, when all the world besides practiced persecution against every ~ other form of religious belief besides their own. They were and are the fathers of radical politics, and a free-trade Christianity; coercion and physical force was hateful to their souls, for voluntaryism was the very taproot of their church constitution and government. Believing that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, they kept aloof from the least appearance of compulsion, dictation, and mere human authority.

I began with Doctor Bradwardine in the thirteenth century because of the limitation of the space at my disposal. I could have begun with the first century, and carried the succession of pastors and churches downwards to this, the end of the nineteenth century. This would have been a congenial task to my taste and inclination, but it would have been far beyond the scope of this summarized survey

of the church, of the commission at Olchon, and elsewhere, from the days of Bradwardine, Chaucer, John Ball (or Beale), Wickliffe, Sir John Old Castle, the Lollards, Caxton, Tyndal, and John Cann, down to the time of the Protestant Reformation. The relics, as I said, of the old, sacred, and memorable fabric where scriptural believers met, and of Olchon Court-the once proud Lordly seat of Sir John Oldcastle-are worthy of a visit.

If any should doubt or deny my advisedly daring and deliberate avowals, I challenge contradiction and defy all hostile criticism. I take my stand on carefully sifted, unbiased, and unprejudiced tradition; I have sought out amongst the posterity of the old members of Olchon, all that they, their lineal descendants, could tell me. I have perused carefully and exhaustively the chroniclers and narrators of Baptist worthies and Baptist antiquities, both with reference to their scriptural views, their few places of worship for generations, their devotional services and Christian lives, and I can come to no other conclusion in the sequel, than what, that here was the redundant source of our present day progress, and eighteenth and nineteenth century prosperity. The little one has become, not a thousand, but myriads of thousands, and the small one a strong nation. Who dares despise us now? Who would venture to coin calumnies at present to bring us into contempt and derision? We are able hence to bind their princes with chains, and their kings with fetters of iron. I can hear, methinks, and near at hand as well, the musical roar of the incoming, shoreward sweeping, Pentecostal tide of millennial, majestic, 'monumental splendor, when the now little known, and but slenderly appreciated renown of Olchon, shall be redolent with reverence, and resplendent with coruscations of glory. The fame also then of Sir John Oldcastle, and the long unnoted Lollards-the mediaeval Baptists-shall shine with unperishable and unquenchable luster, amid the supernal brilliance and unparalleled sublimities of a day of beatific radiance, and an age of supremely sabbatic serenity, transparent luminosity, and celestial exultation. The saints of the genuine Church of the Savior, in their might memories and resurrected remembrances, shall live (this old work ends here, REP).

J. Davis' History of the Welsh Baptists

In Davis' *History of the Welsh Baptists*, there are many interesting statements about this old church. I will quote from a few:

The vale of Carleon is situated between England and the mountainous part of Wales, just at the foot of the mountains. It is our valley of Piedmont; the mountains of Merthyn Tydfyl, our Alps; and the crevices of the rocks, the hiding-places of the lambs of the sheep of Christ, where the ordinances of the gospel, to this day, have been administered in their primitive mode, without being adulterated by the corrupt church of Rome. It was no wonder that Penry, Wroth and Erbury, commonly called the first reformers of the Baptist denomination in Wales, should have so many followers at once, when we consider that the field of their labors was the vale of Carleon and its vicinity. Had they like many of their countrymen, never bowed the knee to the great Ball of Rome, nor any of the horns of the beast in Britain, it is probably we should not have heard of their names: but as they were great and learned men, belonging to that religion, (or rather irreligion) established by law, and particularly as they left that establishment and joined the poor Baptists, their names are handed down to posterity, not only but their friends, but also by their foes, because more notice was taken of them than those scattered Baptists on the mountains of the Principality. As this denomination had always existed in the country, from the year 63, and had been so often and so severely persecuted, it was

by this time an old thing. But the men who left the popish establishment were the chief objects of their rage; particularly as they boldly and publicly headed that sect that is everywhere spoken against, and planted, and reorganized Baptist churches throughout the country, like the men who were charged with turning the world upside down. The vale of Olchon, also, is situated between mountains almost inaccessible. How many hundreds of years it had been inhabited by Baptists before William Erbury ever visited the place, we cannot tell. We have no account of him, or any other person baptizing there before the time we know that there was a Baptist church there; that is, in 1633. It is a fact that cannot be controverted, that there were Baptists here at the commencement of the Reformation; and no man upon earth can tell when the church was formed, and who began to baptize in this little Piedmont. Whence came these Baptists? It is universally believed that it (Olchon REP) is the oldest church, but how old none can tell. We know that, at the Reformation (that is when Laud was put down and Cromwell began, REP), in the reign of Charles the First, they had a minister named Howell Vaughan, quite a different sort of a Baptist from Erbury, Wroth, Vavasor Power and others, who were the great reformers, but had not reformed as far as they ought to have done, in the opinion of the Olchon Baptists. And this was not to be wondered at; for they had dissented from the church of England, and probably brought some of her corruptions with them, but the mountain Baptists were not dissenters from that establishment. We know that the reformers were for mixed communion, but the Olchon Baptists received no such practices. In short, these were plain, strict, apostolic Baptists. They would have order and no confusion- the word of God their only rule. The reformers, or the reformed Baptists whom they found on the mountains of Wales were no advocates for it. As the Baptists of Piedmont were much disappointed in the reformation of Luther; so these on the mountains of the Principality were, in some degree, disappointed in the reformation of their Baptist brethren in Wales. For the Olchon Baptists were like those Baptists that would not compromise matters with Austin. Indeed, they were so much like them, in many things too numerous to be mentioned, that they must have been a separate people, maintaining the order of the New Testament in every age, maintaining, the order of the New Testament in every age and generation, from the year 63 to the present time.

Notwithstanding the Baptists in Wales were very numerous in 1653, yet there were but six or seven churches of the old Baptist order. However, the differences between them and V. Powell and other reformers, was not a bar of communion. At the same time, it is evident, that they had a more intimate fellowship with one another. Six of them joined together in an association; namely, Olchon, Llanwerarth, Llantrisant, Swansea, and Carmarthen-the other was the church of Dolan. All the other churches, and numerous religious societies, gathered by the instrumentality of the reformed Baptists, such as Penry, Erbury, Wroth, V. Powell, and others, had not as yet joined this association. J. Davis, History of the Welsh Baptists, Pittsburgh; 1835, edition published by The Baptist, 1976, pages 19, 20.

John Miles and the old Church at Olchon

The Glass House Particular Baptist Church in London, sometimes called Glazier's Hall church, sent John Miles and Thomas Proud into Wales to do gospel outreach work. When they got there, they constituted several churches and these churches joined with the old Church at Olchon to form the Welsh Baptist Association in 1650.

William L. Lumpkin stated:

An Antidote Against the Infection of the Times, 1656

The early growth of the Welsh Particular Baptist cause is largely to be accounted for by the zeal and administrative ability of John Myles, who is chiefly responsible for *An Antidote*. An Oxford graduate, Myles had begun to preach in Wales by 1644 or 1645, probably as an Independent. Meeting some Particular Baptist who belonged to a detachment of the New Model Army, sent to Wales in 1648, he was converted to their views. In the spring of 1649, he journeyed to London, where he was baptized on profession of faith. The Glass House church welcomed him with enthusiasm and recorded that his coming was an answer to prayer for home missionaries. (They didn't use those terms, for they didn't call their outreach ministers missionaries, REP.)

After a fortnight's stay in London, during which time he became acquainted with the practices of the leading Particular Baptist churches, he returned to Gower with the endorsement of the Glass House Yard Church and threw himself into his work. Five congregations were under his care by 1652, all practicing close communion. There were, however, other Baptists in Wales; and to protect themselves against the easier discipline of the Arminian Baptists and the milder doctrinal views of certain Particular Baptists, Myles effected an organization of his churches which gave the General Meetings so close a supervision over them as to approach presbyterianism. *(If a person reads the minutes of these old meetings, he will see this is not so. Lumpkin's evaluations must be taken with a grain of salt. His historical facts are very good however. REP)*

The originality of the Confession must be traced to the genius of Myles, and both the symmetry of thought and the force of expression of the document do credit to the abilities of the author. The Confession is divided into three sections. The first, "Considerations presented to Sinners," is the doctrinal section; the second, "Admonitions to Saints," concerns the five "reigning corruptions" of the day; and the third, "Invitations to the Backsliders," contained practical considerations for erring Christians.

The Confession served as a rally point for the "Close" Baptists, while other Welsh Baptist groups were shattered by the Quaker movement. Baptist Confessions of Faith, pages 216-217.

More from Davis' history, page 38:

John Myles began to preach about the year 1645. He was the founder of the Baptist church at Swansea, Galmorganshire, South Wales. He was one of the greatest advocates for close communion in the Principality, in his time, and the leading minister of the Baptist denomination in Wales.

The church at Swansea was formed in the year 1644. (Mistake on that date, it was 1649-REP) In that year, John Myles, the pastor of the church at Swansea, wrote a letter to the church of Olchon, in which he promised to pay them a visit and defend the practice of close communion; which also he did. And in the following year, he sent there another epistle on that subject, which may be seen recorded in the church book at Abergavenny.

In 1651, he was sent as the representative of all the Baptist churches in Wales, to the Baptist ministers' meeting at Glazier's Hall, London, with a letter giving an account of the peace, union, and increase of the Baptist churches; and returned with a written letter from the London ministers to their brethren in Wales, in which they were advised to form new churches; so that their members who lived at a distance, might be made more useful; and that several of the small churches so formed should meet together, as often as convenient, to break bread. And as their ordained ministers were comparatively few, they were advised to look out for the most gifted among themselves, by whom they might be edified in the Lord; for, in so doing, they might find out some to labor in word and doctrine among them.

At this time, please note the close connection with the old church at Olchon, or the Hay, with the newly formed churches under the ministry and care of John Myles. They were not separated from the London Particular Baptist churches, but in very close connection with them. *They even represented at the London Particular Baptist meetings when they could do so.*

Joshua Thomas' Remarks

Joshua Thomas, the Welsh Baptist historian of the mid and late 1700s, even suggests that the old church at Olchon became reorganized under the care and leadership of John Myles and the other brethren and these new churches. Here are his remarks:

Now (1646 REP) the light of the Gospel shone so clearly among the people of the country, that they have never since been so dark as they had been long before. Thus the people were united together in a mixed communion consisting of Paedobaptists and Baptists. Though many of the latter were scattered through the country in a few years, yet there was no proper Baptist Churches, except at Olchon was so, which it is believed was the case.

The first Baptist church in Wales, after the reformation, was formed at Ilston, near Swansea in Glamorganshire, in 1649, which was less than twenty years old after the Bible came among the common people in their own language. . . .

Mr. Myles seems to have been the first Baptist minister in Wales who defended and maintained unmixt communion among the Baptists in the Principality, in a public open way. (Olchon minister of the same sentiment and practice, was a man little know abroad). After the Ilston church was constituted, Mr. Myles was very active in other places. Very probably his Church Book gives a more particular account of the formation of other churches soon after. From the extracts, we may conclude that they Hay church, including Olchon, was formed in 1650, as several were baptized in that year at Llaeigon and the Hay; it is probable that they all and Olchon made one church formed anew, under the direction of Mr. Myles. Joshua Thomas, *A History of the Baptist Association in Wales from the year 1650, the year 1790*, London; 1795, pages 5, 6.

In B. R. White's *Associational Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660*, published by the Baptist Historical Society, London, in 1974, the associational meetings are given in what appears to be their entirety. However, the letter to the Glasshouse church and its letter back are not included. I am sure that the Baptist Historical Society has these items in additional studies, but I do not yet have them.

In Conclusion to the Early Welsh Baptist studies in General, and the Olchon Church in Particular, note three important points:

1. The ancient Particular Baptist Church at Olchon joined with the churches gathered by ministers sent into Wales from one of the Particular Baptist Churches in London which issued the First London Confession of Faith, the Glass House Church. The old church at Olchon did not form these other churches, these 5 churches which joined with the Olchon church, to form the beginning of this association, were gathered by John Miles and Thomas Proud. A good account of this is found in *Lumpkin's Baptist Confessions of Faith*, pages 216-218, published by Judson Press, 1959.
2. These old Baptists in Wales were one with the London Brethren. Their union with the five churches gathered by Myles proves this.
3. In addition, remember that the real father of Whitsittism, Gould, in his *Open Communion and the Baptists in Norwich*, 1860, has told the world that William Kiffen was the only Closed Communion Baptist in the 1600s. The Glass House Church was closed communion, one of the 7 churches in London. The old Welsh Association was formed as a closed communion association. All the London Associational churches were closed communion. Benjamin Cox was closed communion even before he united with the Baptists.

The Link Between the Old Church at Olchon and the London Particular Baptists

Joshua Thomas suggested that the old Church at Olchon became reorganized and included preaching stations or branches in other areas. This reorganization took place due to the efforts of John Myles. The Glasshouse Church sent him and Thomas Proud into Wales. Here is a brief statement as to its origin:

Thomas Gunne and John Mabbatt gathered the Church at the Glasshouse. They were both baptized as a result of the Blount mission between 1640-1642. John Mabbatt published his Reply to Mr. Knutton in 1645. It also is one of the earlier works issued by these ministers. In 1652 William Conset and Richard Graves served this church. Edward Drapes returned home from Ireland in the late 1640s but was dead by 1651 and did not sign any of the Confessions. John Vernon also ministered here. This church sponsored John Myles' efforts in Wales.

Now, the question arises, where did Joshua Thomas the Welsh Baptist Historian obtain his information? *Here are his words:*

When the Book was circulated (his first effort to write his history REP), remarks were made, some right, and some wrong; some in a friendly way, others not quite so; but the Writer availed himself all the could of every information, not regarding whether it came from a friend or a foe. In about twenty month 18 pages of Addenda and Corrigenda were printed off, of the same size as the book, and circulated gratis, that those who chose it might bind them with the book. Thus far, the Writer did what he could.

In 1781, Mr. Backus's Church History of New England, fell into his hands. There he found an account of Ilston church, near Swansea, of which he had no hint before, but that appeared in an old book of church records in Abergavenny. By the New England History, it appears, that a net church-book had been carried from Ilston to

America, containing a particular account of the Baptist churches in Wales, about the year 1650. And that the book was still in being. (John Myles wrote this old book and carried it into New England with him when he fled Wales due to persecution when the Stuarts were reestablished about 1660, R. E. Pound.) It is easy to conceive that the Author of the Welsh History much wished to see that book. But the American war, and a number of other hindrances, seemed to render it impossible. He wrote to Mr. Backus in 1738. He very soon, and very obligingly answered, and wrote large Extracts out of it, of what he judged most to the purpose. These cast considerable light upon what was before impenetrably dark. On page 5 of the History, those Extracts are referred to. They came in 1784, and now it was strongly concluded, that, on this subject, there was still more light to be derived from the Ilston book, than could be had any where else upon earth. Impelled by hope, several queries more were framed, and a second application made in 1785. But for three years, no answer came. The author had mentioned in the Welsh History, his design to draw up a short account of the Welsh Association, if life and health continued. He was not willing to set about it till the second Extracts arrived. In 1788, he wrote again. Age coming on, a Baptist Register being likely to appear, and other things conspiring, the writer set about the History of the Association, without the advantage of the second Extracts. He finished it and sent the Manuscript to London for the Register. But still lamented the disappointment of further intelligence, which he was confident might be had in the book. One sheet was printed in the second Number of that work, Aug. 1791. This happened to be the very part which chiefly wanted the additional information. In that year Dr. Rippon writing to Mr. Backus obligingly mentioned the disappointment. Mr. Backus was struck, and replied, that the letters of 1785 and 1788 had duly come to hand, and that he had sent large Extracts, and a long letter in 1787; but says he never could learn whether they were received or not, till Brother Rippon's letter came in October 1791. He took the first opportunity and made large extracts containing sixty-four quarto pages: and his letter says, "I got the book, and now send you all the light I can get from thence about the history of your country. Joshua Thomas, *A History of the Welsh Baptist Association*, London: 1795, pages iii and iv, of Address to the Reader.

Joshua Thomas' remarks came from John Myles' old history and accounts of these churches. Isaac Backus copied them and sent them over to Mr. Thomas. I would say Mr. Thomas' remarks were very well grounded.

Now, we shall move into England and begin our slow journey into London.

Part II

The Ancient English Particular Baptist Churches

In this section I will document the early origins of the English Particular Baptists. I will do this by presenting some brief remarks about two of their oldest Churches, the Church at the Hop Garden and the Church at Hill Cliff. Then I shall move into London and show the existence of the Particular Baptists herein back into the 1400s. Once that is established, it is clear to see the links with the older Dark Ages groups.

The old Baptists didn't use the term missionary. However, they recognized two types of ministers, the *Feeding Minister*, or the Pastor who labored in one gospel church, and the *Begetting Minister*, who was church sent to beget persons into gospel faith, order, worship and works. This distinction runs all through the early writings of those old brethren in the early 1600s. Please note:

The Last Will and Testimony of Obadiah Holmes

23. I believe that although God can bring men to Christ and cause them to believe in Him for life, yet He has appointed an ordinary way to effect that great work of faith which is by means of sending a ministry into the world to publish repentance to the sinner and salvation, and that by Jesus Christ. They that are faithful shall save their own souls and some that hear them.

26. I believe that no man is to rush into the ministry without a special call from God, even as the Gospel ministers had of old. (This) was the call of the Holy Spirit with some talent or talents to declare the counsel of God to poor sinners, declaring the grace of God through Jesus Christ even to

those that are yet in the power of Satan, yea, to bring glad tidings by and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

27. I believe that this ministry is to go forth and he that has received grace with a talent or talents, as he has received freely of the Lord so he is freely to give, looking for nothing to gain but the promise of the Lord.

28. I believe that none is to go forth but by commission, and carefully to observe the same according as Christ gave it forth, without adding or diminishing: first, to preach Christ (that is, to make disciples), and then, to baptize them—but not to baptize them before they believe; and, then, to teach them what Christ commanded them, for as the Father had his order in the former dispensation and administration, so has the Son (in former times, the Lord spoke in divers way and manners, but now has He spoken by His Son).

29. I believe that as God prepared a begetting ministry, even so does He also prepare a feeding ministry in the church, who are a people called out of the world by the word and Spirit of the Lord, assembling themselves together in a holy brotherhood, continuing in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, breaking bread and prayer. *Edwin S. Gaustad, Baptist Piety, the last Will and Testimony of Obadiah Holmes, Christian University Press; Grand Rapids: 1978, pages 89-91.*

The Abington Association, John Bunyan and the Ancient Particular Baptist Church, the Church of the Hop Garden

The Church at the Hop Garden, or the old Particular Baptist Church near Abingdon, originated near Longworth. Here is a brief account of its location:

Longworth, where the Church-in-the-Hop-Garden originated, lies equi-distant from the three old Saxon towns of Abingdon, Faringdon, and Wantage, all connected with the story I am about to tell. It is, of course, in the vale of the White Horse, the great monument of Alfred the Great's victory. At Longworth was born the author of Lorna Doone. John Stanley, *The Church in the Hop Garden, A Chatty Account of the Longworth-Coate Baptist Meeting: Berks and Oxfordshire (Ante 1481-1935) and its Ministers*; London, The Kingsgate Press; 1934, page 20.

The Church in the Hop Garden

Longworth, where the Church-in-the-Hop-Garden originated, lies equi-distant from the three old Saxon towns of Abingdon, Farmingdon, and Wantage, all connected with the story I am about to tell. It is, of course, in the Vale of the White horse, the great monument of Alfred the Great's victory.

BEGINNINGS

A CONTINUOUS history is traced from the days of Edward IV. and probably a hundred years before when, as I believe, Wycliff's Poor Preachers took their newly translated Scriptures to read at Long-worth Market Cross. We never shall, I suppose, discover the precise date and circumstances of the origin of

this church (I have been searching for thirty years and more), but it is quite reasonable, as I shall show, to believe it to be the outcome of the work and influence of John Wycliff at Oxford. Oxford, the home of great religious movements in England, may therefore be regarded as the *Alma Mater* of this community, and a hundred others besides. James Hinton, M.A., claimed the same origin for New Road Church, Oxford. Walter Wilson, the historian, says (1808) that the oldest Nonconformist church in London "was derived from Wycliff." The Longworth-Coate Church is thus a living link with Wycliff and his helpers at the University, and the present day.

It is not my purpose, of course, to deal with the times and work of Wycliff, except as they show the probability of connection with the Longworth Meeting and identity of doctrines. Wycliff went up to Oxford in his sixteenth year, and was entered at Queen's College, just founded by Philippa, wife of Edward I., and friend of the Burghers of Calais. He was amongst the first batch of Bursars and probably had the Black Prince for a fellow student. The Queen and her son, John O'Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, were his life-long friends and protectors.

Oxford in those days was a slum compared with the glorious city it now is. Great Tom, whose 101 strokes are the curfew, closing the gates of all the college at five minutes past nine, then hung in its original belfry at Osney Abbey.

S. R. Green gives a graphic picture of the University in those early days, and a beautiful vignette of that sweet boy, Edmund Rice, of Abingdon, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and saint. Just before Wycliff became Master of Balliol, the Archbishop of Armagh sent some of his young priests to Oxford to study Divinity. The young men could not find a Bible at the University, and returned to Ireland. This provoked Wycliff to provide an English Bible for Englishmen. Later, when he was the most popular man and teacher in the University, he gathered a number of graduates around him to assist in the great work of translating and transcribing into English Jerome's *Vulgate*.

There was a great revival in the University which spread throughout the country, until one bitterly, "You can't meet two men, but one will be a Lollard"--for so were they 'Wycliffites' nicknamed.

Wycliff's heart was on fire with love of the Savior, and he gathered a band of young priests filled with the same sacred passion and trained them as preachers. The hall was in the newly-founded new College, but in those days any college would have supplied the hall.

So you have the three works proceeding at the same time translating the Scriptures, multiplying the copies and distributing them by the young Poore Preachers accompanied by reading and preaching. This was done within a couple of hours' walk of Longworth. If Wycliff's influence was felt on the

Continent, is it wonderful that it should be felt eight or ten miles from the University? John Milton thought that to Wycliff belongs all the human glory of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. . . .

Among the truths that Wycliff taught his young preachers were these:

The Scriptures are the sole rule of Doctrine, Faith and Practice. They are the final Court of Appeal—the Casareum Appellunt of the Church. "What is not found in them is not binding on any man's conscience." Very profound was his belief in the Word of God, and that every man should have it in his own tongue—an English Bible for English men.

To Wycliff the Pope was merely and only the Bishop of Rome. He repudiated the Pope's claim to sovereignty over the consciences of men; also to any kind of temporal sovereignty. He contended that Peter never held, nor claimed to hold, any temporal jurisdiction; therefore, what he never possessed he could not hand down to another.

He held that the New Testament knows only two orders of ministry, Bishops (Pastors) and Deacons, and contended that on occasion a layman might be permitted to consecrate the Eucharist. He taught the common Priesthood of Believers; also that our Lord instituted only two ordinances, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. He denied Baptismal Regeneration.

In HENRY VIII.'s time, the Lollards were lost in the Anabaptists. He repudiated Transubstantiation, contending that the wafer--the Host on the Altar was not turned into the Body and Blood of our Lord by the Prayer of Consecration, but was simply only and always the effectual signs of Him." He preached vehemently against ceremonialism, and denounced the priests as coming between the sinner and his Saviour. "The magical Power of the Altar seemed to invest the Celebrant with a power which bewildered simple minds." On the other hand Wycliffe saw that "every man was the object of God's love and might live in the continual sense of His Presence." He opposed the compulsory payment of tithes, saying "that ministers should be supported by the voluntary gifts of their people," and strenuously opposed the Pope's claim to "Peter's Pence," "First Fruits," "Appropriation of Livings," ect. He denounced the compulsory celibacy of clergy, Confessions, Absolution, Penance, and indulgences. Very earnestly he taught that religion should be inward, not outward exercises only, and preached very vehemently against ceremonialism as the condition of salvation.

Are not these doctrines the teachings that the Baptists of Coate, and all evangelical people, hold to-day? Remember that Wycliff was a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, and knew nothing of these things until he found them in the Scriptures he was so diligently studying. . . .

The little assemblies formed in the great Hall of the Manor House, or in the farm kitchen, to hear the reading of the new English Scriptures, were

hardened by persecution into little communities, which, as the result of the New Teaching and its implications, developed into independent churches with their own elected ministers, much on the lines of Baptist Churches today.

This was a hundred years before Caxton printed his first book, and the only way to publish new ideas and new teaching was for heralds, evangelists, to stand in the marketplace, or perchance in the parish church, and proclaim the New Message. So did Paul, and so did the preaching Friars, and so did Wycliff and his Poore Preachers, the only thing he ever borrowed from the Friars. In Apostolic fashion he sent them out, "Two and two," to read and expound the English Scriptures in the neighbouring villages and towns.

"He sent them out—two and two, Saying, Go, preach the Gospel."

The sun is rising gloriously over the eastern hills, as two of the Poore Preachers leave Oxford by the western gate. Their habits are long, and russet-coloured. In one hand each carries a staff, and with the other clasps to his breast his precious portion of Scripture—probably copied *with* his own hand.

Their going forth greatly annoys the Archbishop, who complains that these "Unauthorised (by him) itinerant Preachers preach in Churches and Chapels, and public squares, and other prophane places." But his Grace cannot stop them, for the University is with them almost to a man. Wycliff's opposing the Pope pleased the citizens for political reasons, and the clergy knew that he was *fighting* their battle at Rome.

OLD RECORDS.

DURING the Commonwealth, when the non-Episcopal churches were settled, formed and re-formed, they naturally set up a Church Book to record their doings, Longworth amongst them. A few churches still retain their old Church Book, as Tewkesbury, *but* the most are lost through the carelessness of their owners, or destroyed by enemies. The men who pulled down their meeting houses, destroyed their books and papers. Often, too, their owners did not realize their value. An old man, of Faringdon, once told his minister, my friend, Rev. H. Smith, that he remembered seeing such a Curious old book, with such curious letters as no one couldn't read, and seemed to be no use on." This was, of course, the precious old Church Book. Sometimes a cantankerous clerk, or deacon, when "dismissed," or leaving in a temper, would refuse to give up the books, and they disappeared. Well, about this time, or earlier, Longworth set up its brand new Church Book. No one has seen this book for over two hundred years. But before it disappeared, some unknown person, at an unknown time, and for an unknown purpose, made extracts from it which have come down to us, and which I have called the The Fragment—it is better known as "The Barkshire Records." This precious volume owned (and probably copied) by a minister of Coate nearly two

hundred years ago, was utterly unknown at Coate *until* I Came across It about thirty years ago.

Dr. Whitely thinks that Benjamin Stinton, a predecessor of C. H. Spurgeon, who was collecting materials for a History of the Baptists, and entered, made these extracts by him in his book of materials. However, he died before he wrote the book, and bequeathed the job and the materials to his friend and deacon, Thomas Crosby, who for some reason did not use the Fragment. But when his young friend, Joseph Stennet, the son of his famous friend, Dr. Stennett, came to Coate, he naturally showed him the extracts, and as naturally Stennett made a complete copy of them in a small octavo book, which still bears the inscription on the fly leaf,

Joseph Stennett, 1747

This precious little volume is now in the Library of Regents' Part College and is known as the "Barkshire Records." Stinton's original manuscript of "materials" is now lost, but before it disappeared the Rev. George Gould (father of Rev. Dr. Gould and Sir Alfred Pearce Gould) had made a careful copy of it, which is also in the Library of Regents Part College.

Young Stennett made his copy four years after he came to Coate.

The history of the old Church Book is most baffling. The first extracts are dated 1648, and the last 1708, five years after young Collett became Pastor of Coate. . . .

The Association was formed in 1652. The constituent churches were Abingdon (including Longworth), Henley, and Reading. Several churches joined later, including Oxford and Wantage. Abingdon appears to have been the leading church, and probably its famous young minister had suggested the Association. . . .

At a Meeting ye 12th day of ye 10th month, 1656, when the Church at Longworth did first Stand up, as a distinct (separate) Church from ye Abingdon Church. That the members in and near Longworth, together with our Brother Coomes, being still persuaded 'twill most tend to the glory of God, that we stand up as a distinct Church of Christ, our Brother Coomes being to walk with us so long as himself shall be persuaded that his call from the Lords is to bee amongst us; to bee at present upon Trial, to see how ye Lord will owe his labors amongst us.

This being resolved upon by us, we whose names are underwritten, doe in ye Presence of ye Lord give up ourselves to walk together as a Church of Christ.

. .

John Pendarvis settled down in Abingdon in 1652. Longworth had no pastor and linked up with Abingdon to enjoy the wonderful ministry of the young

ministers, but still worshipped in their own place at Longworth, and their own Church Book and Registers, as today, Coate and Buckland are distinct churches, united only in the one ministry. And Pendarvis, who was fond of itinerating, would go out and preach to them (alternately with John Coombes), and administer the Ordinances. In 1656, the young pastor died, and the Longworth Meeting took the opportunity of amicably separating- not a hint of discontent, nor grievance.

I will give the minutes of the separation of the Faringdon members of Longworth as recorded in the Fragment, and you will see the difference in the proceedings:

At a Meeting of the Churches (note the Plural) of Longworth with several Messengers from the Churches of Abingdon, Wantage and Oxford at Barcout (Buckland) the 27th day of ye 9th month, 1657, it was agreed unanimously as followeth, that it will most tend to the Glory of God—that those Members in and near Faringdon do stand up as a distinct Church and that our Brother Coombes be a Member with them, to be with them to help on the work of the Lord the First Days in Three, and do stand as a help to ye Church of Longworth, to be with them one First Day in Three.

The 11th Day of ye 10th month 1657, was this Agreement completed and ye Members in and about Faringdon were then solemnly given up to walk as a particular congregation of Jesus Christ—and these are the Names.” Here follow twenty-three names.

This followed the usual procedure of forming a new church. First the matter is carefully and prayerfully debated, and settled. Then a meeting (public) is called and neighboring churches are invited to send delegates, especially their ministers, who would certify themselves as to the correctness of all the proceedings, and give their sanction and blessing to the young church. Delegates came from Abingdon, Oxford and Wantage to Buckland, where the Longworth People had a Meeting House (as it has today) and all was done “decently and in order.

Nothing of this occurred in the separation of Longworth from Abingdon. Simply a notification of the withdrawal and the appointment of John Coombes as Pastor.

John Pendarvis was thus the first Pastor of Longworth, of whom we have knowledge. Longworth had come under his spell, perhaps the Revival had come through him, and at their request, he took them under his wing. . . . pages 1-70.

I have given an long account of this old Particular Baptist Church to establish:

1. Many of these old churches had their origins back in the dark ages;

2. They were formed at an early time, but then they would be scattered and almost die out and then be revived and many times were reconstituted with neighboring churches helping, some times alone;
3. They had a set way of multiplying, and it was according to gospel order;
4. The old association, known as the Abingdon Association became constituted during the early 1650s;
5. John Pendarvis was the main minister in that area, and no doubt, responsible for the formation of this Association.

Now we come to the *Particular Baptist Records to 1660*, edited by B. R. White of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland:

It should be noticed that the early meetings show a considerable concern for the theological basis of association between churches and that emphasis is laid less upon agreement over a wide spectrum of doctrine than upon agreement over the nature and extent of the cooperation that there ought to be between independent churches. This does not, of course, indicate a lack of concern for doctrinal matters, rather, in all probability, it does mean that the Confession of 1644 was generally accepted as providing a common doctrinal basis. After all, Benjamin Cox himself, the leader of the Abingdon Association's eastern wing, had earlier produced a theological Appendix to the 1646 edition of the 1644 Confession. It ought also, at the same time, to be recognized that this association as a whole, in spite of the part played in it by the Fifth Monarchist, John Pendarvis, shows little sign of millenarian excitement though some churches seem to have favored radical political reforms. Page 125.

Now, note the following points:

1. The Abingdon Association was under the influence of the aged minister from London, Benjamin Cox; who signed the First London Confession 1646 and wrote an Appendix. We have this in our Library ready for persons today to read and study.
2. John Pendarvis was murdered while out on a preaching tour. Being a Fifth Monarchist, or Post-Millist, his friends felt like the followers of the state religion had a part in his murder.
3. Stanley, in his *The Church of the Hop Garden* gives an account of the funeral proceedings and even suggests that this why the old church separated into two churches. He points out, as do others, that the Baptists and others, were so upset over Pendarvis' murder that a revolt nearly took place. Cromwell had to send several of his best troops into the area to settle things down and keep law and order. It was after this that the old church became two by a peaceful and mutual consent.
4. Be that as it may, this old Association has its roots in the Lollard days. It did not owe its origin either to John Spilsbury or to the Richard Blount efforts, but it did fellowship those churches and did maintain the same faith and order.

