

THE LONDON CALVINISTIC BAPTIST LEADERSHIP

1644 - 1660

The 1644 *Confession* provides the first clear example of intercongregational co-operation between the London Calvinistic Baptists. In its revised edition of 1646 it also provided the doctrinal standard for the first period of their expansion which closed with the restoration of Charles II in 1660. The two editions also introduced as signatories some of their earliest influential leaders.

Since the 1596 Separatist *Confession* provided the source which was used virtually verbatim by the 1644 *Confession* for matters ecclesiological the differences between them concerning both the ministry and church-state relationships are the more noteworthy. These were areas, among others, where the London Baptist leaders first established positions which were to be important for the future.

In 1596 the Separatist *Confession* had emphasized that every congregation of believers had power to elect, ordain and even, if necessary, to dismiss their ministers.(1) Further, they claimed, that Christ had

instituted and ratified to continue unto the world's end only this public ordinary Ministry of Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, Helpers to the instruction, government, and service of his Church.(2)

The Baptists took this over but omitted 'Helpers' in 1644 and 'Pastors' and 'Teachers' from 1646 onwards.(3) Furthermore, the men of 1644, unlike those in 1596, did not prohibit the administration of sacraments 'until the Pastors or Teachers be chosen and ordained into their office'.(4)

Equally, both statements agreed that they should be prepared to practise their form of churchmanship whether the secular authorities allowed them freedom to do so or not, and that they should be prepared to suffer any consequent penalties without resistance. While both also agreed in teaching obedience to the demands of the State in all other matters, they apparently differed in their expectations of what the State might ideally be expected to do for the Church. The Separatists had taught the government's responsibility for the suppression of every false church and ministry and believed that it should also positively 'establish and maintain by their laws every part of God's word, his pure religion and true ministry'.(5) Although they never explicitly asserted that the State should give financial support to true churches (such as they believed their own to be) they could be argued to have implied it. Certainly the period of the Civil War and Interregnum was to provide plenty of examples of the willingness of their successors among the Congregationalists to accept and even expect financial support for the ministry from tithes and other sources outside those of the gathered churches themselves. The Baptists of 1644 and thereafter, however, were to

find the question of payment of the ministry not only a source of considerable strain upon many of their congregations but also a matter of debate among some of them. Indeed, a minority of those pastors who held Baptist views were also prepared to accept secular financial support. However, in 1644 the London leaders asserted:

the due maintenance of the Officers aforesaid, should be the free and voluntary communication of the Church that according to Christ's ordinance, they that preach the Gospel should live on the Gospel and not by constraint to be compelled from the people by a forced law. (6)

Yet they came to accept a fair amount of government and secular support in individual cases without, apparently, any great embarrassment for a few years. Then, in the later 1650s, the line seems to have hardened. In the Leominster Churchbook there is a record of a letter from Devizes where a group of leaders, including Harrison, Kiffin and Hobson from London, had shared in constructing an answer to the Hereford church which had asked whether it was right to accept state maintenance for a minister. The letter was written in the August of 1657 and suggested that, while ministers should not be grasping, each church should see that its pastor was 'sufficiently and comfortably supplied'. If, they continued, an individual congregation were unable to do this it should seek help of others. It is significant that Abraham Cheare, minister at Plymouth, was present and that, three months earlier, he had played a part in the arguments which had led to the London leaders working towards a national fund to help supplement ministers' salaries. (7)

At the same time the Calvinistic Baptists of 1644 had some positive things to say about the State. They accepted that the civil power was an ordinance of God and that the supreme power at that time in England was 'the King and Parliament freely chosen by the Kingdom'. This power they must not merely obey but defend in all civil matters:

although we should suffer never so much from them in not actively submitting to some ecclesiastical laws, which might be conceived by them to be their duties to establish which we for the present could not see, nor our consciences could submit to; yet are we bound to yield our persons to their pleasures. (8)

Such a statement on the necessities of church-state confrontation could hardly be less belligerently put!

