
A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php

The Lord's Supper

ADMISSION AND EXCLUSION AMONG THE BAPTISTS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

IN *The Fellowship of Believers,* Dr. E. A. Payne wrote that the "terms of communion occupied far more attention in Baptist circles than have theological questions regarding the meaning and significance of the Supper itself."[1] It is our purpose to examine this matter so far as the seventeenth century is concerned.

General Baptists

Like John Smyth,[2] the General Baptists were all "Strict" communionists, and held Table fellowship only with Baptists.[3] We can rule out therefore from the start all discussion of inter-communion with Independents, Presbyterian or Established Churches.

Some churches went further, and would not join at the Lord's Table those who rejected or made optional the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized.[4] The 1656 General Assembly adopted this rule.[5] The Kent Association meeting in the following year made the six points listed in *Hebrews* vi. 1f.* necessary tenets for a true church with which it would hold Table fellowship.[6] The London churches in 1692 excluded from their joint annual Communion service the Hart Street church members, because they had "Received Persons to there (sic) Cummunion that Have not Submitted To the 4th Principle† of the Doctrine of Christ yrr laying on of Hands. Therefore wee cannot Until They Repent Have Communion wth Them."[7] Other churches which made the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized an option, and not a term of Communion, were Slapton[8] and Fenstanton.[9]

Regular attendance at the Lord's Table was both a privilege and a duty. Non-attendance was regarded as a serious matter, and in some churches the names of members were called over at every celebration and the names of absentees noted.[10] Frequently an absence was followed with an enquiring visit. At the Ford-Cuddington church, for example, we find that the names of those delegated to visit the offenders are recorded in the minutes.[11]

* "The foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith towards God, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

† V. *Hebrews* vi. 1f.

Despite their strictness in many cases in the matter of the laying on of hands, the doctrine of General Redemption does not seem to have been made one of the terms of Communion.[12] Thomas Grantham, the most influential Baptist in the eastern half of England in the latter half of the century, refused to unchurch others over "the Extent of the Redemption paid for mankind."[13] The Ford-Cuddington church, after some debate, allowed a member to remove to the Particular Church at Hemel Hempstead, without formal dismission, but without censure.[14] It was also agreed to retain within its own membership those who believed in "Particular Redemption," provided that they did not disturb the church by attempting to win others to their point of view or undermine the teaching of the elders.[15] The London Association agreed to this as a general practice for the churches. There was no obligation to grant a "dismissal" to persons who disturbed the peace in the matter, though to do so might be convenient for all concerned.[16]

A General Baptist could communicate with another congregation only if he had the approval of his own congregation and received a "testimonial" from it.[17] We quote *verbatim* one such "testimonial"[18]:

> The brethren in and about Caxton and Fenstanton, to all the churches of Christ whom it may concern, wish grace, mercy and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.
> Dear and holy brethren, we commend unto you our beloved brother Thomas Disbrowe, he being a member of the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, received by us, according to the order of the gospel. Wherefore we beseech you to receive him in the Lord, as becometh saints, and to assist him in whatsoever business he shall stand in need of you; and we shall account it as done unto ourselves. Farewell.
> Your brethren in the Lord Jesus Christ.
> Caxton.
> The 30th Day of the 10th Month, 1655.

Exclusion: The local church was the source, seat and area of authority for all that the church did. "The Church, consisting of Elders and Brethren," had *inter alia* "power to binde impenitent sinners under the censures of the Church, and to binde sin upon their conscience: and in case of their repentance, to release them of the same. . . .[19] While the whole church had the power to admit and exclude members, it was the elders who made the formal pronouncements in either case.[20] However, when a member was excluded, if the offence was a "public" one, e.g. a notorious scandal, the exclusion was announced at public worship, i.e. to the world at large; but if the offence was "private" the exclusion was notified to the church privately, i.e. at the Lord's Table.[21]

While the General Baptist churches were in many respects Independent in polity, nevertheless the names of the excommuni-

cated would be published to all the churches.[22] Further the Orthodox Creed of 1678 even allowed a majority of the General Assembly to excommunicate an offender from his own and all the congregations.[23] This right, however, was not universally accepted. What was much more universally accepted was the necessity in cases of dispute, e.g. between the officers and members, or over the excommunication of an elder, to refer the matter to a "consociation of churches" since "in multitude of counsellors there is safety."[24]

