

# Calvinism in Free Church History\*

FOR the understanding of some aspects of Free Church history Calvinism is certainly a useful key; not always, perhaps, in the ways commonly supposed.

The connotations and associations of Calvinism are many and various. At its most technical, there are the famous Five Points contained in the canons of the Synod of Dort of 1619: unconditional election, limited atonement, total depravity, irresistibility of grace, and final perseverance. Run these together, and they can be seen to be expressions of a single, clear, logical system of soteriology: men *need* salvation, and only *God* can save; *some* men *will* be saved, and only *God* can decide who.

Of Calvin himself Dr. Payne says in the *New Cambridge Modern History* that "the older view that his dominating conception is the sovereignty of God . . . has been modified by theological research which in recent years has brought to the fore its Christocentric reference";<sup>1</sup> but popular interpretation has not been at fault in regarding the system of Calvinism as giving a fundamental and peculiar position to the biblical doctrines of divine election and predestination. We may in any case say of Calvinism what Dr. Payne says of Calvin, that it brings together "the great watchwords: 'Sola fide; sola gratia'; 'Sola Scriptura'; 'Soli Deo gloria'".<sup>2</sup> The simplicity of Calvinist worship and the bareness of a Calvinist church-building (such as the Dutch Church in Austin Friars or the Baptist churches at Tottlebank in North Lancashire and Bratton in Wiltshire) is in line with this sol-arity. The sol-arity has reference primarily to God and His sole sovereign power and grace, but secondarily also to man, who must believe *for* himself (though not *by* himself) and who even in the community of worship *can* and perhaps *must* come to God for himself, no more resting on meretricious aids or group emotion than on priest. Such a system of faith and worship calls out individual sturdiness of character, independence and initiative, and powers of endurance (sometimes put to the test by being in prison for conscience' sake). Those who possessed, or admired, these qualities in the seventeenth century, when in religion as in other spheres "the common man" was beginning to come into his own—the Puritans, as men called them, using a nickname of which they were not at all ashamed—Calvinism fitted as a well made glove fits a hand.

Now the doctrines of election and predestination, especially when related to the biblical doctrine of the remnant, can easily become in effect a doctrine of the salvation of the few. This is naturally attractive

\*A paper read to the first Summer School of the Baptist Historical Society, 1968.

to those who in fact *are* few. Those who separate from existing churchmanship, moved by passionate commitment to a holiness not found in the conventional ways of a Church in their eyes become worldly, thus form another group to whom Calvinism is acceptable. It justifies their stand, or exodus, theologically; it helps to explain their eccentricity and consequent unpopularity, ostracism and persecution, and so to make these more tolerable. While on the Continent and in Scotland Calvinism has been, and continues to be, at least in name, the theology of large and established Churches, in England it has flourished among small and separatist Churches.

Yet again, Calvinism as a system is unashamedly intellectual and logical. Martin Schneckenburger brings this out repeatedly in his *Vergleichende Darstellung*, a detailed comparison of Calvinism with Lutheranism. Where Lutheranism appeals to the immediacy of experience, Calvinism presents the considered results of reflection. Faith, Schneckenburger observes, is now much less *fiducia*, much more *notitia* and *assensus*.<sup>3</sup> Consequently Calvinism attracts the intellectual and rational mentality. On this ground it exerts a powerful appeal in a rationalizing age such as the eighteenth century. In that period, it is true, reason does much to weaken Calvinism's premisses and assumptions. On the other hand, those loyal to the system are also (unconsciously) affected by the *Zeitgeist*, and retort by drawing out the system's logic further than ever.

These general considerations are intended to provide some framework within which we may proceed to consider Calvinism in Free Church history. They suggest reasons why in England we do not look for Calvinism, as in Scotland or on the Continent, to the Reformed, or Presbyterian, Churches. In England it is the Presbyterians who abandon Calvinism and become Arminians, Arians, Socinians, Unitarians. In England it is among the Baptists, the most consistently Separatist of the Three Denominations, that Calvinism has been most prevalent, most fully developed and most tenaciously preserved.