Now, we continue in White's *Records*, over to page 131 where we take up:

“an ensuing epistle which was subscribed by the messengers to the churches of Henly, Kenseworth and Eversholt and afterwards by the churches of Abington and Reading:

To the church of Christ of which our brethren John Spilsbury and William Kiffen are members and to the rest of the churches in and near London, agreeing with the said church in principles and constitutions and accordingly holding communion with the same, the churches of Abington, Reading, Henlie, Kensworth and Eversholt send greeting:

Faithful and beloved brethren:

The Lord our God having made us to lay to heart how the churches of Christ in the apostles' days held a firm communion each with other and how necessary it was for us to endeavor to do the same, as it becomes particular assemblies which make up but one Mount Sion, Is. 4:5. 4:5, that we might endeavor to keep each other pure and to clear the profession of the Gospel from scandal and to manifest our love to all the saints, and thereby to manifest ourselves to be true churches of Christ, and that we may show ourselves sensible of the need that we have, or may have, one of another, and that the whole or God, wherein all the churches are concerned, might be the better carried on by a combination of counsels, prayers and endeavors. Through the assistance of the same God (after many conferences and seeking to the Lord) we solemnly entered into such an association each with other as this enclosed copy of our Agreement does manifest. And we have agreed to the confirmation of some conclusions of which we also send you an enclosed copy. These things we thus present unto you, not only because we desire to conceal nothing of this nature from you, but also that we may manifest both our due esteem of you and also our desire to partake of the benefit of the gifts which God has given you for the counsel and advice and brotherly assistance; and for the increase and furtherance of love and amitie and good correspondence between us, not doubting but that you will receive this our declaration with the right hand and so construe the same as the Spirit of love shall direct you.

Subscribed in the name and by the appointment of the churches last above mentioned, by us ect.

Postscript, it is our earnest request to the church above named, that this our declaration and the enclosed papers may be communicated to the rest of the churches above signified.

Those enclosed papers were: the copy of our agreement and of the conclusions confirmed at this meeting and the last. Page 131.

Several points about this epistle:

1. The Abington Association sent this to the one church of Spilsbury and Kiffen. Several other Epistles are so named and addressed, see for example Obadiah's Holmes Letter, after the Congregationalists nearly beat him to death at Boston near 1651. It is John Clark's *III News from New England*.
2. However, this old church at Wapping became two churches in 1638. Their closeness continued even up to this Associational meeting in April of 1653.
3. The entire association and those in and near London they addressed were one in principles and constitutions with the old Church walking with Kiffen and Spilsbury. There is no doubt that Kiffen was a strict communion and strict membership Baptist from 1639 to his death. He affirms such in his great book on Communion published about 1680.
4. In addition, Spilsbury's church, and the other churches in and about London were of the same in principles and constitutions.
5. This means they were all strict communion and closed membership churches just like William Kiffen and John Spilsbury.
6. This Epistle from the Abington Association destroys forever the idea that Kiffen and Spilsbury were different kinds of Baptists.
7. I repeat, these old churches were of the same principles and constitutions.

I hope someday the Spilsbury bashing will end.

Let us remember this before we go on, the most rigid and strict Baptists of those days, sought recognition and approval from BOTH John Spilsbury and William Kiffen. These two men, and their union together into one constitution and fellowship with the oneness of their principles, was well known among those old Particular Baptists.

Also remember, the Abington Association sent this letter after the supposed separation between Spilsbury and Kiffen over pulpit affiliation and mixed church membership.

I believe I have demonstrated the ancient origin and long existence of this *Old Church at the Hop Garden* and have showed its oneness with the other churches near by and their oneness with the churches in London. These all were one with John Spilsbury and William Kiffen.

The minutes of the old Abington Association are a study of the order and principles of Old Landmarkism (but not modern or neo Landmarkism).

Before passing from this old association, let me note the following points which will further show and document their union with the London Particular Baptists in general, and John Spilsbury in particular:

The church at Watford is known from one external source: in 1669 John Crawley taught in that town in his own house and John Coleman was also a Baptist teacher, O. P. II.883. James Stuart, op. Cit., 9ff., quotes church records to indicate that the Baptists there in the 1650s grew from 'a branch of a church in London meeting at a place called Coal Harbour, Mr. John Spilsbury being pastor.' Among local preachers were Richard Coleman,

George Eve, John Crawley and John Reeve. The church was maintained, with help from London preachers, for a number of years but during the years of persecution, while one group tended to keep their links with London, many others joined the Hemel Hempstead congregation. B. R. White, Particular Baptist Records, p. 214.

The Abington Association and John Bunyan

From its very beginning the ministers and churches that formed this association were strict communionists and closed membership. By that, I mean they practiced in church ordinances and they gathered their churches only of baptized believers.

John Bunyan was the opposite. We know he practiced open communion and walked with an open membership church. Now, please note B. R. White's remarks:

The Bedford church reported that one of their members, John Taylor, had been suspended for attempted suicide. This helps to prove that the church was not the one known as Bunyan Meeting. In any case these associations were 'closed-membership' Calvinistic Baptists and so neither Bunyan Meeting or any other which tolerated infant baptism would be welcome to join. In any event no such case as John Taylor's figures at that period on Bunyan Meeting's records. Ibid,.

Speaking of another church then, White continues:

It is clear that this church must have practiced 'closed membership' to be considered 'orderly walking' by Benjamin Coxe and his friends. Ibid., page 214.

The reason there has been so much confusion about these old Particular Baptists is because there often existed Particular Baptist Churches in the same town or area, one was mixed membership and the other was closed membership. In these churches also there seems to have been a going back and forth of some of the members. Moreover, to add more problems, often times men or women of the same names would be found in different places and in different churches.

However, this one thing is certain, the closed communion and closed membership Particular Baptist Churches gathered around the *First London Confession of Faith* and measured themselves by the walk, principles and constitution of the one church of John Spilsbury and William Kiffen. This is very important, as I shall later tie this all together dealing with the origin of the London Particular Baptist Churches.

Whitsittism Would Make John Spilsbury and John Bunyan Agree on Communion and Mixed Church Membership

For now, let me observe that John Bunyan practiced open communion and mixed church membership. He and his church were not among these old Baptists. Get this point very well; the Whitsittes claim John Spilsbury held these views. John Bunyan, *not John Spilsbury* practiced open communion and mixed church membership.

The rejection of John Bunyan and his open communion and mixed membership church in the old Abington Association and its measuring itself by William Kiffen and John Spilsbury and all the other churches of London of the same constitution, order and principles as that church, prove, beyond doubt that both Kiffen and Spilsbury and their one church were strict communion and closed membership.

Therefore, Whitsittism is again weighed in the balances and found wanting.

William Kiffen, John Spilsbury, Benjamin Cox and the London and Abington Churches were One

These old churches were all strict communion and closed membership churches, that is, they were made up of baptized believers only. Bunyan, Tombs (who will be considered under the Midland Association), Jessey and Powell, were all open membership and open communion Baptists. They stood outside of these old churches. Whitsittism would make Spilsbury into the very same type of Baptists as these open membership and open communion Baptists.

The Old Particular Baptist Associations

Before passing on, it may be well to show some of the ancient ways of those old Particular Baptists and their Associations.

B. R. White's studies and his publication of the *Particular Baptist Records 1650-1660* are a must study for any serious student of Particular Baptist history during those times. By a careful study of those records from their original sources, we note the following:

1. The old associations met often at one of the churches. The officers in the hosting church served as the leaders of the association.
2. The minutes were copied by the clerk of the hosting church and preserved as a part of the official church records.
3. There was much inner communion among the churches, that is, inner church workings, but I have not found any instances of their taking the Lord's Supper, at any of the meetings or of the practice of an inner Lord's Supper. I have found no document, nor statement, nor sermon from that time period dealing with an inner Lord's Supper between the churches,
4. The churches had no standing officers, such as modern associations or conventions have, but they did have strong aggressive outreach efforts. Many of them had begetting ministers, or church messengers, some even, in the case of the Somerset Association, had an apostle, Thomas Collier.
5. These men functioned outside of the pastoral office of a particular church and served at large to preach, baptize and constituted new churches. They were often called evangelists, apostles, or church messengers. They were also known as begetting ministers in distinction from the feeding minister or pastor. They believed strongly in a God called and church sent ministry. Please go to my work *A Vindication of the Old Paths*, and therein study well the documented statements on the old Particular Baptists and church sending.
6. These old associations were not executive associations in any way, for those old Brethren rightly believed in the old Baptist concept that the power was in the people. The saints in a gospel church called out one from themselves and ordained him as their shepherd.
7. As to Associational officers as such, the mostly didn't have any. Thomas Collier seems to have been the only exception to this rule. He wanted the Somerset

association to chose him, ordain him at large, and send him forth. This they did. His case seems to have been a very rare one and was not the practices of the churches of that time. However, in all but this the Somerset Association was one with the London Association. I will show this when we deal with the Somerset Association.

Now, we move into Northern England.

The Ancient Particular Baptist Church at Hill Cliff

The ancient name of the place where Hill Cliff Chapel stands was Stockton, and it so appears in the deeds and elsewhere. The name Hill Cliff was probably taken originally from the fact that the hill on the side of which the chapel and burial ground are has to peaks or high points, and was consequently called the Clift Hill or Hill Clift, the way the name was often spelt. Hill Cliff is the modern name. The site of the chapel and burial ground contains one Cheshire acre of land. James

Kenworthy, *History of the Baptist Church at Hill Cliff, Baptist Tract and Book Society*, London: n.d. (about 1900, REP): page 50.

This old church was located near Warrington. This is in the northern part of England. I am very disappointed that B. R. White did not include the associational history and record of this old church and its association in his excellent work, *The Particular Baptist Records to 1660*. At one time, I had Douglas' *History of the Baptists in Northern England*, published about 1850. It is very good, but does not give the minutes as is found in White's work. Furthermore, I do have the history of the Hexhem Church and its records. This will help us greatly because the old Hexhem Church and the Hill Cliff Church were in close communion with each other. Thomas Tillam served them both.

In the following quotes, please note the absence of Whitsittism, and a clear and unmistakable belief in the divine origin and unbroken succession of the Baptists. I note in particular the following points:

1. The Baptists have a divine origin and have continued to existence since Christ's time;
2. The old Anabaptists and the dark ages groups such as the Waldenses and Lollards were what we would now call Baptists;
3. The historic mode of baptism among the Baptists, for all times had been immersion;
4. The close relationship between the old Hill Cliff Church and the Particular Baptist Church at Coleman Street, in London, pastored by Hansard Knollys.

The following comes from Kenworthy's *History of the Hill Cliff Church*, pages 1-50.

HISTORY Of the Baptist Church at Hill Cliff, Near Warrington.

GENERAL HISTORY.

BEFORE entering on the definite object of publishing the records of and references to the ancient Baptist Church at Hill Cliff, it will be useful to give a short account of the tenets of the Baptists, as well as a statement of some of the facts of history relating to them and to the practice of immersion. Baptists have, in all ages, insisted upon full religious liberty, every man to act according to the dictates of his conscience and the Word of God—the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, being the guide of this body. Consequently, wherever Christians were found they formed communities called churches, entirely independent of each other and of the State. While insisting on their spiritual rights, they ever insisted, with equal firmness, on being subject to the powers that be in *temporal* matters, even suffering injustice rather than *being* rebellious subjects of the State. In spiritual matters, no outside influence was allowed to intrude between them and their God. Their authority was derived direct from the teachings of Christ and His apostles, and no teaching was accepted unless there was a "Thus saith the Lord for it. To the present day, these have continued the principles of this body.

On the subject of baptism, they have always followed the practice of the Christians of the New Testament and of the early churches-baptism by immersion or dipping. The subjects of this ordinance have always been those who were of an age to fully comprehend its meaning and object. None were baptized but those who themselves professed faith in Christ for salvation. Of the ordinances, there were only two, baptism and the Lord's supper. By the former, a public profession of faith was made, and nothing further was symbolized than that they believed in Christ and were now about to live a new life and forsake the old paths. Only after such confession and baptism was a person received among the membership of the Church. The Lord's supper was a memorial service by baptized members to keep in their memory their Master's dying love and to carry out His commandment, "Do this in remembrance of Me." Very often has a Roman Catholic, who had the history of the *Church* (as he called his Church) ever ready for use in argument, said to the writer, The Baptists are the only *honest* Christians outside the *Church*, for they are the only body that carry out the teachings of the New Testament in their practice; all other denominations practice baptism as altered by the *Church* or ignore it altogether as of no importance or use. The *Church* has altered both its form of administration and the subjects of the *rite* to suit the circumstances of the time, and they have forsaken *the Church*, but keep up its teachings."

All writers on this subject now agree that adult baptism (immersion) only was practiced by the Christians of the Bible history, and that for several centuries no alteration was made in the mode of adding members to each separate community or Church. The first trace in history that we have of a departure from this practice was in A. D. 370, when there is an account of an *infant* being baptized (by immersion). This was the beginning of infant baptism, and was brought about by the teaching of the false doctrine of baptismal regeneration. If baptism did save, as was then and is still taught by many teachers of Christianity, then perform the rite as soon after birth as convenient, and make salvation sure. The form of baptism by immersion remained practically the same, however, for many succeeding centuries. Those who most strenuously opposed this new departure were firm in their opposition, and required all who wished to join their communion to be baptized a second time, as the first immersion was considered not valid, having been administered to an unconscious subject. Hence arose the name Ana-Baptist, or one who baptizes again or rebaptizes. The first time this body appears in the history of religion, as opposed to the teaching of infant baptism, is in the sixth century, showing that in about one hundred and eighty years from the first commencement of infant baptism it had become the rule of the then Established Church, and opposers of the practice were persecuted and afterwards nick-named Ana-Baptists. These Christians were always very numerous and were as ruthlessly destroyed by the Romish Church and its emissaries, as are the Armenians of to day by the savage Turks. A further alteration was the introduction of triune baptism or dipping three times, once for each person of the Trinity. Some time after this

alteration came the split of the Catholic Church into two parts, the Eastern or Greek Catholic Church and the Western or Roman Catholic Church. The Greek Church has retained the then practice of both branches, and immerses the child three times in the names of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. This division took place about A. D. 1054. It was about 300 years after this event that the form of baptism was altered to that of sprinkling, but this form was never fully accepted and enforced. When the Reformation took place under Henry VIII., no great alteration in the teachings of religion was made, the only serious change being that Henry deposed the Pope from having authority in religion in England and reigned in his stead. In the reign of Elizabeth, the present Church of England was established firmly, and its prayer book is little more or less than the ritual of the Church of Rome transferred bodily for use in the Church of England service. In its baptismal service it will be found that the priest is ordered to *dip* the child warily, unless of delicate health. The custom has grown to be sprinkling and not dipping, with the approval and sanction of those placed in authority for the purpose of keeping up the integrity of the Church. So popish was the established religion, minus the Pope, in the time of Henry VIII., that a witty Frenchman said in Latin to an English friend: "I see that in England if a man is for the Pope you hang him; but if against the Pope you burn him."

It has been estimated that during its existence the Romish Church has been responsible for the martyrdom or murder of upwards of fifty millions of men, women and children. All governments are or should be for the protection of the weak and defenseless against oppression. Yet this government, to which it has added the name of religion, has gained for itself immortal shame and disgrace as by far the worst form of government that ever existed.

The persecutors of Christians were first the pagan Romans. The Christians refused to worship the images and idols, and were in consequence made to suffer even to the death. A little later, Constantine professed Christianity, but insisted on putting the idols and images he previously worshipped into the Church buildings. From this circumstance arose the bowing to images so prevalent even to day in Roman Catholic worship. Constantine was baptized at the age of 62 years, a few months before his death. The persecutions that were perpetrated by this unholy Church on what they were pleased to call heretics have already been referred to under the various names of Donatists, Paulicians, Waldenses, Vaudois, etc.; these Christians suffered terrible persecutions in various parts of Italy, Piedmont, Switzerland, France, North Africa (Carthage, Egypt), Asia Minor, Germany, Hungary, Holland, England, Wales, etc. Those who wish to read the harrowing details must consult the histories already published.

That portion of the Church of Rome which was reformed during the reigns of the Tudors, and thenceforth called the Church of England, was itself a *bitter* persecutor of those who would not subscribe to its tenets. Thus the

Separatists, as well as the Romish Catholics, had to suffer at the hands of the Established Protestant Church. For from two to three hundred years this dominant Church imbued its hands in the blood of fellow Christians who preferred the teaching of the word of God before that of kings or bishops. Later persecutors were the Presbyterian Church, formed by John Calvin and John Knox, both brought up in the Romish Church, and who transferred many of its errors to the new Church. These were bitter persecutors during the Commonwealth. All the other religious bodies, Congregationalists, Wesleyan and other Methodist bodies, Quakers, etc., are of modern origin, and are none of them yet three hundred year old.

Editor's Note: Here are some points Mr. Kenworthy was mistaken about:

1. Being an Englishman, the Baptists who were involved in Oliver Cromwell's efforts, are an embarrassment to Mr. Kenworthy. It is the usual practice of the English historians to try and forget certain things about these old Baptists. They were very active in political affairs and many of them were involved in bringing down the Anglican Church and the resulting times of the Civil Wars, about 1641-1649. Once these efforts failed, and the Stuarts again were re-established with their state church after 1660, the papalized Anglican Church, the old brethren were not involved much in political affairs. A good documented study of this may be found in Brown's *The Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy Movement* published near the 1900s.
2. During the 1600s, the Baptists held that there were several church ordinances not only just two. For an example of this see Thomas Collier's *Body of Divinity*, and Thomas Tillam's *The Temple of Lively Stones*, published in the 1660s.

What I have said is not to discredit Mr. Kenworthy's remarkable work, but to clarify some things he may not have been aware of because he did not have the abundant materials we now have.

LOCAL HISTORY

IT is generally acknowledged now by all learned men that in all ages of the Christian era there have been found bodies of Christians, under different names, who have practiced and upheld the doctrines and principles which the Baptists now hold. Suffice it to say with an eminent writer, not holding the opinions of this body, that "no man of any ecclesiastical, historical knowledge will care to risk his reputation by denying that immersion was the one form of baptism in the days of the Apostles, and for several succeeding centuries."

Mosheim says that "the true origin of Anabaptists is hid in the remote depths of antiquity," and that "in the third century no persons were admitted to baptism by the churches generally but such as had been previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and had also given satisfactory proofs of pious dispositions and upright intentions." In the year 410, Pelagius, once a monk at Bangor, spread his opinions in *this country*. He believed in the lawfulness and necessity of infant baptism. Two

continental bishops labored to prevent the spread of his opinions. Many were reclaimed and baptized in the River Allen, near Chester (now Alyn).

It is thus seen that 400 years after Christ's birth, the general body of the people in England was in favor of baptism by immersion, and that many who were led away by the teaching of infant baptism were brought back to the religion of their forefathers, and baptized or dipped in the River Allen, only about 25 miles distant from Hill Cliff.

About the year 600, Austin, a bishop of Rome, who was sent to England by the Pope, found a Society of Christians at Bangor, Flintsbire, consisting of 2,100 persons. They were afterwards destroyed because they refused to baptize infants at the command of the Pope.

That many of the people of England at this time, and for long after, held the opinions of the Baptists will be clearly shown by a careful examination of the writings of those who have dealt with this subject. These writers were almost invariably those who were opposed to the Baptists, and often "hated them with a bitter hatred."

In Shobert's "Persecutions of Popery," vol. I, page 216, it is said, "A Christian community, whose origin is based in the obscurity of the early ages, whose doctrines appear to have been transmitted them from the primitive Apostles, and to have been untainted from the successive corruptions engrafted on the mild precepts of the Gospel by the Church of Rome, a community which consequently never needed reformation, is a phenomenon that must excite peculiar interest in the mind of the philosopher, as well as the religious reader. Such a phenomenon is presented by the Vaudois, or Waldenses, the very purity of whose doctrines has gained them a place in the calendar of Popish persecutions." We will now see where these religious bodies were to be found, and what were their opinions as regards the rite of baptism.

Matthew Paris says, " The Borengarian or Waldensian heresy had about the year 1180 generally infected all France, Italy, and *England*."

Guitmond, the Popish writer, says, " Not only the weaker sort in the country villages, but the nobility and gentry in the chief towns and cities, were infected therewith, and therefore Lanfrane, Archbishop of Canterbury, who held this See both in the reign of William the Conqueror and of his son, William Rufus, wrote against them in 1087." Dr. Wall tells us that about this time (1100) the Petro-Brussians withdrew from the Church of Rome, then very corrupt. "They did reckon infant baptism as one of the corruptions of that Church, and accordingly renounced it, and practiced only adult baptism." Other writers say that several Waldenses, who came out of France, were apprehended, and, by the king's command, were marked in the forehead with a koy or hot iron. "This sect were called the Publicani, whose

origin was from Gascoigne, and who, being as numerous as the sands of the sea, did sorely infest both France, Italy, Spain, and *England*."

Perrin, in his "Histoire des Vaudois," gives the confession of the Vaudois. Its seventh article is as follows:

" We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is the visible and external sign which represents to us that which, by virtue of God's invisible operations, is within us—namely, the renovation of our minds and the mortification of our members through (the faith of) Jesus Christ. And by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life."

From these extracts and other writings it is quite clear that there were in England and in Cheshire those who were Baptists, although not known by that name, from the planting of Christianity about A.D. 100 to A.D. 1200. In the Dark Ages, it was the common practice of the ruling religion to destroy all writings and relics that would point to the existence of such persons as were by them styled heretics. Books and writings were cast into the flames in which the martyrs themselves were burnt to death. Thus, it is that, as a denomination, the Baptists have very few ancient documents to which they can refer to show their existence at certain times and places. Yet, the strong hatred of which they were the objects caused their persecutors to write things that clearly prove their existence in large numbers at different times.

We cannot go back to the foundation of the Hill Cliff Church, but at the time the earliest reference is made to it, it is then in a flourishing condition, and the very reference itself points to its earlier existence.

The selection of Hill Cliff as a place of meeting for Christian worshippers can only be accounted for on the ground that the great object in view was concealment from their persecutors. It would be impossible to have chosen a better place for the purpose. Surrounded as it was until recently hid by woods, at a safe distance also from the public highway, and very the boundary of the counties of Lancaster and Chester, it was as safe a place as could possibly have been found in those dark days of persecution. Whenever the persecuting spirit was strong in Lancashire, then the people would worship at Hill Cliff, but when the persecuting spirit in Cheshire was the stronger, the people worshipped in Warrington, there being at the earliest time of which there remain any records of the existence of 'Hill Cliff Chapel, a meeting-house in connection therewith at Warrington. Also, as an Lancashire writ could not be served in Cheshire, nor a Cheshire writ in Lancashire, the Cheshire Baptists often worshipped at Warrington, and the Lancashire Baptists at Hill Cliff.

The old meeting-house in Warrington was situated in what was formerly the Roe Rick Yard, Bridge Street. In Baines' "History of Warrington," after a description of the Parish Church and Trinity Church in Warrington, and St.

James' Church, LabeFord, is given a list of places of worship appropriated to the use of other religious communities, among which appears "The Baptist Meeting-room in Bridge Street, which is an elder branch of the early Meeting House at Hill Cliff." The earliest evidence of the existence of Hill Cliff is found on a stone in the burial ground and bearing date 1357. Another stone has been found with the date 1414. Another has the date 1523, *another* 1599, *but* the dates of the greater portion of the old stones are lost.

Over the grave of a young man accidentally killed

*Just as he bloomed, he drooped and fell,
He had not time to bid his friends farewell,
Reader, prepare, make no delay,
God only knows thy dying day.*

It has often been said among the Hill Cliff people that during the persecutions in the reign of Mary (the bloody queen) the members at Hill Cliff suffered with their fellow Christians in other parts of the kingdom. Although there is no direct evidence of this, yet it may be mentioned that a hole (about four yards long, three yards wide and two yards deep) was dug in the sandstone rock on which the buildings stand into which the persecuted ones fled for safety from their persecutors. This hole is now the cellar of the Chapel-house, and some of its walls consist only of sandstone rock; the brickwork of the house and chapel commencing on the rook at the top of the cellar. Also in the reign of the above-named queen, on June 27th, 1558, a Baptist of the name of Roger Holland, of a good county family, suffered martyrdom because of his religion. Roger Holland was of the family of Sir Robert Holland, who, in the reign of Henry I., appears to have been a very prominent subject. It has been said that some of his descendants were the most powerful of subjects but the most unfortunate of individuals. Two of these Hollands were created earls, but were both killed by the populace. A third of the family was mysteriously destroyed in an unknown manner, his body being found floating in the Straits of Dover. His family gave the name of Up- Holland to a district near Wigan, and branches of the family were settled at Litherland, Dalton, Eccleston, Denton, &Co as well as at Upholland and several places in North Cheshire, and were allied by marriage with many of the principal county families. All these places of residence are within twelve or fourteen miles of Warrington, and lie around Warrington and Hill Cliff as a common center. Roger Holland's death, instead of destroying the faith of the Baptists only made it the stronger, and his many relatives and friends in both Lancashire and Cheshire would be the more determined to uphold the principles for which he died. A striking coincidence is to be found in the fact that two of the signatories to the letter of 1654 from Hill Cliff are of the same name, Holland. This points to, at any rate, a probability of his having been a Hill Cliff Baptist, perhaps minister there. It is well known that the county family of the Hollands were strong supporters of Free Church bodies in Cheshire for a very long time.

During the rebuilding of the chapel in 1800 a stone baptistery, well cemented, was found in the ground. As no one at the time knew of its existence and it was evidently of a great age, it is likely that as the more troublous times had passed, it fell into disuse, and the baptism of believers in the brooks and streams in the neighborhood took place. (From the ministry of the Rev. John Thompson up to recent times, the chief places of baptisms were at Lower Walton, near the brook that ran through the center of the village¹ and in Cann Lane, Appleton.) This stone baptistery points to a great change for the chapel and the practice of immersion there.

The first minister of Hill Cliff of whom anything is known was Mr. Weyerburton, a person of property and a devoted man. He belonged to the Cheshire family of the Warburtons of Arley, and lived at Broomfields, now a farmhouse near Stockton Quay. That he was the recognized minister at Hill Cliffe was discovered in examining the deeds of the Warburton estates some years ago. He remained with the people to the end of his days, his death taking place in 1591. It is very probable that further information respecting this minister will some day be forthcoming which will throw considerable light on the early history both of Hill Cliff and its earlier ministers.

Mr. Daintith succeeded Mr. Weyerburton, but very little beyond the fact of his being the minister is known of him. In the deeds of 1660 and 1663, the name of Peter Daintith appears a principal. It is probable that he would be a son or relative of the minister of that name.

The north-western portion of Appleton, including the two-peaked hill, was formerly called Hull or Hill, but is now included with the other portion of the township under one name, Appleton-with-Hull. In this portion (Hull) is to be found a farm which to the present day is known as *Daintith* Farm. A short distance south of the farmhouse is an old house called "Denow" which has in one of the window places an inscription "wDe, 1661." These are said to be the initials of William Daintith and his wife. The name of William Daintith appears in the list of Charterers in Appleton in 1666 in Sir Peter Leicester's history. There is a strong probability that these Daintiths were of the same family as the minister of that name.

The next minister, Thomas Slater Layland, was buried in the graveyard in 1602, and is styled on the stone "a minister of the gospel." In 1642 Mr. Tillam was the minister, and in 1650 he removed to Hexham, in Northumberland, but a year or two later he returned to Hill Cliff for a short time. There are several published accounts having reference to Hill Cliff, which will be here introduced. In an account of Cromwell's visit to Lancashire, by Dr. Kendrick, the following information appears :-Tradition further asserts-and with much probability, when the habits of the great soldier are considered-that Cromwell (not then yet Lord Protector) during his brief stay in the town attended worship in the ancient Baptist chapel at Hill Cliff, a mile and a half distant from Warrington; and it is further said that one of his soldiers-a common occurrence during the Civil War occupied the

pulpit on the occasion. No doubt the stern soldier-preacher would regale the General and his hearers with an address, under various heads, in the orthodox "I smite-them-hip-and-thigh style," and bristling with wrested texts supposed to be appropriate to the occasion. Another tradition current among the congregation who still worship at Hill Cliff Chapel is to the effect that during the Civil War troubles, a man and his wife, members of the congregation suffered martyrdom presumably for their religious tenets by order of a person of high authority in Warrington." Lord Derby is evidently the person indicated. Dr. Kendrick was not successful in finding any written record of the occurrence when collecting materials for the compilation of his paper above referred to; yet the tradition, he observes, is singularly in accord with a passage in 'Lancashire's Valley of Achor,' printed in the same year (1643), in which it is stated that the Royalists at Warrington killed a godly man and his wife in their own house."

The next time Lord Derby passed through Warrington was after the "crowning mercy of Worcester" as a prisoner, on his way to Bolton, where he was executed.

The minister's walking-stick and pulpit Bible of this time are still in existence. The Bible was printed in 1638, and was used a few years later as the pulpit Bible.

Some records published in a history of the Northern Baptists, by David Douglas, have reference to Hill Cliff Baptist Chapel and its position at this time. At page 7, writing of Hexham, the place to which Mr. Tillam, the minister of Hill Cliff, had a short time previously removed, the author says :-"Hexham is also distinguished for the antiquity and beauty of its cathedral or abbey. This was erected in 673 by St. Wilfrid, Bishop of York. Two other churches, St. Mary's and St. Peter's, were erected by him about the same time. St. Mary's was the parish church, and its remains are nearly completely obliterated; St. Peter's completely so. In 1130 the cure of the parish returned to the abbey. The living is a perpetual curacy. A lectureship was established in the church by the Mercers' Company of London, pursuant to the will and bequest of Mr. Richard Fishbourne, dated March 30th, 1625."

We have given these minute particulars of this interesting town owing to the circumstance that the first Baptist minister in it held a lectureship belonging to the abbey, the duties of which he performed, and the salary of which he received. The messuage and orchard purchased by Mr. Fishbourne's legacies would likewise be possessed by him. The name of this individual was Mr. Thomas Tillam, "a messenger," as he styles himself, "of one of the seven churches in London." He appears to have been originally a Catholic, and had traveled on the Continent, but afterwards seems to have been converted to the Protestant faith, and to have united himself with the Baptists. He was selected by the church to which he belonged to be a minister of the gospel, as he gives himself the designation of minister. The nature of his work may be known from what is said of another individual who

lived in the same period in Ireland namely, Mr. Thomas Patient. Of him it is affirmed that he had, by the Baptist Church in Dublin, "been appointed an evangelist to preach up and down in the country." Such appears to have been the work of Mr. Tillam. We are not informed to what church Mr. Tillam originally belonged, or by what church he was first appointed to ministerial labor; but when he came to Hexham he was married, and Mrs. Tillam is said to have been a member of the Church in Cheshire, probably Hill Cliff, as afterwards noticed; and we find also that Mr. Tillam, soon after he came to Hexham, went to Cheshire to itinerate for a short time. From these considerations it seems probable that Mrs. Tillam was a native of Cheshire, and that he himself had, before his coming to Hexham, been a resident in that county, and had preached the gospel there.

It was the church in Coleman Street, London, then under the care of Messrs. Hansard Knollys, John Perry, and William Howard, that sent Mr. Tillam as their messenger to Hexham.

1653. In the beginning of March, the church at Hexham wrote to the church in London soliciting them to allow Mr. Tillam, to whom they refer in the most affectionate terms, to become their pastor. They say "Although as a general officer he hath labored amongst us, yet our hearts' desires are for a nearer interest in him, if) by the will of God, this grace may be ministered unto us by you." Every church, it would appear, at that period, seems to have claimed a special right in its members and the ministers it ordained, so that none of these, without their sanction, could unite with any other church, either as members, ministers, or pastors. When a pastor then was wanted by any church, application was made) not to the minister himself, but to the church with whom he was connected, and if he did anything without their concurrence, he was either suspended or dismissed, Circumstances, however, so transpired that Mr. Tillam never became pastor. (Thus, so early as the 1st of March, 1653, did the feuds begin between Mr. Goare and Mr. Tillam, and went on increasing till 1655, when Mr. Tillam appears to have withdrawn from the church.) The good cause, however, still continued to advance in this place. On the 19th March three females were baptized. One Charles Bond, a member of Dr. Chamberlain's church, London, was admitted to communion on the 3rd April, and on the same day a member named John Hudspeth was excluded, and Mr. Tillam also, at this time, was solemnly commended to the grace of God (like Paul when he left Antioch) in proceeding to Cheshire on a missionary or evangelistic tour. It is called "The work in Cheshire," and it is said, "The church sent their deacon with their minister (like John surnamed Mark, with Paul) in much love, by which many were added to the church in Cheshire." When this church was formed in this county we are not told; but from its being *the* church in Cheshire, we may conclude that it was the only church in the whole county at that time. (1653)

On the return of Mr. Tillam and the deacon from their mission, it is said that "it caused great joy to the church at Hexham."

(The following is a footnote in the text, REP:

This was probably the ancient church at Hill Cliffe, in this county, near to Warrington, and was likely, from this sometimes called the Church of Warrington. Of this church Hr. How was pastor in 1689. Sec Chap. iv.