Should a church receive into its fellowship one who had been excommunicated elsewhere? Properly and normally the church to receive back a repentant sinner was the one from which he had been excommunicated. But there were three circumstances in which another church might receive him.[25] If he were far removed from the church which had excommunicated him a penitent might be received into the fellowship of another church. If the church to which the penitent one had dissolved since his excommunication he could apply elsewhere for membership upon repentance. Thirdly, if the other churches were agreed the excommunicating church had done grave injustice in excommunicating, one of them might receive into their membership the one expelled.[26]

Excommunication was the end term of an admonitory process which was based on various scripture texts, notably, *Matthew* xviii. 15-18.[27] The churches endeavoured to carry out the procedure exactly as outlined by the Lord in the Gospel. Private admonition was followed by the admonition of the church if repentance was not forthcoming. Excommunication followed the rejection of the second admonition of the church.[28]

When the repentance of the offender was proven, *alias* he had accepted the admonition of the church, the admonitory procedure came to an end.[29] The repentant one was received back into fellowship, even if excommunication had already come. However, due certainty of the penitence was ensured. We shall quote *verbatim* from Christopher Blackwood the procedure at the re-reception:[30]

> Let the Elders in the name of the Church propose these Questions:
>
> 1. Whether he confess the crime for which he was excommunicate.
> 2. Whether he thinks himself justly punished.
> 3. Whether he be heartily sorry for the offence committed.
> 4. Whether he desire the forgiveness of the Church.
> 5. Whether he have a purpose to amend his life.
> 6. Whether he would have the Church, whom he hath offended, to pray for him.
>
> After which, let the Pastor add a grave Exhortation concerning God's wrath against sin, both in punishments temporal and eternal; of the danger of Scandal; of the frailty of man's nature; of true repentance; of free pardon in Christ's blood; of the loving affections God's people ought to show with gladness to a person repenting. . . .

While many offences not repented of could result in excommunication, fundamentally there was only one reason for excommunication: that was failure to "hear the church," i.e. the rejection of the admonition of the church. For example, Thomas Helwys said that not the "committing of sin doth cut off from the Church but refusing to hear the Church to reformation."[31]

However, such as Thomas Grantham[32] and Christopher Blackwood thought that some offences were so grave in themselves that they deserved expulsion from the Table. The latter catalogued such offences as "Living in a purpose of sin" and "notorious sins" such as heresy.[33] Even if the offender repented and submitted to the church he would be suspended from the Table for some four to six months, during which he should give "some proof of his humiliation." Both Grantham and Blackwood cited the case of incest in 1 *Corinthians* v. 11 as their scriptural precedent in this matter.[34] However, it was more often the refusal of the admonition, rather than the offence itself, which invoked excommunication. Thus, we find that for, for example, in the minutes of the Fenstanton church, that frequently the final clause in a list of indictments against one excommunicated has a phrase such as "For despising and contemning the admonitions of the church."[35]

Unrepented moral offences often were the prelude to excommunication. There are examples of drunkenness,[36] a widow's refusal to pay her late husband's debts,[37] being hateful to one's wife, telling of lies out of covetousness, forging a warrant, fornication, adultery, breaking a promise, etc.[38]

An unrepented breach of church discipline could also lead to excommunication. There are examples relating to such matters as refusing to contribute one's quota towards church expenses,[39] and attendance at the parish church.[40]

In this connexion, marriage outside the communion, or against the advice of the church, presented a special problem. The General Assembly frequently asserted that a marriage outside the communion deserved excommunication, and the latter often followed such a marriage. Two consequences were that the churches became weakened numerically, and the Association meetings tended to become occasions of match-making.[41] However, the Assembly of 1656 decided that the churches must accept mixed marriages after the event, and not expect the parties to separate: they must then either accept the parties of mixed marriages in their excommunicate state, or "accept of such repentance as the reality thereof may not be questioned by any circumstances attending."[42] The latter course was preferred and was the policy of the Assembly for many years.[43] There was such a repentance, followed by restoration to communion in the Ford-Cuddington church, in 1697;[44] but such an event seems to have been rare. At Fenstanton two men were excommunicated,

because they "stood to maintain in the congregation that it was lawful for members of the congregation to marry those that are without, and that they persuaded others to yield to the same opinion";[45] the men later repented and were received back again.