Cautiously, in the 1646 edition of the *Confession*, by means of an extensive marginal note, the writers went further and insisted that

it is the Magistrate's duty to tender the liberty of men's consciences... without which all other liberties will not be worth the naming, much less enjoying, and to protect all under them from all wrong, injury, oppression and molestation.

This claim to religious toleration as a universal human right was supported by a new article asserting that it was lawful for a Christian both to be a magistrate and to take an oath. By this means the Calvinistic Baptists stressed that they belonged to the mainstream upholders of Christian practice and that they did not share some of the views attributed to the Anabaptists. They then rounded off their statement with an admission that:

we know but in part, and we are ignorant of many things which we desire and seek to know: and if any shall do us that friendly part to show us from the word of God that we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and them.(9)

It is clear that they were very sharply aware of the general damage done to their cause by the label 'anabaptist' and were seeking to move very carefully indeed in their public pronouncements. However, it may have been the suppression of the Levellers that caused the marginal note about freedom of conscience to be wholly omitted from the 1651 and 1652 London printings of the *Confession*.

The personnel and nature of the London leadership is somewhat difficult to assess during the 1640s and 1650s since its membership can only be reconstructed from the members' occasional appearance as authors and signatories of various documents of the time. Otherwise the part played by the various leaders can be assessed from their writings, their occasional appearance in other documents, and the part some of them played in the politics of the period.

Two or three things are quite clear, however: first, there were no discernible links with the London General Baptist community or its leaders before 1660 and, secondly, those who, like Henry Jessey, retained a mixed membership in their congregation of those who had been baptized as believers and those who held to their baptism as infants, remained much more closely linked with the wider circle of Independents, and were virtually excluded from the communion of mainstream Calvinistic Baptists. On the other hand the leaders of the mainstream group did have some links with the London Independents in such matters as the repudiation of John Lilburne and the Levellers.(10)

The membership of the London Calvinistic Baptist leadership was also somewhat fluid both in its geographical situation and in its theological convictions. For example, Paul Hobson, who with Thomas Gower signed both the 1644 *Confession* and its 1646 edition as a leader of one of the London churches, was even then spending most of his time away from London. In August 1644 he had been made a captain in the army of the Eastern Association at Lincoln.(11) He then became well-known as a Baptist evangelist in the London area and the west country during his travels with the army during the next couple of years. Then, in August 1648, he was appointed deputy-governor of Newcastle and, apparently, with Thomas Gower became the founder of a Baptist church there. From then on until the Restoration he became involved in a series of ecclesiastical

adventures and misadventures in the north which, while showing him to have continued his relationships with the London churches, must have been something of an embarrassment to them. (12)

Thomas Patient from 1644 onwards seems to have shared the leadership of another London congregation with William Kiffin, probably down to the time of Cromwell's invasion of Ireland in 1650. He then joined the army in Ireland early in that year. By December 1652 Patient, then in Dublin, was one of those who were appointed to preach in Christ Church cathedral on Sundays. (13) He soon became known as the pastor of a closed-membership Baptist church in the city. His relationships with Henry Cromwell tended to be uneasy and it seems probable that he was opposed also to the direction the Protector and his government in London were taking. Nevertheless, as late as 8th July 1659 Patient was listed as a chaplain to the headquarters staff of the army and it is clear that he received payment for this post even if not for his preaching in the cathedral. (14) After the Restoration Patient helped to lead another closed-membership congregation at Bristol (not Broadmead) and then returned to London to work once more with William Kiffin and his church. He died of the plague in 1666. (15)