Baptists, indeed, are found on both sides of the Great Divide. During the three hundred and fifty years with which we are concerned there have been General, or Arminian, as well as Particular, or Calvinist, Baptists. The curious thing is that, while, with the lapse of the years, those who still go under the name of General Baptists have abandoned believers' baptism, if not baptism altogether, the Particular Baptists have, in the main, abandoned the name "Particular" and the Calvinist system, though not the Particular Baptist Fund or, entirely, what used to be called "Calvinist sentiments"—of which more later. The inter-relations of these General and Particular Baptists are complex. In 1770 those General Baptists who were troubled by the growth among them, as among the Presbyterians, of Arianism and Socinianism, and who were in sympathy with the Evangelical Revival, formed a New Connexion. Fifteen years later, in 1785, the Revival stormed the Particular Baptist stronghold: in his tract *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* Andrew Fuller broke

through the developed High (or Hyper) Calvinism long guarded by John Gill and John Brine. With the nineteenth century the General Baptist New Connexion and the Evangelicals among the Particular Baptists began to draw together; till eventually, in 1891, the New Connexion was absorbed into the Baptist Union. The original General Baptists still continued, but had long been closely co-operating with the Presbyterians who by now were Unitarian. In 1916 an agreement was reached by the Baptist Union with them also. Four churches were accepted as in the Baptist Union; the rest, still preserving a legal entity, with an annual General Assembly—by 1960 they numbered eleven churches in England and two in Wales—were accepted as Unitarian.

The earlier theological and denominational movements in this strange kaleidoscope have lately received attention and elucidation. The abandonment of Calvinism by the Presbyterians has been studied by the Rev. Roger Thomas and Dr. Jeremy Goring in the recent illuminating, if sometimes perverse, symposium entitled *The English Presbyterians* (1968). The moderation of Calvinism by some Baptists and Congregationalists has been studied in a B.D. thesis and in articles in the *Baptist Quarterly* on Andrew Fuller by the Rev. E. F. Clipsham, in a Ph.D. thesis and published *Life of Edward Williams of Rotherham* by Dr. W. T. Owen, and in an article by myself in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. The heightening of Calvinism by other Baptists and Congregationalists has been studied in an M.Th. thesis and a book entitled *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism*, and in a series of biographical articles in the *Free Grace Record*, by Mr. Peter Toon, and in a number of pamphlets and articles on Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire churches by Mr. H. G. Tibbutt. The theology of the New Connexion is the subject of current research by Miss Mary Hart.

From this and other work it has become clear that, while a relatively small number of individual Presbyterian, Congregational and Baptist churches, some of them influential churches, trace their origins to the two decades before or after the Great Ejection of 1662, it was during the eighteenth century that historic Dissent took the form in which it has been a recognizable part of the English scene; and that the poles between which, by attraction or repulsion, it did so were Calvinism and the Evangelical Revival.

The Evangelical Revival, like the practice of believers' baptism, is found on both sides of the Great Divide. Of the new religious groupings for which it was directly responsible, the Methodists as they were called, some followed John Wesley, and these, who in England formed the majority, were Arminians. Others, who followed George Whitefield and the Countess of Huntingdon, were Calvinists, as were the majority in Wales, the followers of Howel Harris and Daniel Rowland. These eventually adopted the name "Calvinistic Methodists"—a form never in use in England among those content to be known as the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, which to-day has

a place in the Free Church Federal Council, though it claims but 36 churches.

Besides creating these new groupings, the Evangelical Revival (more particularly in its Calvinistic form) acted powerfully, though slowly, on the Older Dissenters. Its influence on Dissent in Wales is the subject of a number of studies by Professor R. T. Jenkins. In England it was their Evangelical sympathies and concern which was the driving power behind Fuller and Edward Williams, and which led both to a reduction of Calvinism and to the foundation of missionary societies. Many churches were reinvigorated, and many fresh churches were gathered, through the preaching of the students itinerating from Lady Huntingdon's College at Trevecca<sup>4</sup> and from a number of institutions influenced by Trevecca,<sup>5</sup> all of them Evangelical as well as Calvinist.