Heresies, such as a discontinuance in attendance at or belief in the ordinances, disbelief in the Holy Scriptures, holding a rigid determinism, blasphemy, etc., resulted in excommunication if persisted in.[46] However, unorthodox Christology became a reason for admonition and excommunication only if it produced a dispute within the congregation. This was true of the six earliest Baptist churches,[47] as of later days, as for example at Spilshill.[48]

Both John Smyth and Thomas Helwys stated that excommunication did not affect civil society and natural human relationships as such.[49] However, church members should not partake in avoidable social relationships with those excommunicated,[50] except that "subjects, servants, children, parents, wife or husband, &C. that are bound to him may performe civil and naturall offices to him."[51] The 1656 General Assembly endorsed this view.[52]

The excommunicated were cut off from the body of the church, "as a rotten member whom all ought to shun,"[53] and cut off from the realm of grace were delivered into the realm of Satan and still under the "wrath of God." It was a provisional separation from inward communion with Christ. It was final only if the church had not erred and the offender did not later repent.[54] Then, what was bound on earth was bound in heaven.[55]

It contained "a binding of sin upon the sinner's conscience . . . so that if godly, his heart is for the present more devoid of comfort; if wicked, he becomes more hardened in sin."[56] As those who had never entered the realm of grace, the excommunicate were still to be wooed to repentance.[57] Their burden was not to be made intolerable, and if they were in want they were still to be treated with charity. The joy in heaven over the repentance of one sinner and the eternal law of love were ever to be borne in mind.[58] For the ordinance of excommunication was not "given to the Church for any man's ruine, but for edification . . . that the soul by repentance may come to have inward communion with God,"[59] i.e. it is for the good of the soul of the offender. Other purposes of the ordinance were "to bridle men that are wicked in doctrine and practice," to purify the church, "that the Church may be well reported of," and to deter men from sinning.[60]

However, in later days there seems to have been a reluctance to use the instrument of excommunication, as a final cutting off, and as opposed to provisional suspension, since it was "difficult to know when any man hath sinned the unpardonable sin and so incur a total cutting off from the church."[61]

PARTICULAR BAPTISTS

In contrast to the General Baptists, the earliest Particular* Baptist churches were of the "Open" membership type.[62] However, within about fifteen years there was a "Strict" Particular Baptist church in Bristol[63] and another in Wales.[64] A considerable amount of research in this matter was undertaken by Dr. George Gould, whose book, *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich,* showed how the term "Particular Baptists" did not necessarily imply any one polity regarding admission to the Lord's Table. Particular Baptist churches might be of the "Closed" Communion or "Open" (alias "Mixt") Communion types, or even have "Closed" membership but with "Open" Communion. Further, he showed, some erstwhile "Open" membership churches became "Closed" later, and *vice versa.*[65]

The 1677 Confession of Faith[66] had a long appendix relating to baptism, which, however, reveals that there was no one mind in the matter of whether the undergoing of "Believers Baptism" was a *necessary* prerequisite to be received at the Supper. The 1689 Assembly had also to agree to differ in the matter,[67] despite the fact that this Assembly was not attended by churches such as that at Bedford, which had "Mixt" membership.[68]

The "Strict" Particular Baptists argued from Scripture and church history, that the right to the Supper depended on Baptism. This was a matter of church order than a theology of church membership.[69] Since the only Baptism acknowledged was that of "Believers," the Lord's Supper was restricted to those so baptized.[70] The Baptist Catechism[71] put the matter thus:

> *Q.* 103. Who are the proper subjects of this ordinance (i.e. the Lord's Supper)?
> *A.* They who have been baptized upon a personal profession of their faith in Jesus Christ, and repentance from dead works (*Acts* ii, 41, 42).

However, some churches, such as that at Falmouth, and perhaps that at Bridgewater, had "Closed" membership, but nonetheless "Open" communion, for both Baptists and Independents desiring transient communion.[72] Dr. Gould showed how "Closed" membership had not always implied "Strict" communion. He showed, too, that only seven of the 46 Particular Baptist churches had signed the 1644 Confession of Faith which implied "Closed" membership.[73] Further, John Spilsbury, from whose "Open" membership church William Kiffin later seceded to form a "Strict" communion church, had been a signatory. Clearly that Confession

* This term relates solely to a belief in a "Particular" Redemption, i.e. an Atonement by Christ for the elect alone. It has nothing to do with being "particular" as to who is received at the Lord's Table. The latter erroneous notion is found even in high places outside the Baptist world at times.

did not preclude "Open" communion, or Spilsbury would not have signed it.[74] Thus, both the 1644 Confession and the 1689 Assembly[75] seem to have represented the "Closed" membership but "Open" communion polity.