William Kiffin (1616-1701), (16) shared in the London leadership throughout the period from 1644 to the Restoration. He apparently made himself a fortune in the cloth trade and he seems to have been the most financially secure of all the early leaders. About 1644 he shared in an unsuccessful mission with Thomas Patient in Kent from which the converts, in many cases, became General Baptists. From at least 1644 he seems to have been pastor of the congregation which later became the Devonshire Square Baptist church. He was a signatory of most of the important documents which the new denomination was to publish. The general mood of the London leadership was moderate politically and it was probably not merely characteristic of Kiffin's own policy that in 1649 he hastened to present a petition to the House of Commons on behalf of the Calvinistic Baptists dissociating themselves from John Lilburne and the Levellers. (17) He also joined with John Spilsbury to send a letter to the Baptists in Ireland during early 1654 to urge them to accept the Protectorate. (18) He served as M.P. for Middlesex in the Protectorate Parliament of 1656 and successfully opposed the western churches joining the Fifth Monarchists at a meeting in Dorchester, Dorset, held in 1658. In fact, he and John Spilsbury appear to have provided the core of the leadership of the Calvinistic Baptists throughout the period and he was himself to remain a significant leader down to his death in 1701.

John Spilsbury (1593-?1668), (19) a cobbler in Aldersgate, London, had led a congregation of Calvinistic Baptists since at least as early as 1638. In 1643 he published *A treatise concerning the lawfull subject of baptisme*. He was active as a leader of the group from at least the publication of the 1644 *Confession* onwards: in the 1650s, like Kiffin, he seems largely to have supported the Protectorate and to have opposed the Fifth Monarchists. During the 1650s his house appears to have been used as the meeting-place for

weekly gatherings of the London leaders and he, with his church, seems to have taken an active interest in the Abingdon Association and the wider development of association life. They even suggested, in 1657, a national programme to help the payment of ministers but this apparently came to nothing before the Restoration drove the whole movement underground.(20) He seems to have lived into the 1660s but the date of his death is uncertain.

There were at least two other businessmen, signatories of the 1644 and 1646 editions of the *Confession*, who are also likely to have shared in the central leadership for some years. The first was Thomas Kilcop,(21) who had been baptized as a believer in January 1642 but who, in a millenarian work, *The ancient and durable gospel* (1648) refuted *Justification by Christ alone* (1647) by Samuel Richardson, the other businessman of early significance.(22) What is quite unclear at this period is how much disagreement was accepted among the London leaders and how far the non-appearance of particular names on public documents means that the men concerned had by now either withdrawn from the group or been excluded from it or merely by some accidental circumstance (such as Hobson's posting to the Newcastle area a little later) were prevented from being part of it. Richardson, who was very probably still a leader at the time that he produced the important tract, *The necessity of toleration* (1647) almost certainly continued until the final break between the London Calvinistic Baptists and the Levellers in 1649. On the other hand, it is hardly conceivable that when he published *Of the torments of hell* (1658), denying the traditional doctrine of eternal punishment, he was still part of the leadership group.

Two other noteworthy signatures appeared upon the 1646 *Confession*. They were those of Hanserd Knollys(23) and Benjamin Cox(24). Both were former Anglican clergymen and both, once they had abandoned their Church of England ordination, moved into positions of leadership and considerable influence, no doubt on grounds of their experience, age and education. Only one other man with a similar background was apparently to play any noteworthy part in the London leadership: this was Edward Harrison(25) and he was, it seems, to come in only during the 1650s. Three other former ministers of the Church of England were to play a notable part outside the capital but would hardly touch the London scene directly. They were Christopher Blackwood,(26) who became prominent during the Irish invasion of the 1650s, John Miles (27) in South Wales and John Pendarves(28) in Abingdon and the West Country.