These Evangelical Dissenters were confronted, however, by others determined to stand by High Calvinism, ready to meet liberalism and reduction with conservatism or exaggeration. The consequent conflict often led to secession and the gathering of a fresh church locally, which commonly came to be distinguished by a different denomination. Something of this sort had been happening since the end of the seventeenth century, before the Evangelical Revival had risen above time's horizon. Action and reaction was already taking place: for reasons then not evangelical but rationalistic some Dissenters were abandoning Calvinism, while others both heightened its claims and were active and expansive in preaching the gospel.

Between them, Calvinism and the Revival were thus responsible for a threefold movement: first, for the appearance of fresh groupings, with new names; secondly, for changes within the older, despite continuity of nomenclature; and thirdly, for division of churches and the appearance locally of a second church, often under a second denomination, where formerly there had been but one.

It is this last phenomenon which we will now consider. The year 1719, with the debate over subscription to the Trinity at Salters' Hall, has long been recognized as a turning-point. At Salters' Hall the division was largely one of age, the younger men being unwilling to subscribe; but from then on what had earlier been no more than denominations in a literal sense became separate, and even hostile, though still for certain purposes collaborating, institutions. From then on many churches divided into two, sometimes amicably, more often bitterly, as those called Presbyterians trod the path leading from Arminianism to Unitarianism, while those who held to Calvinism in general, and to subscription to the Trinity in particular, formed new Independent, or Congregational, churches. Sometimes the division which took place is masked by the extinction of the Presbyterian church. At Warminster, in Wiltshire, for instance, there is a Congregational church, for which the foundation-date is given as 1719 exactly. This in fact is the date when there was a secession from a Presbyterian church then becoming Arian. The Presbyterians in time became Unitarian; later their church died out, the meeting-house

became a boot factory and is now pulled down, and even the street in which it was situated, Meeting House Lane, has been renamed North Street.

The point over which these secessions took place was commonly doctrinal, Christological. What lay beneath the surface, and not very far beneath, was the fear, or the conviction, that "the gentlemen of the new scheme", as the Calvinists called them, were inclined "to neglect Christ under the pretence of exalting reason and goodness". "Not that I think there is anything properly new in it", as David Rees, minister of the Baptist church worshipping in Lime-house, London, wrote in 1736; "for 'tis only a crude collection of heathenish notions, framed into a system of stupid and lifeless morality". In the calmer phrases of an Independent minister four years earlier, what was objectionable was "applauding the doctrine of universal redemption . . . and . . . the possibility of salvation merely by the light of nature", together with "a small opinion of revelation". It is noteworthy that several of those who inclined to "the new scheme" still claimed to be "moderate Calvinists": among them Ralph Milner, whose ministry at Great Yarmouth led to a Congregational secession in 1732; Samuel Chandler of the Old Jewry congregation in London, who in 1746 published a work with the significant title *Christ the Pattern*; and Samuel Bates, who in these years was the minister of the Presbyterian church at Warminster, where the separation had already taken place.<sup>6</sup> When, a generation of two later, Evangelicals such as Fuller and Edward Williams pleaded for a "moderate Calvinism", it is not surprising that some of the more orthodox took fright.