John Bunyan was the Baptist minister of a "Mixt" membership church, which did not keep separate lists of those baptized as infants, and as "Believers." There is no record of Bunyan's own immersion,[76] though in his controversial writings the first person plural is often used with respect to the Baptist position. Membership did not depend on immersion but on acceptance as a "visible saint."[77] It was membership and not Baptism which was the prerequisite for admission to the Lord's Supper, and a man was not allowed to receive the Supper when he wanted to do so without being a member.[78] Since the only Baptism that Bunyan recognized was that of "Believers," but he did not insist on church members and communicants being thus baptized, some baptized neither as infants nor as "believers" may have been admitted to the Lord's Supper, though there seems no record that this did happen. John Tombe's position was similar to that of Bunyan.[79]

Bunyan denied that Baptism divided the holy from the unholy, that it must precede membership of the church, that it was the initiatory ordinance.[80] "Faith and a life becoming the ten commandments, should be the chief and most solid argument with churches to receive to fellowship."[81] He wanted "scripture proof" that "it is a duty to refuse communion* with those of the saints that differ from them at baptism."[82]

Other churches practising "Open" membership included that of Henry Jessey[83] in London, those sponsored by Vavasor Powell in Wales,[84] Broadmead in Bristol,[85] those started by William Mitchell and David Crosley in the north-west,[86], and those that sprang up because of the work and influence of John Tombes.[87]

Some Baptist churches had covenants, the acceptance of which was a condition of membership.[88] Such said that "Baptism is one branche of the Covenant." "The Covenant and not Baptisme formes the Church, and the manner how."[89] The covenants of churches such as those at Gosport[90] or Horsly Down,[91] were similar to those of Independent churches, but also involved submission to "Believers Baptism." Thus, both Spilsbury who believed in "Open" communion and Keach who believed in "Strict" communion accepted a covenant basis to membership.

Those who accepted "Open" membership making Baptist Baptism optional seem to have made the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized also optional. We instance Jessey[92] and Bunyan.[93] However, the "Strict" Baptist position does not seem

* i.e. fellowship, including, but not confined to, communion at the Supper.

to have necessarily entailed insistence upon laying on of hands. For, while Benjamin Keach, for example, did insist upon the laying on of hands upon the newly baptized,[94] the "Closed" membership churches of the West Country made the matter optional.[95]

Finally, we should note that any church, whether "Open" or "Closed" in polity, had to be satisfied that the one desiring membership and acceptance at the Lord's Table had experienced a work of grace in the heart.[96] This would often involve a personal testimony in front of the church assembled.[97] Here, we quote the words of Benjamin Keach[98]:

> That every person before they are admitted Members in such a church so constituted, must declare to the Church (or to such with the Pastor, that they shall appoint) what God hath done for their Souls, or their Experiences of a Saving work of Grace upon their hearts; . . . . . and also a strict Enquiry must be made about his Life and Conversation; but if through Bashfulness the Party cannot speak before the Congregation, the Elder and two or three more Persons may receive an account of his or her Faith, and report it to the Church. But if full Satisfaction by the Testimony of good and credible Persons is not given of the Party's Life and Conversation, he must be put by until Satisfaction is obtained in that respect. Moreover, when the Majority are satisfied, and yet one or two Persons are not, the Church and Elder will do well to wait a little time, and endeavour to satisfy such Persons, especially if the Reasons of their dissent seem weighty.

As among the General Baptists, attendance was a duty as well as a privilege. At a number of churches, such as that at the Barbican,[99] that at Bromsgrove,[100] and the Crosley-Mitchell group of churches in the north-west,[101] careful observation was made of which members, if any, were absent from the Supper. Avoidable absence, not repented of, would involve disciplinary action.[102]

Many of the Particular Baptist churches recognized each other as true churches and therefore accepted each other's members to the Lord's Table, either temporarily upon the production of a "Testimonial," or as a permanent member following the receipt of a "Dismissal." For example, the churches at Hexham, Co. Durham, and Coleman Street, London, thus recognized each other.[103] But there were exceptions. For example, the Bunyan church refused to grant letters of "Dismissal" to a church either unknown or known to be of "Strict" communion principles.[104]

One could be a member of only one church at a time. In 1696 the Bristol Baptist Association decided that a certain man who was a member simultaneously of both a Baptist and a paedo-baptist church must relinquish his membership of the latter.[105]