Hanserd Knollys (?1599-1691) returned to England from Massachusetts in December 1641 and by 1645 he had gathered the London Calvinistic Baptist congregation of which he was to be pastor for the rest of his life. Throughout the period to 1660 he supported himself as a schoolmaster although he seems to have been engaged in some evangelistic missions in the provinces. During the 1650s, unlike Kiffin, he seems to have been on the fringe of the Fifth Monarchy movement although it is difficult to determine precisely how far his sympathies were engaged with them. In 1657 he signed the letter to

Cromwell mentioned below, urging him not to accept the crown. Almost immediately after the Restoration Knollys was imprisoned and soon after his release went abroad. On his return he resumed his position among the London leaders although now Kiffin and he were supported by a younger generation of leaders. His interest in eschatology continued with several publications in the 1670s and 1680s. His last important contribution was to head the list with Kiffin of those who jointly summoned the Calvinistic Baptist assembly of 1689.(29)

Benjamin Cox not only signed the 1646 *Confession* but he also, by the end of the year, published *An appendix* to it, as the representative of the London leaders, for the sake, so the title page affirmed, 'of some well-affected and godly persons in the country'. Whether or not there had been specific enquiries, the pamphlet laid down the ground plan for the evangelistic programme of the years immediately to follow. It not only stressed its own particular brand of evangelical Calvinism but also explicitly laid down the policy which was to exclude such people as Henry Jessey and John Tombes, together with such congregations as Broadmead, Bristol and that at Bedford which John Bunyan was to join. So Cox asserted that 'we... do not admit any to the use of the supper, nor communicate with any in the use of this ordinance, but disciples baptized, lest we should have fellowship with them in doing contrary to order'. But he was not content merely to lay down the principle of 'closed-communion' and, by implication, closed-membership. He also sought to describe the task of a Calvinistic Baptist evangelist: he was not merely to convert and baptize individuals but to unite them into congregational church fellowship and 'guide the action of a church in the use of the supper'. Furthermore, Cox wrote, such evangelists 'may also call upon the churches and advise them to choose fit men for officers, and may settle such officers so chosen by a church, in the places or offices to which they are chosen, by imposition of hands and prayer'.(30) It was clear that Benjamin Cox did not believe that an evangelist had completed his work with the conversion of individuals. Those individuals must not only be drawn together into church fellowship but also the church was not adequately founded until the officers had been appointed whom he believed the New Testament model required.

Of course, it must be recognized that, while the Londoners gave the lead and sought to establish a uniform policy, they had no power to enforce it upon the individual churches and evangelists. No doubt the further from the capital the churches were the less likely it was that any close uniformity would exist, especially as individual leaders placed their own personal mark upon their work.

The third man, among those who had formerly been Anglican parsons, to play a notable part in the London leadership was Edward Harrison (1618-1689). He had been vicar of Kensworth in Bedfordshire with property both there and in London who had become known as a Baptist by 1646. He then seems to have moved to the capital where he signed the 1651 and 1652 editions of the *Confession* and led a congregation which often met in his home until

1672. In 1657 he signed the letter, also signed by the maverick Independent minister, John Goodwin, as well as a number of other Calvinistic Baptists, urging Cromwell not to accept the crown. It was notable both that William Kiffin did not sign the document and that the signatories apparently also welcomed the support of the open-membership minister, Henry Jessey.(31) Other London leaders who signed it included Knollys and Spilsbury. Kiffin himself tended to go, throughout his life, with those in power and, either on business or theological grounds or perhaps a little of both, tended to move as little against the government as possible whether he was dealing with the Stuarts or with Cromwell.

Meanwhile, an important but perhaps somewhat neglected document of the London leadership of this period is *Heartbleedings for professors abominations*. This was first published by itself in 1650 but it was reprinted with the 1652 and 1653 editions of the *Confession*. It was, on the one hand, an attempt to correct and summon to repentance those guilty of encouraging a 'slight esteem of Christ, his Word and Ordinances'. Such people were saying that there was 'no sin but what contradicts a man's own light' and that 'sin is only sin to him that thinks it so'. It was also believed that men might count all their actions good 'being acted by their own spirits, which (as they think) are God'. Such convictions had led some into a disobedience not merely to the Christian way but to 'the very principles and light of nature'. The way back from such disastrous antinomianism was, argued the authors of *Heartbleedings*, to return to Jesus Christ as living Saviour and Lord and to the Bible as 'the infallible Word of God'. It was evident from this tract that the Calvinistic Baptists were feeling the impact of the sectarian left wing for whom the world had really and truly turned upside down.(32)