Now in these same years when Congregational churches were being formed out of Presbyterian because the Presbyterians were abandoning, or at least moderating, their Calvinism, Baptist churches were being formed from Congregational, or Congregational churches were becoming Baptist, for the similar reason, only at a point further along the line, that the Congregationalists were no longer true to Calvinism. Here there is no date corresponding to 1719, no event so dramatic as the debate at Salters' Hall. We must point rather to a book, Joseph Hussey's *God's Operations of Grace; but No Offers of Grace* (1707), as the origin of a supralapsarian Calvinism which took election and predestination so seriously as to prohibit evangelical preaching as useless, and indeed arrogant, human interference with the sovereignty and mystery of God's grace. Hussey had been ordained as a Presbyterian minister; but by 1707 he was Congregational, and the Presbyterian church at Cambridge to which he ministered (now Emmanuel, where he appears in a stained-glass window in the apse) had become Congregational with him. In the year when he published his book, he was also building a new meeting-house. A donation towards the expenses was received from Northampton, from a people who had separated from the Dissenting church on Castle Hill in order to form a more strictly Congregational and Calvinist church. This church (now College Street) practised believers' baptism; and when in 1721

Hussey left Cambridge for London, some of his people separated to form a Baptist church in Cambridge (now St. Andrew's Street). A similar pattern may be observed again and again. Sometimes the Presbyterians withdrew, as at Wrexham, in Denbighshire, where it was the Calvinists who remained in possession of the Old Meeting; this, which began as a Congregational church, has long been Baptist. A pretty example is provided by Samuel Stockell, minister from 1728 to 1750 of the Congregational church worshipping in Red Cross Street, Cripplegate. Stockell had been a member of Hussey's London church and had come powerfully under Hussey's influence; like Hussey, he remained a Congregationalist himself; but the minister whom the church chose as his successor came from College Street, Northampton; and two years later Red Cross Street duly became a Baptist church. Ringstead in Northamptonshire, and Kimbolton and Great Grandsen in Huntingdonshire, are further examples of Congregational churches which became Baptist; Kettering and Olney of places where Baptist churches arose from secessions out of loyalty to Calvinism.

Nor is this the end of the story. The churches of the Baptist Union and the members of this Historical Society doubtless regard Andrew Fuller and his friends as having won the day in the reduction of Calvinism; but Fuller was not entirely successful. Just as, when Presbyterian churches abandoned Calvinism, Congregational churches arose; and just as, when Congregational churches liberalized Calvinism, Baptist churches arose; so, when Baptist churches reduced Calvinism, Strict Baptist churches arose. These churches were true to Hussey and (as Mr. Toon has shown in articles in the *Free Grace Record* and the *Evangelical Quarterly*) to Hussey's follower, Samuel Stockell; a book published by Stockell in 1733, *The Redeemer's Glory Unveil'd*, had, and continues to have, great influence among them. Most of us pay as little attention to these Strict Baptists as in an earlier day was paid by the Church of England to any kind of Dissenters. They do not take part in the Free Church Federal Council, let alone the British Council of Churches; but they form part of the history of Dissent, which can hardly fully be understood without awareness of them. According to a tabulation by Mr. Toon<sup>7</sup> they claim 468 churches. A third of these are in Kent, Sussex and Suffolk, counties of which Kent<sup>8</sup> has been favourable to Baptist principles since the seventeenth century and Suffolk since the eighteenth. Interesting examples of ancient foundations, in each case in the interests of Calvinism, are Carlton, Southill and Stevington, all in Bedfordshire, each of which began as a Congregational church, later became Baptist and is now Strict Baptist. In 1960 a Strict Baptist Historical Society was formed, and successive volumes recording the history of their churches are now appearing. "The years to which the majority . . . owe their origins",<sup>9</sup> we are told, are, as we should expect, the years 1790-1830, when Fullerism was making its inroads.