Mr. Tillam was an author, one of his books being entitled "The Temple of Lively Stones; or, the prophecied glory of the last days appearing in the perfect pattern of the House in the top of the mountains, established upon the never-failing foundation of Apostles and Prophets, by Christ, the Chief Corner Stone.) Page 57. 1651.

Some time between the 6th and 28th of May, Mr. Tillam appears to have gone to London and visited other churches. Whilst in London, Mr. Tillam wrote a letter to the church at Hexham, an extract from which Mr. Douglas gives ; then proceeds: ' There is no date to this letter, but it is probable that it was sent to Hexham along with another that at this time is dated Warrington, 4m. (June), 26th day, 1654. Mr. Tillam, in the above letter, mentions his having received a letter from the church at Coleman Street to the church in Cheshire. It seems, as already intimated) that this was the ancient church at Hill Cliff, near Warrington. It is probable that some of the members lived at Warrington, and the church at Hill Cliff had meetings there. It is known that they were a zealous people, as they afterwards laid the foundation of a church in Liverpool. No other church is ever referred to in Cheshire but one, and as Hill Cliff is very ancient, it seems most likely to have been it; and from the interest Mr. Tillam seems always to have taken in it, and the affectionate manner in which they refer to him in their letter) and the relationship they say they have to him in common with the church at Hexham, all seem to render it highly probable that it was the church of which Mrs. Tillam was a member, and which Mr. Tillam had visited on a former occasion mentioned in our narrative.

OLD LETTER

"As this is perhaps the only ancient document of this church in existence, we give it entire:

"Dearly Beloved in ye Lord our hope and joy. The choicest graces and spiritual blessings be multiplied and continually flowing into your souls from yt Eternal Fountain where refreshing streams of Divine consolations have (through grace) been conveying unto us by His eminent (by us intirely affected) servant of Jes. Christ. [Note.-Supposed to be Mr. Tillam], who we trust will be instrumental in ye hand of our God, whom we serve, to carry on both you and us in this our pilgrimage in a progress of grace, so as one day He may present us with exceeding joy, one pure and spotless virgin before our Redeemer, when he of whom ye Lord bath made such a blessed use, shall shine as stare in glory.

"Precious brethren! that we faint not in this our journey, how necessary ist yt our joint interest be mutually improved at the Throne of Grace, in each other's behalf, that in these dangerous declining times, when 'tis evident, our grand adversary, perceiving his tottering kingdom near a fall, is employing his utmost force and deepest subtiltye to delude and draw poor souls from their profession.

"We desire to magnify the name of or God for that refreshment to or spirits received by yr sweet epistle, wherein doth appear ye steadfastness of yr faith in Jes. Chr., manger all ye malice manifested by ye endeavors of ye enemy and his instruments, some of whom have been busily employed in these parts to the saddening of many, yet through mercy we stand to ye praise of ye glory of yt grace, which we acknowledge our support.

"We bless God for ye continual enlargement of yr hearts to ye liberty of or dearly beloved brother's stay with us, though God is pleased to order it now but short.

"Brethren, we beseech you, pray for us yt ye know- ledge of Jesus Christ may increase among us, yt we may come to a more clear approbation of ye great mystery God in Christ and Christ in us, united and made one with Him by ye eternal spirit. Then shall we perfectly see ye tabernacle of God dwelling with men, and have occasion (from such blessed communion) to rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory when all doubts and distractions will be passed away; nee night or cloud to interpose between or souls and ye love of or precious Redeemer. Ah! this would he a precious pledge or earnest of yt glorious condition into which we shortly shall be translated when we have a full enjoyment of Him whom now our souls are thirsting after, in unconceivable and eternal joy.

Peace be to all, with love and faith from God or Father and Lord Jes. Chr. in whom wee are entirely yr affectionate brethren. WILL BOOTH. THOS. FOLLINGS.

PETER EATON.

JOHN TOMLESON.

ROBERT MILLINGTON.

JOHN SPROSON.

THO. HOLLAND.

CHAS. HOLLAND.

Ric. AMERY.

Warrington, 4m., 26

day, 1654."

Here are some important points in conclusion:

- 1. The ancient origin and succession the Baptists in general and the old Hill Cliff church in particular;**
- 2. The close connection between the old church and the Coleman Street Church in London which Hansard Knollys pastored. Mr. Knollys will witness for us later about the orderly and historic origin of the London Particular Baptists. He was one with William Kiffen who was one with John Spilsbury.**
- 3. The manner in which Mr. Thomas Tillam came among the old Baptists at Hill Cliff. By noting this you will understand that The Coleman St. Church sent Mr. Tillam to the Hill**

Cliff area as a church messenger. You will see that the Hill Cliff church requested the Mr. Tillam's release from that church so he could become the minister at Hill Cliff;

4. You were introduced to Dr. Peter Chamberlain. He pastored an ancient Sabbatherian Particular Baptist Church. Dr. Chamberlain's church stood for the laying on hands after baptism and before church communion;
5. Dr. Chamberlain and William Kiffen debated on the matter of laying on hands in 1646. Dr. Chamberlain was a very high grace Particular Baptist. His church was never in the London Association of Particular Baptist Churches, but still was one with them except for the matter of laying on of hands and the Sabbath question.
6. This is another example of an ancient Particular Baptist Church in the London area that we know very little about. In their first volume of historical studies, the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland have a large and interesting study about Dr. Chamberlain, but there is not much about his church or its origin.
7. Note as well the mention of Thomas Patient in Ireland and his gospel outreach work.

Now let us briefly turn toward another church.

The Particular Baptist Church at Hexham

The Particular Baptist Church in London meeting in Coleman Street walking with Mr. Hansard Knollys sent Mr. Thomas Tillam to Hexham to gather a church in gospel order. This he did. We shall give an account of this in a few moments. First, I want to lay a foundation:

1. In 1645 Mr. Knollys baptized and ordained Mr. Henry Jessey. Jessey maintained his pastorate at the Pedobaptist church. In fact, in this church there existed two groups, a Baptist Church and a Pedobaptist church. Mr. Richard Adams pastored the Baptist group. When Jessey died, this group went over to Mr. Kiffen's church and joined there. Mr. Adams became Kiffen's assistant minister. For a while the old Hexham church letters from two Particular Baptists on Coleman Street, one from the Knollys' church and the other from the Jessey' church. When the strict Baptists left the Hexham church, then the strict Baptists disowned them, and the open and mixed communion people around Jessey and Tombs only recognized them as a church. This shall all be given later when I present the series of letters covering this. These letters are the original letters that passed back and forth between these old churches.
2. In the 1640s, large revivals broke out all over the land where these old Particular Baptist ministers went.
3. Multitudes were converted and baptized, church were constituted;
4. Great excitement followed hard upon these revivals and the new churches, with newly baptized ministers, gathered in many different types of people;
5. During the late 1640s and early 1650s two elements began to form, there started up the idea that the newly baptized should have the laying on of hands to give them the Holy Spirit; and also some went the other way and felt it was alright to take in many before and without baptism, while they were seeking for further light;
6. These two concepts produced devastating effects on many of the Particular Baptists in the late 1640s and early 1650s;
7. The church at Hexham was no exemption. It being a new church, and made up of many new Baptists, it was natural that it should be carried about with terrible winds of heresy;
8. It went into a mixed communion mode, and ceased much fellowship with Hansard Knollys and took up fellowship with Mr. Henry Jessey;

9. Mr. Henry Jessey was the father of mixed membership and open communion among the Baptists in the 1640s;
10. God raised up a very strong voice against this practice at Hexham and elsewhere, Mr. Thomas Goare;
11. Mr. Goare was one of the original signers of the First London Confession, editions of 1644 and 1646. He moved out into the country and gathered a church at Newcastle.
12. That is not all, Mr. Goare came from that old Church that he, Paul Hobson and Mr. Green formed in 1638;
13. They were first with Mr. Spilsbury and his Wapping church;
14. Mr. Goare stands as another link in the oneness between Spilsbury and the others on the side of closed communion and closed church membership.
15. In due time this will be explained more fully.

Now, here is an account of the origin of the church at Hexham.

The Hexham Church

In dealing with this old church, there are certain epics to be noted:

1. Thomas Tillam began the church as a messenger from Hansard Knolly's church in London;
2. Soon thereafter, a member of Dr. Chamberlain's church came among them. This began the controversy of the laying on of hands;
3. Thomas Goare, one of Spilsbury's early ministers, now in Newcastle with Paul Hobson, opposed Tillam and was so successful in his opposition that Knolly's Church excluded Tillam over the laying on of hands upon baptized believers;
4. In due time the Hexham church split over this issue;
5. In addition to this split, the Hexham church became also an mixed membership church, and started receiving letters from and fellowshipped with Henry Jessey's mixed membership church meeting in Coleman St. in London; soon they were recognized by John Tombs and those who fellowshipped with him in mixed membership churches.
6. An added highlight is that of Edward Hickhorngill. The original Hexham Church sent him as a messenger into Scotland to help in the Lord's work there.

These points are all very important and show again the oneness of John Spilsbury, William Kiffen, Paul Hobson, Thomas Goare and Hansard Knollys.

This information is from *The Records of the Churches of Christ, gathered at Fenstaton, Warboys, and Hexham, 1644-1720*; edited for The Hansard Knollys Society, by Edward Bean Underhill; London, 1854.

THE RECORDS, ETC

IN the name of the Lord Christ, I (Thomas Tillam-REP) came to Hexham the 27th day of the 10th month, 1651, and so wonderfully hath God appeared in this dark corner, that upon the 21st day of the 5th month, 1652 (that is, the

7th month following), after serious consideration and some gospel preparation, a living temple began of these living stones:-

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN HEXHAM

Thomas Tillam, minister, and a messenger of one of the seven churches in London, did administer the holy ordinance of baptism, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (under the] 4th principle'). (Here is a listing of several names, under the fourth principal means laying on hands following baptism and before the Lord's Supper. REP)

These, solemnly giving up themselves to the Lord and one to another, to walk In communion together with submission to all the ordinances of the gospel, I, Tho. Tillam, espoused to one husband; hoping that I shall present them a chaste virgin to Christ, with all that in sincerity of heart, have (through the mighty power of God), or shall be, joined to them.

At my desire and testimonial of my wife, as a member of the church of Christ in Cheshire, they gave her the right hand of fellowship.

The 25th day of the 5th month, 1662, the church joyfully celebrated the Lord's supper:

John Thirlwall being desired (for proof) to supply the place of deacon. And the church began a stock, putting it into his hand. Persons since baptized and added to the church,

The 23rd day of the seventh month] the church celebrated a day of praise, and had a love-feast, and after it the holy ordinance of our Lord's supper; to which we admitted Richard Denton Trumpet, a member of one of the London churches.

Brother Holmes minister of By well [Northumberland], a member of' a church in London, was admitted to 'our communion, 8th month. 17th day.

The 20th day of the 10th month, the church, with prayer, fasting, and imposition of the hands of the minister, ordained brother Hickhorngill a minister, and their messenger into Scotland; and brother John Thirlwall, deacon.

Charles Bond, a member with Dr. Chamberlain,' was admitted to communion, 2nd mo., 3rd day. And the same day, John Hudspeth, who before was suspended and again embraced, was now excommunicated.

The same day the church solemnly commended their minister to the grace of God for the work in Cheshire, and sent their deacon with him, in much love. By which means many were added to the church in Cheshire, which, upon our return, caused great joy to the church of Hexham; whereunto, by the

Lord's presence with the labors of Tho. Tillam and S. Anderton, preaching in several parts of the country, many precious souls fly as a cloud, and as doves to their windows.

The 4th month, 4th day, a child of the devil came from Rome to ruin this church, and with great subtlety made a most glorious confession of Christ, pretending that he had been a Jew, and that his name was Joseph Ben Israd. After his declaration in the parish house, he was baptized. But the Holy One of Israel, our gracious Protector, brought the hellish impostor to light before he had any church communion. Ever blessed be his glorious name for this great deliverance.

[Mr. Douglas has given at some length an account of this singular imposture. The pretended Rabbi turned out to be the son of Dr A. Ramsey, a Scotch physician. This story is confirmatory of the wide spread impression existing during the Commonwealth, that papist spies were employed to add to the distractions of the times, by mixing with the various sects. Douglas, History of N. Churches, pp.24-29. Broadmead Records, pp. 42-46.]

The 5th month, 3rd day, we prepared for the great work at Stokesley, seven members engaging in the journey, where Mr. William Kaye, the minister, and nineteen with him, were baptized by Tho. Tillam; a work of wonder, and calling for our high praises. In our journey, going and returning, eight persons were baptized, and are since added to the church of Hexham.

Three ministers engaging at Muggleswicke, their great design being to set up infant sprinkling, and the people in great expectation; the Lord so appeared on our side, that six persons, the same evening, desired the ordinance of baptism, and the next morning were baptized.

The 16th of the 6th month, Capt. Sympson and Capt. Mason, with br. Blenkinsop, came to visit us, by order, - from London and Newcastle church & They hearing of our constitution and condition, sweetly and lovinly owned us as their brethren; which was far from the rugged and unbrotherly carriage of Mr. Goare, &c.

The beginning of the 10th month, 1653) a charge came from the church of Newcastle, to the brethren of Derwent-side, consisting of twelve articles against Mr. Tillam, wherein manifestly appeared a subtle design to break or divide the church of Hexham. To which the person concerned returned (55 was but needful) a speedy answer, which was approved; a Christian, sober, and faithful answer, and such as they did hope would amount to the satisfaction of those that follow after such things as make for peace amongst brethren. And as such it was subscribed by the whole church's full consent.

STEPHEN ANDERTON, JOHN THIRLWALL, JOHN READSRAW, Deacons and ect.

Notwithstanding, Mr. Goare, with much violence, labored with the church at London, from whom Mr. Tillam was a messenger; but God blasted all his endeavors, and wonderfully preserved the integrity of his despised servant, giving him still a large room in the hearts of his people of that society. Ever praised be His most glorious name.

Mr. Thomas Gower, or Gower, or Gover, was a member of the church at Newcastle, and a colleague of Mr. Paul Hobson, at this time one of it's ministers. This other church is the one at Coleman St. of Mr. Hansard Knollys was pastor.

Great storms and commotions, raised by Mr. Gower more than ever, so far prevailing with the church in Coleman Street, as to a disowning of Mr. Tillam, and all that are in the practice of laying on of hand.

Mr. Anderton first endeavored a schism about imposition of hands; but failing therein, he opened his mouth in blaspheming against Mr. Tillam's doctrine, and plunged himself into other gross evils. For which he was by the elders, with the joint approbation of the church, delivered unto Satan, with Thomas Ogle.

The 4th of the 9th month, 1655, the church withdrew from Jo. Warde and John Readshaw. Rom. 1. 31; 2 Tim. in~. 3.

The lath 18th of the 9th month, 1655.

Being at Richmond, Ann Blackburne and Ann Lambe were added to the church.

Brother Blenkinsopp and brother Angas having been at Dotland Park to invite us to a meeting with Derwent friends, we met them at Eadsbridge, the 26th of the 4th month, 1656; where we debated the cause of our division. And we did confess we had done better if we had laid Mr. Tillam aside, and not so suddenly bad communion with him, till & first we had used all means, and waited some time, to satisfy Coleman Street church by which we know) in the insufficiency of their grounds of dealing with Mr. Tillam. And also for the evil that br. Heslopp acquainted us with, we should not have communion with him, till God should give him repentance; laboring by all means for peace with truth, but could not have it, unless we could see ourselves to have & sinned in not hearkening unto the first testimony of Coleman Street church, concerning their withdrawing from Mr. Tillam, though contrary to our consciences and [to] appearances, and would own our friends' withdrawing (as they call it) from us to be according to rule. And so we parted) leaving them (as appeared to us) in the same mind they were before they went to London. Though in private, elder Warde did seem to confess their withdrawing not right, as to manner, before brother Blenkinsopp.

The 11th of the 5th month went to Newcastle to the messengers. The 15th of the same, our Derwent friends and we met before them there. The 22nd [was] agreed upon for a conclusion between us and meeting at brother Joblin's, and each party declaring the sense of their miscarriage to the other, we were by the messengers declared to be one body in the Lord.

The same day, the messengers having the bearing of the difference betwixt Mr. Anderton and the church, they judged Mr. Anderton had no warrantable ground to withdraw from the church, and that his withdrawing was but a fruit of passion, and [a breach of] the rules by which he pretended to withdraw; but the grounds for which the church dealt with him [were] warrantable and . . . much whereof was confusedly by himself granted.

The 28th of the 9th month ('58), the church withdrew from Tho. Rewcastle, for marrying with an unbeliever. - 1 Cor. vii. 39, and ix. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15.

The 26th of the 10th month ('58,), John Johnson did acknowledge his sin (from Rom. xiii. 13, 14), in going to one of the world's drinkings after a wedding, and so was received; and so did Jo. Orde for the same.

The 14th of the 2nd month, 1660, Stephen Anderton made a declaration to the church of his repentance; and was again received with great joy.

The 22nd of the same, Aylos Robson and Elizabeth Younger were baptized, and the 13th of the 3rd month were added to the church.

[Mr. Hickhorngill was appointed a messenger of the church to Scotland on the 20th December, 1652.]

[Monk, who shortly after left Scotland, and took a command in the fleet in the Dutch War.]

[A Col. Charles Howard was associated with Col. Lilburne as a substitute for Lambert, in the execution of his office as one of the military major-generals appointed by Cromwell in 1655; Carlyle's Cromwell, ji. 376.]

[In Guizot Memoirs of Monk, Lilburne is spoken of as a "fanatic Anabaptist". In 1647, he was governor of Newcastle-on-tyne, and the year following sat as one of the king's judges and signed the warrant of execution. On the restoration he was tried as a regicide, but offered no defense. He was exiled to the isle of St. Nicholas, off Plymouth, where he died in 1665.]

HANSARD KNOLLYS,' JOHN PERRY,'

[Mr. Hansard Knollys was born in 1598; and died at the good old age of Ninety-three. He was buried in Bunhill field. He became a Baptist about the year 1636, surrendering his preferment in the establishment. As confessor

of Christ he was eminent, and endured several imprisonments, and years of exile, for the truth; Wilson, 2, p. 563].

**THOMAS BUTTIVANT, HENRY PARRPOINTE, THEODORE JENNINGS,
JOHN . . . WILLIAM SPIER, WILLIAM JENNINGS, BENEDICT HUNT,**

London, signed with the unanimous consent of the church assembled in one, this 9th day of the eleventh month, 1652-3; William Howard, John Amiger.

Mr. Tornbs. Brethren, be earnest with God, that I may walk worthy of his mercies bestowed upon me, and that I may have a prosperous and speedy return to you For God is my witness how greatly I long after you all in the bowels of Jesus Christ. Oh I how greatly have you endeared [yourselves to] me, by your faithful affection and tender care of my dear yoke fellow, which is conveyed through mine eye to my heart, by the faithful pen of my beloved brother Rich. Orde unto whom I return my unfeigned thanks. And I thank and heartily salute you all. Oh that you could embrace it as the mind of Christ, to greet one another with a holy kiss. Oh how amiable it is in the churches where it is practiced. Salute my beloved yoke fellow. The churches of Christ do bless you and heartily salute you. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, Amen.

[The laying on of hands, Heb. Vi. 1.]

[Mr. Tillam and Mr. Anderton were commended to the work in Cheshire, by this church, on the 3rd April, 1653.]

[Mr. D'Anvers says the practice of laying on of hands was first introduced in 1646, by Mr. Cornwell, then a minister of a baptized congregation in Kent. It was first practiced in London by the church meeting in the Spittle in Bishopsgate Street, after sermons by Mr. Cornwell on the subject, see the above year. Treatise page 53.]

The First London Confession of Faith from Scotland:

A

CONFESSION OF FAITH,

**Of the several Congregations or Churches of Christ in London, which are
commonly (though unjustly) called**

ANABAPTISTS.

**Published for the vindication of the Truth, and Information of the ignorant;
likewise for the taking off of those aspersions which are frequently, both in
Pulpit and Print,
unjustly cast upon them.**

**Unto which is added
HEART-BLEEDINGS**

For Professors abominations:

Or a faithful general Epistle (from the same Churches) presented to all who have known the way of truth, forewarning them to flee Security, and careless walking under the profession of the same; discovering some of Satans wiles, whereby also wanton persons and their ungodly ways are disclaimed.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way they call heresy, so worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things that are written in the Law and the Prophets, and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, Acts 24. 14, 15.

For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen, and heard, Acts 4:20.

The Fourth Impression Corrected.

Printed at Leith, 1653.

To the Impartial Reader:

The consideration of these many errors that is this day abroad in the world, by which many poor souls are deluded through the entanglements of Satan, together with the inventions of men, by reason of that gross ignorance which over spreads the hosts of people, we find ourselves engaged to bear witness to that truth of God which we possess and practice, which is so much mistaken, vilified and rejected: We therefore are willing to preprint this ensuing Confession of our Faith, together with Heart-bleedings for Professors' Abominations, it being formerly set forth by the Churches walking in the order of the gospel in London as that which does contain the principals and substance both of theirs and our Faith and order. And since the Lord has given to us an understanding heart, and enlightened eyes in the reading hereof, it will be by a means to take off that prejudice which generally returns to us. We find that mostly persons in these days are subject to one of these three extremes, viz., to sit down in a state of wickedness, without in this evil world, or else to cloth themselves with a form of godliness without submitting to the power of it, and so walk short of the golden rule of the Gospel. . .(cannot make out the words here) or become notional under pretence of enjoyments tramplanting the Lord and His Truth under foot, as legal, and too contemptible for them to walk in; but if any hereby shall gain information and a better light, and are willing to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, God shall have the glory,

themselves shall reap the benefit, and we shall receive our reward, who subscribe ourselves faithful friends to all that wish well to Sion;

Leith the 10th of the first Month, Vulgarly called March, 1652, 3.

Signed in the name and by the appointment of the Church of Christ, usually meeting at Leith and Edinburgh. THOMAS SPENSER, ABRA. HOLMES, THO.POWELL, JOHN BRADY.

The Epistle to the Reader.

Courteous Reader,

There is nothing wherein Saints should be more conversant than in promoting the honor of the Lord and His Christ, striving and studying to walk before him agreeable to the truth recorded in His word, the consideration of which, is a strong inducement unto us to engage (to the utmost of our abilities) in this work, that when other men content themselves by living below the rule, we may strive to walk close thereunto, (suitable to the pattern left us by God in His word) and when many account it their glory to turn their backs upon what they professed to have received from Christ, we may strive to honor God, by a steadfast continuance in what we have received, and in a diligent speaking the things which we have seen and heard from him; the weight of which at first prevailed upon us to declare unto the world this our Confession of Faith, and faithful Epistle, which we have again reprinted, and made public for the reasons following.

First, the invitations and earnest solicitations of several of our Brethren, from all parts of the Nation, whose hearts long to behold (in public) our stability and perseverance in the way and truth of our God, that by it they may have wherewith to put to silence those who have lately taken liberty to reproach and undervalue the truth professed by us.

Secondly, that the world may behold that through grace, (by which alone we stand) we are preserved from back-sliding or revolting from the way and truth, we for some years have followed God in: IN which (through the faith and obedience) we trust to be continued, unto the coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, that we might prevent Satan and his accomplices in their enterprises, who have of late abounded more than ordinary, with stratagems and inventions to circumvent poor Saints, in their stability and love unto the truth, amongst which this was no small one (in several remote parts) that we had cast off all our former profession and practice, so that none remained together, worshipping God in His way, owning themselves the Churches of Christ, but were grown up to a further attainment and light (as they say) to live more immediately with God and Christ, then in so low,

mean, and contemptible a way as Ordinances, thinking thereby to stumble and dishearten many, whose hearts were approved to God.

Fourthly, That we might take off prejudice from the hearts of those (many of which we have comfortable hopes) who are or may be prejudiced against us, from these many invectives, and bitter unjust reproaches, we are or may be (for worshipping our God according to our consciences and rule of truth) exposed unto, and they (if it be the good pleasure of our God) come to understand our practice, and subject themselves to the Lord in His commands.

Lastly, The remembrance of what good this our undertaking hath formerly done in the Countries, where it hath been spread (of which we have had particular notice from several, whose hearts have been refreshed therewith) is no small inducement to us to bring this forth again in print.

Courteous Friend, we desire thee soberly to weigh and consider what we have professed before men and Angels, out of the simplicity of our hearts, and let not prejudice prevent your profiting. But make it your great care and study to give up your understanding to love and receive the truth, as it is in Jesus, delighting thyself in that Government, which is by His own hand established in His house. Be not disheartened although thou should hear of the miscarriage of some, knowing that in many things we sin all, and come short of the grace of our God. Or if thou should be advertised of the falling away of any one, do but consider we live in the last ages of the world, Wherein many shall depart from the truth, (neither is it a new thing for men to relinquish their profession.)

But strive thou to follow God fully, and to stand fast in the simplicity of the truth; and God our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ be with thee, and be your guide and Counselor.

Signed in the name, and by the appointment of the aforesaid several Churches, meeting in London.

William Kiffen,	Edward Harrison,
John Spilsbery,	Richard Graves,
Joseph Sanson,	Edward Roberts,
Hugh Gosnell,	Thomas Waters,
Thomas Pault,	Henry Forthy,
Joseph Patshall,	Thomas Young,
William Conset,	John Watson.

Hickhorngill's Fall and Recovery

[After a while Mr. Hickhorngill went off into Quakerism and notionalism (seekerism), common for many in those days, but he did not remain in such

a condition. What follows is a series of letters dealing with this issue between the church at Hexham and the church at Leigh. In addition, you will note his happy restoration and return from such a terrible condition.

After this series of letters we will consider the Hexham church being disowned by the closed membership brethren and then their being received by the mixed membership churches. This was the beginning of their long decline and near death for many, many years. REP]

14. Mr. Thomas Stackhouse to the church at Hexham.

Dear Brethren,- After that the Lord had brought me safe hither, I was kindly entertained by Major General Lilburne in his house, who lovingly received the epistle, inquired of you all, and declared his joy in my return. It was his pleasure that I should continue here until Mr. Hickhorngill came back, and then if he refused to stand as formerly, to take me into the same relation. I was invited, and went to the church at Leith, where I obtained this enclosed for you. Touching that passage of their dealing with Mr. Hickhorngill, I did object that it was the judgement of some in the church at Hexham, that no person ought to have the censure of excommunication past upon him in any church, but in that only wherein he was first a member; and that it was conceived to be their duty only to admonish, withdraw, and certify concerning him. And therefore I desired some scripture from them that I might represent to you as a warrant for such a practice, for the satisfaction of those that question it. They offered none to me, save that of Titus iii. 10, and their unanimous approbation of it. Yet, nevertheless, they desired me to acquaint you that they were willing, if you had an opportunity, that you rather should deal with him; because they apprehended you had where withal to charge him, which they had not. The 12th of this instant he came to Dalkeith in a swaggering garb, full of vain and idle discourse, and in my judgment a desperate atheist. He hath caused much sadness upon the spirits of all his brethren here. And the colonel professeth that he is very much afflicted in him. When at supper he was desired to crave a blessing, he publicly replied that his devotion was worn threadbare, and often saith that he hath left his religion in England. He saith that he went from hence a Quaker; but now hath attained to a better and higher dispensation, wherein he finds much comfort, and rests upon the everlasting arm of his God, being overtaken neither with fear, anger, nor sorrow, but is full of joy in his God. And [he] propounds no other rule to himself but his reason, which if a man sin not against, he shall be happy enough. He seems to be very worldly, and is willing to stand as chaplain, though he will neither pray nor preach, otherwise than by common discourse. He is very cautious and sparing of his discourse with me. The reason he gives is, because he knows it is my principle to declare to the church what I know of him. Though he cares not a fig for excommunication, yet he would not be talked of in the world. He is very wicked and blasphemous. I have acquainted brother Tillam with some of his impieties, which I think he will communicate to you. Let him that stands take heed lest he fall. And now, my dear brethren, if you consider my

condition here, it will call for the improvement of all your interest at the throne of grace for me. My work is great; my strength is small. My life in every respect is warfare. Corruptions within, enemies without. And though I never was in a condition wherein I might enjoy God and myself more fully, yet therein I see much danger, lest in this fat pasture I should lift up my heel against him that found out my way. My life hath been sweet to me, ever since I came from you, until Mr. Hickhorngill came, who troubles all that love the welfare of Sion, and causes them to vex their souls from day to day with his unlawful deed. My brother Bond. and I had had a sore trial. We have not wrestled with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers, with spiritual wickedness in high places, having had many secret temptations stealing in upon us unawares, even the fiery darts of Satan, our wicked hearts being full of atheism. But blessed be God that hath given strength to overcome them, and hath taught us to deny the wicked one and his instruments any further discourse. For why should we question the reality of those things which we have seen, and tasted, and handled? I am much refreshed when I think of your faith and love (James v. 16), and I doubt not but you will be mindful of,

Your poor brother in the faith, Tho. STACKHOUSE
Dalkeith, 5th month, 14th day, 1653.

15. Letter of commendation.

To all the churches of Christ in the grace and order of the gospel, joy and peace, with everlasting rest.

Holy and beloved,- After our dear salutations in the Lord Jesus, we offer unto your Christian communion, care, and guard, this our beloved brother, Hugh Hesloppe, who is baptized in the name of the Lord, and in full communion with us, your brethren; who do beseech you to open your arms of love to embrace and instruct him, according to the mind of Christ; in whom we are, Your most affectionate brethren, praying for your flourishing estate in these days of the power of our Lord Jesus. THOMAS TILLAM.

From the church of Christ at Hexham, in Northumberland, 23rd, sixth month, 1653.

16. Edward Hickhorngill to the church at Hexham

For the church of Christ at Hexham,

Dear Friends, - I cannot but be sensible of the perseverance of your love and tenderness, signified in a letter to brother Stackhouse, notwithstanding my inexcusable slighting and neglecting you. And truly how much your and long-suffering, after all my prodigal-like extravagances, hath wrought with me, I am not able to express. Blessed be God that hath not quite estranged the hearts of my dear brethren from me. But hath yet, through the abundance of his free love, not only afforded me smiles from himself, but hath given me a room (as I hope) in your hearts which as I saddened too, too long, by a grievous apostasy. So now I doubt not but by an unfeigned return to rejoice you. For I can, through grace, experience that godly sorrow that worketh repentance never to be repented of; having wrought in me carefulness to walk more uprightly for the future; yea, what indignation to

my former wildness; yea, what fear further to offend. Yet still are my temptations strong, and my strength weak, having a heart hankering after novelties which haul (I find) hither to been my distemper, and partly the fuel of my extravagances. Let me, I beseech you, be happy in your fervent prayers to the Lord for me, and your Christian advice; and you will further be a comfort to me, and will add to all the former favors conferred upon, Your assuredly loving brother in the gospel bond,

E. HICKHORNGILL.

I am at present lieutenant to Captain Gascoigne, in Colonel Daniell's regiment, in his garrison of Johnston's; disposed hither by my old friend Colonel Lilburne, it being the first vacancy in Scotland after the resignation of my chaplain's employment. The brethren here at Johnston's are in good health, and would be glad to hear the same of you, and of the presence of the Lord with you. St. Johnston', 7ber, '53.

The Irish Connection

As we continue our travel back to London, and the 1630-40s, we must pause briefly and note the Particular Baptist outreach into Ireland. At this point, I am not as certain as I would like to be about several points:

1. I have not yet been able to document when or by whom the Particular Baptist outreach went into Ireland;
2. Cathcart feels like Thomas Patient may have been the first. However, many other brethren were in Ireland just as soon, if not sooner, than Patience.
3. Edward Drapes and John Vernon were both in Ireland in the mid to late 1640s. They were both from the Glasshouse church.
4. In addition to the many different preaching brothers from the London Particular Baptist Churches, Christopher Blackwood was also there.
5. The Calminian, Francis Cornwell, baptized Blackwood, a Particular Baptist. Blackwood belongs to that group of "Renegade Baptists" who believed in taking state pay for preaching. For this reason, he was never involved in the affairs of the London Particular Baptists though he wrote several interesting works. See our classifications of the Particular Baptists at the first part of this study.
6. When we first visit the Irish work and learn about their successes and their problems we find certain things present:
 - a. Well established gospel churches and ministers with a close connection with William Kiffen and John Spilsbury;
 - b. A close inner communion between the churches (not Lord's Supper, but church fellowship);
 - c. The Irish brethren looked upon the London Particular Baptists as their foundational standard by which they measured themselves;
 - d. The problem of open communion and open church membership came into Ireland and the strong and clear majority of the brethren put it down.

Because of the increasing concerns about open communion, the brethren drafted, signed and sent a large letter from Waterford to Dublin on Jan. 14, 1652. White, page122; I do not now have this letter, if I secure it I shall add it later.

The Irish Particular Baptist records show us the close union between the Particular Baptists in Ireland and in London. In fact, most of the known ministers came from the Seven Particular Baptist Churches in London.

