



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

Votre lieu Votre référence

Votre lieu Votre référence

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

A Historical and Comparative Study of the  
First and Second London Baptist Confessions  
of Faith with reference to the Westminster  
and Savoy Confessions

by

Barry Howson  
Religious Studies Department  
McGill University, Montreal  
January, 1996

A thesis submitted to the Faculty  
of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of Master of Arts

(c)  
Barry Howson  
1996



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-12037-6

Canada

## ABSTRACT

The Particular Baptists of England emerged in the middle of the seventeenth century around the time of the Revolution. The first half of this thesis looks at the history of the first two London Particular Baptist Confessions of Faith written in 1644 and 1689. It examines the history behind the making of both Confessions as well as the sources from which they drew their material. The second half of the thesis is a comparison study. Firstly, the two Baptist Confessions are compared with each other in the areas of the atonement, baptism, the Church, and religious liberty, to see if Particular Baptist beliefs had changed. Secondly, the 1689 Baptist Confession is compared with the two leading English Calvinistic Confessions of the seventeenth century, the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* and the Congregationalist *Savoy Declaration*, in order to see their similarities and differences in the same four areas.

Les Particular Baptists d'Angleterre sont apparus vers le milieu du dix-septième siècle au temps de la Révolution. La première partie de cette thèse concerne l'histoire des deux premières Confessions de Foi des Particular Baptists de Londres, écrites en 1644 et 1689. Elle examine l'histoire derrière la rédaction des deux Confessions ainsi que les sources desquelles ils ont puisé leur matériel. La deuxième partie de la thèse est une comparaison. Premièrement, les deux Confessions Baptistes sont comparées entre elles dans les domaines de l'expiation, le baptême, l'Eglise, et la liberté religieuse, afin de découvrir si les croyances des Particular Baptists avaient changé. Deuxièmement, la Confession Baptiste de 1689 est comparée au deux principales Confessions Calvinistes Anglaises du dix-septième siècle, la *Westminster Confession* des Presbytériens et la *Savoy Declaration* des Congrégationalistes, afin de voir leurs similarités et leurs différences dans les quatre domaines précités.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people I would like to acknowledge for their help on this project. Firstly, I am grateful to the people of Dalesville Baptist Church who allowed me the time to pursue my Master's degree while I was their pastor. I want to thank Noreen Bider for her encouragement to pursue graduate studies at McGill and for the same during those studies. I thank also the Religious Studies librarians, Jennifer Wheeler, Norma Johnson and Mary Klempa, for their kind help in finding material for me through inter-library loan. And I am grateful to Roy and Marion Vanderlip who read over the thesis at various times, making grammatical corrections. I am also grateful to my friend Dr Michael Haykin who has been a great help and support through this project, reading over and correcting the manuscript. And I want to thank my supervisor, Dr Edward Furcha, for his guidance and help, keeping me on the right path in this thesis. Finally, I am so grateful to God for my family. My children, Natalie and Shawna, are a continuous encouragement to me. And my wife Sharon has always been my companion, supporting me in the pastorate and in my studies. This thesis is as much hers as it is mine.

SOLI DEO GLORIA

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1. History of the First London Baptist Confession of Faith 1644.....	9
A. History of Particular Baptists Beginnings in England.....	9
B. History of the 1644 Confession.....	13
C. Sources of the 1644 Confession.....	18
Chapter 2. History of the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith 1689.....	30
A. History of the Particular Baptists from 1640-1689.....	30
B. History of the 1689 Particular Baptist Confession of Faith....	38
Chapter 3. Comparison of the Two Particular Baptist Confessions.....	65
Atonement.....	68
Baptism.....	71
Church.....	73
Religious Liberty.....	77
Chapter 4. Comparison of the Second London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689 with the Westminster and Savoy Confessions.....	87
Atonement.....	93
Baptism.....	100
Church.....	107
Religious Liberty.....	115
Conclusion.....	131
Appendix A: Table Comparison of the Westminster, Savoy and Second London Baptist Confessions on the Sacraments.....	134
Appendix B: Table Comparison of the Westminster, Savoy, and Second London Baptist Confessions on Baptism.....	136
Appendix C: Table Comparison of the Westminster, Savoy and Second London Baptist Confessions on the Church.....	138
Appendix D: Table Comparison of the Westminster, Savoy and Second London Baptist Confessions on Christian Liberty & the Civil Magistrate...	146
Appendix E: Savoy's Platform of Church Polity .....	152
Bibliography.....	157

## INTRODUCTION

Confessions of faith among Baptists have not been as popular as they have been with some other denominations. Nevertheless, they have played an important role in Baptist history.<sup>1</sup> In this thesis we will look at two of the first and most important Baptist confessions that played a foundational role in the early history of English Particular Baptists. They are the *First London Confession of Faith of 1644* and the *Second London Confession of Faith of 1689*. We will, firstly, study their respective histories, and then compare them with each other to see their differences and similarities. Thirdly, we will compare the 1689 *Confession*, the most influential of all Baptist Confessions, with the two most important confessions of its time, the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* and Congregationalist *Savoy Declaration*. Particular attention will be given to their doctrines of the atonement, baptism, the church, and religious liberty.

In order to place the Particular Baptists and their confessions in context, we need to look briefly at the historical beginnings of Baptists in England.