One church, or a group of churches, might declare "non-communion"[106] with a church which it found offensive, but no Association or other group of churches could either excommunicate an individual, or declare him a communicant at a given church. Some

would not even allow that an Association could declare even a church outside communion.[107]

A member of a church "that is corrupt or erroneous in Principles" might, if he himself were sound in faith and morals, be received into membership by a "true" church, subject to a satisfactory account of the member being obtained from "the Church that is corrupt."[108]

Often, a number of congregations formed but one church, and had but one pastor, membership, and communion of the Lord's Supper,[109] but met in separate congregations for the hearing of the Word and for prayer. For example, the minute book of Beechen Grove Church, Watford, shows that at one time in the seventeenth century it was a sub-congregation of the "Church in London, meeting at a place called Coal Harbour, Mr. John Spilsbury being pastor."[110] Later the Watford congregation became a branch of the church at Horsly Down.[111] At one time the Watford congregation was partly in membership at Horsly Down and partly in membership at Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead. During this period both groups met together for preaching and prayer, but apparently each had the Lord's Supper only alternate weeks when their own pastor, respectiveiy, administered it.[112] This latter situation must be regarded as unusual; but the fact that the Watford Baptists were only one congregation out of a number constituting one church was not at all unusual. In fact, the General Assembly encouraged the grouping of congregations for "church" purposes.[113] In Wales, the earliest Baptist churches formed one group Church centred at Ilston.

Inter-communion by Particular and General Baptists was dependent on how far the specific Particular and General Baptist churches concerned regarded the doctrine of Particular and General Redemption, respectively, as a *sine qua non* to a true church. For the Nantwich General Baptist church was able to enjoy intercommunion with the Barbican church, London,[114] but not with the Wrexham church,[115] because the former regarded the doctrine of Particular Redemption as an open question,[116] while the Wrexham church regarded General Redemption as a heresy.[117] The Barbican church later merged with the Turners Hall General Baptist church;[118]; but such a merger was rare if not unique.

"Strict" Baptists, i.e. with "Closed" communion, did not allow Independents the right of "transient" communion, as we have seen. But the churches with "Closed" membership but "Open" communion allowed Independents to "transient" communion upon the production of a "Testimonial." If an erstwhile Independent wanted to become a member of such a church he could not be accepted on a letter any more than at a "Strict" Baptist church, but had to submit to "Believers Baptism." In churches with

"Mixt" membership, Baptists and Independents were on an equal footing as regards both "transient" communion and permanent membership.

There was no inter-communion with either the Presbyterian or the Established Church.

Exclusion: The manner of exclusion from the Lord's Table followed largely the same pattern as in the General Baptist churches. It was on the authority of the whole congregation.[119] Final exclusion followed the rejection of the second admonition of the church.[120] All the members had mutual responsibility for the Christian life of each and all of the fellowship.[121]

However, some, such as Keach,[122] recognized three categories of exclusion from the Table, as follows:

1. Suspension is to be when a member falls under Sin, and the Church wants time fully to consider the matter, and so can't withdraw from him, or cast him out.
2. Withdrawal, carried out by some churches, e.g., Bromsgrove,[123] and Tottlebank,[124] was a provisional refusal of Table fellowship with a view to inducing repentance in the offended, after the verbal admonitory procedure had failed. It was for "Backsliders," such as were irregular in attendance, or negligent in instructing children in the faith, or failing to help church maintenance financially.[125] "This sort are still to be owned as Members, tho' disorderly ones: the church must note him so as not to have Communion or Company with him in that sense."[126]
3. Cutting off, And delivering to Satan, such as are obstinate, Hereticks or guilty of those sins that are scarce nam'd among the Gentiles."[127]

If a person was wrongly withdrawn from or excommunicated he or she should apply to another church for membership. If that church was satisfied as to the aggrieved brother's/sister's cause, it should make every effort to have him restored, or, failing that, receive him into its own fellowship.[128] As among the General Baptist churches, an excommunicate or suspended person would be received back into communicant fellowship upon convincing repentance[129]; we have instances of this being done.[130]

The offences, which, not repented of, would lead to excommunication, were much the same as in General Baptist churches. Moral offences loomed large. Examples include misdemeanors with the other sex,[131] slander,[132] breach of promise,[133] debt,[134] drunkenness and irresponsible behaviour,[135] fraud,[136] neglect of family prayers.[137]