One important highlight of the Irish Baptist work occurred after Oliver Cromwell died. Henry, the new Protector of the United Kingdom, tried to bring John Spilsbury over into Ireland in an effort to make sure the Irish Anabaptists remained loyal to him as they did to his father. In her remarkable work, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum*, Dr. Louise Fargo Brown records this interesting fact about Henry Cromwell, Oliver's son, and his efforts to secure the services of John Spilsbury in Ireland:

He followed his father's advice in using efforts to conciliate the Baptists still hostile to the government, assiduously circulating the loyal address of the Welsh Baptists to Cromwell. He endeavored, too, to secure for Ireland the ministry of Spilsbury, the Baptist minister who had so successfully interceded with his brethren the previous year. That worthy divine had, however, just accepted a call from a "very great people" in England, and was not obtainable.

The date is documented at the note on the bottom of the page as Feb. 19, 1655/6; p. 160.

Spilsbury referred to the newly gathered church at Bromsgrove as the "very great people"

As we dig deeply into the pedobaptist writers, we find several bits and pieces of some value from Gangarea or Thomas Edwards, Presbyterian. In his *Gangraena*, volume 1, London 1646, he stated:

They (the Anabaptists-REP) send forth into several Countries of this Kingdom from their Churches in London, as Church acts, several Emissaries, members of their Churches, to preach, and spread their errors, to dip, to gather and settle Churches. They are not content with their own meetings on Lord's days, week days, keeping constant Lectures in set places for all to come to that will, thereby poisoning many in the City. They endeavor the leavening of all the Counties, as I might give instances of Lam, (Lamb, the General Baptist, REP) Kiffen, with many others sent abound, yea are some sent into the North as far as York. Page 65.

Trying to make the Anabaptists look like the Jesuits, Edwards stated:

As the Jesuits are famous for sending out Emissaries into several Countries, to corrupt, not contenting themselves to do mischief at home, so do our Sectaries send forth their members into all Counties and places of this Kingdom. They lay hands upon, and send them as a church act to preach such and such errors, to rebaptize ect. Pages 45, 46.

He makes this interesting statement:

. . . these men were sent down from the Church as a Church Act unto the country of Esses to make Disciples and propage their way, and indeed into most counties of England (where these men can do with safety) some Emissaries out of the Sectaries Churches are sent to infect and poison the counties, some out of Lamb's, some out of Kiffen's, some out of others. About September last one Kiffen, an Anabaptist, went his progress in Kent, and did a great deal of hurt; and I have been informed from good hands, by the means of some that are acquainted and intimate with them, that not only Emissaries from London go into these nigher counties, as Esses, Kent, Suffolk, Harford, Cambridge, &c., but into Yorkshire and those Northern parts (since reduced to the Parliament) and no doubt also into the West; and several Sectaries went early to Bristol and those parts, as one Mr. Bacon, Sumonds, &c., and

into Wales, also, so that we are like to have Sectarisme like a universal Leprosy over-spread this whole Kingdom. I pray God keeps it out of Ireland; and I hope Scotland by God's mercy, and the benefit of the Presbyterial Government will keep it out there. Page 93.

From these comments, we can gather that the Particular Baptists had not sent their "Emissaries" into Ireland yet in 1645. It is interesting to note that Edwards knew about their way of church sending.

The Irish notes which follow came from White's Particular Baptist Records to 1660, pages 110-124.

The Irish Correspondence of 1653

Editorial Note

The 'received text' of the documents printed below and dated from June and July 1653, was published by Joseph Ivimey in 1811 and was, apparently, derived from the work of John Rippon. The present text, however, is the result of the collation of a transcript made from the Ilston church book: with the version preserved in the Llanwerarth Church book. This is substantially different from Ivimey's. First, in the actual letter from Dublin as given here a longer text is preserved than that known to Ivimey and Rippon which reflects in rather more detail the political attitudes of the writers in the early summer of 1653. Secondly, some of the names of the Particular Baptists in Ireland are given more accurately and, thirdly, some additional fragments of information help to clarify a little further what was happening among them at the time.

The history in detail of the manuscript tradition of these documents can only be guessed but certain aspects of it seem quite clear. It seems probable, for example, that, when the London Baptists had read the letter and supporting documents which John Vernon had brought them, they had a large number of copies made which they had sent out, with their own covering letter, to a number of churches in England, Scotland and Wales. They, in their turn; it was evidently hoped, would make and pass on further copies to nearby congregations.

This correspondence has had its significance somewhat misunderstood by at least two students of the history of Baptist association life" in the present century and may finally prove to be of greater importance as reflecting political attitudes and eschatological hopes among the Calvinistic Baptists in Ireland in the months before the failure of the Barebones Parliament and the inauguration of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector.

I. The covering letter from London.

From the Church of Christ at Glasshouse, London
Dearly beloved brethren,

Whilst we were slumbering and sleeping with those wise virgins mentioned by our Savior, Mat. 25, regardless of the obligations and engagements to the Lord which, by so eminent and signal discoveries of love and works of wonder wrought for us in these last days, he hath laid upon us it hath pleased the Watchman of Israel, who neither slumbers nor sleeps, to raise up a quickening spirit in the hearts of our brethren of Ireland, provoking them to call upon us to awake to righteousness, to

remember our first love, to mend our hearts and not our garments and to turn to the Lord with our whole hearts that, doing our first works, we might receive answers of peace from the God of peace and healing of all our wounds from him, whose property is to heal backsliding and to love freely and that the weak amongst us might be as David and David as an angel of God.

We have sent you enclosed a copy of what we received from them, which we pray the Lord to sanctify to you as in some measure he hath done to us, that it may serve, through the co-operation of the Spirit, as Nathan's parable to David and as the cock-crowing to Peter, to bring to our remembrance all the deadness, wantonness, unfruitfulness, want of love and unsuitableness of spirit which have too much prevailed in you and upon you, to the grieving of the Spirit of God, the provoking of the eyes of his jealousy, the hardening of such as know not the Lord and the wounding of each other's hearts in these times of Gospel peace and liberty. We desire you to communicate the same to all our beloved brethren near you and, with all convenient speed, to certify us not only what effect the subject therein contained hath wrought upon your hearts but also a particular account of theirs and your estates and conditions with relation to your communion each with other, as grounded upon your fellowship with the Father and the Son, in the faith and obedience of the Gospel of Christ. In order whereunto we entreat your care and pains in visiting the several weak and scattered brethren in your parts, that from a thorough knowledge of, and acquaintance with, their present standing, we may receive information from you and our brethren in Ireland, according to their desires, from us: what churches and societies we may groundedly communicate with, according to a rule of Christ, and what not. We shall not offer arguments to persuade you to compliance with our brethren's desires and ours, they carrying so much evidence and demonstration of truth, necessity and suitableness to the Gospel rule, in the very first view of them. We have already kept a day of holy fasting and prayer, upon the grounds therein expressed and, we trust, shall never lay down those spiritual weapons till Satan, the world, and the lusts of our flesh, be made our footstool. Which the Lord hasten, for his Christ's sake. To whose fatherly care and tuition we commend you and subscribe ourselves,

Your affectionate brethren in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel,

William Kiffen: Edward Harrison, Thomas White, Joseph Sansom, Thomas Cowper, Henry Hills' John Perry' Richard Tredwell, Robert Bowes, Peter Scutt,

Our great desire in this letter is to obtain a full knowledge of all the churches in England, Scotland and Wales and, therefore, we desire you not to forget to inform us not only concerning the estates of any churches that are in your country, or near adjacent that so, if it may be possible, we might have the full knowledge of all the churches or saints that are one with us in the sound principles of truth. And [to] yourselves, or any other church of Christ, we shall be ready to give the like account, if desired thereunto, of ourselves or the churches near us.

From the several churches of Christ in London, the 24th day of the 5th month 1653.

2. The letter of exhortation from Ireland.

For the Churches of Christ in London when assembled.

Dear friends,

We cannot without much sense and shame speak of our long silence to you nor, without much grief of heart, think of yours to us, which we earnestly desire may be mutually laid to heart by us all for to prevent the like occasion of complaining for the future. Surely, it is a needful, wholesome word of exhortation, Heb. 3. [13], to exhort one another daily. Had it been more in our hearts it would have been more in our mouths in those several opportunities we have had of conversing together by our private pennings upon more common and less profitable affairs. Oh, how many packets have passed filled with worldly matters since we have heard one word from you, or you from us of the condition, increase, growth and decrease of the commonwealth of Israel for whose sakes we have heard with our cares and scene with our eyes that our God hath greatly reprov'd kings and mighty men. What hath the Lord been doing these many years but casting contempt upon princes and taking away the reproach of his people who were some years since brought low through oppressions, afflictions and sorrow. His hand hath been still stretched forth to set his poor despised ones on high from the kings of the earth, even whereby increasing the family of those that fear his name like a flock. Yea, God hath done great things for us, whereof we have made mention, for which we ought greatly to rejoice: but, how little dare we wisely consider of his doings for us. For which we have much cause to mourn or, having seen great things of our God for our good, but not observed, neither feelingly laid them to heart, how many have been broken that have been gathered together against Sion and fallen for their sakes. And, surely, were we not hardened through the deceitfulness of sin, our hearts would be more awakened, and all that is within us to bless his holy name, who has so blasted the wisdom and power of men, when it hath been opposite to the works that our God is carrying on in the earth. which, as we have clearly seen, we have soon forgot through our carnality's which have suffered too much to reign in our mortal bodies.

Precious friends, let us in this our day search and examine our hearts by the light of the Word and Spirit of our God, and, surely, we shall find that the posture of those poor virgins, Mat. 25, hath been too much ours. For, whilst our Bridegroom tarrieth, do we not all slumber and sleep so that little difference is discerned between the foolish and the wise? Alas, alas, what means the dull, cold, estranged frame of heart we bear each to other as is before mentioned? Moreover, is it not the like to our God? Doth it not appear by our little zeal for him and less delight in his ways, with constant complaining, with little sense of our victory over our leanness, our dryness and barrenness. Are not these instead of the songs of Sion and [that] in the hour of temptation wherein the Lord, as a man of war riding on victoriously, conquering, yea, and to conquer and subdue all those that will not that Christ shall reign over them. Moreover, doth not his voice cry loud to every subject in Sion, Prepare ye, awake to meet thy God, oh Israeli. Yea, doth he not pronounce woes to them that are at ease in Sion? Doubtless expecting, whilst these turnings, overturning and changes are working in the earth, we should stand upon our watch, enter into our chamber, be a holy, praying, yea with all supplications in the Spirit, humble, praying people. For, doubtless now, if ever, we are especially called upon to put on the whole armor of God that we may be able to stand in this day, and, having done all, to stand.

We therefore desire to revive your memory and our own, with these known and approved exhortations, Eph. 6.10-17. Beloved brethren and sisters, we, even with tears, beg for you and our selves, that all and each of us may in truth of heart be retiredly exercised in recounting and calling to mind what the Lord hath done for our souls and for our bodies, for his people in general, and what he is doing and

with what great and precious promises he tells us are in his heart, as his resolved intendments, speedily to accomplish.

Wherein and in expectation where of he calls upon us, Is. 65.18, but be ye glad, rejoice for ever, in that which I create. For, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing place and her people a joy. We recommend unto you the foregoing and following verses, earnestly begging that every one of us may give all diligence to keep alive, yea rather to beget oil in our lamps least they go out and we sit down in silence, yea, even depart in sorrow. We, therefore [are] to recount the special and signal ways the Lord took with our forefathers, Israel of old, with the returns they made and the frames of their hearts and therefore in very faithfulness [what] the Lord gave them; all which are left upon record for our instruction.

Dearly beloved brethren, the Lord engaged our hearts with the rest of the churches of Christ in the faith and order of the Gospel in this nation jointly as one person to wait upon him by fasting and humiliation and cry to him by prayer and supplications in the sense of our great shortness of and unsuitableness unto what is in the within-closed particular expressed; the which we also tenderly offer and, as our resolutions direct, recommend unto you, our fellow members, followers of the Lamb, our Lord Jesus Christ, being hopefully assured This will be our recovery from a slippery and slothful condition, the which hath made in us all too much as a seat of Satan, the sad fruits of which temper are manifest, Prov. 24, latter end. Yea, precious friends, the Lord hath given us comfortable hopes that, in the prosecution hereof, the Lord will roar out of Sion to the consumption and utter destruction of Antichrist, the man of sin, and will, through his mighty working of his blessed Spirit, fit and prepare us for every condition. Yea, if he shall bring upon us such a trial as hath not yet been seen in our days or this the dawning of his blessed day, so much promised yet too little hoped for. However, he will hasten it in his time, Is. 63.22.

We, for our convenience, have agreed to keep the first Wednesday in every month, from 6 to 6, the which, with others the breathing of our hearts, we have committed to the care and trust of our beloved and faithful brother, John Vernon, the bearer hereof who, through the blessing of the Lord, will suddenly be with you and will also acquaint you with our state and condition. He is in full communion with us, his conversation hath been in zeal and faithfulness. The Lord having put it into the hearts of all his congregations in this Land to keep a more revived correspondence with each other by letters and loving epistles. The which we acquaint you with having in the practice hereof found great advantage not only weakening Satan's suggestions and jealousies but it hath begot a closer union and knitting up of heart and, which is not in order to the rest, we are enabled thereby feelingly and knowingly to present each other's wants and conditions before our God in the sense thereof. And that we might be thereby the better enabled to answer our duty towards you and you towards us and bear each others burdens and so fulfilling the righteous law of Christ in our great and near relation, we hereby earnestly request and beg the same brotherly correspondence with you and from you desiring the same things by your means with all the rest of the churches of Christ in England, Scotland and Wales whom we trust you will provoke to the same feelings and which we hope, once in 3 months, may be mutually obtained. You may remember, sometimes since, our earnest request, which request was to you once and again, to have a perfect account from you of all the churches of Christ owned in communion with you in the places before mentioned, which desire, had it been answered, might have prevented our long sad silence and the dangers of receiving or refusing such as ought, or ought not, to be communicated with. And with this we offer one request

more unto you, if it hath not been lately practiced: which is that you would send two or more faithful brethren, well acquainted with the discipline and order of the Lord's house and that may be able to speak seasonable words suiting with the needs of his people, to visit, comfort and confirm all the flock of our Lord Jesus that are, or have given up their names to be, under his rule and government in England, Scotland and Wales. And for the small handful owned by the Lord in this nation, we trust it shall be our care more naturally to look after and watch over then heretofore the rather because we have observed Satan, our subtle enemy, by his depths and wiles, whose time we believe is short, taking the opportunity of the peace and rest lent to us by our God, ready to slay us by casting us into carnal security even lulling our hearts asleep and that in this hour wherein as before exprest we are especially called upon to be a praying, watchful people. For surely the Lord is now at hand! Therefore, let us leave off the beggarly pursuit of the things of this world and let our moderation be known unto all men, being careful for nothing but in everything by prayer and supplication and thanksgiving making known our request unto God for Sion, for each soul therein, for all the particulars herein mentioned, for the peace and tranquility of the nation wherein we live, Jer. 29.7, and for the rulers and magistrates the Lord hath set over us and particularly for those with you, in whose prosperity the honor of God, the quiet and rest of his people and the cause of the poor and needy, the widows and the fatherless are so much concerned and whose miscarriage (if the Lord shall suffer) we may expect will bring in as floods, sorrows and miseries, yea, what not!

Dear friends, ought not we to be earnest with the Lord to know our work and duties in these latter days wherein our God is working terrible things in righteousness and making his own pleasure to prosper, in pulling down the proud and mighty from their seats and exalting the base and mean things of this world. Yet such as he hath put his Spirit in and name upon, even such as he hath made a refuge from the storms of the violent, even hiding places and nursing fathers to his people. Now, friends, we are called upon to labor with them and for them in our prayers. Yea, how are we called upon to walk by faith and not by sense, is it not our strength to sit still and see the salvation of the Lord who worketh all things according to the counsel of his own good will and who will certainly bring his great promises and determinations to pass. Only believe, be strong in the power of his might, believe in the Lord your God, so shall you be established. Believe his prophets, so shall you prosper: not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord of hosts, shall these things be brought to pass. And, though the enemies come in like a flood and all tongues rage, yet that good Spirit shall lift up a standard against them and every tongues he will condemn, yea, the rage of man shall praise the Lord and the remainder he will restrain, so our eyes and hearts be fixed upon that God who changes not, whose glorious name is our strong tower. In him though the earth be removed and the inhabitants be dissolved have we ground to rejoice for evermore and humbly to bless all the daylong. Yea, though in ourselves and in the sense of the very vileness of our natures which lusteth to envy and is treacherously bent hell wards, there is continued occasions of the great work now desired and endeavored after even soul abasing and low prostrating ourselves at the foot-stool of his Majesty with a deep fasting, with a pressing the Lord by all manner of prayer and supplication to be gracious to us in not bringing upon us the fruits of our doings even which is recorded in Deut. 28.47f. Also that he would be gracious to us in knowing the sad condition of hearts searching, the heart breaking because of the sore and uncomfortable divisions amongst the redeemed ones which have their lamentable effects to the joy and puffing up of the uncircumcised which cry, "Ha, ha, so would we have it, did we not say this it would come to?" And, "Tarry. a little, you

shall see these: divisions come amongst them all." Also that the Lord would be gracious to us in acquainting us with what he speaks to us in his sore snatching and removing from us not only useful members in Sion but even our eyes, our hands and our hearts, never to be forgotten young Drapes, dear Consett, pretious Peck, useful Saffry, and that in the midst of their days and beginning of wondrous works. Ah, dear friends, were they to holy, to heavenly for our society? Or did we abuse the mercy, some dotting upon them whilst others slighted them, yea, hardly took notice there was prophets amongst them. Or may we not all conclude that the indifference and worldly-mindedness and hypocrisy of hearts are so great and have so highly provoked the jealousy of our God who hath left his means unattempted that we might have been a people of and to his praise that he is coming forth against us in his indignation and displeasure with some visitation and scourge and therefore hath called home his choice ones that they might not see the evil that is coming upon us neither stand in the gap to appease his fury and turn away his wrath from us. And lastly. friends, mightily cry unto our God, even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. give him no rest until he be entreated by us in the things within mentioned and particularly for those poor insufficient instruments whom he hath signally signified out and whose standings are so slippery, whose temptations are so many and whose work is so great and mighty, on whom our eyes are fixed and from whom same three nations expect so great things as returns and fruits of all the abundance of blood, of travels, of hazards, of long waiting, large promises and vast expenses. Precious friends, though we are called to look higher then instruments, yea, the blessed Spirit directs us to look to our God through Jesus Christ who is the author and from whom all our mercies flow by whom what we expect must be brought about, to him they belong, being for his honor and praise intended. Yet, seeing hoc conveys and works by and through instruments and they are such with whom he hath much appeared and in whom we have cause to believe he hath placed his fear and who have by testimony of his good Spirit obtained like precious faith with us and by whom his name is called upon and through whose suitable or unsuitable walking and actings either much glory and honor or shame and reproach will accrue to his great name. To our joy and consolation or to our sorrow and reproach, we therefore once more beseech you earnestly to beg of the Lord that he would not leave them to their own wisdom nor to be discouraged under their many strengths but that he would be wisdom and strength to them and' keep their hearts in a holy depending upon him void of pride and ostentation; that they may be the repairers of our many breaches and restorers of paths to dwell in; that they may be nursing fathers, the officers under them peace and exactors [of] righteousness: that they may be a terror to evildoers and for prays to them that do well; that under them we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

And now. dear brethren, beloved of the Lord, let not this sad subject of long silence be any more amongst us but rather let us be constant provokers of each other to every good word and work by our epistles, by our holy, humble, persevering Christian conversation suiting ourselves to that precious and ever to be remembered example, our Lord Jesus Christ. And seeing that nothing can separate, neither height, nor depth, between us and that everlasting love of our heavenly Father in his &ere Son, and those inestimable mansions of love, prepared for us by him where we, even we, shall behold the glorious face of our God, and joyfully sing the everlasting song of Moses and the Lamb! Oh. then. Ice neither sea nor land, things present nor things to come. separate us from a Christian correspondence each with other, whereby we may be enabled knowingly to mourn with those that mourn and to rejoice with those that rejoice, that we may be sympathizing in faith, offer supplications and prayers answerable to the dealings of our God to any of his

members. And now the very God of peace help you and us to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ and, in truth of heart, so to pray for each other, may we know the comfortable fruits of near relations.

Finally, brethren, farewell, be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace: Let us follow the things which make for peace and things where with one may edify another, and the God of peace shall be with you and us.

Your poor weak brethren yet fellow heirs, expectors of the consolation ready to be revealed at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ who will now come, without sin, to our salvation.

From the Church of Christ in Waterford, being now assembled upon the ground within mentioned 1 day 4 Month 1653.

The names of the brethren that subscribed this be viz.,

At Waterford:

Robert Kingdom, Thomas Skelson, Edward Marshall, Peter Rowe, Thomas Boulton, Thomas Sparking, George Cawdron, John Rowe, William Leigh, Richard Sutton, Robert Murry, Thomas . .

At Killkeny:

Anthony Harrison, John Pratte, Humphry Prichard, Thomas Willsoppe, John Courte, Arnold Thomas, Christopher Blackwood, Richard Wood;

At Dublin:

James Hardish, Henry Jones, James Montely, William Sands, William Salt, Edward Roberts, Philip Careret, Thomas Patient, Nicholas Scots, Adrian Strong.

3. Two documents accompanying the letter of exhortation from Ireland.

i. The agreement concerning matters requiring prayer by the churches.

The churches of Christ in Ireland, walking in the faith and order of the *Gospel*, do agree together, through the Lord's assistance, to set apart one day in every, month, solemnly to seek the face of our God. And, by fasting and praying, humbly to mourn before him for the things following which is also recommended to our dear friends the church of Christ in England and scattered brethren in several places, who have obtained like precious faith with us.

1. Our little knowledge of and less trusting in the name of our God in Christ, so as to set him for ever before our eyes, that we may glorify him both in our bodies and souls, which are his, I. Cor. 6.20; Heb. 5.12.

2. Our little sincere love to the Lord and his people. And our little knowledge of the office and proper place of each member as God hath set him in the body of Christ, to the end that every particular member might be now effectually improved for the mutual edification of the whole, I. Cor. 12.21, Eph. 4.16.

3. Our little serious searching into the word of God and not substantially acquainting ourselves with the foundation truths revealed them, 2 Tim. 3.15; 2. Pet.

2.2; Rom. 1.16f.

4. Our little faith in the great and precious promises of the Lord, which are to be fulfilled in the latter days, Lk. 18.8; 2. Pet. 1.4.

5. Our little pressing after the mark of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ and our inordinate affections after earthly things, Luke 10.40; Phil. 3.9 [714]; Col. 3.2.

6. Our little praying and praising frames of hearts in particular for faithful laborers in the Lord's vineyard and for all whom he hath set in authority over us, under whom we have much opportunity to practice the truth we profess. Mat. 9.37f; I. Cor. 2.4; Is. 9.7; I Tim. 2.2; I. Pet. 2.14; Jn. 15.4; Ps. 22.4.

7. Our little sense of saints' sufferings, Lk. 18.7; Rev. 17.6.

8 Our great aptness to forget the great things God hath done for us. And the abuse of the many precious mercies he hath multiplied upon us, Ps. 7.8; 10.6, 13.

9. Our want of spiritual wisdom to reprove sin plainly in all without respect of persons and to exhort faithfully so as to stop the mouths of gainsayers and to give no just offence to any, Prov. 19.15; 9.8f; 2. Tim. 4.4; I. Cor. 10.28.

10. Our little laying to heart the great breaches the Lord hath made amongst us by removing many righteous ones from us and from the evil to come, Is. 57.1f; 2.22.

11. Our little mourning for sin both in ourselves and others, Ezek. 9.4; Hos. 4.1f.

12. Our great ignorance of the deceitfulness of our own hearts, Jer. 17.9.

These things amongst others ought to be sufficient grounds of our being low before the Lord that his voice [may] lift us up in due time, James 4.9f, and supply all our wants according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus, Phil. 4.19.

ii. Details of the Particular Baptist churches in Ireland.

The churches of Christ in Ireland walking together in the faith and order of the Gospel and [*sic*] are resident in several places as followeth, viz.,

In Dublin. With whom are brother Patience, brother Lamb, brother Vernon, brother Roberts, brother Smith, with several others through grace who walk comfortably together. But most of the brethren besides brother Patient have relation to the army and therefore are subject to be called away, as occasion requires, to perform their duty in their places.

In Waterford. With whom are brother Wade, brother Row, brother Boulton, brother Caudron, brother Kingdon with several others walking together comfortably, most of them being resident there who, we trust, are in a thriving condition in their spiritual state.

In Clommell. With whom are brother Charles, brother Drapes: and sometimes brother Hutchinson and Bullock, to assist them, who are commonly abroad improving their gifts in several garrisons. Some other brethren, scattered, are in several places in those parts who are recommended to the care of our friends at Clommell who are nearest unto them.

In Killkenny. With whom are brother Blackwood, brother Card, brother Axtell, brother Gough, with several others whom we hope also are in a growing condition and do walk orderly. We know, not any particular friends scattered abroad in the country but [if there be any they] are committed to the care of some friends near them who, we hope, as they are able will discharge their duty towards them.

In Corke. With whom are brother Lamb, brother Coleman, with several others who walk orderly together though in a place of much opposition to them by such as

slight the way of the Lord, with whom also are in communion some friends at Brand Kingsaile, and other parts of the country.

In Lymrick. With whom are brother Knight, brother Uzell, brother Skinner, with some others whom, we fear, may be in a decaying condition for want of able brethren to strengthen them. Brother Knight having been weak and not able to be with them.

In Galloway. With whom are brother Clark, brother Davies, with several others who, we understand, do walk orderly but have few able amongst them to edify the body.

In Wexford. Are a people lately gathered by brother Blackwood with whom are brother Tomlins, brother Hussy, brother Neale, brother Biggs, with several others who have not much help amongst themselves but are sometimes visited by our friends at Waterford.

In Kerry. Also are some friends received lately by brother Dix, and brother Nelson, brother Browne, and his wife: with whom is brother Chambers that do speak to them. Of these we have not much experience but have lately heard from brother Chambers that they walk orderly.

In the north near Carrick Fergus are several lately, received by brother Reade, who were baptized here by brother Patient whom we understand are precious but want some able brethren to establish them.

Friends deceased of the several places and churches before mentioned as followeth Sister Watson, sister Marv Rowe at Waterford, Sister Deane at Killkenny. Brother Brookes at Clommell.

Brother Brookes, brother Cooper, brother Rush, at or near Lymrick.

Several cast out for sin, viz.,

Brother Dixon, brother Clayton, brother Price, brother Thornhill, brother Francis at Clommell.

Brother Fogg at Killkeny.

One at Galloway and some at Lymrick a particular account of whom we have not at present.

Sister Sarah Barret at Dublin, sometime servant to brother Patient, who is now coming for England. Brother Vernon can more particularly inform you of her.

In conclusion to the Irish Connection, I cannot help but remark about these additional points:

1. The place of Fasting and Prayer in the lives of these old Saints.
2. The several ministers in each area and in each church; the brethren believed in many preaching brothers in one gospel church;
3. Their efforts at maintaining the same constitutional order, that is, baptized membership and closed communion.
4. The union between these churches and the London Particular Baptists.

The Particular Baptist Outreach into the Midlands

We are not able to tell exactly when the London Particular Baptists reached out into the Midlands, but we are able to show they made efforts in the early 1640s. How long before this we do not know. That would take us into the terrible times of Laud and his hellhounds. Benjamin Cox and Daniel King were the main movers in the gathering of those old Midland churches. In fact, at least four men who signed the *First London Confession of Faith* played import roles in establishing the Midlands churches.

Introduction to the Midlands Particular Baptist Association

For this part, I have gone back as much as possible to the original writings of the 1600s. They have come from two main sources.

First, I have taken most of this material from B. W. White's *The Particular Baptist Records 1500 to 1660*. I would call special attention to his footnotes at the conclusion of the section. In these he documents many important items. He deals with two very important men living in that era and location, Daniel King and John Tombs. We need to pay special attention to these two very different men.

Secondly, I have borrowed many interesting remarks from Robert Baillie, Presbyterian. I have already introduced Thomas (Gangarea) Edwards. In *The Irish Connection*, he testified about the Particular Baptists of the 1640s, and their church sendings. Baillie is another very important Pedobaptist contributor.

In the early 1640s, the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland sent Mr. Robert Baillie, Minister at Glasgow, into England. The English Presbyterians called out to Scotland for help against the Anabaptists, to repress them. Mr. Baillie issued his *Anabaptism, The True Foundation of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, and Familism, and the most of the other Errors, which for the time do trouble the Church of England, Unsealed. Also, The Questions of Pedobaptism and Dipping handled from Scripture. In A Second Part of The Dissuasive from the Errors of the time*. London, Samuel Gellibrand; 1647.

Mr. Baillie set forth this thesis in his work: *The English Anabaptists of the 1600s are one with the older Anabaptists in Germany and other places, from the 1500s*. He covers the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and makes sure he can place before his readers as many evil reports and slanders as he can dig up. However, in spite of all this, he gives a very good overview of those times and their different groups of Anabaptists.

One of the constants in his work is the place of John Spilsbury and his leadership among the London Particular Baptists. He shows that John Spilsbury wrote most of the *First London Confession of Faith*.

Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists were rigid Anabaptist dipper separatists. They were not only separatists, but *rigid dipper separatists*. He explains by showing that they withdrew from all others who were not of their dipped way. He then shows that the English Anabaptists were just like them in this same regard of dipped separation.

Baillie claims one of the main problems with the *Anabaptists of the 1500s was their desire to have a church made up only of true believers dipped. This is what led*

them away from all other groups. He then shows the same is true of the Anabaptists in England during his time, the 1640s.

In his efforts to make the Anabaptists look like an unorganized mob of dipped madmen with many, many different opinions, he singles out *John Tombs* for closer consideration. Baillie introduces us to John Tombs, the first English writer in favor of open communion. It seems that Tombs promoted open communion Baptist concepts a few years before he became baptized and joined up with some of the Anabaptists, if he ever did.

Baillie settles this question for us, did Spilsbury and the others walking with him in their church constitutions, practice open communion and mixed membership? *He lists them as part of the rigid separatists Anabaptists like those of the 1500s. They were not open communion or open church membership like Tombs and later Jessey, and still later, John Bunyan. Baillie shows us that the conclusions of Gould and Whitsitt, centuries later, were unfounded, misleading and false.*

John Tombs is placed almost alone and the Rigid Anabaptists are centered around John Spilsbury where they should be. Baillie shows us that the English Rigid Anabaptists held to the ordinance of hearing, that is, they would not even hear the Pedobaptist ministers. He shows us that they inherited this practice from the older Anabaptists of the 1500s. Remember that John Spilsbury was the main mover and writer among the Rigid English Anabaptists. In Baillie's work, Spilsbury is targeted as the main writer of the *First London Confession* and the leader among the Rigid Anabaptist Dippers. He succeeded in causing John Spilsbury later to move into the country away from London due to persecution.

As I give Baillie's definition of Rigid Separation, please remember he shows that the English Anabaptists of his days practiced the same concept. This destroys the groundless falsehood that Spilsbury and Kiffen separated over Pulpit Affiliation, that is, Spilsbury invited unbaptized men into his pulpit.

Along with Featly and Taylor, Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and the English Anabaptists of the 1600s were constant dippers. Thus, he destroys the very foundation of Whitsittism.

However, one of his most important efforts centers around John Tombs, showing him as writing in favor of open communion before he became a dipped Anabaptist. I will take up his remarks about John Tombs because they are vital in understanding some of the positions the old Midland Association of Particular Baptists took.

After I do this, then, I will turn our attention toward Daniel King and show from whence he came. By doing this, I shall show the oneness of King and the London Particular Baptists in general and Spilsbury and Kiffen in particular. This will remove effectually even further some false and misleading claims about the Midland Baptists and their Confession of Faith.

John Tombs is the First English Writer in Favor of Open Communion.

Distinction here between open communion and open or mixed membership should be noted. Later Henry Jessey started the English *practice* of open or mixed membership, that is a church can include both the unbaptized and the baptized. However, early in Tombs' ministry, even before he became an open communion Baptist in practice, he wrote in favor

of open communion. Soon following Tombs' book, Jessey simply practiced what Tombs had written, but had not done. *Tombs was the first English writer in favor of open communion and mixed membership and Jessey is the first to practice it in London.*

In its proper place I will include *Orchard's History of Open Communion*, show its origin, and rise among the Polish Socinian Anabaptists. For our purposes in England, Tombs and Jessey are the originators of this disorder. John Bunyan came later.