In this century there has been an ongoing debate concerning the roots of English Baptist history. Scholars differ as to whether Puritanism, Separatism, Anabaptism or a combination

of these is the source of Baptist beginnings. The prime area of debate concerns the place of Anabaptism in this history. For example, Winthrop Hudson<sup>7</sup>, Hugh Wamble<sup>8</sup> and Lonnie Kliever<sup>4</sup> do not believe there was Anabaptist influence in English Baptist beginnings. On the other hand, Calvin Pater<sup>5</sup>, Glen Stassen<sup>6</sup> and Ernest Payne<sup>7</sup> contend otherwise.<sup>8</sup>

It is difficult to know which is correct on the basis of the evidence. Calvin Pater writes,

To what extent this Separatist tradition had been moulded not only by the inner logic of disestablished Calvinism but also by the presence of Dutch Baptists and Calvinists on English soil will probably remain a question of debate, in view of the lacunae that remain.<sup>9</sup>

The roots of English Baptist history remain somewhat unanswered.

We do know, however, a significant amount about Baptist beginnings despite our lack of knowledge concerning clear roots. We know that two distinct groups of Baptists emerged in the first half of the seventeenth century on English soil. The first group came to be known as General Baptists. They had their formation in 1609 under the leadership of John Smyth and Thomas Helwys. The second group called the Particular Baptists, emerged a generation later in the 1630's under the leadership of John Spilsbury and later William Kiffin.<sup>10</sup>

It appears from the existing evidence that these two groups had distinct and separate beginnings in England. Before we look at each group in more detail, let us briefly trace each one's roots from the beginning of the English Reformation.

The Reformation in England began in the first half of the



sixteenth century and manifested itself in various ways. It began politically with Henry VIII and religiously with Edward VI.<sup>11</sup>

The movement that came to be known as Puritanism probably began during the reign of Mary(1553-58).<sup>12</sup> When Elizabeth ascended to the throne in 1558 she followed the course of the 'via media' regarding the Reformation. This was unsatisfactory to the Puritans who desired a reformation like that of the Swiss churches.

Some unsatisfied Puritans felt it was necessary to separate themselves from the Church of England and to practice what they believed to be Biblical Christianity. Some of these separatists hoped that their separation would be temporary until the state church reformed; others separated because they believed "the church ought to be free from government connection."<sup>13</sup> It was primarily from this latter group that the Baptists emerged.

In the 1560's and 1570's separatist congregations existed in London. But it was not until Robert Browne's publication of *A Treatise of reformation without tarrying for anie* in 1582 that Separatism became popular. He formed a church in Norwich in 1581 and two followers, Henry Barrow and John Greenwood carried on his separatism in London. They were imprisoned in 1588 and executed in 1593.

The Barrow-Greenwood congregation became a church in 1592 under the leadership of Francis Johnson. After the Barrow/Greenwood executions and the Conventicle Act of 1593 part of the church left for Amsterdam to be free of persecution.

Johnson was imprisoned prior to this, and Henry Ainsworth eventually became the teacher of this church. The church put out an important confession called the *True Confession* in 1596 defining its beliefs. This church later split over the issue of church government. Johnson, having joined the group in Amsterdam after his release from prison, promoted a presbyterial form of church government; Ainsworth, on the other hand, held to a congregational form.

In 1608 John Robinson led his church from Scrooby Manor, England, to Amsterdam, and shortly afterward to Leyden. It was some of these church members who sailed on the Mayflower in 1620 to New England.<sup>14</sup>

The first of the English Baptists was John Smyth. He was born in the east of England, and studied theology at Cambridge, tutored by the would-be separatist, Francis Johnson. Shortly after his ordination and brief lectureship at Lincoln Cathedral(1600) he was dismissed for "personal preaching"(1602). He went on to pastor a church in Gainsborough, and later removed this church to Amsterdam in 1607. A number of the members of this church lodged in the large bakehouse of a leading Amsterdam Mennonite, Jan Munter.<sup>15</sup> Most likely through the influence of these Waterlander Mennonites, Smyth came to the conviction that only believers, not infants, should be baptized. Smyth at this time did not agree with a number of Mennonite beliefs, and so kept his congregation separate from the Waterlanders.<sup>16</sup> Consequently, he was not baptized by them but instead baptized

himself. Then he baptized Thomas Helwys and about forty others. Their mode of baptism was pouring, not immersion.

Not long after this Smyth rejected his self-baptism and encouraged the church to join the Mennonites. A number of the members refused to follow Smyth. With Helwys as their leader they returned in 1611 to London where they established a church.<sup>17</sup> This was the first General Baptist Church on English soil. By 1624 there were five General Baptist Churches in England. They were called "General" Baptist churches because of their belief in the general atonement of Christ as opposed to the Calvinistic limited atonement.<sup>18</sup>

Another significant person in early Baptist history is Henry Jacob. He was a semi-separatist who never fully embraced separatist ideals. While living in Holland with other Separatists in the early years of the sixteenth century he gathered a church near Leyden in Middleburg. In 1616 he went back to England and formed a church which came to be known as the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church.<sup>19</sup> This was the mother church from which the first Particular Baptist Churches sprang.<sup>20</sup> We will learn more about Jacob and the JLJ church in the next chapter.

From this brief look at the beginnings of English Baptist history it is clear that both groups of Baptists have Separatist and Puritan roots. If this is so, then why and how did they come to believe in the Baptist distinctives of believer's baptism, religious liberty, separation of church and state? Were these distinctives born out of a Puritan and/or Separatist tradition?