In his history of *The Baptist Union* Dr. Payne remarks that, while

in England (though not in Wales) the practice of close communion has been abandoned by most churches in the Union, the Strict Baptists preserve the practice; and that "Fullerism" and the communion issue" were in fact *together* responsible for the rise of Strict Baptist Associations: one of these adopted the name "The Association of Baptists holding Particular Redemption and practising Strict Communion".<sup>10</sup> It is instructive to observe the genuine link here between Calvinism as a theological system and close, or closed, communion as a disciplinary and liturgical practice. Except that for Baptist churches, or most of them, believers' baptism was a condition of membership which Congregational churches did not require, Baptists and Congregationalists were at one, so long as they held to a Calvinist theology and discipline, in associating the Lord's Supper and the church meeting. The presence at *both* was both an immense privilege and the duty of *all* church members, giving devotional and responsible meaning to membership, and of *none but* members; and the absence of members from either ordinance was an occasion for discipline. With our abandonment of Calvinism, we are still at one, but negatively. We no longer require attendance at either ordinance as a condition of membership; and we practise an open communion, in which we welcome all Christians, if not all men whosoever, to the Lord's Table, and in some churches to the church meeting also. It is not surprising that church meetings are now often ill attended. With the duty, the sense of privilege—in the proper, Calvinist, sense of being "chosen, called, faithful"—has gone. The Lord's Supper is ill attended too. It would be worse attended, were it not that here ecumenical pressures encourage frequent observance, though on an understanding in terms of individual piety almost wholly foreign to the communal and domestic piety of our fathers. *They* at the Table accepted their *mutual responsibilities* of holiness and love, and *together* boasted their Saviour's name before the scoffing age, knowing themselves to be

A little spot enclosed by grace

Out of the world's wide wilderness.

Here, the Strict Baptists cannot fairly be said to have heightened, let alone innovated, in their Calvinism; they have but conserved.

In denominational terms the development we have been watching may be represented by juxtaposing three statements about antinomianism from the successive centuries. In 1667 Richard Baxter, when controverting the High Calvinism inspired by sermons by Tobias Crisp (sermons republished by John Gill in 1755), wrote: "The Antinomians were commonly Independants".<sup>11</sup> In 1741 it was the turn of a Congregational minister, Edmund Jones of Pontypool, to write: "When they become Antinomians, they will readily turn Anabaptists".<sup>12</sup> By 1810 the eminent Baptist, Robert Hall, had taken up the tale: antinomianism, Hall writes, is to be feared and condemned as "the thick-skinned monster of the ooze and mire which no weapon can pierce, no discipline can tame".<sup>13</sup>

Antinomianism is not Calvinism; but it is Calvinism's peril. Every religious system has its peril. Catholicism can degenerate into superstition, Protestantism into a thin humanism. So Calvinism can degenerate into antinomianism of a dry, doctrinal kind, in which God's predetermination of all things not only precedes human action, including obedience to God's law, but precludes it, makes it gratuitous for those already predestined to salvation. The curious thing is that Calvinism's opposite, whether Arminianism, universalism or enthusiasm, can also degenerate into antinomianism, though of a more practical kind. Here an emphasis on the unconditional love of God for all men, or on the ability of men, by their reason or their innate goodness, to have some share in their salvation, at least by way of response to God's grace, can breed a tolerant compassionateness, and then a loose permissiveness, wholly antipathetic to the fulfilment of law divine or human.

The dry, doctrinal antinomianism which is Calvinism's peril arises in part from the undue attention to logic often found in those fascinated by a system and without the mental ability or training to recognise reason's limits. Antinomianism has frequently been preached by the unordained and theologically untrained: "ignorant and rash intruders", "illiterate and conceited persons", "ignorant and scandalous persons intruding themselves into the ministry" are varying descriptions of such preachers during the last decade of the seventeenth century. We should remember that almost all these Dissenting preachers, whether ordained or not, lacked a University education—through no fault of their own. The Presbyterians, who were the best educated among them, were the first to abandon Calvinism; the Baptists, who remained loyal Calvinists longest, were the least well educated, and were the last to establish an Academy for training their ministers. It would be worth while to inquire to what extent Bernard Foskett and the Bristol Baptist Academy and Education Society fostered the movement towards Fullerism.