Now, we will take up some of Baillie's remarks:

The Increase of the Mennonists:

While all the other factions of the Anabaptists did decrease, the followers of the priest Menno did much increase. They did reject the earthly Kingdom and Polygamy of the Monasterians and Battenburgicks, also the revelations and extraordinary calling of the Hophmanists, with the most of the blasphemies of David George. Against all these, Menno did write with passion. But to the point of Anabaptism and separation from all other reformed Churches to independency, and to a number more of the Anabaptists' tenets he did firmly adhere, alluring many thousands to his way, who continue to this day propagating their error to many countries. *(1646-a very note worthy statement in light of the present day denial that those old brethern practices dipping, REP)*

The Errors of the Mennonists

The wickedness of that spirit which reigned in Menno, and yet rages in his followers, notwithstanding of all their profession of great piety, of singular modesty and extreme destation of all the other sects of Anabaptists, is apparent in the manifold grievous heresies and gross schisms, whereby they themselves have of old broken out and preserve therein to this day.

Who are pleased to read the late little and accurate and learned *Treatise of Clopenburgh*, may perceive that the Mennonists dippers do oppose the truth of Christ's human nature. *(Editor's Note, they believed in the pre-existence and heavenly origin of Christ's human nature, REP) Page 16.*

Independency the Cause of their Increase and Boldness

Hence, it was that the Anabaptists made little noise in England, till of late the Independents have corrupted and made worse the principles of the old Separatists, proclaiming for errors a liberty both in Church and State; under this shelter the Anabaptists have lift up their head, and increased their numbers, much above all other sects of the land. Their ways as yet are not well known, but a little time it seems will discover them, for their singular zeal to propagate their way will not permit them long to lurk. Only the Confession of Faith which the other year seven of their Congregations did put forth, and of late again in a second corrected edition have set out with a bold preface to both Houses of Parl. May not no more be taken for the measure of their faith, then that Confession which their elder Brethren in Holland did print not long ago in the name of all their Congregations. (see Mr. Marshall's Defense against Tombs, page 76, REP) Page 18.

The Tenets of the old Anabaptists

The Most applauded Tenets of our modern Anabaptists are the self same with what the old Anabaptists did invent.

THE errors of the Anabaptists and their divisions among themselves are so many that to set them down distinctly in any good order, is a task which I dare not undertake, much less can I give assurance what is common to them all and what proper to their several sects. Only that I may demonstrate the same very spirit to breath this day in the Anabaptists of Britain, which inspired their Fathers of former times in Germany, I will remark what tenets Authors of good credit ascribe to both; hoping that this discovery maybe a means to bring many simple well-meaning people who are not yet plunged in the deeps of obstinacy to a more accurate trial and greater suspicion of their ways: when they shall all see it made visible and palpable upon undeniable evidence, that their most beloved tenets and practices which they, believe to be full of truth and holiness, are no other but the same very singularities which the known event doth now convince all who without prejudice can but read unquestionable Histories, to have been the inventions and dictates of the false and unclean spirit which acted and moved in Muncer, Becold, David George, and such like abominable monsters of mankind.

Their first and prime Tenet was a necessity of gathering Churches out of Churches, and of separating from the best reformed in their time, because of mixed communion.

The first and leading tenet of the old Anabaptists was a necessity to gather new Churches out of that which Luther and Zuingles and their followers had reformed from Popery. It is remarkable that these men had never a stomach to trouble themselves with any labor to make converts from Popery or profaneness, only so soon as gracious persons had drawn any Cities or Countries out of the kingdom of Antichrist, then they fell on and everywhere did much disturb the work of the new Reformation.

At the beginning, they dissembled the grossest of their errors and their intention to quarrel infant's baptism they did only press a greater measure of holiness and mortification then was ordinary, in this all good men went along with them: but when they began to teach that the Church behoved to consist of no other members but such as were not in profession and aim alone, but also visibly, and really holy and elect, and therefore that new Churches behoved to be gathered, and that all the old any where extant behoved to be separate from as mixed, and so corrupted societies. Then Luther and Zunlius did oppose themselves to this schismatic honor. Page 29.

When they found themselves disappointed of the assistance of Luther and Zuinglius, and all the rest of the orthodox Preachers, without more delay they fell upon their intended work themselves alone, first by private conventicles, then by preaching in the open streets they gathered and set up Churches after their own mind, consisting merely of Saints, who did forbear communion in religious exercises with all other Churches, whom they avowed to be for the most part but worldly, carnal, and profane Gospels, and their best Preachers, especially Luther and Zuinglius, to be but Scribes and Pharisees, false Prophets, large as evil as the Pope and his Antichristian Priests.

Antipedobaptism became at last their greatest darling

For the stricter engagements of the Saints and godly party their adherents, and for the clearer distinction of them from the profane multitude of all other Congregations, they thought meet to put upon them the mark and character of a new Baptism, making them renounce their old as null, because received in their infancy, and in a false Church. At the beginning this rebaptism was but a secondary and less principle doctrine among them, for Muncer himself was never rebaptized, neither in his own person did he rebaptize any, yet thereafter it became a more essential note of a member of their Church, and the crying down of infant's baptism came to be a most principal and distinctive Doctrine of all in their way.

Unto their new gathered Churches of rebaptized and dipped Saints, they did ascribe very ample privileges, for first they gave to every one of them a power of questioning in public before the whole Congregation any part of their Preacher's Doctrine. Secondly, to every one of their members they have a power of public preaching. Page 30.

Their Pastors must renounce all former Ordination, and take their full call of new, must come from the hands of their people.

Thirdly, to their particular Churches they gave power of electing and ordaining such of their own Prophets whom they thought fittest to be Pastors to the rest.. whoever was not elected and ordained, whoever had not their full calling from the people their full call alone, and did not renounce what ever ordination they had from any other, to them were no Pastors at all.

The Ordinance of Hearing

Upon this ground among others they refused to hear any of the Ministers of the reformed Churches, because they did not renounce their former ordination and calling to the Minister that they might take it again from the hands of their new gathered and separate Congregations.

The Congregation Has The Highest Power

Seventhly, unto their single Congregations they gave supreme and independent power to judge in all Ecclesiastical causes, not only judicially to pronounce all questions about their Pastor's Doctrine, but also to proceed to the highest censure of excommunication, as well against their Pastors as others when they found cause. Page 31.

Every Anabaptist is at Least a Rigid Separatists

For the first, the soberest Anabaptists do embrace the whole way of the rigid separation. **The Brownists did borrow all their Tenets from the Anabaptists of old, it is but equal that the Anabaptists this day should seek back again their Father's debt from the Brownists.** The chief singularities of Brownism are about the constitution and government of the Church, they say the Church is made up only of members who are really and convincingly holy, of such who do evidence the truth of their regeneration to the satisfaction of the whole or the greater part of the Church. Page 49.

Though the Independents offer to Conclude with the Anabaptists, yet they separate from the Independents no less then from the Brownists as Antichristian.

The first of these pleas the Independents hold fast with both their hands, and upon it are as rigid Separatists as any we know. But the Anabaptists take possession of both the grounds, that the walls of their separati0ojn may the more firmly be established. They will

have all their members to be real Saints, and they separate from all other Churches who neglect to press the necessity of such a qualification, but to strengthen the right of their separation, they go on to pronounce all these Churches from whom they separate Antichristian. And, this their charity they extend to their other ways very dear friends the Independents and Brownists, for all even of them are such who by their doctrine and practice of Pedobaptism, deny that Christ is yet come in the flesh. The Brownists in their honest simplicity are loath to be long in the Anabaptist's debt. They quickly unchurch and excommunicate them also for denying baptism to infants, but the Independents will be wiser than their Fathers, Anabaptism to them is so small a peccadillo that it deserves no censure at all. They are most willing to retain the Anabaptists in their bosom, but here they pity, no caresses can keep the most of the Anabaptists in the Independent Congregations. So soon as they begin to weigh their own principles, they find their infant baptism a clear nullity, and so a necessity laid upon them to be rebaptized. The Independents denying to them this Sacrament, they cannot choose but to go out to the avowed Anabaptists, who by this means embodies them in their Churches, where they alone can partake of baptism. Page 50

They avow all their Members to be Holy and Elect, and some of them are for their Perfection.

But for the more clear and distinct demonstration of these things, consider yet further first that in the qualification of members, the Anabaptists go as far as either the Independents or Brownists. The Confession of the Seven Churches do clearly bear this much, but others go further, avowing with their Fathers, the Dutch Perfectionists, that all of their society are so perfectly holy as they may not pray for the remission of any the least sin. Page 51.

After They Separate from all other Churches, they run next away from them their own selves.

As for the second, a natural result of the former, a separation from all other reformed Churches as impure, it is clear by their constant uniform practice which M. Kiffen, one of their prime Confessionists does justify at length against his opposite, Mr. Ricraft. In this separation, they run on so rashly that themselves know not where to stop it; for first with the Separatists they divide from all other Protestants, thereafter they shake off the Separatists. For the most intelligent and zealous among them refuse to remain in any congregation either of the Independents or Brownists. Lastly, the break among themselves in many pieces. Page 51.

They Separate from all who renounce not Pedobaptism

Fifthly, by their rejecting of infant baptism, they fall into the error of rigid Separation; they baptize none but actual believers, such as give them satisfaction of their actual faith and holiness. Thus far, they go along with the rigid Separatists. But hence they proceed to another ground, whereupon they leave the Separatists and all who follow them not to Anabaptism. They take baptism for a sacrament of initiation, for a door and means of entering into the Church. These who are not baptized, they count not as Church members. Infant baptism they pronounce a nullity, and such a disobedience to the Gospel as infers Antichristianism, and a real denial that Christ is yet come in the flesh. So the separatists who are all baptized in their infancy, and refuse to be rebaptized, to them are no better than unbaptized and Antichristian rebels, not capable of Church membership, or of any Church communion. Upon this ground (as their great Patron acknowledged) (Spilsbury

REP) they are forced to declare the Independent and Brownists Congregations, how dear otherwise soever, to be but Antichristian Synagogues, and no true Churches. Pages 90, 91.

Mr. Tombs' New Way

Seventhly, of those who impugn Pedobaptism some go a new way of their own, wherein as yet they have very few followers, if any at all, for to this day I have heard of none. Mr. Tombs, a learned and very bold man, at this time when so many new ways are in hand, had thought meet to make a hotchpotch of many of them together:

First, with all his strength and greater diligence then any before him, he impugns Pedobaptism.

Secondly, though as yet I have marked nothing to fall from his pen, neither for any of the old Anabaptist for the rite of dipping, or against our custom of sprinkling, yet in spoiling of Christian infants not only of Baptism but of all interest in the Covenant of Grace, as much as the children of Turks, and Pagans, in making Circumcision a seal to the Jews only of earthly and temporal privileges;

in denying to Jewish infants all right to the New Covenant, till their riper years when they become actual believers; in giving a power to persons unbaptized to baptize others;

in making apologies for the work of the Anabaptists, even those of Munster, and invectives against the best that oppose them, the first reformers, the Assembly at Westminster, the Church of Scotland, M. Marshall, Mr. Goodwin, and others;

he flies as high as any civil and discrete Anabaptist I have met with: but in those things he goes far beyond all the Anabaptists I have heard of.

He makes Baptism a Rite Needless either to Young or Old

First, he esteems baptism so unnecessary a rite, that men who are meet to receive it, may very well be without it, as Constantine, Ambrose, and others, did delay to their old age that Sacrament; and as it seems, himself is careless to this day to be baptized; for his infant baptism according to his arguments must be null, and another Baptism, so as yet it seems he has not received; for he professed an unwillingness to join himself as a member to any of the Anabaptist Churches. I suppose they are unwilling to baptize any who will not join in communion with them.

He Allows of a Frequent Rebaptism

Secondly, when a man is baptized according to his own mind he allows him to be off thereafter rebaptized; even so often as he repents for sin, which by the godly is done, at least ought to be done, every day oftener than once.

He admits unbaptized persons to the Lord's Table

Thirdly, he makes it lawful for persons before they are baptized to partake of the Lord's Supper.

He is a Gross Erastian.

Fourthly, to show how little inclinable he is to join with the Anabaptists, he declares himself a complete Erastian; avowing that no scandalous professor ought to be kept from the Lord's Table. Also, that there is no such thing as any censure of excommunication;

further, that Christ in Scripture has not appointed nay particular government for His Church, but that the governing of the Church belongs to the Magistrate only, and to such whom he appoints to that service by virtue of a commission flowing from himself. Pages 91, 92.

This concludes Mr. Baillie's remarks.

When Did Mr. Tombs become a Baptist?

Thomas Crosby gives the following account:

After this (after being turned out of the Temple in London in 1646, REP), the people of Bewdley in Worcestershire, the town of his nativity, chose him for their minister. And now he began to preach and dispute publicly against infant-baptism, and to put his opinion into practice, being baptized by immersion, on a personal profession of faith. And seeing no prospect of any reformation in the established church in this point, he there gathered a separate church of those of his own persuasion, continuing at the same time minister of the parish.

His society of Baptists was not very large, but consisted of such who were of good esteem for their piety and solid judgment; and three eminent ministers of that persuasion were trained up in it, Mr. Richard Adams, Mr. John Eccles, and one Captian Boylston, and it continued till about the time of the king's restoration. Volume 1, pages 287, 288.

I, (REP), don't know much about Cap. Boylston, but the others I do know about. They were not open communion nor mixed membership Baptists. In fact, Mr. Richard Adams also later joined with William Kiffen. John Eccles preached John Spilsbury's funeral message.

In B. W. White's notes at the conclusion of his history of the Midlands Association, this is found:

37. Bewdley appears to date from 1649 (*T.B.H. S.*, VII.12) and the work of John Tombs. In 1653, a letter was sent to Hexham (E. B. Underhill, *Records of the churches of Christ, Hanserd Knollys Society, London; 1854, 344f.*) signed by Tho. Bolstonne, Philip Mun and Robert Goodlad. The hesitation over Bewdley's membership of the association is likely to have been due to its open-membership practice inherited from Tombs.

Daniel King

Now, we direct our attention towards Daniel King. Some time in the late 1640s and early 1650s, Daniel King was pastoring the Particular Baptist Church at Warwick, outside of London. We will take up from William Stokes' *History of the Midlands Association of Baptist Churches, from its Rise in the year 1655 to 1855*; London: 1855.

The Midlands Association was formed in the following manner:

On the 3rd of May, 1655, a preliminary meeting of Pastors and Messengers was held at Warwick, for the purpose of considering certain Articles of Faith

to be submitted to their respective churches, as the doctrinal basis of the intended Association. These brethren represented Baptist churches at Warwick, Morton, Bouton-on-the-Water, Alcester, Tewkesbury, Hook-Norton, and Derby. By whom they were called together, or who organized and conducted the correspondence that must have preceded such a meeting is not distinctly stated. Yet, there is strong reason for believing that the excellent and devoted Mr. King, then pastor of the Baptist Church at Warwick, was the principal man in these arrangements That each of these churches had a much earlier origin is evident from the undoubted circumstances that in 1655 they were able to depute their pastors and to bear their charges when distance and time were important considerations to the successive meetings for deliberation which the intended union required. And when it is remembered that so early as 1643, the Rev. Benjamin Cox (son of Bishop Cox) had visited Coventry, at the express invitation of a number of Baptists there who wished to be formed into a church, and that for his success in spreading his "Anabaptist" sentiments he was committed to Coventry goal, it is not hazarding in the way of opinion more than then general circumstances warrant, to affirm, that these churches were formed at least as early as 1640. Pages 22-24.

Where did Daniel King come from and who were his ministering brothers? He came from London and was one of John Spilsbury's young ministering brothers.

Here are more of B. W. White's remarks from his footnotes at the conclusion to his Midlands Baptist Association.

5. Daniel King published, *A Way to Sion* in 1650 (Thomason: 23 March) describing himself as 'Preacher of the Word near Coventry'. Included was an 'Epistle Dedicatory' signed by 'Thomas Patient, John Spilsbury, William Kiffen, John Pearson' commending the tract and describing King as one 'whom we judge a faithful and painful Minister of Jesus Christ'. He later published *A discovery of some troublesome thoughts* dated from 'rile Lime-kiln at Pickle hexing in Southwark this 7th of the 11th Month mentioning that he was 'near related' to the following churches: 'the Churches of Christ in London meeting usually at the glass-house in Broad street, the Church in Coventry, the Church in Warwick, the Church at Hook Norton in Oxfordshire and the Church meeting near Morton-Hinmarsh in Gloucestershire. The title page describes the tract as published in 1651 but there is no Thomason copy and therefore no indication as to whether the date given by King relates to February 1650/51 or 1651/2. All that can be safely claimed is that these member churches of this association which he mentioned were in being by February 1652. In 1658 King was one of the Particular Baptist leaders made trustees of money bequeathed by Robert Bowes (*B.Q.*, VII.217). In 1672, he joined William Kiffen to produce material incorporated in *The Life of Henry Hills*; 1688: King's name does not appear among those attending the 1689 Assembly.

Daniel King , founder of the Midlands Baptist Association, was a ministering brother with

Spilsbury, Kiffen and Thomas Patience, and others among the London Particular Baptists. Later, King published his *A Discovery of Some Troublesome Thoughts*, London; 1651. This little work of about 65 pages is one of the sweetest and most important from that time dealing with Christian Experience, Assurance and Hope. In this sweet little work, King says this on the last page of his Introduction:

So I commit it to the blessing of God, and the approbation of the Churches of Christ, and such in them, as are most experienced in the dealings of God with troubled souls; and desire to continue as by the grace of God I am. From the Lime-kiln at Pickle Hering in Southwark this 7th of the 11th month, A servant to Christ and the meanest of His Saints, Daniel King.

In his footnote, he lists those churches:

As namely, the churches of Christ, in London, meeting usually at the Glasshouse in Broad Street, The Church in Coventry, the Church in Warwick, the Church at Hook Norton in Oxfordshire, and the Church meeting near Martin-Hinmarsh in Gloucestershire, or any others whom I am near related.

Now, let us identify these others. Note the listing of the Churches at the Second Meeting of the Midlands Baptist Association. King was in a special way already, in 1651, related to those in Warwick, Hook Norton, Martin-Hinmarsh and the church at Coventry.

First, the Glass House Church is one of those issuing the First London Confession.

Of Warwick(5)′ Daniel King(6) and Henry Vencent(7);

Of Morton(8)′ John Mayo, John :Man;

Of Bourton-on-the-Water(9)′ Henry Collins and John Mitchell, Anthony Colet;

Of Alchester(10)′ Thomas Arme and Stephen Wade(11);

Of Teuxbury(12)′ John Brian, Samuel Toney;

Of Hook Norton(13)′ James Willmore and Mathew Tomlinson (16).

Of Derby(15)′ Henry Davise and William Tomlinson⁽¹⁶⁾.

Benjamin Cox, in about 1643, gathered the church at Coventry, one of the foundational churches in the association. Cox was from the London Particular Baptists and signed the 1646 Confession with Thomas Kilcop from the Petty France Church. At this point, we should also remember that Benjamin Cox issued his Appendix to the Confession of Faith, in 1646, for the benefit of those dear saints in Coventry.

Now, note B. W. White’s remarks:

17. **This agreement should be compared with the Abingdon or Berkshire Association agreement printed as Appendix I to E. A. Payne's, *The Baptists of Berkshire*, London 1951, 147ff. The share taken by the Berkshire Association and their representatives in the foundation of this association will be seen in the Abingdon MS.**

At the organization of the Midlands Baptist Association, the older Abington Association sent representatives. I have already showed that the London Particular Baptists helped

form the Abington Association.

The Midlands Baptist Association owed its origin to:

First, the ministry of Benjamin Cox from London, one of the ministering brethren from the Seven Churches in London;

Second, from Daniel King, one of the ministering brethren from the Seven Churches in London, and;

Third, from the older Abington Association that came from the Particular Baptists in London.

Why, then, is the Midland's Baptist Confession so different from the First London Confession? For several reasons:

First, it was never designed to be printed in a book form as was the First London Confession. It was copied and placed in a church record book.

Second, it was an abridged form of the First London Confession. Daniel King, doubtless, wrote the Midland's Confession.

Third, it is no more different from the First London than the Somerset Baptist Confession is. Yet, in their introduction, those who published the Somerset Confession affirmed their oneness with that older Confession and the churches and ministers in London who issued it. See my remarks on The Somerset Baptist Association and its Confession of Faith.

The old Midlands Baptist Association came into being from the London Particular Baptists and may be considered one of their outreaches from London.

Now, let us move on further into the business about the differences between mixed membership and open communion, or the battle between John Tombs and Daniel King.

Daniel King verses John Tombs

Note B. W. White's remarks:

The Leominster Churchbook, p.21, reads: 'The 28th day of the 7th month 1656 was the Church of Christ meeting at brother Joseph Patshalls house in Leominster constituted and the persons undernamed did, after a solemn seeking of God, give up themselves to the Lord and to one another to walk together in all the ordinances of Jesus according to his appointments. Which was done in the presence of, and with the assistance of our brother Daniel King and other brethren'. A long list of over 130 men and women followed but most of these presumably joined later. Question 4, raised by the Leominster messengers at the eighth General Meeting, more probably indicates the size of their congregation at this time. Edward Price represented Leominster as pastor, at the 1689 Assembly. A man named Patshall left Jessey's congregation for believer's baptism in 1643 (*T.B.H.S.*, I. 245) and a Joseph Patshall signed the new revision of the 1644 confession in 1651.

Please note the name of Joseph Patshall and see his development:

First, in Jessey's church and then leaving it in 1643 for gospel baptism;

Second, the constitution of the Particular Baptist Church at Leominster, in 1656. Many of these persons came from Tombs' church. In the Associational records, you will note their leaving and forming a new church. When they did this, Tomb's church complained and the association upheld the new church and ruled against Tombs and his church's objections.

Third, when the Particular Baptists reissued the London Confession in 1651, it was not simply a confession of the London Churches. Note these introductory remarks giving several reasons why they reissued their old Confession:

First, The invitations and earnest solicitations of several of our brethren, from all parts of the nation, whose hearts long to behold (in public) our stability and perseverance in the way and truth of our God, that by it they may have wherewith to put to silence those who have lately taken liberty to reproach and undervalue the truth professed by us.

Joseph Patshall signed the 1651 edition of the First London Confession. He is with King and opposing John Tombs. They assisted in the gathering of the New Church at Leominster.

So, further, in the old Midlands Baptist Association you find active one of the signers of the First London Confession, Joseph Patshall, plus Daniel King and Benjamin Cox, all from the London Particular Baptist Churches.

B. W. White says further about John Tombs:

28. **John Tombs (C.R., 487f.) was probably the most learned defender of the Baptist position during this period when he was active in, among other places, Bewdley, Ledbury and Leominster. He remains peripheral to the story of the Particular Baptist associations of the time because of his open-membership practice. No doubt, it was disagreement over these that led to the withdrawal of Patshall and his friends at Leominster in 1656.**
29. **Richard Harrison (C.R., 250, two successive entries) also practiced open-membership almost certainly.**

Establishing another link to the London Particular Baptists to the Midlands and also their rejection of open membership, is Benjamin Cox's letter against Richard Harrison over the matter of taking state pay for preaching the gospel.

30. **Benjamin Coxe (T.B.H.S., VI.50-59) acted here as the messenger of the Abington Association. His rather lengthy paper against Richard Harrison's willingness to accept state pay has been transcribed from the Leominster Churchbook and is to be found as an Appendix to these records. For further details see White, 'Organization' 216-20.**

Now here are additional names that interest us. Thomas Shephard signed the First London Confession in 1644.

White continues:

31. According to T. Thache, *The Gainsayer Convicted*, London 1649, (Thomason date: 6 August), 16 a Londoner called Harrison had drawn together a congregation in Cirencester whom he had not yet fully persuaded of the truth of believer's baptism. Among his disciples were 'M. Rudge' (mentioned in the epistle to the Reader), Thomas Chutterbuck, William Burge, Giles Handcox, Thomas Shepheard, Caleb Setfe (p.29) and others referred to (p.61) as 'Roger the Shoomnker' and 'Samuel the Boddicemaker'. Of these the Cirencester Churchbook (deposited with the Gloucestershire Record office) mentions Caleb Setfe only although Richard Burge and James Clutterbucke were members by 1655---the year in which the first entries are to be found. A certain Giles Waticins (who went as minister to the 1689 Assembly) was also a leading member in 1655. On the '9th day of the 7th month 1659' it was agreed that 'our friends in the country' could 'sitt downe as a church of them selves', probably under the leadership of one William Moulder. It should be noted that the association record does *not* say that the church at Cirencester became a member of the association at this point.

Edward Harrison is the Londoner named Harrison here. He was another signer of the First London Confession of Faith.

How many signers of the First London Confession were active in the Midlands Baptist Association? Cox, Harrison, Patshall and Shepherd. Then, there is Daniel King, that great leader who opposed John Tombs. The old Midlands Baptist Association was in reality the Second London Particular Baptist Association! It stood just as solidly against John Tombs and his open communion and mixed church membership as the London Brethren did against Henry Jessey.

Now, we are ready for the minutes of the Old Midlands Baptist Association.

White continues:

**Association Records of the
Particular Baptists of the Midlands to 1660**

Editorial Note.

Two attempts have made to tell the story of the churches associated together over the years in the Midlands and these have both included some material from the earliest period. They are William Stokes, *The History of the Midland Association* (London 1855) and J. M. Gwynne Owen, *Records of an old Association* (n.p. 1905). In addition, W. T. Whitley produced a useful survey which included some relevant material in *Baptist Association life in Worcestershire 1655-1926*, n. p. 1926).

Nevertheless, the great bulk of the material primed here from the Tewkesbury and Leominster Church books has not been made available before. Much of it, like that contained in the Welsh Records, concerns the answers of the messengers to queries proposed by the churches. However,

unlike the Welsh records, no arrangements appear to have been made at association level for preaching plans. What seem characteristic of both sets of records are the churches' two major concerns: over and over again the queries raise questions concerned with internal church life and discipleship on the one hand and forms of ministry upon the other.

THE MIDLAND RECORDS

(The Original Midlands Baptist Confession-REP)

The first General Meeting, 2 May 1655

Articles unanimously agreed unto by all the messengers of the churches met at Warwick on the 2nd day of the 3rd month 1655.

1. We believe that there is one only true God which is one God who is eternal, almighty, unchangeable and incomprehensible, infinite; who is a spirit having (3) his being of himself and giveth being, to all creatures and doth what he will in heaven and in earth moving all things according to the counsel of His own will.

2. That this infinite being is set forth to be Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit and these three are one. I. J'n.5.7.

3. We profess and believe the Holy Scriptures, the Old and New Testament, to be the word and reveled mind of God which are able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus and are given by inspiration of God serving to furnish the man of God to every good work and that by them we are instructed to try all things whatsoever that are brought unto us under pretense of truth. Is. 8.20; 2 Tim. 3.15ff.

4. Though Adam was created righteous yet he fell through the temptation of Satan and in his fall overthrew not only himself but all posterity making them sinners by his disobedience so that we were by nature children of wrath and defiled from the womb being shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin. Ps. 51.5; Ro. 4.11.

5. That God elected and chose, in his eternal counsel, some persons to life and salvation even before the foundation of the world. Acts 13.48; Eph. 1.3f; 2 Thes.2.13; I. Pet. 1.2. Whom accordingly he doth and will effectually call and whom he doth so call he will certainly keep by his power through faith and unto salvation. 2 Tim. 1. 9f; I. Cor. 1.9; I Thess. 5.24; I. Pet. 1.5 etc.

6. That election was free in God and of his good pleasure and not at all for or with reference to any foreseen works or faith in the creature as the motive thereunto. Eph.1.4f; Ro. 11.5f.

7. That Christ Jesus was in the fullness of time manifested in the flesh being borne of a woman and being perfectly righteous gave Himself for His elect to redeem them unto God by his blood. Jn. 10.15; Eph.2.25ff; Ro.5.9.

8. That all until they are quickened by Christ are dead in sin and trespasses, Eph2.1, and therefore have not power to believe. savingly of them selves, Jn.10.23; Is.26.12, but faith is the free gift of God and mighty work of God in

the soul even like the raising of Christ from the dead, Eph. 1.9. Thus, we consent not with those that hold that God hath given power to all men to believe to salvation.

9. That Christ is the only true king, priest and prophet of the Church. Acts 3.22f; Heb. 4.14; 7.1.

10. That every man that is justified is justified by Christ, Ro. 8.33; I. Cor. 6.11 apprehended by faith. And that no man is justified in the sight of God partly by Christ, partly by works. Ro. 3.20, 28, 30; Gal. 5.4.

11. That Jesus of Nazareth of whom the Scriptures of the Old Testament prophesies (*sic*) is the true Messiah and Savior of man and that he dyed on the cross, was buried, rose again in the same body in the which he suffered and ascended to the right hand of the majesty on high and appeareth in the presence of God making intercession for us.

12. That all that have faith wrought in their harts by the power of God according to his good pleasure should be careful to maintain good works and to abound in them acting from principles of true faith and unfeigned love looking to God's glory as the main end. Tit. 3.8; Heb. 11.6; I. Cor. 13.1; 10.31.

13. That all those that profess faith in Christ and make the same appear by their fruits are the proper subjects of baptism. Acts 8.37.

14. That baptizing is not by sprinkling but dipping of the person in the water representing the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Ro. 6. 3f; Col. 2.12.

15. That persons so baptized ought to walk together by free consent as God shall give opportunity in distinct churches or assemblies of Zion continuing in the apostle' doctrine and fellowship and breaking of bread and prayers as fellow members caring for one another according to the will of God. Acts 2.42,46.

16. That at the time appointed of the Lord the dead bodies of all men shall rise again that they may receive according to what they have done good or evil. I. Cor. 15.53; Mt. 24.31.

The Second General Meeting, 26 June 1655.

The agreement of certain churches at our meeting together at Morton hinmarsh the 26 day of the 4 month 1655.

The Lord our God having, according to his free and infinite mercy, given us to be in his son Jesus Christ and in himself, through him and to be baptized into his name and to walk in distinct churches and assemblies of Zion; according to the rule of Ns ward, according to the measure and knowledge of grace which he hath bestowed upon us and given unto us to agree in thc same principles as appeareth by our unanimous consenting in the same truths and especially contained in sixteen articles of faith and order agreeable to the holy Scriptures hath effectually taught us to endeavor to walk answerably, we do therefore, according to He will! of God, clearly appearing in his word, with true thankfulness unto him for his grace, mutually acknowledge each other to be true churches of Christ, and that it is

our duty to hold a close communion each to other as the Lord shall give opportunity and ability, endeavoring that we may all increase more and more in faith and knowledge and in all purity and holiness to the honor of our God, and it is our resolution, in the strength of Christ, to endeavor' thus to do. Subscribed in the name of the churches above mentioned by us the messengers of the said churches respectively by them thereunto authorized and appointed.

Of Warwick(5)′ Daniel King(6) and Henry Vencent(7);

Of Morton(8)′ John Mayo, John :Man;

Of Bourton-on-the-Water(9)′ Henry Collins and John Mitchell, Anthony Colet;

Of Alcester(10)′ Thomas Arme and Stephen Wade(11);

Of Teuxbury(12)′ John Brian, Samuel Toney;

Of Hook Norton(13)′ James Willmore and Mathew Tomlinson (16).

Of Derby(15)′ Henry Davise and William Tomlinson⁽¹⁶⁾.

Forasmuch (17) as the churches of Warwick, Morton hinmarsh, Bourton-on-the-Water, Teuxbury, Hook Norton, Darby, Alcester do mutually acknowledge each other to be true churches of Christ and that it is their duty to hold a close communion each with other according to the rule of his word and so be helpful each to other as God shall give opportunity and ability and these churches are now desired to consider that they acknowledge each other and are faithfully to hold such communion each with other and to endeavor to be helpful each to other:

1. In giving of advice after serious consultation and deliberation in matters and controversies remaining doubtful to any particular church as plainly appear in the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch. Acts 15.

2. In giving and receiving all so in case of poverty and want of any particular churches as appeareth in the approved and due acting of the churches of the Gentiles towards the churches of Jerusalem. Rom. 15.26f.

3. In sending their gifted brethren to use their gifts for the edification of the churches that need the same: as they shall see it seasonable, as the church at Jerusalem sonic J2:mabas to Antioch. Acts 11.22.

4. In a joint caring (*sic*) on of any work of the Lord that is common to the churches as they shall! have opportunity to join therein to the glory of God as appears in 2 Cor. 8.19.

5. In watching over each other and considering each other for good in respect of purity of doctrine, exercise of love and good conversation: they being all members of the same body of Christ, I Cor. 12:12, who therefore ought to have care one of another, I Cor. 12:29, especially considering how the glory of God is concerned in their standing and their holy conservation.

The (18) churches now associated are desired to take these things into consideration and to signify by their messengers at the next meeting how far they close with thc same and that they jjudge expedient to be farther considered and done for the glory of God and the good of His people.

Touching marriage:

1. Whether it be not utterly and manifestly unlawful for a church member to marry one who cannot be duly looked upon to be a true believer in Christ considering' I. Cor. 7.39; 9.5; I. Peter 3.7.

2. Whether it be not at best a very inconvenient and uncomfortable and dangerous thing, for a church member to be married to one who, though pretending godliness, doth yet stand out against the ways of Christ refusing to yield obedience to his command touching baptism, and walking in church communion. Whether the fruit of such marriages have not ben lamentable and consequently whether all church members whom this may concern, ought not to be admonished and charged to take heed of such a snare, and that they be fart from following the example of those sinners in Gen. 6.2 and that they be not found to temp God by their exposing themselves to a continual temptation or clog from a bosom companion and yoke-fellow.