Or were there other traditions, like that of the Anabaptists, that influenced the early Baptists in these areas? The answers must be sought in the specific histories of these two Baptist groups. This thesis will seek to answer those questions concerning the later group of Baptists called Particular Baptists. In subsequent chapters we will examine the history and confessions of this branch of English Baptists in order to answer these questions.

#### NOTES

1. Baptist Confessions have been little more than "mere declarations of faith prevailing at the time(of writing) in the denomination"(Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom Vol.1*(Grand Rapids:Baker Book House, 1990), p.852). For more on Baptist Confessions see Roger Hayden, "The Particular Baptist Confession of 1689 and Baptists Today," *The Baptist Quarterly* 32(1987,88):403-417, and William L. Lumpkin, "The Nature and Authority of Baptist Confessions of Faith," *Review and Expositor* 76(1979):17-28. Confessions of faith for Baptist churches, historically, have been a standard part of associational fellowship. A group of like-minded churches professing believer's baptism would form an association based on a confession of faith to which they all ascribed. If a church desired to associate with other Baptist churches already associated then it had to accept the association's confession. If it could not agree to the confession then it was free to exist and hold its own convictions. Baptist associations have always organized themselves in this way. The basis for this use of confessions lies in Baptist ecclesiology where each local congregation is autonomous and free to believe and practice its belief without interference from ecclesiastical or civil authorities. Dr. Joseph Angus, a nineteenth-century English Baptist, writes:

The Baptist creeds were prepared in the first instance for apologetic and defensive purposes. They merely describe the doctrines held by the bodies from which they emanated. They were never imposed on ministers and members of the churches of either section of the Baptists. Even when adopted, as they sometimes were, by any church, as an expression of its sentiments, all sister churches were left free, and in the particular church a considerable latitude of judgment was allowed in interpreting them. They have never been accepted

as tests and merely represent in a general way the sentiment of the body (Schaff, p.852).

The American Baptist Francis Wayland writes:

No church has any power over any other church. No minister has any authority in any church except that which has called him to be its pastor. Every church, therefore, when it expresses its own belief, expresses the belief of no other than its own members. If several churches understand the Scriptures in the same way, and all unite in the same confession, then this expresses the opinions and belief of those who profess it. It, however, expresses their belief because all of them, from the study of the Scriptures, understand them in the same manner, and not because any tribunal has imposed such interpretations upon them (Schaff, p.853).

2. Glen H. Stassen, "Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of The Particular Baptists," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36(1962):324.
3. Hugh Wamble, "Inter-relations of Seventeenth Century English Baptists," *Review and Expositor* 54(1957):407-425.
4. Lonnie D. Kliever, "General Baptist Origins: The Question of Anabaptist Influence," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36(1962):291-321.
5. Calvin Pater, *Karlstadt as the Father of the Baptist Movements: The Emergence of Lay Protestantism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), pp.253-278.
6. Stassen, pp.322-348.
7. Ernest A. Payne, "Contacts Between Mennonites and Baptists," *Foundations* 4(1961):39-55. Payne, "Who were the Baptists?" *The Baptist Quarterly* 26(1956):339-342.
8. H. Leon McBeth, *The Baptist Heritage* (Nashville:Broadman Press, 1987), p.49-63. This is an overview of the sources of Baptist beginnings and life.
9. Pater, p.257. There is no doubt that both the General and Particular Baptists were in contact with Anabaptists. It may be assumed, therefore, that they were both influenced by them but the question is to what extent?
10. William Kiffin was an important leader among the Particular Baptists but it is uncertain as to when he came to Baptist convictions. It was certainly by 1644. See B.R. White, "How did William Kiffin join the Baptists," *The Baptist Quarterly* 23(1970):201-207. For a different scenario see Murray Tolmie, *The Triumph of the Saints*. (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp.192-195.

11. There are two schools of thought concerning the English Reformation. There is the traditional historiography of A.G. Dickens which holds that the Reformation in England essentially took place between 1525 and 1570. There is also the revisionist school of Christopher Haigh which sees the Reformation taking a much longer time going into the seventeenth century. For more on the historiography of the English Reformation and this recent debate see Rosemary O'Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1986). See also A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (New York: Schocken Books, 1964) and Christopher Haigh, *The English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
12. Puritanism is considered by most scholars to have begun in the 1550's. Some believe Puritanism began with Bishop John Hooper. Puritanism was surely born out of the Frankfurt controversy. See C.H. George, "Puritanism as History and Historiography," *Past and Present* 41(1968):77-104; and William M. Lamont, "Puritanism as History and Historiography: Some Further Thoughts," *Past and Present* 44(1969):133-146. See also Ronald J. Vander Molen, "Anglican against Puritan: Ideological Origins during the Marian Exile," *Church History* 42(1973):45-57, and W.M.S. West, "John Hooper and the Origins of Puritanism," *The Baptist Quarterly* 15(1953-54):346-368 and 16(1955-1956):22-46, 67-88.
13. McBeth, p.25.
14. William Bradford, *The History of Plymouth Colony - A Modern English Version with an Introduction by George F. Willison* (Roslyn, N.Y.: Walter J. Black, Inc., 1948), pp.xiv-xix, 3-75.
15. Payne, p.42.
16. Payne, p.44. He gives some reasons why they did not.
17. The group that joined with the Mennonites under Smyth were accepted as members in 1615. Smyth himself, however, died in 1612 before this took place.
18. For a detailed history of the General Baptists in their first forty years, see Murray Tolmie, "General and Particular Baptists in the Puritan Revolution," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1960), pp.1-102.
19. It became known as the JLJ church.
20. For the history of Henry Jacob and the JLJ church see Tolmie, *Triumph...*, pp.7-27.