In the last pages of the pamphlet the Baptists turned outwards and ventured some rather sketchy apologetics. They confessed that a number of those who had fallen into such 'desperate abominations' were from their ranks but insisted that most 'were never members with us'. After all, they argued, even the apostolic age had its losses; the Spirit in Scripture foretold such happenings - the sifting of wheat from tares; and, in any case, the Baptists had taken care to ensure that such persons, if guilty of errors of either doctrine or behaviour, had been expelled from their congregations. Having said this, they felt called upon to defend themselves against a charge of uncharity and asserted robustly that 'true love and charity is not the soothing of any in their sins'. Rather was it uncharity to allow 'God to be dishonoured, his Son to be vilified, his Truth trampled under foot, his Ordinances sleighted'.(33) This is the only document produced by the London leaders of this period to reflect something of the impact of the radicals upon their people.

There were also some signs that in matters, for example, concerning the ministry it was felt that the associations needed to develop some of the statements which had been made in the *Confession*. This was shown at one point by the Abingdon Association when it sought advice from Edward Harrison and the

church in Petty France in a letter dated 30 December 1656 concerning the proper testing, election and ordination of elders and deacons.(34)

The Petty France church answered with a very firm statement that, first, authority for testing the gifts and electing officers lay with the congregation as a whole. Ordination itself should then follow 'the trial and examination of the person's gifts and graces and endowments by scripture qualifications'. When the church was satisfied the election should take place with the public raising of hands. The Londoners went on to explain that the ordination should be

by fasting and prayers, together with the laying on of hands by an orderly evangelist or eldership, where such as [sic] to be had or, in case of that defect, by such gifted brethren of the same congregation as may be called prophets and teachers, (Acts 13.1)

In fact, they went on to explain, in order themselves to maintain an orderly succession of ministers and to have persons of 'approved wisdom, experience, gravity and fidelity' to carry through an ordination within their own congregation, they had sought the help of 'orderly elders from other congregations and others besides us have since done the like'.

While it is clear that in Petty France and in the Abingdon Association the shape of the ministry closely followed that reflected in the *Confession* with but two basic types of ministers, elders and deacons, it is interesting to note that when John Miles and the South Wales churches had discussed questions related to the ministry in 1654 they had laid out, at least ideally, something closer to the normal presbyterian ideal with pastors, teachers and elders.(35)

Nevertheless, the major initiatives undertaken by the London leaders were concerned with programmes of evangelism and church-planting described by Benjamin Cox in the *Appendix* to the 1646 *Confession*. When these were successful the infant congregations were drawn into the inter-congregational groups later called associations.(36) The circumstances in which these missions were financed and carried through varied very greatly and the relationships with London also varied partly due to the personalities involved.

One of the first of these missions was largely, if not wholly, the work of Thomas Collier. Collier had been an itinerant evangelist for the Calvinistic Baptists as early as 1646. He seems to have been a native of Somerset who was, nevertheless, in the 1640s a member of William Kiffin's church and an early writing of his, *The exaltation of Christ* (1646), had a preface by Hanserd Knollys. Collier became a chaplain with the parliamentary army in 1648 but finally returned to the west country in 1651. Within a year or two he had become a member of the Baptist church at Wells which he may have founded. This remained his base for some fifteen years.(37) In 1656 the

churches of Somerset and near that county published their own *Confession*. In its epistle dedicatory Collier made a point of saying that they were one with the London Calvinistic Baptists 'both in faith and practice' and that they published in order to show both that those in the provinces really were 'of our brethren's judgement that published that confession of faith in London' and to provide a renewed 'declaration of our faith' in days when believers were generally so divided.(38) This group nevertheless tended to show itself, as the years passed, rather sharply independent of London.