Also the churches are desired to be careful of their duty in this respect so by their messengers to signify their judgment and resolution(22).

Resolution touching these things at the next meeting.

Touching the practice of any brother that doth or shall preach to the world and take maintenance from the world, whether tithes or augmentations or any other salary or pension, the churches am in-treated to consider:

1. Whether this be not a thing of evil report and that which opens the mouths of the world against the people and ways of God.

2. Whether it doth not savor of taking an enforced maintenance which was justly condemned in the Babylonish clergy, and whether such a one doth not act as one preaching for hire.

3. Whether that practice be any way agreeable to the New Testament rule touching preachers' maintenance, which we see in Gal. 6.6.

4. Whether it doth net commonly and principally (if not altogether) unavoidably dash him that practices upon other evils (viz.) as acting towards the world as it were the church, a countenancing of national worship and ministry and a hardening of the people in their idolizing of their temples.

5. Whether it doth not deprive the churches of the benefits of those gifts given for the churches' edification, as in Eph. 4. 12.

6. Whether it doth not manifest much covetousness or much mistrust in

Christ's promises or provision or both.

The churches are humbly pressed, to seek the Lord for right information in the thing, there being presert need of the same and that they would signify their judgment touching it also at the next meeting.(19) As, likewise, whether they can see it either convenient or lawful for any church member to go forth to preach to the world without any approbation or sending from the church Also that they would consider whether they have not members fit in some measure for the offices that Christ hath ordained in his Church and, if they have, that then they would lay to heart their duty to endeavor that they may orderly be brought to serve Christ and his Church in these offices. And that for help to know and do the will of God in these, things there may be an earnest seeking of the face of God in prayer with fasting.

The next meeting appointed at Morton hinmarsh, October 24, 1655 at 9 of the clock in the morn.

The third General Meeting, 24 October 1655.

The conclusions of the messengers of the churches upon some of the queries at the last meeting that were sent to the churches:

In answer to the first question, what it is to be duty a true believer in Christ, that they explain themselves by, "duly" that is, to be rightly and warrantable in Christ in profession and conversion' that is to have a principle of grace through he or she be not baptized nor in church communion, but they that are baptized are more orderly. This question was put to clear the former (viz) whether a believer sinneth in marrying any other but a believer considering I Cor. 7:39.

It is affirmatively, they sin if they marry with any other. The second question, whether it be not a very inconvenient and dangerous and uncomfortable thing for 'a church member to be married to one who, professing godliness, yet standeth out against baptism and church communion, [they] answer affirmatively: it is very inconvenient.

To the first of the 6 questions about ministers' maintenance: whether it be not a thing unlawful and of evil report for preaching of the Gospel to take tithes, augmentations, or any other salary or pension from the world? '

Answer: as the case of the question standeth some are in the negative and some in affirmative provided the maintenance be freely given, except tithes.

Next, this following quest/on is put to se if it will answer the former: whether it be nor unlawful for a member of the Church of Christ to go forth to preach by the magistrate's authority and to be maintained by him accordingly.

Answer: it is unlawful:

1. Because our Lord Christ sends forth his ministers by his power alone, Mt. 28.19, and he is the head of the body the Church that in all things he might have the preeminence, Col. 1.18; Eph. 1.22.

2. Because Christ hath left all power in his Church both to call and send forth ministers, Matt. 28.20, saying, I am with you to the end of the world, and I. Tim.

3; Titus 1; Acts 14; Mt. 18 and 16.18f. 3. Because we find the Church only exercising that power both in choosing and sending forth ministers as appeareth by these Scriptures, Acts 1.23, 26; 8.14; 13.2f and 11.22. We think fit to add that we taking this question entire consider it to be fully answered.

The 6 questions about ministers' maintenance are supposed by the messengers generally to be fully answered in the former question and therefore have waved them.

In answer to the next question whether it be lawful for a church-member to go forth and preach to the world without the sending or approbation of the church: it is unanimously agreed upon that it is not except in extraordinary cases.

In answer to the last question, whether it be the duty of every church of Christ to call to forth those to officiate in the offices of Christ and His Church as they find in a good measure qualified for the same according to the Scriptures: it is agreed in the affirmative and that from these Scriptures: Matt. 24.45; Tit. 1.5; Eph. 4.11; I Cor. 12.28; Acts 20.28.12.28; Acts 20.28.

There are many congregation[s] that have gifted brethren that are approved of for the public preaching of the word that do not baptize nor administer the Supper. The churches are desired to consider whether these churches may not call forth those members to break bread and to baptize as need shall require.

Answer: in the affirmative, the churches may call forth such to baptize and administer the Supper provided they be very careful that their effectual endeavor after an official minister be not hereby neglected.

1. Because preaching the word is the greater work as appeareth, I Cor. 1.17, Paul was not sent to baptize but to preach the Gospel, which, we conceive, is he was not so much sent to baptize. If he was not sent to baptize at all he had done evil to assume that authority, but his main work was to preach the gospel though he was sent to baptize as appears, Acts 26.16, where God appeared to Paul for this purpose' to make him a

minister and a witness, both of those things which he had scene and would appear to him. In Acts 9 God promises to tell Paul what he must do and he acknowledged he was an apostle of Christ in quality, and proportion with the rest of the apostles, 2 Cor. 12.11, who had commission to preach and baptize, Mt. 28.19f., for that he had authority, comparing the Scriptures together. It proves his not being sent to baptize is not so much as preaching which was the greatest work.

2. Because, where there is ability to preach publicly, there is authority to baptize also, Mt. 28.19; the disciples were to preach and baptize together as appears in Phillip's baptizing the eunuch, Acts 8.38.

Signed by the messengers of the churches respectively:

Morton John Mano;

Warwick Daniel King, John Career;

Bourton: John Michill, John Fox;²⁰

Tewkesbury: John Fluck, Thomas Smith, William Haines;

Hook Norton: James Willmat, John Archer;²¹

Alcester: Thomas Arme, John Johnstones;

Derby: Godfrey Archer, Henry Davis.

The next meeting to be at Warwick on Monday in ester week by 12 a clock and to continue two days.

The Fourth General Meeting, 7/8 April 1656.

The joint agreement of the messengers of the several churches being met at Warwick the 7 and 8 day of the 2nd month 1656 after they had joined together in prayer to seek the Lord for their direction in answer to these quires following'

Question 1. How the church ought to send forth their public approved gifted brethren that so they may answer the Scripture role..

Answer: with fasting and praises and laying on of hands with care for their maintenance, Acts 13.3: I. Tim. 4.14; Mt. 10.9f; Mk. 6.8; 3 In. 7; I. Cor. 9.7.

Question 2. Whether in churches that are associated if they have one or two or more of able, gifted, approved brethren in one or two churches, whether they ought not rather to improve them for the good of the whole churches that are in want than to confine him or them to any particular church.

Answer: they ought to improve the gifts of God to the honor of God's majesty. Therefore, considering the end of members congregating and churches associating, we judge wherein particular churches ought not to suffer other churches to want but they ought to partake of their gifts as they appear to have need both in spiritualities and temporals, Acts 11.22; 8.14; 2

Cot. 8.13-18; Eph. 1.11f.

Question 3. Whether it be not a great part of a gospel minister's work to instruct his flock by catechizing of them as well as preaching for their more perfect education.

Answer: by catechizing only is meant questioning for the more perfect knowledge of the condition of members so that by the discovery. of weakness, suitable strength may be added. We judge it a duty of a minister of Christ in this as in all other particulars as occasion offers itself to show himself a man approved in the work of God's house, 2 Tim. 3.15, which we conceive he cannot do except he inquire into the state of the flock that he may give everyone his portion of meat in due season and, we judge, there ought to be a readiness in every member to give an account of their state and condition to the elder or to any appointed thereunto, I. Thess 3.5ff; Prov. 27.23; I. Pet. 3.15.

The conclusions of these messengers of the things going before at their meeting at Warwick the 7th and 8th days of the second month 1656.

**Warwick: Nathaniel Alsop, John Turner.
Morton hinmarsh: Daniel King, John Doll.
Alcester: Thomas Arme, Stephen Wade.
Hook Norton: James Willmatt, John Archer.
Bourton: John Michael, Anthony Collett.
Derby: Robert Hope,²², William Tomlison.**

The next meeting is to be at Morton hinmarsh, June 4th by 8 of the clock in the morning and to continue three days of the 4th month 1656.

The Fifth General Meeting, 4/6 June 1656.

The conclusions of the messengers of the churches at their meeting at Morton Hinmarsh the 4th, 5th and 6th days of the 4th months 1656 to certain queries as they, follow:

Question 1. Whether baptized believers may join in any part of worship or public hearing the national ministers preach or others that are not baptized.

Answer: baptized believers ought not to hear the national ministers preach nor join with them in their public worship, their pretended ministry being Babylonish, Rev. 18.4. Neither may they so hear or join with unbaptized persons, though hoped to be godly, because they are disorderly in carrying on a public ministry and worship without baptism, Col. 2.5; 2 Thess. 3.6 no, nor with baptized persons neither if not sound in the faith which is the cause of those that are called free willers, Prov. 19.27.

Question 2. Whether it is the duty of church members always to call each

other brother and sister?

Answer, it is the duty of church members 'always' to owe each other in their hearts as brethren and sisters and to manifest the same by calling each other so when it is expedient and convenient, I. Pet. 2.17. But, sometimes, we know it may lawfully be forborn as divers Scriptures' example do manifest, Col. 1.2; I. Tim. 1.12; Titus 1.4.

Question 3. Whether an approved gospel minister, who hath gathered many churches, which churches have no administrator of the ordinances but himself, he may be chosen into office by any of the said churches without the full consent of the others?

Answer, such a gospel minister cannot be orderly chosen as an officer by any church unless he be orderly a member of the same, Acts 6.3; 14.23. And that church of which he is orderly a member ought in this cause to do that and only that which shall be most for the churches' good and for the glory of God, I Cor. 10.31.

Question 4. What are the spiritual duties of believing parents and masters to their children and servants ?

Answer, for the first branch of it. In general to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, Eph. 6.4, which takes in these particulars, to instruct them in the things of God according to our ability and their capacity, Prov. 22.6, to exhort and charge them' to walk closely with God, I. Thess. 2.11. 3rdly, to do it in such a way as not to provoke them to wrath lest they should be discouraged, Eph. 6.4; Col. 3.21. 4thly, to chastise them with severity if they be perverse or stubborn in sin, Deut. 21.18; Heb. 12.7; Prov. 23.13f. 5thly, to pray for them (so did Abraham for Ishmael, O that Ishmael may live in th3' sight; so did Job, Chap. 1, see also 2 Sam. 12.16; flit. 19.22).

To the second part, what are the spiritual duties of believing masters to their servants? 1. If they are believing servants, they are to perform duties to them as to brethren for this relation, I. Tim. 6.2, but, if they be unbelievers, thus, the master what in him lieth must not suffer them to live in sin.

3. He may and ought to hold forth the truth of God to them to prepare them for the Lord as it is probable Cornelius did.

4. He ought to endeavor to rule them well, I. Tim. 3.4; Eph. 6.9; compared with the former verses. 4tNy, so to walk as to show them a good example himself, Ps. 101.2.

Question 5. Whether there be a distinct (*sic*) difference between noting and casting out?

Answer, agreed unto by the messengers of the churches of Warwick, Alcester, Tuexbury, Morton hinmarsh, Borton-on-the-water and Hooke Norton as their present judgment that the withdrawing, noting and having no company with, spoken of in 2 Thess. 3 is all one with casting out.

Question 6. What ought to be the behavior of a church or each member to one noted or cast out?

Answer, agreed by the messengers of the churches aforementioned, we judge that our carriage to a *person* cast out of the church ought to be as towards a heathen or a publican, Mt. !8.17. Iii we find him hardened and persisting in sin then to leave him and take no more notice of him than of another wicked person. But if we find him willing to hear us and so likely to be gained then to use such means as the Scriptures affordeth for the regaining of him.

Question 7. Whether any part of church business may not be done before the world and what it is?

Answer: some parts may,

- 1. as preaching or prophesying in general, I. Cor. 14.24. But, if it be for trial of gifts or trial of a man before late be chosen into office, it is most convenient to be done before the church only: because the world is not concerned in such cases, I. Cor. 2.14.**
- 2. Baptism may be administered before the world for we conceive John baptizing such multitudes as he did and in a river, did it before the world. Acts 2.38,41 [is] considerable to this purpose: those 3,000 we conceive professed faith and were baptized before the world being so great a work done in so short a time and the people being generally drawn together it is probable that it could not be done privately.**
- 3. Prayer, we judge, may be made before the world, I. Cox,. 14.15, I will pray with my understanding, saith Paul, that is, in a known tongue to others that stand by and this being a church meeting, as appears vv. 18, 19, and unbelievers being admitted to hear prophesying as v. 24 we judge they stood by at prayers also. But this we desire may be considered, that we mean prayers upon common occasions at ordinary church meetings. But for prayers upon special occasions, particularly to the church, we see not grounds then to admit them.**
- 4. We judge breaking of bread may be done before the world because it is the Lord's death and is to show forth I Cor. 11.26, which is a weighty doctrine of the gospel and if the Lord's death may be showed forth in preaching and baptizing, as is clear, we conclude in this ordinance also.**
- 5. We judge also the pronouncing of the sentence of excommunication may be done before the world that they may see the church doth not bear with sin and sinners. That it may mind them of the woeful condition of wicked man and that God will denounce that terrible sentence against them, Go, ye cursed.**

6. But, for admonition generally before excommunication in hope the offender may be recovered, that may not be done before the world because sins of offending brethren are not to be told the church till former admonition be visited.
7. Debating of doubtful [matters] that concerns the church only may not be before the world, Acts 15 (the former part of the chapter).
8. Trial, election and ordination of officers we judge is not to be done before the world because the world is not concerned in such cases, neither are such chosen to officiate to the world as officers but to the church.

Question 8. Whether a competent number of baptized believers in a troop or regiment may there walk as a church?

Answer: we do not discern that a number of disciples in a troop or regiment can there walk as and act as a particular church of Christ as there is no Scripture to warrant it nor discerning them to be in a capacity to keep close to the rule of the word in receiving of members, dealing with them in all cases as the matter shall require, and that they are continually liable to be dissolved.

Question 9. What is a true gospel prophesying in the church and who may or ought to appear in that great duty?

Answer: to the first branch, we answer, we find in I Cor. 14.3 concerning gospel prophesying that he that prophesieth speaketh to edification and exhortation and comfort. Hereupon we humbly offer it to consideration, whether it may not now be called gospel prophesying when men thus speak. To the 2nd branch we answer that they and they only may and ought to appear in the work whom God hath endued with gifts thus to speak, I. Pet. 4.10.

Question 10. How far women may speak in the church and how far not?

Answer: we answer that women in some cases may speak in the churches and in some cases again may not. That in some cases they may not speak manifestly appears in I. Cor. 14.34f. and I Tim. 2.11f. They may not so speak as that their speaking shall not show a not acknowledging of the inferiority of their sex and so is an usurping of authority over the man and more particularly thus-

1. A woman may not publicly teach in the church. This appears to have been much in the apostle's eye, I. Cor. 14.
2. She may not speak in the church by way of passing sentence upon doctrines or cases in the church.
3. She may not stand up as a ruler in the church and so speak upon that account.
4. She may not speak in prayer as the mouth of the church, that is very clear in I. Tim. 2;
5. yet, in the cases that follow and, possibly, in some other cases a woman

may speak in the church and not be found to offend against the rule of the apostle, she desire to make a profession of her faith to the church to express her desire to baptism and communion with the church.

6. if she be a witness concerning the church admonition of one that the church is to deal with or must herself tell the matter to the church according to the rule in Mt. 18.17.
7. If she be sent from another church as a messenger, she may deliver her message.
8. If she have need of the church's assistance in any things she may impart her just desire and lay open her case to them.
9. if a woman have sinned and [ben] cast out of the church and God hath given her repentance, undoubtedly she may manifest it in the church.

Some queries presented to the several churches.

First, if a gospel minister be mistaken in something he delivered publicly, or some member of the church conceive so, he may be questioned before the world or whether that is to be done before the brethren only.

1. Whether it be not the duty of every gospel minister to join himself as member to some particular church of Christ who may encourage him in well doing and deal with him in case he sin or fall?
2. What are the duties of believing servants towards their masters and governors?
3. Whether it be regular for a church to call in help of those that are not properly members there, to deal with offenders before the church themselves or [if] herself and her own members have tried what they can do of themselves.
4. Whether persons in case of offence or trespass against brethren may regularly have their matters brought to the church before they have been twice admonished according to Mt. 18.17?

The next meeting of the messengers is appointed at Allcester the 15th day of the 8th month 1656 by 10 of the clock in the morning where those queries before laid down are answered by the messengers.

The Seventh General Meeting, 2/4 Apr. 1657.

Debated and resolved by the messengers of the several churches at their meeting at Morton Hinmarsh the 2nd and 3rd and 4th days of the 2nd month 1657.

Question 1. Whether it be lawful for a Christian to join or make a show of joining with a visible unbeliever when he makes a show of speaking in prayer, either in saying of grace, as they call it, or otherwise.

Answer: we judge it not lawful considering that the sacrifices of the wicked are abomination to the Lord, Prov. 15.8, therefore his prayers also, Prov.

28.9. And that we are not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers, 2 Cor. 6.14, nor to be partakers of other mens' sins, I. Tim. 5.22. But we judge it a Christian's duty in a discreet, sober, way to bear witness against such a practice.

Question 2. Whether a brother, having no other church member nor visible godly person with him, being desired to speak in prayer either as craving a blessing on God's creature to be received or praying for a sister presence [present], may lawfully so do and, if he may, what rule he is to observe or must then observe in the action.

Answer: we offer it to the serious consideration of the churches a brother may lawfully pray as is in this question mentioned so taking heed to his manner of expressing himself that he doth not make a show of taking in the unbelievers company and joining with him in prayer, Acts 27.35; 28.8.

The next meeting is to be at Alcester the 15th day of the 7th month 1657 by two of the clock afternoon and to continue 3 days if need require.

A letter from Daniel King

I do entreat the churches to hasten the view of their copies by this and send it with as much speed as may be to each other, and that the church at Teuksbury (to whom I suppose it will come last) [is] to hasten the return of it to Matron hinmarsh to Brother Rowland Freman for me because I would send it to the church at Lemster who will send messengers to our next meeting, that they may also consider of the particulars, and certify us by. their messengers how far they are on with us in these things or wherein they differ. are on with us in these things or wherein they differ. Your poor unprofitable brother in the faith and fellow in the gospel: Daniel King

The eighth General Meeting, 15/17 September 1657

Question 4. Whether disciples may sit down as a church under the number of 12 or 13.

Answer: it is judged necessary they should amount.to the number of 12 or 13.

Question 5. How to answer an opposer demanding assent for the partaking of our own supper after the Lord's Supper was waved till next meeting.

It was debated whether the church at Leominster and Hereford that walks distinct from Mr. Tombs' were rightly constituted. It was proved and judged they were a true constituted church. It was likewise considered whether the said church might have association with these respective churches. It was generally judged they might only [they] left the completing of it till the messengers had acquainted the several churches.

The people walking with Mr. Tombs put in a letter to the messengers referring to their consideration to consider whether the withdrawing of members were not a great evil. It was found, upon debate, to be their liberty and their duty and an answer was sent of the letters to justify and approve of it.

A paper was sent likewise from Brother Harrison (30) with 3 Queries. The paper is agreed upon by the messengers to be answered by Brother Coxe. (31)

The questions in substance were this:

1. In what cases a member may lawfully depart the church.
2. If lawful, whether all means should not be used to call in the assistance of other churches.
3. If not lawful to depart, how to proceed toward those that shall.

Agreed upon by the messengers of 7 congregations and likewise by messengers of 2 associations that next meeting to be at Alchester in Easter week, 2nd, 3rd and fourth days if need require.

Daniel King, Richard Creed, John Tomlinson, Benjamin Cox.

The ninth General Meeting, 13/14 October 1657³².

The substance of the conclusions of the messengers of the churches when met at Gloster the 13th and 14th days of the 8th month 1657 in answer to some queries at that time propounded.

Question 1. Whether that those that have received the work of regeneration may be said to be baptized with the spirit baptism according to the Scriptures.

Answer: the messengers answer in the negative; first, because we do not find that the work of regeneration is anywhere in Scripture called the baptism of the Spirit. Secondly, because wheresoever we find the Scripture speaking of the baptism of the Spirit, we do understand it to be meant of gifts and miracles and tongues, Acts 2. 3f 19. & Thirdly, because the disciples had the work of regeneration wrought within them yet had not the *Spirit's* baptism till after Christ['s] Ascension, Jn. 7.38f; Acts 1.4f., compared with Acts 2. 2ff, 33 yet we do believe that that work is wrought by the Spirit.

Question 3. Whether a gifted brother so judged by the church may go out to preach at his own will at the time of the church meeting or is to be alone at the disposing of the church.

Answer: we answer that such a brother so adjudged of by the church ought

wholly to be at its disposing. First, because that all those gifted are the church's, I. Cor. 3.22; 12.28; Eph. 4.11f.

Secondly, because if one brother go forth at his own will, then another and so a third, and by that means the church may be wholly neglected.

Thirdly, because, if such a brother miscarry in his ministry, it would be charged upon the church, and so it would prove very dishonorable to the church and truth of Christ.

Fourthly, because, in such a disorderly going out, he cannot expect the prayers of .the church for the Spirit of God to accompany h/m, Col. 4.3; Eph. 6.18f. and we judge if any brother shall persist in such disorderly practice after admonition that it is the church's duty to deal with him as an offender.

Letter from the messengers of the associated churches.

To the several churches of Jesus Christ the messengers of the several congregations met together at Gloucester the 13th day of the 8th month 1657 sendeth (s/c) greeting:

Dearly beloved brethren-in our Lord Jesus Christ whom we love in the Lord and unto whom our bowels yearn in all tenderness of affection: with our hart breathing and sighing with longing desire at the throne of grace: both for you and for all that love our dear Lord Jesus Christ. That you may grow and increase in all the gifts and graces of the Spirit and may be kept steadfast and unmovable in these staggering [?staggering] times and that you may shine forth in your conversation as lights in the world. That you may adorn the precious gospel of our Lord Jesus with a holy and humble conversation and that you may press forward towards the mark that is set before you and that you may be kept unblamable until the coming of our lord Jesus Christ.

Dear brethren, we have been by the precious hand of God our Father brought together from several parts according to our appointment to seek the face of our God together by fasting and prayers. And we can say that our Lord hath not altogether been wanting unto us but hath in some sweet measure kept us humble in him. And we have, through his grace, been enabled to pour out our sorties before him and for more of that blessed Spirit of Christ to be poured out upon Zion in general, and upon ourselves in particular that we might be thereby the more enabled to glorify him in our generation and perform the duties of our relation each to other as becometh a people redeemed by Christ. And we humbly and earnestly beg of you that you may be more in consideration of those blessed cautions that our Lord hath left upon record for to warn us that so a sluggish and drowsy frame of spirit sease [?seize] not on us which is very apt do both on the wise as well as the foolish virgins towards the time of the bridegroom's appearance. Brethren, we have agreed, the Lord assisting [and] willing, to keep our next general meeting at Siseter upon the day usually called Whitson Tuesday.

At which time and place we desire you to send your messengers with your epistle wherein you may let us understand the state and condition of your churches with a resolution to stay with us till our meeting be ended which will continue two days at the least. So, committing you to the Lord on whom you believe, and to the word of his grace, we rest, Your weak and unworthy brethren in the faith and fellowship of the gospel of our Lord Christ.

Signed by us in the name and by the appointment of the whole, John Noob,
John Michell

The twelfth General Meeting, 22 September 1658.³⁸

The substance of the conclusions of the messengers of the church when met at Morton hinmarsh the 22 day of the 7th month 1658 for the work of the Lord.

The first question. Whether it be lawful for a church member at any time to hear a person preach which hath been excommunicated by true church?

Answer: it is not lawful at any time to hear an excommunicated person preach unless some necessity shall be found to require some able brethren to hear in order to a present discovery and refutation of his errors, Lev. 19.17.

Secondly, we should by our hearing of him, both harden him in his sin and embolden others to follow him in it, I. Jn. 3.15.

Thirdly, such a one must be unto us as a heathen and a publican, Mt. 18.17.

Fourthly, in our hearing of him we should not according to the apostle's rule, 2 Thess. 3.14.

Fifthly, we should by our hearing and so owning of him [do] what in us lies to make void the church and null the act of the church by which he is excommunicated.

Further abbreviations used in the footnotes

1. *B. Q. Baptist Quarterly*, 1922-
2. G.R.,- A. G. Matthews, *Calamy Revised*, Oxford 1934.
3. Ivimey,- J. Ivimey, ,4 *History of the English Baptists* (4 vols), London 1811-1830.
4. O.R.,- G. L. Turner, *Original Records of early Nonconformity under persecution and indulgence* (3 vols), London 1911.
5. T. B. H.S.,- *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* (7 vols) 1908-21.

FOOTNOTES

1. All the records printed in this section are transcribed from the Tewkesbury Churchbook unless specifically noted to have been from the Leo-minister book. The extent of the extracts from the Leominster source is indicated by a line down the left-hand margin of the page.
2. This 'Midland Confession' is printed from the Tewkesbury Churchbook. There are numerous unimportant variations from this in the Leominster version but the only significant difference is an addition to be found at the close of the Leominster version of article 15. It is possible that this was added later since Tewkesbury was an original member of the association and Leominster did not join until later. It reads as follows: 'All these Ordinances of Christ are enjoined to his Church being to be observed till his second coming which we all ought diligently to wait for'. The whole Confession was printed by W. L. Lumpkin in *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, Chicago 1959, 198-200, as 'edited in 1905. from the Tewkesbury and Bourton Churchbooks' (*ibid.*, 198 note 36).
3. The Tewkesbury scribe frequently repeated the last word in each line of his MS as the first in the next. These repetitions have been omitted.
4. This section is taken from the Leominster Churchbook.
5. The Warwick church was in being by 1652 (see note 6) but has no records from this period. Paul Fruin who, in 1653, was elder at Dymock, Gloucestershire, was pastor at Warwick in 1689 (*B.Q.*, 11. P.364).
6. Daniel King published, *A Way to Sion* in 1650 (Thomason: 23 March) describing himself as 'Preacher of the Word near Coventry'. Included was an 'Epistle Dedicatory' signed by 'Thomas Patient, John Spilsbury, William Kiffen, John Pearson' commending the tract and describing King as one 'whom we judge a faithful and painful Minister of Jesus Christ'. He later published *.4 discovery of some troublesome thoughts* dated from 'rile Lime-kiln at Pickle hexing in Southwark this 7th of the 11th Month' mentioning that he was 'near related' to the following churches: 'the Churches of Christ in London meeting usually at the glass-house in Broad street, the Church in Coventry, the Church in Warwick, the Church at Hook Norton in Oxfordshire and the Church meeting near Morton-Hinmarsh in Gloucestershire. The title page describes the tract as published in 1651 but there is no Thomason copy and therefore no indication as to whether the date given by King relates to February 1650/51 or 1651/2. All that can be safely claimed is that the these member churches of this association which he mentioned were in being by February 1652. In 1658 King was one of the Particular Baptist leaders made trustees of money bequeathed by Robert Bowes (*B.Q.*, VII.217). In 1672, he joined William Kiffen to produce material incorporated in *The Life of Henry Hills; 1688:* King's name does not appear among those attending the 1689 Assembly.
7. Henry Vencent. Nothing is known about this man: like others mentioned in the association records for whom there will be no note this means that no plausible identification of him seems possible with any bearing a similar name in the works listed above under new abbreviations.

8. The Morton in the Marsh church was in being by February 1652 (see note 6) but no records exist for it from this period. At the 1689 Assembly, it was represented by John Goring as pastor and Anthony Freeman. F. E. Blackaby, *Past and Present: History of the Baptist Church, Stom on the Wold, Stow 1892*, 6-13 cited evidence suggesting that the congregation originally meeting 'near Moreton' (note 6) had moved four miles south to Stow in the 1690's when their first meetinghouse was built.

9. There is no evidence of the existence of the Bourton church before this meeting in 1655 and no records of the church remain for this period. When Anthony Palmer was in Bourton 1646-1660 (C.R., 380) his congregation, if Baptist at all, was of the 'open membership' type and so was separate from that linked with the association. Apparently, no one attended the 1689 Assembly from Bourton.

10. This is the first known mention of the church at Alcester and no contemporary records otherwise remain concerning it. It was represented at the 1689 Assembly by John Willis and John Higgins.

11. In 1663, S. Wade, minister at Chard, was in prison. This could have been the man who represented Alcester in 1655 (*B.Q.*, IV.30).

12. Tewkesbury, in spite of the detailed association records preserved its Churchbook, has no other evidence from this period. Eleazar Herringe represented the church at the 1689 Assembly as pastor and Edward Canter. Herringe died 27 April 1694 (*Ivimey*, II.168).

13. Hook Norton possesses a MS copy of its history by Joshua Thomas with a dedication dated 31 March 1786. (Used in *Ivimey*, II. 517-21). The church was in being by February 1652 (see note 6). Thomas had used Crosby's *History*, III. 124f, other printed materials, oral traditions, and a marble monument which is still to be seen in the present meeting house commemorating William Harwood, a member and benefactor, who had suffered during the Persecution after 1660. According to Crosby, James Willmot, presumably the messenger in 1655 et seq., and Charles Archer, were joint pastors. During the Persecution, they were both imprisoned in Oxford and Witney gaols: unfortunately, no records of these in the period remain. Charles Archer represented Hook Norton at the 1689 Assembly. Members of the Willmot family remained linked with the church throughout the 18th Century.

14. Matthew Teyton. His surname has been variously transcribed as Taylor, Tyton and Wyton.

15. The church at Derby joined with those at Hexham and 'Wharton near Bradford' on 'the first day of the first month 1654' in a letter of loyalty to Cromwell. The letter was signed on behalf of 'the church of Christ at Derby and Burton upon Trent' by Robert Holpe (Hope?) and William Tomblinson. (E. B. Underhill, *Confessions of Faith, Hanserd Knollys Society*, London 1854, 331-4). Derbyshire was not represented at the 1689 Assembly.

16. William Tomblinson's house was licensed for the worship of a Baptist group at Burton on Trent in 1672 (*O.R.*, II.713).

17. This agreement should be compared with the Abingdon or Berkshire Association agreement printed as Appendix I to E. A. Payne's, *The Baptists*

of Berkshire, London 1951, 147ff. The share taken by the Berkshire Association and their representatives in the foundation of this association will be seen in the Abingdon MS.

18. This section is taken from the Leominster Churchbook.

19. It is clear from the Tewkesbury Churchbook that their response to the queries about marriage with those not looked upon as 'true' believers, about the acceptance of any kind of salary from the 'world' and about preaching publicly without the church's permission, were firmly negative.

20. John Fox may have been the owner of the barn in Nailsworth, Glos., registered for worship in 1672 (*O.R.*, 11.816) but this was some 25 miles from Bourton and was, rightly or wrongly, considered a Presbyterian meeting.

21. John Archer from Hook Norton may have been related to the better remembered Charles Archer (see note 13).

22. See note 15.

23. Cf. *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), 1.51 for the following more widely known example of a similar suggestion: when Cromwell lay at Cambridge long before with that famous Troop which he began his Army with, his Officers purposed to make their Troop a gathered Church, and they all subscribed an invitation to me to be their Pastor, and sent it me to Coventry. I sent them a Denial, reproving their Attempt, and told wherein my Judgment was against the Lawfulness and Convenience of their way, and so I heard no more from them'. It would be interesting to have Baxter's reasons but all we know is that he after regretted his refusal--apparently upon the grounds that the men in that 'Troop' included many of those who later exercised wide influence.

24. The Leominster Churchbook reads 'sword' for 'worde' here and it probably to be preferred--as the slightly harder reading which makes good sense.

25. This section is taken from the Leominster Churchbook.

26. This letter is only to be found in the Leominster Churchbook.

27. This section is taken from the Leominster Churchbook.

28. The Leominster Churchbook, p.21, reads: 'The 28th day of the 7th month 1656 was the Church of Christ meeting at brother Joseph Patshalls house in Leominster constituted and the persons undernamed did, after a solemn seeking of God, give up themselves to the Lord and to one another to walk together in all the ordinances of Jesus according to his appointments. Which was done in the presence of, and with the assistance of our brother Daniel King and other brethren'. A long list of ~ of over 130 men and women followed but most of these presumably joined later. Question 4, raised by the Leominster messengers at the eighth General Meeting, more probably indicates the size of their congregation at this time. Edward Price represented Leominster as pastor, at the 1689 Assembly. A man named Patshall left Jessey's congregation for believer's baptism in 1643 (*T.B.H.S.*, I. 245) and a Joseph Patshall signed the new revision of the 1644 confession in 1651.