An unrepented breach of church discipline likewise would bring excommunication. In Particular, as in General Baptist churches, we find such offences as: leaving off church attendance,[138] at the Lord's Supper in particular, disputing "Closed" communion polity,[139] disputing the necessity of laying on of hands upon the newly baptized in a church where this practice was adhered to,[140]

attendance at a parish church,[141] marriage with unbelievers,[142] preaching without due authority,[143] refusing to contribute to the churches expenses in accordance with the prescribed scale,[144] and deceiving the church officers.[145]

Heresy stubbornly maintained was also a cause of persons being excommunicated.[146] Some thought that this should be punished by the magistrates also.[147] John Miles, the "father" of many churches in S. Wales and in America, summarised those who were hereticks to Baptists as: Unitarians, believers in transubstantiation, those who denied the Ascension, the Second Coming or the Divine Inspiration of the Scriptures.[148] When in the New World, Miles forbad the quarrelsome, dissolute and heretical to enter the territory where he was domiciled.[149] A treasurer of the first General Assembly of the Particular Baptists was excommunicated for heresy.[150] Another man was excommunicated for maintaining that the doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ was "as bad as the doctrine of transubstantiation."[151]

E. P. WINTER

NOTES

[1] Payne, E. A.: *op. cit.*, p. 54 (1944 Ed.).
[2] Smyth, J.: (Longer) Confession of Faith, §72. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §31.
[3] Mosheim, J. L. von: *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History Ancient and Modern*, pp. 696f. Cf. e.g. Denne, J.: *Truth Outweighing Error, passim.*
[4] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 205f. Taylor, A.: *History of the General Baptists*, I, pp. 330f.
[5] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes*, I, p. 6.
[6] Baptist Historical Society *Transactions*, III, p. 248.
[7] Glasshouse Yard Church Minute Book.
[8] Slapton Church Book, Resolutions 8 and 9.
[9] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 60f., 63, 69, 205f.
[10] Taylor, A.: *op. cit.*, supra, I, p. 428. Payne, E. A.: *op. cit.*, supra, p. 49.
[11] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book*, pp. 5, 13.
[12] Mosheim, J. L. von: *op. cit., loc. cit.* Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History*, II, p. 234.
[13] Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus*, Book III, Ch. 5, §IV, p. 34.
[14] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book*, p. 5.
[15] *op. cit.*, pp. 33f.
[16] *op. cit.*, p. 37.
[17] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records*, pp. 155f.
[18] *op. cit.*, pp. 166f.
[19] Blackwood, C.: *Tractatus de Clavibus Ecclesiae*, p. 85.
[20] Smyth, J.: *Works*, I, p. 266, II, p. 412-4, 430f. Taylor, A., *History of the General Baptists*, I, pp. 440ff. Blackwood, O.: *op. cit.*, p. 95.
[21] Taylor, *ibid.*
[22] 1651 Confession of Faith (of 30 congregations of Lincolnshire and Leicestershire), §72.
[23] §39.
[24] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[25] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 102f.
[26] *ibid.*
[27] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit., passim.* Evans, B.: *Early English Baptists,* II, pp. 36ff.
[28] Smyth, J.: *Works,* I, p. 262. II, p. 414. 1610 (Latin) Confession of Faith, §17. Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* p. 7. Grantham, Th.: *Christianismus Primitivus,* Book II, Part II, Chap. 4, §IV, p. 70. 1678 Confession of Faith, §34.
[29] Evans, B.: *loc. cit., supra.* Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book,* p. 27. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* p. 12.
[30] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 94.
[31] Helwys, Th.: *Declaration of Faith,* pp. 17f. Cf. Smyth J.: *Works,* I, p. 264. Cf. Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* p. 7.
[32] Grantham, Th.: *loc. cit.*, p. 153.
[33] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[34] Grantham, Th.: *loc. cit.* Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[35] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 11f., 44.
[36] *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[37] Unitarian Historical Society *Transactions,* V, Part I, p. 75.
[38] Underhill, E. B. *Warboys Records,* pp. 277ff.
[39] Whitley, W. T.: *History of the British Baptists,* p. 169.
[40] Burgess, W. H.: *John Smith,* p. 336. Underwood, A. C.: *History of English Baptists,* p. 51.
[41] Taylor, A.: *History of the General Baptists,* I, p. 400. Underwood, A. C.: *History of the English Baptists,* p. 124. Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* p. 169.
[42] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* I, pp. 23f.
[43] *ibid.*
[44] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Ford-Cuddington Church Book,* p. 27.
[45] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Fenstanton Records,* pp. 173f.
[46] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.*, pp. 12, 44.
[47] Evans, B.: *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 27.
[48] Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, pp. 234-6. *Baptist Quarterly,* XV, pp. 73f.
[49] Smyth, J.: (Latin) Confession of Faith, §§17f. (Longer) Confession of Faith, §80. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §34. Helwys, Th.: *Declaration of Faith,* §§17f.
[50] *ibid.* Smyth, J.: *Works,* I, p. 266. Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, pp. 90, 96.
[51] *ibid.*
[52] Whitley, W. T. (Ed.): *Assembly Minutes,* pp. 7f.
[53] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 88.
[54] *ibid.*
[55] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, pp. 85-88. Cf. Smyth, J.: *Works,* II, pp. 412-4.
[56] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 89.
[57] Smyth, J.: (Longer) Confession of Faith, §80. (De Ries) Confession of Faith, §§33f. 1678 Confession of Faith, 34. Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[58] Blackwood, C.: *loc. cit.*
[59] Blackwood, C.: *op. cit.*, p. 90.
[60] *ibid.*
[61] 1678 Confession of Faith, §34.
[62] Gould, G.: *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich,* pp. 123, 317. Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 369.
[63] Richards, Th.: *History of the Puritan Movement in Wales,* 1639-1653, pp. 204f. Thomas, J.: *History of the Baptist Association in Wales,* pp. 5f.