Back in 1644 the Independent John Cotton wrote: "We are far from arrogating infallibility of judgment to ourselves, or affecting uniformity. Uniformity God never required, infallibility He never granted us": "We have tolerated in our churches some Anabaptists, some Antinomians, and some Seekers".<sup>14</sup> "If an Antinomian doctrinal does not prove an Antinomian practical", wrote the layman, John Cook, three years later, in *What the Independents Would Have*, "he thinks some of those opinions are very comfortable, and learns hereby, not to exalt duty too much, but to study free grace the more".<sup>15</sup> There is an echo of this in the funeral sermon for a deacon of Carter Lane Baptist church, Southwark, preached in 1800 by John Rippon: "the old Puritans used to say, *Free grace requires full duty*".<sup>16</sup> Rippon had not been to Cambridge, like Cotton, or to the Inns of Court, like Cook; but he *had* been to the Bristol Academy.

For the purpose of this paper, and in order to bring out the *movement* of history, I may have given the impression that most con-



vinced Dissenters were unqualified in their acceptance of Calvinism. This was by no means the case. What we have been studying is quite as much a growing movement of liberation, giving rise to renewed endeavours to hold the citadel. Many Dissenters were in the position of Samuel Douglas, minister of Baddow Road Independent Church, Chelmsford, of whom his memorialist wrote in 1820: "his Sentiments were what generally pass under the term Calvinistic; not that Calvin, or any other eminent theologian, was 'called master' by him."<sup>17</sup> Such men greatly admired Calvin, especially as a commentator on Scripture; but Scripture, not Calvinism, remained primary for them; and from Scripture, which is not systematic in the sense that Calvinism is, they drew their own, varying, conclusions. By comparison with Richard Baxter, John Owen would be considered a thorough-paced Calvinist; yet even Owen says that in some things he thought very differently, *diversissime*,<sup>18</sup> from Calvin. At the other extreme there is the noted Universalist, Elhanan Winchester, who in 1788-89, by one of history's turns of irony, was preaching in London in what had earlier been Hussey's meeting-house. Winchester, who had a considerable influence on the General Baptist New Connexion, might be assumed to have been a keen defender of Arminius. Yet in, actually, a *Funeral Sermon for . . . John Wesley* (1791) he writes: "I am neither a Calvinist nor an Arminian. I seriously wish both these names were buried in oblivion", "My religion is this", he continues:

"I read the Bible for myself, and what that teaches me to believe, I sincerely believe, according to the best light I have, without any regard to what others may think; and what I find there commanded I endeavour to practise. I do not rank under the standard of Calvin, nor Arminius; I know nothing about them, having never read their works, and I am determined never to call myself after either of their names, or that of any other man."<sup>19</sup>

In the years either side of 1800 expressions of an independent balanced eclecticism are common. In a sermon preached in 1819 on the anniversary of Hoxton Academy entitled *The Best Means of Preventing the Spread of Antinomianism*, which he describes as "the epidemic malady of the present", John Hooper of Hoxton is careful to say: "We must not merge the doctrinal in the practical preacher; to avoid the gulphs of antinomianism, we must not dash against the rocks of arminianism; the golden mean lies between, and happy is he who is enabled to maintain it"<sup>20</sup> The influence of Baxter and Doddridge is perceptible here, I submit, rather than, as some would claim, in the Unitarian Society formed at this time. Daniel Fisher, tutor at Homerton Academy, is called a "rigid Calvinist" in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (in an article *not* by Alexander Gordon); but in the funeral sermon preached on his death we read that "his sentiments were strictly Calvinistical, but his discourses were seldom controversial, and never bitter; they were chiefly evangelical, experimental, and practical"<sup>21</sup> So again, in the *Evangelical Magazine*

for November 1793, the obituary of Nathaniel Trotman reads: "His sentiments were strictly Calvinistic; his subjects purely evangelical. In his preaching there was the light of doctrine, without the dryness of system; the warmth of experience, without the wild-fire of enthusiasm; the necessity of morality, without the ostentation of pharisaism".<sup>22</sup>