29. John Tombs (*C.R.*, 487f.) was probably the most learned defender of the Baptist position during this period when he was active

in, among other places, Bewdley, Ledbury and Leominster. He remains peripheral to the story of the Particular Baptist associations of the time because of his open-membership practice. No doubt, it was disagreement over these that led to the withdrawal of Patshall and his friends at Leominster in 1656.

30. Richard Harrison (*C.R.*, 250, two successive entries) also practiced open-membership almost certainly.

31. Benjamin Coxe (*T.B.H.S.*, VI.50-59) acted here as the messenger of the Abington Association. His rather lengthy paper against Richard Harrison's willingness to accept state pay has been transcribed from the Leominster Churchbook and is to be found as an Appendix to these records. For further details see White, 'Organization' 216-20.

32. This meeting at Gloucester only a month after the last one is unexpected in both venue

and timing. Perhaps it was summoned because of the foundation of the congregation that applied for membership of the association at the tenth General Meeting in April 1658.

33. According to T. Thache, *The Gainsayer Convicted*, London 1649, (Thomason date: 6 August), 16 a Londoner called Harrison had drawn together a congregation in Cirencester whom he had not yet fully persuaded of the truth of believer's baptism. Among his disciples were 'M. Rudge' (mentioned in the epistle to the Reader), Thomas Chutterbuck, William Burge, Giles Handcox, Thomas Sheppard, Caleb Setfe (p.29) and others referred to (p.61) as 'Roger the Shoemaker' and 'Samuel the Boddicemaker'. Of these the Cirencester Churchbook (deposited with the Gloucestershire Record office) mentions Caleb Setfe only although Richard Burge and James Clutterbuck were members by 1655---the year in which the first entries are to be found. A certain Giles Waticins (who went as minister to the 1689 Assembly) was also a leading member in 1655. On the '9th day of the 7th month 1659' it was agreed that 'our friends in the country' could 'sitt downe as a church of them selves', probably under the leadership of one William Moulder. It should be noted that, the association record does *not* say that the church at Cirencester became a member of the association at this point.

34. The apparent confusion in entering this meeting, *before the tenth* must be due to a scribal mistake: the Cirencester meeting, though ineffectual, was intended whereas the meeting at Alcester which took place before it was not.

35. This section is taken from the Leominster Church Records.

36. Nothing else is known of the church at Gloucester at this time. It was not represented at the 1689 Assembly.

37. Bewdley appears to date from 1649 (*T.B.H. S.*, VII.12) and the work of John Tombs. In 1653, a letter was sent to Hexham (E. B. Underhill, *Records of the churches of Christ*, Hanserd Knollys Society, London; 1854, 344f.) signed by Tho. Bolstonne, Philip Mun and Robert Goodlad. The hesitation over Bewdley's membership of the association is likely to have been due to its open-membership practice inherited from Tombs.

38. Note the conflict of this dare with that said to have been proposed in the last paragraph above.

39. The first Churchbook now known at Sansome Walk, Worcester opens in 1796 with an historical survey by the then pastor, William Belsher. He reports, (p.1) that 'There is before me an old book belonging to the Baptists of Worcester' with an entry by Thomas Fecknam (O.R., 11.786, S02, two entries concerning him as active in 1669) of January. 1658/9 with the names of 17 men in addition to himself and 21 women in membership. Belsher also noted that the Worcester church had proposed two queries for discussion at the meeting of the association at Alcester 12/13 days of the 2nd month 1659. This reference contains the only information extant about this meeting: unfortunately, Belsher did not trouble to transcribe any details. Cf. W. T. Whitley, 'Persecutions of Worcestershire Dissenters under the Stuarts', (B.Q., L373-83). The church was not represented at the 1689 Assembly.

The Kiffen Manuscript

As we continue looking to the historical links connecting the English Particular Baptists to the old Waldenses and Anabaptists, we must not overlook the Kiffen Manuscript. However, there are many difficult problems dealing with it. Let me show some of these.

The Major Extremes

First, there are two extreme views regarding it. The first arose when George Gould of Norwich, England and his personal secretary recopied it and somewhat changed or enlarged it. This adding of a statement in a place or two is what has given rise to Whitsittism. The Whitsittites take the Gould altered edition and use it to try to prove no one in England dipped until 1641 when Richard Blount returned from the Waldenses or Anabaptists with their baptism and commission to baptize and constitute churches.

The second major extreme is found in John T. Christian's writings such as Baptist History Vindicated. Reacting against Whitsittism, Christian seemed to throw out the baby with the dirty bath water. That is, he denied altogether that there was a real and true Kiffen Manuscript. This is why Christian, for all his well-documented history and studies, could never quite figure out the truth about the English Particular Baptists and their origins.

The History and Backgrounds of the Kiffen Manuscripts

In English Baptist History, what is known as the Kiffen Manuscript explains how the first and second great gatherings of the Seven Particular Baptist Churches had their rise. The KM (Kiffen Manuscript) is interwoven with what is called The Jessey Church Records. These Records trace the history of Jacob's Pedobaptist Church, which Henry Jessey pastored, from its origin in the late 1500s, up to the time when several of the London

Particular Baptists came out as they became aware of the Biblical teachings about the subjects of baptism, 1633-1641.

Note this statement from W. T. Whitely in his Baptist Bibliography, London, 1916, Volume 1, page 18: *Manuscript account of the rise of Particular Baptists in London, 1633-1644. Printed from a third-hand copy in the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Vol. 1, page 230.*

Here is a brief history of the Kiffen Manuscript in distinction from the entire Jessey Church Records:

William Kiffen preserved it as a part of the Devonshire Square Records (This the church Mr. Kiffen gathered in 1638);

Upon Mr. Kiffen's death his co pastor, Mr. Richard Adams, passed it to Mr. Benjamin Stennett;

Mr. Stennett gave it to his brother in law, Mr. Thomas Crosby, who presented it to Mr. Daniel Neal, the author of The History of the Puritans;

Mr. Crosby retrieved it back from Mr. Neal in disgust at Neal's ignoring the facts therein, and later Mr. Crosby wrote his The History of the English Baptists and based much of his volume 1 on the KM.

The KM surfaced again in unfriendly hands in the 1850s, when George Gould and his personal secretary again copied it and made another addition. It was from this Gould edition that Whitsittism has arisen. The Gould edition contains a statement that they added claiming that no one in England practiced adult baptism by dipping in 1641.

In this history, there are two notable epics that account for the confusion surrounding the Kiffen Manuscript. They are:

Mr. Stennet's treatment of these old records. Stennet was Benjamin Keach's son in law, and had no real interest in showing the clear separation between the Particular and General Baptists. Even the Baptist Union historians note Stennet's unscientific treatment of these two separate groups by trying to merge them into one in his writings. This followed over when Stennet's brother in law, Thomas Crosby took them over and wrote his History of the English Baptists. But, even more, the Baptist Union historians show that Stennet was very careless and indifferent about many different things in his writings. They affirm that Stennet recopied these old records and then presented Crosby with a copy of a copy. Of course, with Stennet's careless ways, no telling what has been altered and what had not been. What we are dealing with here is the era between 1633-1644.

Mr. Gould of Norwich and his private secretary made yet another copy of these old records. This made matters even worse. John T. Christian gives us two copies of the Kiffen Manuscript. By comparing them we find that many of the difficult statements are not in the first copy, but are found in the second copy.

Since Gould's times, those who follow him try to show that Mr. Spilsbury wasn't a rigid Baptist and that the Particular Baptists simply evolved into being Baptist Churches from about 1638-1644. The final stages of evolution were supposed to come about 1643 when Kiffen finally reached the Baptist position, became dissatisfied with Spilsbury and broke away and gathered a new church. This is all untrue.

In 1738 Mr. John Lewis wrote his *A Brief History of the Rise and Progress of Anabaptism in England*. In the same year Mr. Thomas Crosby followed with his *A Brief Reply*. I do not have Crosby's work and will start making plans now to secure it. It seems to be separate from his larger *History of the Baptists*. I never noted that before.

The Battle over the Kiffen Manuscript and Results

In the early part of the 1700s Richard Adams, co-pastor with William Kiffen, passed the Kiffen Manuscript to Benjamin Stennet shortly following Mr. Kiffen's death. Mr. Stennet was supposed to be preparing a history of the English Baptists. For some reason, Mr. Stennet did not proceed with this project, but passed them over to his brother in law, Mr. Thomas Crosby. Mr. Stennet and Mr. Crosby held much the same attitude, that is, that the division between the Particular and the General Baptists was unnecessary. Because of this, they had a very lax attitude in their historical treatment of different subjects. Crosby's work is greatly hampered because of this failure. He failed to identify the true causes of separation between the two Baptist groups and their separate origins. This is why he did not understand fully the intent of the Kiffen Manuscript.

In the mid 1800s, George Gould pastored the old Particular Baptist Church in Norwich, England. His son later became Principal Gould of Bristol Baptist College. Principal Gould also was a very influential leader in the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland and its historical publications during the late 1800s and early 1900s. With these considerations in mind let us note these following facts and see how they have colored Baptist history with some various interpretations that have come from the early Particular Baptists.

Gould was an open communionist. In fact, he may not have even believed that baptism was necessary for membership in a gospel church. When he became pastor of the old church at Norwich, it was still closed communion.

In time Gould's open communion influence soon corrupted the Norwich church. It became an open communion church.

As a result of this, the closed communion Baptists, led by Joseph Ivemy, started legal actions against Gould and the church there. The title deeds to the meeting house and church property were such that if the church left its original position, it would lose its privileges to the meeting house and property.

1. A long lawsuit developed, and in the end the judge ruled against Gould and the open communion church.
2. In the course of the lawsuit, Gould prepared many notes about the origin and rise of the Particular Baptists in London. He did this in order to try to prove his open communion position in his case in court. He was very successful. Since then, the established views about the Particular Baptists and their origins in general and John Spilsbury in particular have followed the concepts Gould presented in this court case.
3. Gould published his court notes and arguments under the title of *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich, 1860*.
4. Shortly following its publication, Gould sent copies of this work into America, into the hands of Thomas Armitage in the North and Norman Fox, of William Jewell College, in Missouri. One of Fox's prize pupils, William Whitsitt, joined this document with the researches of Henry Dexter, Congregationalists historian of the post Civil War era, and developed his thesis which has spread forth under the title of *Whitsittism*.
5. Whitsitt's thesis is that before 1641 the English Baptists did not immerse. Most of the Anabaptists in Europe forsook immersion also in the late 1500s and early

1600s. Therefore, there has not been an unbroken succession of true baptism and true churches since the days of Christ and His apostles. It then followed that Baptist Churches are not of divine origin nor have they had an unbroken succession since Christ's time. They are only one of the many Protestant groups, merely another part of the universal, invisible church.

6. Gould's thesis was that John Spilsbury was an open communion Baptist and pastored a mixed communion church. William Kiffen joined that mixed communion Baptist church. Spilsbury and his church is supposed to have received dipping sometime in the mid 1640s. Later, because Spilsbury wanted to continue his fellowship with unbaptized persons, Kiffen and Spilsbury split and formed separate churches. This is supposed to have happened about 1651. John Spilsbury is regarded as living and dying as a mixed communion Baptist minister. In addition to this, Gould maintained that Kiffen was the only closed communion Baptist living in the 1600s, with the possible exception of Benjamin Cox. He was forced to include Cox because Cox's rejection from a living in the Anglican Church was too well known in church history. Cox became a close communion Anglican even before he became a Baptist. He opposed offering communion to the ungodly. His Bishop, Martian Blake, published *The Great Question Answered*, London, about 1644. In this, Blake included Cox's work on the Lord's Supper. Because Cox would not leave Closed Communion views, Blake excommunicated him. Later Cox became a Particular Baptist and signed the 1646 Confession of Faith. He was also involved in several public debates defending Baptist principles and writing several works. We have most of these in modern print now.
7. Both Gould and the Closed Communion defender, Ivimey, the Baptist historian, made the same basic mistakes in arguing their case. Neither of them came close to stating the truth about John Spilsbury and his doctrinal position. Both blundered greatly about even who the Particular Baptists were in the 1640s. Both included General Baptist leaders, Thomas Lamb and Edward Barber as Particular Baptists. This is why volume 2 in Ivimey is such a mess. Volumes 1, 3 and 4 are fairly reliable, but Volume 2 is full of such false conclusions and improper facts that it would almost take a work as large to sort all the mistakes out. The sad result is, both Gould and Ivimey did have access to the original works, but neither resorted to them. The signers of the First London Confession are clear and easily read on each of the editions of 1644, 1646, 1651 and 1652. Neither man took the trouble to go to and find out the originals and the men who made up those churches and signed their confessions. This is only one example of their terrible mistakes.
8. By making Spilsbury and all the other Particular Baptists into open communion and mixed membership Baptists, Gould sought to isolate William Kiffen from the main line of Baptist thought and practice. Ivimey was so determined to fight Gould that he did not research into the original works and make a factual case before the court. Since the Norwich Court Case, and Gould's victory, all the established Baptist writers have taken the conclusions of Gould and his work. After all, this is what stood up in court. The established Baptist writers are those of the Baptist Union and the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions. Even some of the Strict and Particular Baptist historians like, S. F. Paul, in his *Historical Sketch of the Gospel Standard Baptists*, London; 1954, 1961, adopted their conclusions. In America, later such men as William L. Lumpkin in his *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, The Judson Press; Philadelphia: 1959, followed this thesis completely. So did H. C. Vedder, Albert Henry Newman and all their followers, the infamous host of modern Baptists historians in America and England today.
9. The First Key is understanding John Spilsbury and his writings and his stand. He was never a mixed communionist one day in his life. The 1646 confession makes this plain. So does his second edition of *A Treatise of a Lawful Subject of Baptism*,

London; 1652. Next is understanding that for a time John Spilsbury and some of the brethren felt it was alright to listen to a preacher before his baptism, if he were being tried and tested in lieu of becoming a Baptist minister. This was a part of his examination. This concept was often debated in the association meetings and the majority determined it was wrong to do this. Kiffen stood with the majority and Spilsbury with the minority on this issue. But, remember this was only a trial hearing of a man who was soon to become a Baptist minister. It was not pulpit affiliation with the Pedobaptists. John Spilsbury still suffered severe persecution in London as late as 1651. This is why he left London and took up a new pastorate in the country near Broomsgrove. In Jane Turner's Choice Experiences, with a large introduction by John Spilsbury, the concept of hearing the Pedobaptists is discussed. All the Particular Baptists, except the mixed communion men, walked under the same rule, no hearing the Pedobaptists. This is called The Ordinance of Hearing. To offend on this matter brought church exclusion. Here are some of Jane Turner's remarks about this subject:

First, I thought though the Saints of old did practice these things, yet as they were now practiced it was some kind of bondage, and below the privilege of the Gospel to be tied to a particular people, especially in relation to hearing; for I thought I should not forbear hearing some particular men, [who were not in the order of the Gospel] that formerly I used to hear.

That as faith comes by hearing; so there may be a hearing that tends to the prejudice of faith. And such I conclude is all hearing out of the way of God, though some more, some less; I mean public hearing out of the Church of God; and though some do judge it their liberty and privilege so to do, I must needs confess I cannot so judge: For though possibly glorious things may be spoken, yet what privilege can it be for Saints to hear glorious things, where there is no promise of a blessing from God and therefore I may say as the Apostle, of speaking in an unknown tongue, I had rather hear five words from a true Ministry, or in a Church of Christ, where he hath promised his blessing and presence, than five thousand elsewhere, though I desire in a personal way to own and embrace all or any appearance of God where ever I find it, and can upon that account truly say, I do much respect, love, and delight in some who are not yet come up to the true worship of Christ in his Church, but I must be true to my principles, I cannot see how we that are, according to the Gospel, joined to the Lord, and his Church, by which we hold out to the world a visible profession of his name, and a separation from all false ways of worship which in our principles we judge them who are not rightly constituted with us according to the appointment and practice of Christ and his Apostles to be on other, I say I cannot see how we can meet with them in their public worship, to hear their Ministers, or in any other spiritual duty, but it is a crossing our own principles: As thus, they own themselves true Churches, and Ministers of Christ, the ignorant world knoweth not but they are so, we by our presence being silent do say the same, though in our Judgment we cannot so own them, which is a plain contradiction in our principles; we say they are not Churches and Ministers of Christ, by our practice we say they are, as hath been minded.

Secondly, As it is a contradiction of our own principles so it hath had such effects, which are too visible, and remains unto this day. I must confess, in my most serious thoughts I have wondered what should be the reason that any in the house of God should desire to be elsewhere: I am sure there is no reason to be given for it, neither from Scripture, nor experience; therefore I conclude, its either from ignorance, and so persons in their practice cross their own principles and not, know it; or else its from corrupt principles; or else they are overcome by some violent temptations. As to the first of these, I trust there are not many in the house of God so ignorant. As to the second it is the desire of my soul, that God would reprove and shew them the evil of such principles, and recover them out

of such snares. As to the third, let them take heed lest having put their hand to the plow, and looking back, they become unfit for the Kingdom of God, Luke 9.62. and let them likewise take heed of pleasing men, or halting between two opinions, but if God be God follow him, if Baal follow him, IKings 28.21. This may seem harsh language to some but I am satisfied that what I have written hath not been from a censorious spirit, to Judge of the final state of any, or to question the grace of God in any, where it doth appear in the least measure, and therefore let none say that because I cannot own any to be true Churches or Ministers of Christ, but such as are in the same order with us, that therefore I say there is nothing of God or Truth in them, or that none shall be saved but ourselves, or that we love none but those of our own judgment, which if any do so think, or speak of us, it is a very great mistake; for if I may speak for others, as I have already said, I do upon a godly account love, and delight in some who are not in our Churches, and do wait for the accomplishment of those glorious promises when they and we shall have a pure language, and shall call upon the Lord, and serve him with one consent, and when we shall have one heart and one way, and there shall be one Lord, and his name one, Zep.3.9. Jer.32.39. Zach.14.9. In the meantime Let none under a pretense of waiting for the accomplishment of such promises as these, grow cold, and indifferent in the great things of God: For none can truly wait for the accomplishment of Promises, but such as do wait in a close walking with God, according to that measure of light received and so those that have but a little of the knowledge of God, let them follow on to know the Lord, Hosea 6.3. and let those that are in the faith, earnestly contend for it, Jude 3. and such as are in Gospel Churches, let them stand fast in one Spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel, Phil.1.27. and let every one that names the name of Christ depart from iniquity, IITim. 2.19. and those that love the Lord, hate evil, Ps. 97.10. And as I desire the none may slight grow cold, or indifferent in the great things of God, under a pretense of waiting for high enjoyments of discoveries, which shall be in the later days; so I desire likewise that Truth under a pretense of Love, as many do in these days, laboring to confound light with darkness, truth with error, and to make an agreement, where God hath made none. Let such know, that true spiritual love, as it is wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God, so it is bounded within the limits of Truth. Love and Truth go hand in hand; it is so fixed upon God, that it Loves all in and for him; spiritual Love must have a spiritual object, and as the object is more or less visible, so is that Love, it cannot love everything alike, nay it works as well by hatred of evil as approving that which is good, Ps.101. Ps.97.10. Rev.2.6. Ps.119.122,128. It loves that which God loves and hates that which he hates; it loves the Word of God, the Ordinances of God, and the people of God, and hates all that is in opposition to these, it rejoiceth not in iniquity, but refoiceth in the truth, ICor.13.6. This is true spiritual love, in which we are to receive every truth, and which faith worketh, IIThes.2.10. Gal.5.6. and I dare affirm, whatever persons may pretend of spiritual love that is not of this nature, it is a mere delusion, and that all that fear the Lord ought to take heed of it

*The fourth Note of Experience, how I was convinced and brought to submit to Baptism
and
Church-fellowship commanded by Christ.*

Being through mercy now well satisfied in point of Justification, Redemption, and Salvation, though I had nothing to do to be saved, yet I had much to do to glorify God in relation to Sanctification and Obedience; but notwithstanding all my former experience in point of Faith, I was very ignorant of Baptism, and all other duties and Ordinances relating to the visible practice of Believers, only I had some dark apprehensions of separation, and a Church way, by reason of which I had thoughts to join with some who were called INDEPENDENTS; but considering how I had formerly been mistaken about things of that nature, I was not hasty to practice it, until I was better satisfied, being somewhat at a loss about it; then after some time I heard of Baptism, though I had no acquaintance with any

that practiced it, yet knowing there were such, did occasion me to search the Scriptures about it, and by several places in the Acts, with that in Matt.28.19. I was in a great measure convinced that Baptism of Believers was an Ordinance of Christ, and that there could be no true Church without it, and that Baptizing of Infants is that for which I could find no ground in Scripture, and by degrees I was so fully satisfied in it, and I thought the Scriptures were so plain and clear for it, that I did much wonder at my own ignorance, that I should be a professor so long, and so frequent in reading Scripture, and yet ignorant of that which was so plainly therein express, then coming to London to that end, namely to be instructed in the ways of God more perfectly, not knowing the like means elsewhere, I went many times to hear in the Churches of Christ, by which, through the great blessing of God, I was more and more satisfied about it; yet notwithstanding all this, by hearkening to the delusions of my own heart, and Satan's instruments, I met with many interruptions, and temptations that kept me from my duty, at least one whole year after; some of those temptations were these.

First, I thought though the Saints of old did practice these things, yet as they were now practiced it was some kind of bondage, and below the privilege of the Gospel to be tied to a particular people, especially in relation to hearing; for I thought I should not forbear hearing some particular men, [who were not in the order of the Gospel] that formerly I used to hear.

A second thing that hindered me was the failings and miscarriages of some particular persons then in the Churches.

A third hindrance was, I thought it my liberty to do or not do it.

A fourth hindrance was in relation to Persecution, I judged I should not be fit to suffer for it [though a truth of Christ] until all those scruples were removed.

These, with others of the like nature, were the groundless thoughts that kept me from my duty; but though kept back by these for a time, yet I had such strong convictions that I could not leave it so, but was much endeavoring after satisfaction, and in the use of means God was pleased to satisfy me; but by reason of persecution there was no Church I knew of, but only in London, and therefore I could not immediately do it; but being to be married soon after, I was to live in London, and then I resolved to submit to this Ordinance of Christ; but when I came to London, I heard all kind of preachers, one of which preached a strange kind of doctrine much notional, which bred such a confusion in my heart that I knew not what to do, by which I was again hindered from my duty, being willing to try that doctrine, I not having heard the like before, it being full of enticing words of mans wisdom, which I did with as much diligence try for some time, examining the Scriptures about it, as ever I did any doctrine, but could find nothing in it but confusion, a mere sound of words, some of those big swelling words of vanity spoken of Jude16. II Pet.2.18. so, through mercy, I left it, and escaped that snare, which I desire to remember to the praise of God. Then I resolved to prosecute my former purpose in relation to those duties before mentioned, yet still lingering in Babylon till the Lord was pleased by a stretched-out arm, and clear voice, to bring to my remembrance those words in the 22. chapter of the Acts. verse 6. Arise and be baptized, why tarryest thou? and [as I remember] for some days together, whatever I was doing, those words were much in my thoughts, then I began to take particular notice of it, applying it to my own condition, whether I was able to give a reason why I tarried, the Lord having removed all my scruples, and answered all my objections and speaking of it to my Husband, who was then much in the same condition, I remember we some discourse about it, and the result was that the next first day we would go to the Church [where we had often heard] and declare what God had done for us in the great work of conversion, desiring also to obey him in all his commands, which

accordingly we did, and gave them full satisfaction, and the week following were baptized and added to the Church, being sweetly satisfied and comforted therein; and as for my former scruples I was troubled no more with them, and in particular as to hearing out of the Church, I never desired it since but God was pleased, and still is, to satisfy me with the fatness of his house, feeding me with green pastures there; and fitting under the shadow of Christ, his Fruit is sweet to my taste; which the L O R D grant I may be found so doing, as he hath commanded, until his second coming. . Choice Experiences, London, 1653, pps. 22-30.

10. Both Jane Turner and her husband, John Turner, walked with John Spilsbury in the church he pastored. If a person will take the time to study really Spilsbury's last writings in 1651, in his second edition of a Treatise of the Lawful Subjects of Baptism, he will see that Mr. Spilsbury makes himself very clear. He understood well that many of his statements had been misunderstood in his first edition against Praise God Barebones in about 1643. In his second edition he states plainly that there is no church gathering and constitution except by faith and baptism. He says this many times in the second edition. Here are two direct quotes from this old work:

Secondly, the ordinance of baptism instituted by Christ is so essential to the constitution of the Church under the New Testament that no one can be true in her constitution without it. Neither can THAT BE A FALSE CHURCH WHERE BAPTISM IS TRUELY THE Lord's Ordinance in the administration thereof, as I Cor. 12:13 with Gal. 3:27. So to approve of Antichrist's baptism to be God's ordinance, is to approve of his Church to be also the Church of God. Page 52.

And, lastly, I dare not go from that rule and order which Christ left in His last Testament, for the constituting of his Church, and taking of members into the same, which is by faith and baptism. Page 53.

John Spilsbury and those brethren then believed in the General Church made up of all the Particular Gospel Churches. This is a part of the John Bunyan- Spilsbury, Kiffen and Paul debates. Here is one of Spilsbury's statements that many incorrectly concluded that he meant a mixed membership church:

Again, adding to Churches after baptism is in respect of particular Churches; unto which persons may be recommended, but not of the Universal Church and Body of Christ, into which they are baptized, I Cor. 12:12, 13, Romans 6:3, 4, 2. Now that into which are baptized, must be before baptism: but persons are baptized into that one body the Church, therefore the church is before baptism. Page 69. *A Treatise Concerning the Lawful Subjects of Baptism*; London: 1652.

John Bunyan had no trouble understanding Spilsbury and the others. He knew well what they meant, and said so. Note the following:

So then by "universal, orderly, visible church," this brother must mean those of the saints only that have been, or are baptized as we; this is clear, because baptism, saith he, makes a believer a member of this church: his meaning then is, that there is an universal, orderly, visible church, and they alone are the Baptists; and that every one that is baptized, is by that made a member of the universal, orderly, visible church of Baptists, and that the whole number of the rest of saints are utterly excluded. The Works of John Bunyan, vol. 1, page 467, (of three volumes).

In the Seeker-Quaker-Baptist debates, the Particular Baptists made their position clear on baptism in water being a constitutional ordinance of a gospel church. They did this also in the Baptist-Bunyan Debates as well.

11. Now this question arises, if the Seekers and Quakers understood the meaning of John Spilsbury, and the others about water baptism and I Cor. 12:13, as also later did John Bunyan, then it follows, why didn't Gould, Armitage, Fox, Whitsitt and all the other post-downgrader Baptist historians? Is it that they have a position to prove and will go to any slander and falsehood to justify their position that Baptists are not of divine origin nor have they had an unbroken succession since Christ's time, but they are merely one part of the Universal, Invisible Church, another group of Protestants?
12. Even more telling is the Baptist Union's treatment of William Kiffen and his closed communion views.

In their Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Kiffen's closed communion views, and his becoming a closed membership Baptist are presented. Of course, they try to make it appear that Kiffen became such in the early 1641 or 1642 era. I quote:

The date of Kiffen's baptism is interesting. In 1670 he said that he was arrested in 1640 but was released because Justice Mallaee the prosecutor was himself imprisoned by Parliament. But the date here is wrong, the state papers show that it was in August 1642 that Mallett was arrested. This rectification makes his autobiography fall into line with his statement in 1681 that he had practiced Strict Communion "for these forty years," the context implying that he had never wavered on this point. Hence we get the true sequence: - 1638 joined a congregation which on one occasion was mobbed at Tower Hill, i.e. 21 April 1640. Discussed baptism, and was immersed about 1641. Volume 1, page 227.

What is wrong with this date? We must remember that Kiffen was an aged man when he said these things. Dates and times often become confused. A younger Kiffen, as we shall shown, in 1645 places the gathering of the Particular Baptist Churches in the time of Laud, in the 1630s, not the 1640s. Also remember that Kiffen affirmed that they were gathered under Laud as they existed then, in 1645, when he wrote his Brief Remonstrance. This Baptist Union historian corrects Kiffen's memory problems, but then totally ignores what Kiffen wrote in 1645 placing the constituted origin of the Particular Baptist churches as occurring during the days of Laud's greatest glory and power. Why?

13. William Allen is treated even more unfortunate. I quote the following from Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Volume 1, 1910; page 117:

WILLIAM ALLEN, Tradesman, of London. He was of the Tombs type, open communion. Under Baxter's influence he dissolved the church he was pastor of, tried to convince other Baptist ministers, then abandoned separationism, and wound up by conforming and writing bitterly against separatism. His biography was written by Bishop Williams in 1707.....

1653 Some Baptismal Abuses briefly discovered; or a cordial endeavor to reduce the administration and use of Baptism to its primitive purity. pps. 119.

Please note this, the classifying of Allen with John Tombs is clearly wrong. What ever we may say of his forsaking Baptist views, he clearly was not an open communionist. The reason I know this, note well the title of his work published in 1653. The Baptist Historical Society writer only gave part of the title. Here is the full title:

Some Baptismal Abuses Briefly Discovered or A Cordial Endeavor to Reduce the Administration and Use of Baptism to its Primitive Purity; in two parts.

The First Part,

Tending to disprove the Lawfulness of Infant Baptism.

The Second Part,

Tending to prove it necessary for persons to be Baptized after they believe, their Infant Baptism, or any preprofession of the Gospel notwithstanding.

And also,

Discovering the disorder and irregularity that is in mixt Communion of persons baptized, with such as are unbaptized, in Church-Fellowship.

By

William Allen

LONDON

MDCLIII

Please note the last part, it covers from pages 98-119. It is one of the finest defenses of Closed Communion and the right gathering and constitution of Baptized saints into gospel order separate and apart from unbaptized persons, as I have ever read. I Corinthians 12:13 is often cited as showing that all the members of the first churches were baptized in water.

Now, note again the Baptist Union Historians remarks about William Allen: WILLIAM ALLEN, Tradesman, of London. He was of the Tombs type, open communion.

If misrepresentation makes a thing so, then I suppose it is so. But, William Allen's own works show us that this classification and summation is false. Such historical falsehoods abound in the writings of the historians of The Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain and Ireland. However, in all fairness, these mistakes abound in multiplied instances also in writings on the other side. If mistakes discredit an author and his works, then the historical studies of the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain and Ireland, are discredited. But, they do not. I greatly appreciate these old studies, and am thankful that I have the old works in question and can correct these and many other mistakes. As I said before, both sides have made an abundance of mistakes.

Why So Many Mistakes

These mistakes have come about in two ways:

1. The miss-copying Stennett began and Gould and his personal secretary completed ;
2. The historians failed to consult the original works in question.

What this amounts to is, these historians who have been writing, and then rewriting and still then revising Baptist history have used hearsay, altered and gossip laden sources. These should never have a place in neither scientific investigation nor presentation.

What the Kiffen Manuscript Teaches

In the past I had several copies of The Kiffen Manuscript. The fullest presentation of this old history appeared in The Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain and Ireland, volume 1, under W. B. Whitley's editorship. In addition, the second best appears in John T. Christian's Baptist History Vindicated. Lumpkins' Baptist Confessions of Faith presents the Gould revisionist viewpoint of the Kiffen Manuscript.

The First Gathering of the Lasting Particular Baptists

The Kiffen Manuscript teaches us that in about 1633 several members of the old Pedobaptist dissenter church called Jacob's church, left because they became convinced that believer's baptism is the only true baptism. These persons started walking with John Spilsbury. In addition, it is stated they many of them received a further baptism. To me this means that some wanted to form a Particular Baptist Church with John Spilsbury and received baptism from him, or from one walking with him. However, all that went over to Mr. Spilsbury apparently did not join with him nor did they receive new baptism. In due time some of these returned back to the Jessey Church. One of these appears to have been Mr. Richard Blount. Why, Spilsbury later talks about persons wanting succession in addition to gospel truth and order. This does not mean that Spilsbury denied succession, but that he did not feel that succession was that which made a church a church, but rather gospel faith and order did. John Spilsbury held that if the minister were rightly baptized and given orders, commissioned, then he was duly qualified to preach, baptize and gather churches. Those who went back and were involved in the Blount mission wanted these things and a formal succession in their baptism. There is no proof that either group required a church to give them a vote or authority to become a church.

Mr. Spilsbury's history, ministry and baptism are not accounted for in The Kiffen Manuscript. He is just there as a Particular Baptist minister in 1633. The history of the old Church at Wapping entitled London's Oldest Baptist Church, claims its origin in 1633.

Under the leadership of Laud and his Reign of Terror, the Anglicans severely persecuted Mr. Spilsbury and the others in the next few years after 1633. Mr. Sam Eaton, one of the ministering brethren now with John Spilsbury is imprisoned and later murdered while in prison.