[64] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 41.
[65] Gould, G.: *op. cit.,* pp. 128-139.
[66] McGlothlin, W.: *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* p. 287.
[67] 1689 Assembly, p. 10, §2. Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* p. 176.
[68] Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* pp. 176f.
[69] Cf. Ross, J. M.: *Baptist Quarterly,* XV, p. 105, et v.i., n.3.
[70] Keach, B.: *Tropologia,* p. 622. Kiffin, W.: *Right to Church-Communion, passim.* Cocks (alias Cox), B.: *An Appendix,* §XX.
[71] Underhill, E. B.: *Baptist Confessions of Faith,* p. 268.
[72] Letter from L. A. Fereday, T. D., dated 20.11.52.
[73] Gould, G.: *op. cit.,* p. 128, *et passim.*
[74] *ibid.*
[75] Whitley, W. T.: *loc. cit.,* supra.
[76] Hobson, J. H.: *Baptist Quarterly,* IV, p. 100.
[77] Bunyan, J.: *Works* (Offor Edition), II, pp. 650ff. Cf. A Confession of My Faith and Reason of My Practice, *passim.* Differences in Judgment about Water Baptism no Bar to Communion, *passim.* Peacable Principles and True, *passim.*
[78] Armitage, T.: *History of Baptists,* pp. 522f.
[79] Tombes, J.: *Exercitation,* p. 22. Baillie, R.: *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time,* pp. 79-82.
[80] Bunyan, J.: *Works,* II, pp. 648fff.
[81] *ibid.*
[82] *op. cit.,* p. 656.
[83] Underwood, A. C.: *op. cit.,* p. 103.
[84] Jones, E. K.: *Baptist Quarterly,* XII, pp. 199f. Thomas, J.: *Materials for a History of the Baptist churches in the Principality of Wales from about the year* 1630 *to* 1782, *passim.*
[85] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* pp. 123, 190.
[86] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz,* §37; *Baptist Quarterly,* II, p. 66.
[87] Underwood, A. C.: *op. cit.,* p. 69. Baillie, R.: *A Dissuasive from the Errors of the Time . . . Vindicated,* pp. 79-82.
[88] Burrage, C.: *The Church Covenant Idea,* pp. 115-117.
[89] Spilsbury, J.: *Treatise,* title page.
[90] Webbar, J.: *Gosport Articles of Faith.*
[91] Keach, B.: *Horsly Down Articles of Faith. Horsly Down Covenant.*
[92] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* pp. 346-8.
[93] Quoted verbatim in Armitage, Th.: *History of Baptists,* p. 521.
[94] Keach, B.: *Horsly Down Articles of Faith,* §XXIII.
[95] Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* IV, p. 257. Contrast the Cilgwyn church, which would not admit a James Morgan to communion because when earlier he had been admitted to an English church hands had not been laid on him at Baptism (Thomas, J.: *History of the Baptist Churches in Wales,* p. 280).
[96] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records* pp. 427, 452f.
[97] *ibid.* Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* pp. 6f., 17f.
[98] Keach, B.: *ibid.*
[99] Wilson, W.: *History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches of London,* III, p. 230.
[100] Church Book. Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* I, p. 104.
[101] Whitley, W. T.: *Baptists of North-West England,* p. 77.
[102] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 377.
[103] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* pp. 309, 332, 346-8.
[104] Harrison, G. B. (Ed.): *The Church Book of Bunyan Meeting* 1650-1821, *passim.* Cf. Armitage, T.: *History of Baptists,* pp. 524f. Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 39.