## CHAPTER ONE

### HISTORY OF THE FIRST LONDON BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH 1644

#### A. History of Particular Baptist Beginnings In England

There is an implicit suggestion in the introductory chapter of this thesis that the Particular Baptist churches had a distinct origin from that of the General Baptists. The historical evidence strongly supports the view that they were not an offshoot of this latter group of English Baptists who trace their beginnings to John Smyth.

The Particular Baptist churches trace their roots to Henry Jacob who was a Calvinist and a Puritan but not a separatist of the ilk of John Smyth. He is considered a 'moderate separatist' or semi-separatist.' He believed that the Church of England was a true church, and he would not call it a false one as the Separatists did.'

While calling for reforms in England he was put in prison; after his release he went into exile in Holland in 1605. He pastored an independent church near Leyden and returned to England in 1616 to start a church in Southwark, London.<sup>1</sup> This church became known as the JIJ church (the initials standing for the first letter of the last name of the first three pastors, himself, John Iathrop and Henry Jessey'). In 1622 he left London for Virginia where he died in 1624. This church was unique in that it practiced what came to be called 'open or mixed communion'.

In the 1630's baptism became an important topic of

discussion in the church. Historians are unsure what precisely the discussion was about. The records state that some of the members in 1630 were "grieved against one that had his child then baptized in ye Common Assemblies, & desireing and urging a Renouncing of them."<sup>5</sup> This group under the leadership of Mr. Dupper took issue with the JLJ church's semi-separatist position, and broke away from it forming a new separatist church.<sup>6</sup> In 1633 another group of seventeen or eighteen people<sup>7</sup> under Samuel Eaton "desired dismission that they might become an Entire Church, & further ye Comunion of those Churches in Order amongst themselves, wch at last was granted to them."<sup>8</sup> The minutes of this church also tell us this: "Mr. Eaton<sup>9</sup> with Some others receiving a furthur Baptism."<sup>10</sup>

This is where the confusion lies. Why did these two groups secede? Was it because some members became more separatist, believing the Church of England to be a false church, and therefore, its baptism null and void? Was this "further baptism" therefore a baptizing of its members in a 'true church'? Or was this "further baptism" a baptizing of those only who confess faith, in other words 'believer's baptism'?<sup>11</sup>

An interesting aside to this, which needs further study, is the influence of John Murton's son who was a part of the JLJ church and one of those who separated with Mr. Dupper in 1630. John Murton was the pastor of the first General Baptist Church after Thomas Helwys died in 1616.<sup>12</sup> Did his son influence any of these people and groups of the JLJ church toward believer's



baptism? Is there a connection between the General and Particular Baptists after all?

After the 1633 departure of eighteen members of the JLJ church, six more left over the issue of baptism. This group joined a church whose leader was John Spilsbury.<sup>13</sup> This church could be Samuel Eaton's church which was now led by Spilsbury because of Eaton's imprisonment.<sup>14</sup> Tolmie does not agree with this conjecture.<sup>15</sup> He believes the Spilsbury church came out of the Dupper group that left the JLJ church in 1630.<sup>16</sup> Regardless of the details it is clear that the Spilsbury church at this time believed that baptism should be administered only to those who were able to profess their own faith.<sup>17</sup>

The Spilsbury church is definitely the first Particular Baptist Church in England. By 1644 there were seven such churches.

Up until this time there is no clear evidence that the mode of baptism was anything other than pouring or effusion. In "the mid 1630's the records show several examples of individuals who advocated and/or practiced immersion, including Marke Luker of the Eaton church."<sup>18</sup> By 1642, however, the mode of baptism for Particular Baptists had become immersion.

The "Kiffin Manuscript" gives details of the events surrounding their move to immersion as the mode of baptism.<sup>19</sup> By 1640 the JLJ church split: one group remained with Henry Jessey and the other group followed Praise-God Barebone. Sometime after this Henry Jessey and Richard Blunt<sup>20</sup> discussed the subject of

the mode of baptism, and in light of Colossians 2:12 and Romans 6:4 they concluded that baptism "ought to be by dipping ye Body into ye Water, resembling Burial & riseing again."<sup>21</sup> They believed that baptism was to be by immersion. They heard that a group of Anabaptists in the Netherlands practised immersion, so they sent Dutch-speaking Blunt to Holland to receive advice from them on this subject.<sup>22</sup> This Anabaptist group was called the Rhynsburgers or Collegiants, a liberal Mennonite group somewhat like the Schwenckfelders.<sup>23</sup>

When Blunt returned in 1641 the records tell us:

They proceed on therein,viz, Those Persons yt were persuaded Baptism should be by dipping ye Body had mett in two Companies, & did intend so to meet after this, all these agreed to proceed alike togeather. And then Manifesting (not by any formal Words a Covenant) wch word was scrupled by some of them, but by mutual desires & agreement each Testified.:

Those two Companyes did set apart one to Baptize the rest; So it was solemnly performed by them.