The situation in Ireland was quite different again. There the churches seem not to have been founded as the result of either a London initiative or the efforts of an individual evangelist. They developed rather as the result of Cromwell's invasion of Ireland and, it would seem, were largely composed of people from the English garrisons. The most significant detail of the period is derived from the letters brought to London by John Vernon,(39) himself an army officer who had previously signed *Heartbleedings*. It is noteworthy that the Baptists in Ireland sought the support of the London leaders for the new initiative they proposed in 1653. Among their leaders were Thomas Patient and the former Church of England minister, Christopher Blackwood. The letter came from some form of general meeting at Waterford at which members not only from the Waterford congregation but also from both Kilkenny and Dublin were present. News was given of seven other congregations at Clonmel, Cork, Limerick, Galway, Wexford, Kerry and Carrickfergus. The intention of the letter was to give information about affairs in Ireland, to report their intention to hold a monthly day of prayer, a more regular correspondence between the churches and to ask London to persuade the other congregations in England, Scotland and Wales to develop a similar quarterly link by letter. In particular, too, they asked that the London churches should send:

two or more faithful brethren, well acquainted with the discipline and order of the Lord's house that may be able to speak reasonable 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 than heretofore.(40)

The expectation that London should and could provide the wise and experienced leadership which the country at large needed was very clear. The covering letter which the London churches sent with the copies of this material from Ireland was addressed from 'the Glasshouse, London'. One of the London Calvinistic Baptist churches had met at the Glaziers' Hall in Broad Street since 1649 but the letter on this occasion was sent out in the name of a representative meeting of 'the several [Calvinistic Baptist] churches of Christ in London.(41)

When John Miles and Thomas Proud had been sent out from

Glaziers' Hall in 1649 as evangelists and church planters it seems possible that they were sent out not necessarily as the representatives of one congregation but possibly as the representatives of the whole London community.(42) Incidentally the salaries of this pair were paid by the English government under the 'Act for the better propagation and preaching of the Gospel in Wales'. On the other hand, in 1653, when Knollys' church was meeting in Coleman Street, London, they may have dispatched Thomas Tillam as an evangelist to Hexham in Northumberland as an individual initiative of their own, rather than that of the whole body of their London community.(43) It is noteworthy, that whoever was responsible ultimately for this mission among the London Baptists, there was even as late as 1653 no apparent unease about one of their evangelists being funded by an outside body.

The Abingdon Association records give more indication of the influence of the London leadership during the 1650s. At the meeting in June 1653 at Tetsworth the newly formed association reported their 'Agreement' to 'the church of Christ to which our brethren John Spilsbury and William Kiffin 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'.(44)

As was earlier noted, the same association sent to the London church in Petty France for advice about the settlement of the ministry: Benjamin Cox seems to have led the Kensworth church and the Hertfordshire wing of the association and Edward Harrison of Petty France had continuing links with the Kensworth congregation which he may well have founded. It was in 1657 that the London churches wrote to the Abingdon Association of their anxiety for the pastors of some churches in the provinces who were particularly poorly paid. The letter said that the Londoners had already gathered some money towards a yearly allowance to help such ministers. They then asked the churches of the Abingdon Association first, to ask themselves whether they were adequately caring for their own ministers and, secondly, whether, after providing for their own ministers and their poorer members, they could then spare some money for building up a central fund. It was agreed at the association meeting at which the letter had been read to commend this cause to the churches and ask them to make their response directly to the 'messengers at London meeting weekly at brother Spilsbury's house' as soon as possible.(45)

Thus the London Calvinistic Baptist community appears in this period to have fulfilled three functions.

First, it provided the doctrinal standards for all the churches belonging to them in the country at large by means of the 1644 *Confession* and its various editions.

Secondly, it provided a clearinghouse for ideas and a centre for consultation for those churches.

Thirdly, it initiated evangelistic missions in various parts of the British Isles.