As evidence of *fact* such passages may be suspect on hagiographical grounds; but funeral sermons form a source too little used in identifying what at any particular time was an accepted *ideal* among Christian people. Calvinistic sentiments could hardly be described as an accepted ideal in the Free Churches to-day. Yet there is much to be said for them on grounds both of fidelity to Scripture and of an intelligent reaction to history and experience; and without them to undergird our gathered, communal and responsible churchmanship much of its *raison d'être* is taken away. When Jesus was asked, "Lord, are there few that be saved?" his answer was not exactly encouraging. The image of the shepherd who seeks until he finds is attractive; but the image of the sheep and the goats (which, as Blake says, is "not charitable") and the image of the "little flock" to which it is God's good pleasure to give the kingdom, come from the same source. "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you". Many in Free Church history have been drawn towards some form of Calvinism because passages such as these are in the Bible. As your President said of Nonconformity ten years ago, in his address as Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, quoting an eighteenth-century Independent minister from his beloved, Calvinist, county of Northamptonshire: "So long as the Root of it is in the Bible, it will grow again".<sup>23</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* ii. 118.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> M. Schneckenburger, *Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformirten Lehrbegriffs*, Stuttgart 1855, ii. 109.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my paper, "The Students of Trevecca College 1768-1791", in *Cymmrodorion Society Transactions*, July 1968.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. my Cheshunt College bicentenary lecture, *The Significance of Trevecca College, 1768-91* (Epworth Press, 1969).

<sup>6</sup> In this paragraph I have drawn freely, and gratefully, on *The English Presbyterians*, pages 194, 108, 216-17, 22, 200-1, 181-2, 207.

<sup>7</sup> *Strict Baptist Historical Society Annual Report and Bulletin*, no. 5 (1966).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. my article, "Dissenting Churches in Kent before 1700", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Oct. 1963.

<sup>9</sup> *Strict Baptist Historical Society Annual Report and Bulletin*, no. 5 (1966).

<sup>10</sup> E. A. Payne, *The Baptist Union: a short history* (1958), pages 41, 87.

<sup>11</sup> *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (1696), ed. M. Sylvester, i. 162 (page 111).

<sup>12</sup> Trevecca MS. Letters, no. 362 (National Library of Wales), printed by R. T. Jenkins, in *Y Cofiadur*, rhifyn 12 (Mawrth, 1935), page 11.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Hall, *Essential Difference between Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John*, in *Works* (1832), ed. O. Gregory, ii. 230.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Congregational Historical Society Transactions*, xiv. 4 (May, 1944), page 206.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, xiv. 1 (Dec., 1940), pages 11-12.

<sup>16</sup> John Rippon, *Discourses on the all-sufficient gracious assistance of the spirit of Christ*, 1880, page 23.

<sup>17</sup> Archibald Douglas, *Memoir of the Reverend Samuel Douglas* (1820), page 13.

<sup>18</sup> John Owen, ep. prefixed to George Kendall, *Fur pro Tribunali, Oxonii*, 1657.

<sup>19</sup> *Op cit.*, pages 49-50.

<sup>20</sup> *Op cit.*, page 13.

<sup>21</sup> Samuel Palmer, *The general union of believers at the coming of Christ*, 1807, page 26.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. further my paper, "The Concept of the Chosen People in Christianity", in the Council of Christians and Jews periodical, *Common Ground*, July 1968.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. E. A. Payne, *Free Churchmen Unrepentant and Repentant*, 1965, page 4.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL

---

### THE TASK OF A BAPTIST HISTORIAN

(Concluded from p. 408)

<sup>18</sup> *op. cit.* 17.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, 21.

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*, 22.

<sup>21</sup> *ibid.*, 25.

<sup>22</sup> *Baptist Quarterly*, volume II, 100-112.

<sup>23</sup> *ibid.*, 112.

<sup>24</sup> *ibid.*, 101.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.*, 104.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid.*, 109.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Baptist Quarterly*, volume XVII, 313.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid.*, 315.

<sup>30</sup> *ibid.*, 318.

<sup>31</sup> *Baptist Quarterly*, volume XXII, 65.

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*, 67.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid.*, 71.

B. R. WHITE