Mr Blunt Baptized Mr Blacklock yt was a Teacher amongst them, & Mr Blunt being Baptized, he and Mr Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends that ware so minded, & many being added to them they increased much.<sup>24</sup>

It is uncertain whether Mr. Blunt was baptized in Holland or whether he was baptized by Mr. Blacklock after he had baptized Mr. Blacklock. Burrage gives some strong original evidence for the latter position.<sup>25</sup> There was some concern about historic succession of baptism, and so some Particular Baptists felt Blunt needed to be baptized by someone who was already baptized. Spilsbury, however, did not agree with this, believing there was no need for succession; he said: "Where there is a beginning, some one must be first."<sup>26</sup>

Whether baptism by immersion for Baptists began with Mr. Blunt being baptised by the Collegiants in Holland, or with Mr. Blacklock by an unbaptised Mr. Blunt in England, immersion became the mode of baptism for Particular Baptists by 1642.<sup>27</sup>

It should be noted that neither the General Baptists nor the Particular Baptists used the name 'Baptist' until the mid-1650's. They used the names, "Brethren", "Baptized Churches" or "Churches of the Baptized Way".<sup>28</sup>

#### **B. History of the 1644 Confession**

Due to the political climate of the 1640's dissenters had greater freedom than at any time before in English history. In just six years there were seven Particular Baptists Churches in London. Unfortunately, accompanying their growth, there were numerous accusations levelled against them. They were accused of being Anabaptists, and so anarchists and Pelagians.

The *Confession* of 1644 has been considered to be a response to a scurrilous pamphlet *A Short History of the Anabaptists of High and Low Germany*(1642).<sup>29</sup> However, two other publications could have encouraged its production. The titles of these are *A Warning for England especially for London*(1642) and *A Confutation of the Anabaptists and of all others who affect not Civil Government*.

With these publications it became important for the Particular Baptists to distinguish themselves from the

Anabaptists. They also at this time wanted to show their fellow Calvinists that they were a distinct group from the General Baptists who were Arminian in theology. For these reasons the Particular Baptists wrote their confession. McGlothlin writes:

In order to distinguish themselves from both the Anabaptists and the General Baptists, refute the slanders and remove the misunderstandings of which they were the innocent victims, they determined to draw up and publish a statement of their views.<sup>30</sup>

This purpose for the confession is quite clearly stated in the Title and Preface to the 1644 edition of the *Confession* which states:

The Confession of Faith, of those Churches which are commonly (though falsly) called ANABAPTISTS....Wee question not but that it will seeme strange to many men, that such as wee are frequently termed to be, lying under that calumny and black brand of Heretickes, and sowers of division as wee doo, should presume to appear so publickly as now wee have done:...It is no strange thing to any observing man, what sad charges are laid, not onely by the world, that know not God, but also by those that thinke themselves much wronged, if they be not looked upon as the chiefe Worthies of the Church of God, and Watchmen of the Citie....Of all that think upon us, which they have done both in Pulpit and Print, charging us with holding Free-will, Falling away from grace, denying Original sinne, disclaiming of Magistracy, denying to assist them either in persons or purse in any of their lawfull Commands, doing acts unseemly in the dispensing the Ordinance of Baptism, not to be named amongst Christians: All which charges we disclaime as notoriously untrue, though by reason of these calumnies cast upon us, many that feare God are discouraged and forestalled in harbouring a good thought, either of us or what wee professe....Wee have therefore for the cleering of the truth we professe, that it may be at libertie, though wee be in bonds, briefly published a Confession of our Faith, as desiring all that fear God, seriously to consider whether (if they compare what wee here say and confesse in the presence of the Lord Jesus and his Saints) men have not with their tongues in Pulpit, and pens in Print, both spoken and written things that are contrary to truth.<sup>31</sup>

The seven churches of London already in association with one

another<sup>32</sup>, joined together to prepare and use a confession for apologetic purposes.<sup>33</sup>

The Confession was drawn up and signed by fifteen men from the seven churches. Two notable people who signed were William Kiffin<sup>34</sup> and John Spilsbury. Lumpkin suggests that Spilsbury was the prime author who had the assistance of William Kiffin and Samuel Richardson.<sup>35</sup>

The Confession was well received by Particular Baptists. Others outside the Baptist fold received it "with unequaled surprise. People generally were amazed at the moderation and sanity of its articles".<sup>36</sup> Generally speaking, the Confession fulfilled its purpose. It, however, did not satisfy all its readers. For example, in 1645 the General Baptists responded to it with a pamphlet entitled, *The Foundation of Free Grace Opened*. In this work they defended their doctrine of general atonement and distinguished themselves from Arminians.<sup>37</sup> Of greater concern, however, for the Particular Baptists was the criticism of Daniel Featley, a minister of the state church. He believed that these Baptists were really Anabaptists not yet fully formed.<sup>38</sup> While in prison for disloyalty Featley wrote a book with the short title *The Dippers Dipt* (1645). The last chapter of his book was devoted to exposing heresy in six of the articles of the 1644 Confession. He believed that the English Anabaptists had "inherited all the evils of continental Anabaptism".<sup>39</sup> This book was dedicated to the members of Parliament who were the governing power in England at the time. The Particular Baptists,

concerned for the respect of the Parliament, decided to make some changes to those articles in the Confession to which Dr. Featley objected.

The articles changed were those that dealt with private property, religious freedom, and baptism.<sup>40</sup> Two more articles were added which dealt with the issues of serving as a civil officer, taking of oaths, and the final resurrection and judgment.