Please note John Taylor's remarks from his A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismaticques, London, 1641 pages 6, 7:

A Precious Youth

Also one Spilsbury rose up of late, (Who doth, or did dwell over Aldersgate) His office was to weigh Hay by the Trusse, (Fit for the pallet of Bucephalus) He in short time left his Hay-weighting trade, and afterwards he Irish Stockings made: He rebaptized in Anabaptist fashion one Eaton (of the new found separation) A zealous Button maker, grave and wise; and gave him order, others to baptize; who was so apt to learn that in one day, hee'd do't as well as Spilsbury weighed Hay. This pure Hay-lay man to the Bankside came, A Basket-maker's wife, known wonderous well, in Moses his Alley he and she doth dwell.

Baptized in Anabaptist Fashion

Mr. Spilsbury did rebaptism Mr. Eaton in "Anabaptist fashion". According to Daniel Featly, that is by dipping head and all. In 1645, Mr. Featly informs his readers that the Anabaptists had been baptizing in this fashion for over 20 years near his home place. In addition, Mr. Featly traces this terrible Anabaptist sect and their baptism by Anabaptist fashion clear back to the time of Queen Elizabeth. So much for Whitsittism. Featly stated:

They preach, and print, and practice their heretical impieties openly; they hold their conventicles weekly in our chief cities, and Suburbs thereof, and there prophesy by turns; and (that I may use the phrase of Tertullian) adificantur in ruinam, they build one another in the faith of their Sect, to the ruin of their souls; they flock in great multitudes to their

Jordans, and both Sexes enter into the River, and are dipt after their manner with a kind of spell containing the heads of their erroneous tenants, and their engaging themselves in their schismaticall Covenants, and , (if I may so speak) combinations of separation. And as they defile our Rivers with their impure washings, and our Pulpits with their false prophecies and phanaticall enthusiasms, so the presses sweat and groan under the load of their blasphemies. For they print not only Anabaptism, from which they take their name; but many other most damnable doctrines. . . . Page 3 and 4 of The Epistle Dedicatory. The Dippers Dipt. Or, The Anabaptists Ducked and Plunged over Head and Ears, at a Disputation in Southwark. London, 1645.

The Anglicans defined baptism according to Anabaptist fashion as being dipt and dunked over head and ears. Both John Taylor, speaking of John Spilsbury's baptizing of Sam Eaton, used this terminology, as did Daniel Featley. Featly was good enough to define the act for us. Was this a new act for baptism? No, Featley stated again:

This venomous Serpent (vere solifuga) flying from, and shinning the light of God's Word, is the Anabaptist, who in these later times first showed his shinning head, and speckled skin, and thrust out his sting near the place of my residence, for more than twenty years. Ibid., last page of The Epistle to the Reader.

Complaining further about the antiquity of the Anabaptists, and the reasons why they are no longer held down, Featley stated:

So we may say, the name of the father of the Anabaptists signifieth in English a senseless piece of wood, or block, and a very blockhead was he: yet out of this block were cut those chips that kindled such a fire in Germany, Hosfatia, and Suenia, that could not be fully quenched, no not with the blood of 150,000 of them killed in war, or put to death in several places by the Magistrates.

This fire in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, and King James, and our gracious Sovereign, till now, was covered in England under the ashes; or if it brake out at any time, by the care of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Magistrates it was soon put out. But of late, since the unhappy distractions which our sins have brought upon us, the Temporal sword being other ways employed, and the spiritual locked up fast in the scabbard, this sect, among others, has so far presumed upon the patience of the State, that it has held weekly Conventicles, rebaptized hundred of men and women together in the twilight in Riverlets and some arms of the Thames, and elsewhere, dipping them over head and ears. Ibid., last page of To the Reader. (Remember, there is an Epistle to The Reader and then a To the Reader).

In addition, Mr. Eaton being a preaching brother, Mr. Spilsbury also did "give him orders others to baptize." That is how the Anglicans made fun of Baptist. The reason I have given this note is due to the Gould's position that John Spilsbury and his church were still unbaptized as late as 1644.

In Turloe's State Papers for the year 1638 under item 64. Note the following about Sam Eaton:

Petition of Francis Tucker, B. D., prisoner in Newgate for debt, to the same. Samuel Eaton, prisoner in Newgate, committed by you for a schismatical and dangerous fellow, had held conventicles in the goal, some to the number of 70 persons, and is permitted by the keeper openly to preach. Eaton has oftentimes affirmed in his sermons that baptism was the doctrine of devils and its original an institution from the devil, and has railed against the archbishop, affirming that all bishops are heretics, blasphemers and anti-Christians. The keeper, having notice hereof by petitioner, who desired that these great resorts might be

prevented, and Eaton be reproved, and removed to some other place in the prison, replied to petitioner disdainfully, threatening to remove him to some worse place. The Keeper has been present in a conventicle of 60 persons when Eaton was preaching. He said there was a very fair and goodly company, and stayed there some season. Contrary to the charge of the High Commission, he permits Eaton to go abroad to preach to conventicles. The keeper also caused petitioner's sister to be removed out of the prison, contrary to the opinion of a doctor, and she died the very next day, her chamber being presently after her removal assigned to Eaton, it being the most convenient place in the prison for keeping his conventicles. Prays the Archbishop to refer the examination of this matter to Isaac Pennington and John Wollaston, sheriffs of London, and in the meantime to take such course with the keeper as shall be thought fitting.

Francis Tucker didn't tell all the truth about Eaton's remarks on baptism. Eaton was, with all the Anabaptists, denouncing infant baptism.

Please observe that in the late 1630s, the Anabaptists did preach and baptize in Anabaptist fashion and were imprisoned for it. While in prison, Sam Eaton was able to hold more services and went forth out of the prison and preached and held church services.

Now back to the Kiffen Manuscript. Following this first departure and joining with Mr. Spilsbury, later, in 1638, Mr. Kiffen and some others came over to Mr. Spilsbury and were received and then constituted a separate church. In 1639 Mr. Paul Hobson and some others did the same. There is no record that either Mr. Kiffen or his friends or Mr. Hobson and his friends had been connected with the Jessey church of Pedobaptists.

What do we have in 1639?

By 1639 there existed three Particular Baptist churches in London, Spilsbury's, Kiffen's and Hobson's. These churches were constituted by true gospel faith and believer's dipping. Whitsittism, following Gould's incorrect conclusions, would have us to believe that these churches were not Baptists before the 1641-1644 era because Baptists had not evolved into dipping yet. Is this true? No! Here are some additional testimonies from those old Baptists themselves.

William Kiffen wrote in 1645 his *A Brief Remonstrance of the Reasons and Grounds of Those People Commonly Called Anabaptists, for their Separation*; London, July 26th. 1645; pages 5-7. One of the main points in this work is the affirmation about the origin and nature of the Particular Baptist churches that issued the 1644 Confession of faith:

1. The Seven London Churches of the 1644 Confession were made up of baptized members;
2. The Lord's Supper was restricted to the Baptized church members.

Both of these points were stated in the 1644 Confession under article 33. It taught that the church, thus gathered is to partake of the ordinances of Christ. In the 1646 edition, the articles make it even plainer.

Kiffen's Origin of the Particular Baptist Churches

Kiffen places the origin of the Particular Baptist Churches before they heard of any Reformation. According to Kiffen the churches were gathered and framed at their first beginning as they were then, in 1645. Note that well. This proves the Gould's distortions of to be false and misleading.

In addition, in his work on Communion, Kiffen shows us that the faith and order in his closed communion way was over 40 years old. That work, *A Sober Discourse of Right to Church Communion*, was published in London, in 1681. Remember that his closed communion practices were over 40 years old in 1681. Joseph Ivemy, in his biography of William Kiffen places the origin of Kiffen's Church in 1639. The Kiffen Manuscript places it in 1638. The differences may be between the old calendar and dates and the new calendar which changed in the 1600s.

This concludes the pre-1641 Particular Baptists. To summarize these facts we note again:

1. John Spilsbury, in 1633, was already a baptized Particular Baptist minister, who baptized and ordained others;
2. Certain Pedobaptists left the Jessey church and went over to Mr. Spilsbury, and received a further baptism;
3. William Kiffen and Paul Hobson's churches were gathered, from Spilsbury's work, in 1638 and 1639.

The Second Particular Baptist Gathering

The Kiffen Manuscript informs us that in about 1641 there continued to be many debates about the subject of baptism. This led again to several members withdrawing and wanting to constitute a separate church of Particular Baptists. The main hindrance in this was a lack of a proper administrator. Why was this since Kiffen, Hobson and Spilsbury were already there in gathered churches? It had to do with proper baptismal succession, or a direct link to another church, and a new church being constituted by a direct and formal link to another church.

When Mr. Spilsbury returned to England, he was the only Particular Baptist in the London area. He had no church connection since there were no Particular Baptist Churches thereabouts. He, as a baptized and ordained man, as did Sam Eaton, simply started preaching and baptized his converts. They formed themselves into a gospel church. However, the Blount group of Particular Baptist churches wanted more than this in their baptism, they wanted a traceable succession. Spilsbury and the first group looked upon this as unnecessary.

The next group rallied around Richard Blount, who had earlier left and went to Mr. Spilsbury, but returned due to some unknown reason. Mr. Blount was sent over to Holland to make contact with the old Waldensian-Anabaptists, as he understood their language. He made contact with them and they baptized him received and commissioned him to return to England with baptismal authority. In addition, they sent one of their own ministering brethren back into England with Mr. Blount. Upon his return, with the old Waldensian-Anabaptist minister from that old church where Blount went to link up with the old Waldenses, Mr. Blount baptized a Mr. Blaylock and they in turn both baptized a large number of adults, about 51, both men and women.

From the Blount mission came Thomas Kilcop, Thomas Shephard or Skippard as he is sometimes spelled, and John Mabbitt. These three men eventually formed more Particular Baptist Churches. We have no knowledge of what happened to Richard Blount after this, but he did not seem to be a regular minister, only temporarily appointed to do this work because he understood well the old language of those unto whom he went.

Much of this is discussed in Volume 1 of Ivimey's *History of the English Baptists*. Crosby wonders about the entire happenings, and does however, show us that Spilsbury and the others didn't feel it was necessary. Later, Edward Hutchinson, one of the Particular Baptist ministers with Thomas Patient in Ireland, returned home and settled in order an

Independent Particular Baptist Church much like John Gosnold's church. They were not involved in the Associational work of the original Seven London Particular Baptist Churches. In the mid 1670s, Hutchinson was very busy writing and defending Baptist history and polity. He defended Henry D'Anvers and his great and large Baptist History. In 1676, Hutchinson issued his *A Treatise Concerning the Covenant and Baptism*, London. In this great work he explains and vindicates the separation of the rigid Anabaptists from all others (the old Landmarkers of those days). This is done in the Postscript and on pages 104-105. Hutchinson deals with the supposed disorderly origin of the Particular Baptists on the top of page 4 of the Epistle Dedicatory and fully supports the Kiffen Manuscript.

A few years earlier Mr. John Gosnold, Independent Particular Baptist in London, issued his *A Discourse of the Baptism of Water and the Spirit*, London 1657. This is a great old work against the Seekers and Quakers and shows the succession of water baptism and the other ordinances of Christ in His church to the end of the world, pages 2-5. On page 5, Gosnold takes up the subject of the supposed disorderly origin of the Baptists, coming from an unlawful administrator. On page 7 Gosnold points out that an unbaptized person did not baptize first among the English Baptists, so no unlawful administrator.

In 1691, Mr. Hercules Collins pastored the old Spilsbury Church gathered in 1633. In 1691, Collins published his *Believer's Baptism from Heaven and of Divine Institution*. On page 114, he disputes the Pedobaptist claim that the Baptists came from John Smyth. On page 115, he justified the Kiffen Manuscript and its early history of the rise of the London Particular Baptists. This is a rich Old Landmark Baptist work. On pages, 62-63 he deals with fit administrators and this section is excellent. On pages 82-94 he deals with closed or in church communion. On pages 93 and 94, he deals with the succession of the church, administrators and the ordinances. He shows what the origin of the Anabaptist Muster wars were all about, pages 95-98. He correctly shows that the Reformers brought the riots to Muster, pages 100, 101, and Luther's great evil therein, 101. On pages 105, and 106, he shows that it is from Muster and following Muster that the Mennonites refused to bear arms. Remember that this is the third pastor of the old Spilsbury's church defending these old Baptist points. John Spilsbury was still alive then, though not living in London because of persecution; (Spilsbury left in the early 1650s). Collins followed John Norcott who followed John Spilsbury.

Next, let me cite Thomas Kilcop, one of those Richard Blount baptized. Mr. Kilcop gathered the Petty France Particular Baptist Church about 1641 or 42. In this work, *The Unlimited Authority of Christ's Disciples Cleared, or the Present Church and Ministry Vindicated*, London, 1651, Kilcop makes many interesting points. This burden of this work is to show that the ministers who gathered and formed the Particular Baptist Churches in London, were true and valid ministers in gospel order walking in the apostolic manner. This was in opposition to the Seeker claims expressed in a Seeker work called "A Sober Word to A Serious People." Kilcop shows that the Particular Baptist churches were gathered rightly by persons being converted, then baptized, and then they formed congregations, pages 14, 17. Some did not do it this way, but not the Particular Baptists. Thomas Kilcop calls those the self-seekers on page 17. But the churches Kilcop walked with, the Particular Baptist Churches in London, received baptism first and then after baptism, they, by consent, became a church, page 17. The gathering ministers of these churches were of the right faith and order, professed faith and then received baptism, as were also these churches, pages 20-22.

In this work Kilcop disowns the concept of the Seekers and Rogers Williams that a group of believers may form a church, while unbaptized and appoint one to baptize them, or start baptism de facto, on pages 14, 17. He points out that the problems about baptism and starting it de facto are among those not in the true churches, not those in the

Particular Baptist churches, page 45. He points out that these churches had not changed from 1641 to 1651, they were the same as when first gathered, pages 17, 18. Mr. Kilcop, on pages 14-15, shows that there were no churches gathered without proper ministers and baptism preceding. Mr. Kilcop and Mr. Hansard Knollys say the same things. So, now let me take up with Mr. Hansard Knollys and show nearly the same statements as Mr. Kilcop made.

In 1645 Mr. Knollys issued his A Moderate Answer unto Dr. Bastwick, London; 1645. On pages 18-23 Mr. Knollys discusses the origin of the Particular Baptist Churches in London, and rescues them from the false charges of a disorderly or Seeker type of origin. Knollys shows that the churches were founded by ministers who were driven into London by the persecutions of the Prelates, page 19 (the Anglicans under Laud in the 1630s REP). Knollys shows from quoting Dr. Featly that the Baptized churches were gathered according to the way that Featly and others said they should be gathered:

1. commission was given to the apostles to teach and baptize;
2. condition and terms of admission into churches were a. faith; b. repentance; c. baptism; pages 19-20.
3. The Particular Baptist ministers who were driven into hiding in London gathered churches by preaching faith, repentance and then baptism all before church membership.
4. Those who submitted unto these points were baptized and constituted into gospel churches. Those who did not were not admitted unto the churches, pages 19, 20.

Now I shall take up quoting from Mr. Knollys:

This being the sum and result of that method and practice, which the Dr. conceives should be done in gathering Churches and admitting members, which the Scriptures will warrant, and Christ Jesus approve of as his Father's will, I shall now take liberty to declare, what I know by mine own experience to be the practice of some Churches of God in this City. That so both the Dr. and the Reader may judge how near the Saints, who walk together in the Fellowship of the Gospel do come in their practice, to these Apostolic rules and practices propounded by the Dr. as God's method of ingathering Churches, and admitting Members. I say, that I know by mine own experience (having walked with them) that they were thus gathered; viz., Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the Countries, where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, came to sojourn in this great City, and preached the Word of God both publicly, and from house to house, and fairly in the Temples and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ: and some of them have dwelt in their own hired houses, and received all that came in unto them, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. And when many sinners were converted by their preaching of the Gospel, some of them believed, consorted with them, and of professors a great many, and of the chief women, not a few. And the condition which those Preachers both publicly and privately propounded to the people, unto whom they Preached, upon which they were to be admitted into the Church was Faith, Repentance and Baptism, and none other. And whosoever (poor as well as rich, bond as well as free, servants as well as Masters) did make a profession of their Faith in Christ Jesus, and would be baptized with water into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, were admitted Members of the Church; but such as did not believe, and would not be baptized they would not admit into Church-communion. This has been the practices of some Churches of God in this City, without urging or making any particular covenant with Members upon admittance, which I desire may be examined by the Scriptures cited in the Margent, and then compared with the Doctors three conclusions from the same Scriptures, whereby it may appear to the judicious Reader, how near the Churches some of them come to the practice of the Apostles rule, and practice of the primitive Churches, both in

gathering and admitting members. And by humble request to the Doctor is; That he will use all means, that the method of God and practice of the Apostles in gathering of Churches, and admitting Members, may be conscionable practiced by his Brethren of both sides according to the revealed Word and Will of the Father. Hansard Knollys, A Moderate Answer Unto Dr. Baswick's Book Called Independency not God's Ordinance, London; 1645, pages 19, 20.

Please remember that this is Hansard Knollys' writing, a minister of one of the Seven Particular Baptist Churches in London. He should know more about them Gould, Whitsitt, Fox and the other downgraders in the mid and late 1800s.

Seekers and Others

Both Kilcop and Knollys showed that SOME did form churches out of unbaptized persons, then did start up baptism, de facto, but not of the Particular Baptist Churches. Remember that Richard Blount baptized Thomas Kilcop in 1641. Mr. William Kiffen baptized Mr. Knollys about 1638.

Running from Baptism to Baptism

During the early 1640s, many were running after new baptisms. Of course, they who were doing this type of thing were always called Anabaptists, whether they were or not. One such poor troubled soul was named Richard Barrow. He had a brief paper debate with Pedobaptist Praisegod Barebones. In his A reply to the Frivolous and Impenitent Answer of R. B. to P. B, London; April 14th, 1643, Mr. Barebones makes fun of this sort of thing and ridicules Mr. Barrow and others for casting aside their second and third baptisms and taking up a fourth baptism. This is on pages 3 and 4 of To the Reader. Of course, the Pedobaptists always branded these persons as Anabaptists.

John Spilsbury deals with this briefly in his God's Ordinances, 1644. He explains that those persons were looking for something extraordinary to happen in water baptism. They wanted the great apostolic baptism, the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and when nothing happened, they would go elsewhere.

Summation So Far

The First Lasting Particular Baptist Churches in London

1. There is a distinction between the two methods used to gather these First Seven Particular Baptist Churches;
2. First, is the Spilsbury work, which resulted in three of the first Churches and other preaching brothers such as Sam Eaton;
3. Then the Second method centers around Richard Blount and his results, out of which three others came into being;
4. The Seventh came into being through the efforts of Mr. Knollys, from Mr. Kiffen.
5. Their baptismal succession is as follows;
 - a. Mr. Spilsbury and Mr. Norcott, from the old Waldenses-Anabaptists;
 - b. Mr. Blount and those coming from his efforts, from the old Collegian Waldenses-Anabaptists;
 - c. Mr. Knollys from William Kiffen, who came from Spilsbury's church.
 - d. The only church I have not been able to find out anything about is the French Congregation which signed the 1646 Confession of Faith.

The Differences between the Two Methods

1. If John Spilsbury went over into Holland to receive baptism, there is no real evidence. John Lewis maintains this. Lewis maintains Spilsbury received baptism from John Smith. The ground of this is what Lewis heard. However, this would only be possible if Smith had become a Particular Baptist, for according to Spilsbury's own confession of faith, he had nothing to do with the General Baptists, for he considered them as the ministers of Satan.
 - a. Spilsbury was an active Particular Baptist minister in 1633. I have shown that there were 11 active Baptist churches in the London area in the early 1630s until Laud and his hounds scattered them. It is better to realize that John Spilsbury was already a part of one of the older London Particular Baptist Churches that Laud scattered. It cannot be admitted that Spilsbury would baptize and ordain a preaching brother, as he did with Sam Eaton, if he, himself, were unordained and unbaptized;
 - b. However, there is no account given of Spilsbury's baptism or ordination.
 - c. John Lewis, Anglican is the only historian who mentions Spilsbury by name as going over to Holland. Lewis grounds this upon what he had heard. He had no documented evidence to support his claim. Thomas Crosby denies this.

2. In the case of Richard Blount and his friends, those who wanted a further baptism sent him over into Holland to make contact with the old Waldensian-Anabaptists. He did this, was baptized and sent back for bringing baptism back into London. One of the ministering brothers from Holland came over with him. This is different from Spilsbury's work. I am not saying that Spilsbury had not a form link, but what I am saying is there is not now the required documentation to show this. Here is a direct and formal link by link to the old Church of the Waldensian-Anabaptists.
 - a. The brethren who were involved in this restoration of believer's baptism into London wanted a more sure and certain succession than those involved with John Spilsbury.
 - b. The Blount co-workers wanted a traceable and formal succession, while those around Spilsbury did not feel this was necessary.

3. However, this should be remembered, when all was said and done, these churches all walked together in one common fellowship. This issue did not split them once the actions had been done. The issue seems to have only been over Spilsbury's information action whereas Blount had a formal action and a messenger with him from the old Waldensian-Anabaptist church.

What is Present

- 1) There is a clear and documented link with the old Waldensian-Anabaptists through the older Particular Baptists and later through Richard Blount;
- 2) There is rebaptism and ordination, and from this, others received new baptism and by consent, formed themselves into gospel churches;
- 3) From these efforts most of the Particular Baptists Churches in the English speaking United Kingdom and many in America have come.
- 4) If this is not valid and scriptural, then most of the Baptists today in the English speaking world aren't scriptural churches.
- 5) The succession is in baptism. Believers, following baptism, by mutual consent, form themselves into gospel churches. Therefore, from baptismal succession there is also church succession. Baptismal succession comes from a qualified

administrator. The qualified administrator is one who has been tried and tested by a gospel church, and then by vote of that church, he is commissioned to preach and baptize, gather churches and administer all ordinances. See Knolly's *The Shinning of a Flaming Fire in Sion, London, 1646*; and Daniel King's *Way to Sion, part Two, London 1650 and Edinburg, 1656*.

What is not Present

- 1) Modern Missionism and Modern Landmark Baptist Concepts are not present;
- 2) The succession is in baptism, not in a church voting on baptisms, but in qualified administrators sent out by a church;
- 3) The succession is in churches being formed following baptism by mutual consent, not by being taken back to a mother church and then being voted out or given authority to form into another church;
- 4) There are no starting of missions, no voting to give people the authority to form a new church;
- 5) There is no de facto starting up of baptism, but following baptism, by a properly baptized and ordained minister, believers, by mutual consent, form themselves into gospel churches. The Seekers, not the Baptists started up baptism de facto.

Dr. John Clark, Elders Mark Luker and Obediah Holmns and the
First Baptist Church in Newport R. I.

When Episcopacy was at its ugly high under Laud, the Anabaptists and other dissenters made their way either into Holland or over into New England. Some of Mr. Spilsbury's company left England and gathered around Dr. John Clark and Elder Mark Luker. In this way, the First Baptist Church in Newport, Rhode Island came into being. At least two of these, Mr. Mark Luker and his wife, were former members of Spilsbury's church. The Kiffen Manuscript records them with John Spilsbury in his church in 1633. In 1651 Mr. John Clark, Mr. Obediah Holmns and Mr. John Crandell were arrested near Boston, at Lynn, for conducting Anabaptist services in the home of Mr. William Ritter. An account of this is contained in John Clark's *III News from New England or a Narrative of New England's Persecution*; London, 1652. On pages, 17-23 of this old work is Elder Obediah Holmne's Epistle:

Unto the Well Beloved Brethren John Spilsbury, William Kiffen and the rest that in London stand fast in that Faith, and continue to walk steadfastly in that order of the Gospel which was once delivered unto the Saints by Jesus Christ. Obediah Holms an unworthy witness, that Jesus is the Lord, and of late Prisoner for Jesus sake at Boston scented greeting. Page 17.

Some members from John Spilsbury's church at Wapping went into the early constitution of Clark's church at its gathering. Later, in 1651, after their prison experience, these old brethren addressed the London brethren, John Spilsbury and William Kiffen. This epistle and these members show the link and the close continued fellowship between these three churches, Spilsbury's at Wapping, Kiffen's at Devonshire Square, and Clark's, Luker's and Holmns' in Newport, R. I., in America. This fact also disproves the downgrader's theory that Spilsbury and Kiffen parted company in about 1651 over pulpit affiliation with unbaptized ministers.

Elder Mark Luker

I will take extra time and space to develop more about Elder Mark Luker. He was first with Spilsbury in 1633. Again he shows up in the Kiffen Manuscript in 1641 in the Blount affair,

but this is doubtful because he was already in America exercising as an Elder in the Newport Church with Dr. John Clark. So, here is another of the unexplained contradictions in the Kiffen Manuscript. The Baptist Union historians have much to say about Mark Luker because he came from a well-established family of great importance.

I want to quote from J. R. Graves' and S. Adlam's work *The First Baptist Church in America*, not founded by Roger Williams, Southern Baptist Book House, 1890. While the main concept in this book is true, there are some false conclusions and misstated facts:

That was not the custom of the day, (total separation from the Pedobaptists by Baptists' forming separate churches, REP) until the Particular Baptists instituted it. Even the members of the first church of Particular Baptists in Mr. Spilsbury's—remained in their membership in the Pedobaptist Churches till 1633. In 1639 a minister of Mr. Spilsbury's church, Hansard Knollys (Knowles), was in New England preaching. Dr. Clark was also probably from Mr. Spilsbury's church. Pages 64, 65.

(Note this: The reason these persons remained in Jessey's Pedobaptist church until 1633 is because that is when Spilsbury gathered the church. They were not members of both churches. Furthermore, Adlam's recordings, as well as some of Graves' remarks, are very ungrounded. For example, Graves later quotes from a General Redemptionist Confession and claims it for the original confession. That is not true, we have John Clark's Confession of Faith and Obediah Holmns Confession of Faith as well. There were no general redemptionists among them. In addition, Mr. Knollys was not among those in Mr. Spilsbury's church. Mr. Kiffen baptized Mr. Knollys in the early 1640s. Mr. Knollys has left us his autobiography, enlarged by Mr. Kiffen and published following his death. He does not enter much into his becoming a Baptist, but informs us that he received true ordination from a gospel church of Jesus Christ and gathered his church during the 1644-45 years. REP)

Again, Adlam quotes from Roger Williams' remarks in 1649:

At Seeknok a great many have lately concurred with Mr. John Clarke and our Providence men, about the point of a new baptism, and the manner by dipping. Mr. John Clark hath been there lately and Mr. Lucar (an Elder in Mr. Clark's church), and hath dipped them. Pages 69, 70.

The Well Formed and Gathered Particular Baptist Churches in London

The following contains a brief presentation of what I have found out about these seven Churches. It is mostly from W. T. Whitley's *Baptist Biography* and B. R. White's *Particular Baptists Records*. So far as I have been able to find, the origin of these churches may be summarized in these ways:

John Spilsbury gathered the Church at Wapping, in 1633. Due to the severity of those times under Archbishop Laud's Reign of Terror, there seemed to be no further lasting outreach from Wapping till the late 1630s. Sam Eaton, one of their ministers, was imprisoned in London in the mid 1630s and therein died. While in prison, he still preached and sought to spread the cause of Jesus Christ. He came to a sudden and mysterious end. Thousands attended his remains to their gravesite. This church's earlier ministers and signers of the 1644 Confession were John Spilsbury, George Tipping, and Samuel Richardson. Samuel Richardson did not sign the 1652 edition but Joseph Sansom or Joseph Simpson did.

William Kiffen gathered the Church at Devonshire Squire, in 1638. Thomas Patience was with Kiffen in the early 1640s and signed the 1644 and 1646 Confessions. During the later 1640s he was with the soldier churches in Dublin, Ireland and was a military officer. By 1652, Thomas Pault or Paul signed with Kiffen.

Paul Hobson and Thomas Goare or Gower gathered The Church at Crutched Fryars in 1639. They signed the 1644 and 1646 Confessions. Captain Paul Hobson and Thomas Goare were anti-Cromwell and paid dearly for their convictions. By the early 1650s both of these men were at the baptized church of Jesus Christ at Newcastle where Hobson issued some more works defending the Particular Baptist position.

Thomas Skippard and Thomas Munday gathered the Church at Southwark, between 1640 and 1642. This church is one of the London churches that came under the succession of the old Waldenses by the Richard Blount mission in 1640. In 1646, George Tipping was at this church. I cannot identify this church in 1652 nor who signed the confession for it.

Thomas Kilcop and John Webb gathered the Church at Petty France, between 1640 and 1642. It too, came under the succession of the old Waldenses. Thomas Kilcop issued his work on Baptism near 1641. He replied to reply to Praisegod Barebones and justified the separation and succession of the Baptists and their baptism. Perhaps this is the earliest work on that era by any of these brethren. In 1652, Edward Harrison signed the Confession on behalf of Petty France.

Thomas Gunne and John Mabbatt also gathered the Church at the Glasshouse, because of the Blount mission between 1640-1642. John Mabbatt published his Reply to Mr. Knutton in 1645. It also is one of the earlier works issued by these ministers. In 1652, William Conset and Richard Graves served this church. Edward Drapes returned home from Ireland in the late 1640s but was dead by 1651 and did not sign any of the Confessions. John Vernon also ministered here. This church sponsored the Thomas Proud-John Myles efforts in Wales.

The last of the seven churches issuing the 1644 Confession was gathered between 1640 and 1642 by Joseph Phelps and Edward Heath. I have been unable to find out anything about its history or its succeeding ministers. I cannot find out anything about these two ministers.

By 1646, Hansard Knollys had gathered the church at Great St. Heleans. Later Thomas Holmns assisted him. It came into being in 1645. By 1652, John Watson was serving this church with Hansard Knollys and it was known as the church meeting at Coleman Street.

Another mystery of 1646 is the "French Congregation of the same judgment," served by Denis Le Barbier and Christophle Duret. I have found out nothing as to the origin and following history of this church.

By 1652, several more churches were gathered. The 1652 edition of the First London Confession was no longer issued by the Seven Churches of London, but by several churches in or about London. Hugh Gosnell, Joseph Patshall, Thomas Waters, Henry Forty were some of the additional ministers. Thomas Young ministered at a church meeting at Stokesley.

Succession from the Old Waldensian-Anabaptists

Able Morgan informs about baptism from the old Waldenses.

Our author will not allow the Waldenses to put in for the subjects of our Lord's Promise, in that dark Time, and good reason why, lest he should countenance any thing against infant-baptism; but by his leave, that the Waldenses and others I mentioned before, being opposers of infant-baptism, and in the Practice of Adult-baptism, is not such a Figment, as our Author in Page 11th would have it to be; as appears by the Testimonies produced by Mr. Stennet against Russen, page 81-84, which I should have transcribed, but my Bounds will not permit. AND THAT THE FIRST THAT REVIVED THE ANCIENT PRACTICE OF ADULT BAPTISM IN ENGLAND HAD IT FROM THEM, IS NO MORE UNLIKELY, THAN FOR THE PRESBYTERIANS TO HAVE THEIR DISCIPLINE FROM GENEVA; FOR THE ENGLISH HAD POSSESSION OF THOSE PARTS OF FRANCE WHERE THE WALDENSES WERE MOSTLY CONTENANCED, FROM THE YEAR 1152 TO THE YEAR 1452, WHICH WAS LONG ENOUGH FOR MANY PERSONS TO BECOME ACQUANITED WITH THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACITICES OF THOSE GOLDY PEOPLE, BY SUCH INTREROURSE, AND FROM THEIR EXAMPLE, TO ENDEAVOUR A REFORMATION IN ENGLAND, though with no great success for a while: Our author will find it difficult to fix on any subject of that promise, in the Western Parts of the world; lest (if the Waldenses were not) during a good part of that period; nor can he prove the united practice of Infant-Baptism during the said Period, while the said Waldenses and others have opposed it, and practiced otherwise, within the said Term; and if he could, it would be but a Scriptureless practice still. Able Morgan, Anti-Paedo-Rantism; Philadelphia; 1757: pages 172-173.

However it was, Spilsbury or Blount, it was generally understood that he was the first to introduce adult baptism by dipping back into England.

More about the Blount Mission

When Mr. Richard Blount returned from his mission, John Batten accompanied him back to London and helped in the great gathering of the churches there. From the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain and Ireland, I have gleaned the following statements:

John Batten taught a congregation of Collegiants at Leyden, according to Barclay, who cites no evidence. Dr. Lofton quotes Professor Rauschenbusch finding Jan Batte mentioned in the Geschiedennis der Rhynsburgische Vergadering, as one of the early and prominent teachers. Dr. Christian gives the title of this book as "Historie Der Binsburgsche Vergadering . . . MDCCCLXXV, and confirms Barclay by translating from it a reference to Jan Battern from Leiden as a usual speaker at the meetings before 1618 which resulted in the organization of the Collegiants, who restricted themselves to immersion.

The conferences, the journey of Blunt, his own baptism and his return took several months, and the next date is 1641, even towards the end of the year. Taken from the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, London, 1910; Volume One page 233.