[105] Thomas, J.: *Materials for a History of the Baptist churches in the Principality of Wales from about the year* 1630 *to* 1782, p. 76.

[106] Collier, Th.: *Body of Divinity,* pp. 495f.

[107] Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz;* Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* III, pp. 172f.

[108] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* supra, pp. 17f.

[109] This might be celebrated at different congregations, but it would be presided over by the same pastor(s), who would administer the Supper at different congregations week by week.

[110] Church Book. Stuart, J.: *Beechen Grove Baptist Church, Watford,* p. 9.

[111] *op. cit.,* pp. 10f.

[112] *ibid.*

[113] 1689 Assembly, p. 13.

[114] Whitley, W. T.: *History of British Baptists,* pp. 167f.

[115] Morgan, D. I.: *Quarterly Witness* (of Crewe and District Association of Baptist Churches), October, 1949.

[116] Whitley, W. T.: *op. cit.,* p. 176.

[117] Morgan, D. I.: *loc. cit.*

[118] Church Book. Baptist Historical Society *Transactions,* IV, p. 47.

[119] 1644 Confession of Faith, §XLII. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* pp. 106, 395f., 407. Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 20. Mitchell, W.: *Jachin and Boaz;* Baptist Historical Society, *Transactions,* III, p. 170.

[120] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* pp. 190, 363-7. Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* pp. 24-36. Mitchell, W.: *op. cit.,* §§ 23f.

[121] Webbar, J.: *Gosport Articles of Faith,* §2. Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 7.

[122] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* pp. 21fff. Cf. Horsly Down Covenant, p. 9.

[123] Church Book, p. 15.

[124] Church Book; quoted verbatim, by the Rev. G. D. Savage in letter dated 21.11.52.

[125] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[126] *ibid.*

[127] Keach, B.: Horsly Down Covenant, p. 10. Cf. *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 33.

[128] 1691 Assembly, pp. 11f.

[129] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 36.

[130] Crosby, Th.: *Baptist History,* III, pp. 165-181. Bromsgrove Church Book. Discipline Book of the Hanserd Knollys-Steed Church; printed in *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 124f., 181. *Transactions* of the Baptist Historical Society, I, p. 104.

[131] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 121. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 86.

[132] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 181f.

[133] Goadby, J. J.: *Bye-Paths in Baptist History,* p. 265. Jackman, D.: *Baptists in the West Country,* p. 8.

[134] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 125f. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* p. 413.

[135] *Kensworth Pocket Book;* printed in Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 177; Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 367; and Goadby, J. J.: *op. cit.,* pp. 273f. Bromsgrove Church Book. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *op. cit.,* p. 377.

[136] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 181f.

[137] Keach, B.: *op. cit.,* p. 24.

[138] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 125. Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Broadmead Records,* p. 86.

[139] *Baptist Quarterly,* XIII, p. 150.

[140] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* p. 295.

[141] *Kensworth Pocket Book;* and printed in Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* II, p. 177; Cramp, J. M.: *Baptist History,* p. 367; and Ivimey, J.: *Baptist History,* I, p. 495. Cf. West Midland Association Meeting 1656.
[142] *ibid.* Alcester church covenant.
[143] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 125.
[144] Underhill, E. B. (Ed.): *Hexham Records,* p. 297.
[145] *Baptist Quarterly,* I, pp. 116f., 124f.
[146] Keach, B.: *The Glory of a True Church,* p. 33.
[147] *ibid.,* p. 34.
[148] *Baptist Quarterly,* XIII, p. 152.
[149] *ibid.*
[150] Goadby, J. J.: *Bye-Paths in Baptist History,* p. 248.
[151] Discipline Book of the Hanserd Knollys-Steed church; printed in *Baptist Quarterly,* I, p. 123.

IMPORTANT

The Treasurer would be glad if subscribers who have not yet paid their current subscription would do so immediately.