Other changes were made to make the Confession more Calvinistic. These changes included statements denying free will and falling from grace, making a stronger declaration in favour of election, and a statement on the doctrine of original sin.<sup>41</sup> These additions were probably due to two new Particular Baptists, Hanserd Knollys<sup>42</sup> and Benjamin Cox. To this edition of the Confession there was added an 'Epistle Dedicatory' addressed to the Parliament which preceded the Preface of the first edition, and a conclusion.<sup>43</sup> The entire document was published as the second edition of the 1644 *Confession*, dated 1646.<sup>44</sup> The Confession was apologetically successful with Parliament, which granted Particular Baptists legal toleration on March 4, 1647.

After this edition another publication came out by one of the signatories of the Confession, Benjamin Cox. Its title was "An Appendix of the Confession of faith." As far as we know the Appendix was never published with the Confession until recent years.<sup>45</sup> This appendix consisted of twenty-two articles that elaborated on some points of the Confession. Cox was the only

one to sign the Appendix but he stated that all Particular Baptist Churches were in agreement with him in these articles. The title page declares that it was "Published for the further clearing of the Truth, and the discovery of their mistake who have imagined a dissent in fundamentals where there is none".<sup>46</sup>

McGlothlin notes that these articles

stiffen the Calvinism, declare belief in eternal punishment, define the Christian's relation to the law and to good works more clearly, and express some other points a little more fully than the Confession.<sup>47</sup>

In 1651 and 1652 a third and fourth edition of the Confession was published. These were published with minor changes from the second edition to deal with the appearance of Quakerism.<sup>48</sup> In 1647 George Fox had found the "Inner Light" and a number of Baptists<sup>49</sup> embraced the new teaching in the years to follow. At one point rumours had it that the Baptist churches of London had fallen to Quakerism.<sup>50</sup> But these rumours were false. Even so, the Baptists wanted to stop them from proliferating. The 'Preface' and 'Epistle Dedicatory' of the earlier publications were replaced by an 'Epistle to the Reader'. Also an eight-page appendix was added and addressed to "all the Churches of God sanctified in Jesus Christ." This appendix entitled *Heart Bleedings for Professors' Abominations* made an earnest and powerful plea for Biblical Christianity, against the views of the Quakers and Ranters.<sup>51</sup> This edition went through two printings.

In 1653 a new edition was published by the Baptist Army

Church stationed in Scotland. Its purpose was to show its unity with London. This edition was the same as the 1651 and 1652 publications. The only addition was a short letter 'To the Impartial Reader' which dealt with "errors and prejudices of the time" which were probably specific to Scotland. Also, in 1653 Henry Hills of London published an edition of the Confession.

Although the Particular Baptists published these many editions of the 1644 *Confession*, in less than twenty-five years there were only a few extant copies. This lacuna was one of the reasons for the creating of the 1689 *Confession* which became the standard Particular Baptist Confession into the mid-nineteenth century.

### C. Sources of the 1644 *Confession*

Six sources have been suggested for this Confession:

#### 1. *Aberdeen Confession*

In April 1948 Robert Hannen, after reading the *First London Confession*, found it quite similar to the *Aberdeen Confession* of Scotland.<sup>52</sup> The latter was a document authorized for the Church of Scotland by the Episcopal Assembly in 1616. Hannen sought to show similarities of doctrinal formulations and of the order of treatment. His theory has not gained too many supporters.<sup>53</sup>

#### 2. Spilsbury's Ten Articles

John Spilsbury was one of the chief authors of the 1644



*Confession* and was known as "the great Patriarch of the Anabaptist Confession". Spilsbury wrote a confession of faith in 1643 consisting of ten articles along with a longer treatise on baptism.<sup>54</sup> According to Lumpkin some of the order and phrasing of the Confession is like that of the Spilsbury document.

### 3. *Points of Difference*

This document shows up the differences between the Congregationalist churches and the Church of England. It was submitted to James I in 1603. Articles 36-38 of the 1644 *Confession* derive from this document.<sup>55</sup>

### 4. *True Confession* of 1596

This document came out of the imprisoned Barrow-Greenwood congregation that emigrated to Holland in 1593. In Amsterdam Henry Ainsworth became their teacher. In 1596 this group wrote a Confession to set forth their doctrinal position and ecclesiology. It is thought to be primarily the work of Ainsworth and the Amsterdam branch of the Barrow-Greenwood church.<sup>56</sup> It contains 45 articles with some distinctive features such as: a preface which states that the Church of England is not a true church; the doctrine of double predestination; that churches are to be pure in membership; that local churches are autonomous; and that each church has its own authority to discipline its members for sin.

McGlothlin tells us that twenty-nine out of the fifty-three articles in the *London Confession* of 1644 came from the *True Confession*. They are Articles 1-11;13;15;17;19;20;33,34;36;

42-48 and 50-52 of the *London Confession*.<sup>57</sup> These articles were not "verbatim repetitions"<sup>58</sup> but similar in content. From this it might be assumed that the two Confessions were essentially the same. However, upon a closer examination of these Confessions, it is clear that the Particular Baptists made some significant changes and omissions. For example:

a) In the Baptist Confession there is "a disposition to simplify the [True] Confession by the omission of abstruse theological terms, and theological ideas not well authenticated in Scripture."<sup>59</sup> For instance, the article on the Trinity is changed from "three distinct persons coeternall[sic], coequall[sic], and coessential[sic], beeing every one of them one & the same God" to "In this God-head, there is the Father, the Sonne and the Spirit, being every one of them one and the same God."<sup>60</sup>

b) There is a very clear and definite softening of the Calvinism of Article Three. The 1596 *Confession* reads:

And touching his cheefest Creatures that hath in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of his will, ordeyned some men and Angells, to eternall lyfe to bee accomplished through Jesus Christ, to the prayse of the glorie of his grace. And on thother hand hath likewise before of old according to his just purpose ordyned other both Angells and men, to eternal condemnation, to be accomplished through their own corruption to the prayse of his justice.<sup>61</sup>

The 1644 *Confession* states:

And touching his creature man, God had in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of His will foreordained some men to eternall life through Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of his grace, leaving the rest in their sinne to their just condemnation, to the

praise of his justice.<sup>62</sup>

God is not seen as ordaining human beings to condemnation but as "leaving" them "in their sinne to their just condemnation." The Baptist Confession does not teach double predestination as does the *True Confession*.<sup>63</sup> Also note the change in Article 14 from reconciliation of God to man in the 1596 *Confession* to reconciliation of man to God in the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>64</sup>

c) The large section of the 1596 *Confession* that dealt with the reformation of the Church of England along Separatist lines is absent in the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>65</sup> These Baptists obviously did not think of reforming the English Church but starting a new one.

d) The subject of baptism is more elaborately dealt with in the 1644 *Confession*. There is very little on this subject in the 1596 *Confession*.

##### 5. William Ames' *Marrow of Theology*

Stanley Nelson has shown that the authors of the 1644 *Confession* borrowed from William Ames' *Marrow of Theology*. In four articles, 12,14,16 and 18, they took sections from Ames' *Marrow* almost word for word.<sup>66</sup> In Articles 1,2,3 and 15, they borrowed phrases from Ames.<sup>67</sup> Nelson also posits probable omissions and corrections of the *True Confession* by the authors of the 1644 *Confession* due to Ames, in Articles 3,17,19, and 28.<sup>68</sup> This latter suggestion is less convincing. However, the former two suggestions are quite convincing. Ames' *Marrow* went through three English printings between 1638 and 1643. Both Ames, and his *Marrow* in its Latin and English editions, were very popular among the Puritans. Is it

possible that Ames is the unknown source of the large section of the Confession, Articles 21-32, which deals with life of the believer?

#### 6. Menno Simon's *Foundation-Book*

Menno Simon's *Foundation-Book* has been suggested by Stassen as a probable source for the central motif of the 1644 *Confession's* doctrine of baptism.<sup>69</sup> This central motif is the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ applied to the believer's life. The notion is found only once in the 1596 *Confession* but it is a major theme in the 1644 *Confession*. It comes up in various ways in numerous articles. Regarding Menno's *Foundation-Book* Stassen says, "The Baptists could have learned its basic contents either by reading it or by talking with almost any articulate Mennonite."<sup>70</sup> Stassen shows the similarities between Menno and the 1644 *Confession* and then concludes:

The Baptists are probably indebted either to the *Foundation-Book*, or to another treatise or Mennonite whose position was extremely similar to its contents. The indebtedness includes such doctrines as believer's baptism, the meaning of baptism as signifying the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, immersion, Christology, and that large area we have called the application of the gospel to the believer....The peculiar Baptist bent is the result of a fresh breeze from Holland."<sup>71</sup>

Stassen's hypothesis is a good one. However, does this motif reside in any Puritan writings? It certainly does in Calvin's *Institutes* on the subject of Baptism.<sup>72</sup> If it is present in any Puritan writings then possibly the source of this motif

lies there rather than in Menno's work?"

In conclusion, it seems that the whole of the 1644 Confession was a piecemeal adaptation of other people's thoughts with their new Baptist ecclesiology gleaned from Scripture. B.R. White writes:

The very 'scissors and paste' method used by the compilers of the 1644 *Confession* makes it clear that every part of it has been scrutinized with the utmost care before being included. Hence it can be and should be recognized as the fundamental expression, not merely of the doctrines connected with the central theme of the earthly church, the gathered community of the convinced, converted and committed, but of the faith which these men were desirous to see propagated throughout the British Isles and New England also during the years to come."

#### NOTES

1. McBeth, p.40.
2. *Ibid.*, p.41. See also Stephen Brachlow, *The Communion of Saints: Radical Puritan and Separatist Ecclesiology 1570-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp.56-64, 101-106, 136-141, 185-193, 220-225, 256-262 for more on Jacob's ecclesiology.
3. We know that there were at least four illegal churches in London before 1620: some of Francis Johnson's congregation that did not go to the Netherlands in 1597; the General Baptists under Thomas Helwys; a Judaizing congregation under John Traske; and the congregation under Henry Jacob. B.R. White, "The Origins and Convictions of the First Calvinistic Baptists," *Baptist History and Heritage* 24 No.4 (1990):40-42. For a history of the Jacob church see W.T. Whitley, "The Jacob-Jessey Church, 1616-1678," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1 (1910):246-256. For the church records of this church see W.T. Whitley, "Records of the Jacob-Lathorp-Jessey Church 1616-1641," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1 (1910):203-225.