NOTES

- 1 W. L. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, 1959, 89, article 23.
- 2 Ibid. 88, article 19.
- 3 Ibid. 166, article XXXVI and footnote (a).
- 4 Ibid. 93, article 34.
- 5 Ibid. 94f, article 39.
- 6 Ibid. 166f, article XXXVIII.
- 7 Leominster Churchbook. Cf. ed. B. R. White, *Association Records of the Particular Baptists... to 1660*, 1972-4, 43-50. Here Benjamin Cox took a very firm line against Richard Harrison of Hereford who wished to draw on state support. This letter was dated in early 1658 so the controversy in this case had continued.
- 8 Ibid. 169, article XLIX.
- 9 *A confession of faith of seven congregations* (1646) note to article XLVIII, article L, and The Conclusion.
- 10 B. R. White, 'Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion', in ed. R. B. Knox, *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent*, 1977.
- 11 C. Holmes, *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War*, 1974, 199.
- 12 R. L. Greaves, *Saints and Rebels*, 1985, 133-56 gives a full account of Hobson and his later life.
- 13 St John D. Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland 1647-1661*, 1912, 33.
- 14 T. C. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, 1975, 102, note 63.
- 15 B. R. White, 'Thomas Patient in England and Ireland', *Irish Baptist Historical Journal*, 2, 1969-70, 36-49.
- 16 R. L. Greaves and R. Zaller, *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals, II*, 1983, 'Kiffin, William'.
- 17 William Kiffin and others, *The humble petition and representation of several churches of God in London*, 1649.
- 18 E. B. Underhill, *Confessions of Faith*, 1854, 322-4.
- 19 Greaves and Zaller, op.cit., 'Spilsbury, John'.
- 20 *Association Records*, 173-5.
- 21 Greaves and Zaller, op.cit., 'Kilcop, Thomas'.
- 22 Ibid., 'Richardson, Samuel'.
- 23 B. R. White, *Hanserd Knollys and Radical Dissent*, 1977, 5-18.
- 24 Greaves and Zaller, op.cit., 'Cox, Benjamin'.
- 25 Ibid., 'Harrison, Edward'.
- 26 Ibid., 'Blackwood, Christopher'.
- 27 B. R. White, 'John Miles and the structures of the Calvinistic Baptist mission to South Wales', *Welsh Baptist Studies*, 1976, ed. Mansel John.
- 28 B. R. White, 'John Pendarves, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy', *Baptist Quarterly*, 25, 251-271.
- 29 White, *Hanserd Knollys*, op.cit.
- 30 B. Cox, 'An appendix to a Confession of Faith', *Confessions of Faith*, 1854, ed. E. B. Underhill, 58-9.
- 31 Ibid., 335-8.

- 32 John Spilsbury, William Kiffin, etc., *Heartbleedings*, 1650, 4,7,8,11.
- 33 Ibid., 12,13.
- 34 *Association Records*, 168-72.
- 35 Ibid., 9-12.
- 36 B. R. White, 'The doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession', *JTS New Series* 19, 1963, 570-90.
- 37 R. Land, 'Doctrinal Controversies of the English Particular Baptists (1644-91) as illustrated by the career and writings of Thomas Collier', unpublished Oxford D. Phil. thesis 1979, 18, 25, 44.
- 38 'A Confession of the faith of several churches of Christ', 1656, *Confessions of Faith*, 1854, ed. E. B. Underhill, 63 f.
- 39 Greaves and Zaller, op.cit., 'Vernon, John'.
- 40 *Association Records*, op.cit., 115.
- 41 Ibid., 112.
- 42 *Welsh Baptist Studies*, op.cit., 35-6.
- 43 E. B. Underhill, *Records of the Churches of Christ gathered at Fenstanton, Warboys and Hexham*, 1854, 303f.
- 44 *Association Records*, op.cit., 131.
- 45 Ibid., 173-5.

B. R. WHITE