4. For some of Jessey's involvement with the Particular Baptists in the 1630's and 1640's see B.R. White, "Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion," *Reformation Conformity and Dissent*, Ed. R. Buick Knox (London: Epworth Press, 1977), pp.134-138.
5. Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters* Vol.2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), p.301, or Whitley, "Records...", p.225.
6. See the 'Jessey Memoranda' in Whitley, "Records...", pp.219f.
7. It is not clear as to how many people there were from the records. See Whitley, "Records...", p.220.
8. *Ibid.*, p.220. There were really two groups that broke away at different times.
9. For more on Samuel Eaton, see B.R. White, "Samuel Eaton (d.1639) Particular Baptist Pioneer," *The Baptist Quarterly* 24(1971,72):10-21.
10. Burrage, *Early English Dissenters...*, p.299, or Whitley, "Records...", p.220.
11. B.R. White, one of the foremost scholars of Particular Baptist history, is not dogmatic but is inclined to believe "it could well have been Believer's Baptism." B.R. White, "Baptist Beginnings and the Kiffin Manuscript," *Baptist History and Heritage* 2 No.1(1967):35.
12. McBeth, p.43.
13. See the 'Kiffin Manuscript' in W.T. Whitley, "The Rise of the Particular Baptists in London, 1633-1644," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1(1910):231.
14. W.T. Whitley, "The Seven Churches of London," *The Review and Expositor* 7(1910):386. Whitley believes that Spilsbury founded a church on or before 1633 and Samuel Eaton was one of his chief supporters. See White, "Baptist Beginnings...", pp.30f., for the possible relationships between Spilsbury and Eaton.
15. Neither does White, "Baptist Beginnings...", p.36.
16. Tolmie, *Triumph...*, pp.19-27.
17. B.R. White, *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Baptist Historical Society, 1983), p.59. Whitley believes that "as early as 1633 he (Spilsbury) was 'baptizing' on profession of belief," Whitley, "Seven...", p.386. The Kiffin Manuscript reads, "Mr. Tho: Wilson Mr Pen &

H. Pen & 3 more being convinced that Baptism was not for Infants but professed Believers joyned with Mr Jo: Spilsbury ye Churches Favour being desired therein." Whitley, "Rise...",p.231.

18. McBeth,p.45.
19. See Whitley, "Rise...",pp.232-235. Concerning the Kiffin Manuscript, B.R. White defends the plausibility of Kiffin's authorship contrary to Whitley contention that it was authored by Henry Jessey. B.R. White, "Who really wrote the Kiffin Manuscript?" *Baptist History and Heritage* 1 No.3(1966):3-10,14.
20. He was a part of the Samuel Eaton group.
21. Whitley, "Rise...",p.232. It should be noted that Henry Jessey, however, did not come to the conviction of believer's baptism until 1645 when he was baptised himself. From 1640 to 1645 he immersed infants.
22. Burrage,pp.302-303, or Whitley, "Rise...",pp.232f.
23. The Schwenckfelders were not Mennonites. Both the Collegiants and the Schwenckfelders were Spiritualists. On this movement see George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (Philadelphia:The Westminster Press, 1962).
24. Whitley, "Rise...",pp.233f. 53 people were baptised at this time in January 1642.
25. Champlin Burrage, "The Restoration of Immersion by the English Anabaptists and Baptists (1640-1700)," *The American Journal of Theology* 16(1912):70-79. White agrees with him, "Baptist Beginnings...",p.36.
26. McBeth,p.47.
27. Burrage, "Restoration...",pp.70-89. For further information on the history, administrator and mode of baptism of Particular Baptists from some original documents see this article.
28. McBeth,p.48.
29. William L. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Philadelphia:The Judson Press, 1959),p.145.
30. W.J. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*(London:Baptist Historical Society, 1911),p.169.
31. *Ibid.*,pp.172-173.

32. Some of the details concerning the Seven churches and the creation of the Confession of 1644 and 1646 are given in Tolmie, *Triumph...*, pp.55-65.
33. Lumpkin, p.145.
34. For an account of his life see B.A. Ramsbottom, *Stranger than Fiction: The Life of William Kiffin* (Harpending: Gospel Standard Trust Publications, 1989).
35. Lumpkin, p.146.
36. *Ibid.*, p.147.
37. Paul Linton Gritz, "Samuel Richardson and the Religious and Political Controversies Confronting the London Particular Baptists, 1643 to 1658," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987), pp.216f.
38. W.J. McGlothlin, "Dr. Daniel Featley and the First Calvinistic Baptist Confession," *The Review and Expositor* 6(1909):583.
39. Lumpkin, p.147.
40. McGlothlin, "Dr. Featley...", pp.587-588. Some of these changes regarding baptism were: Article 39 of the 1644 edition which stated that baptism was "to be dispensed onely upon persons professing faith" removed the word "onely" from the 1646 edition. Article 40 which dealt with the mode of baptism being "dipping or plunging the whole body under water" removed the preceding words "the Scripture holds out to be". Both of these changes were in response to Dr. Featley's criticisms. Lumpkin believes that "much of the distinctively Baptist emphasis was removed from some of the articles" of the revised edition (Lumpkin, pp.147-148).
41. Lumpkin, p.148.
42. Pope A. Duncan, *Hanserd Knollys: Seventeenth-Century Baptist* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1965). This a brief but excellent study from mainly primary sources on Knollys life, aspects of Baptist thought illustrated in his life, and Baptist involvement with more radical groups at that time. Also see James Culross, *Hanserd Knollys: A Minister and Witness of Jesus Christ 1598-1691* (London: Alexander and Shephard, 1895). Knollys did not come to the conviction of believer's baptism until after 1644. We know this because he did not sign the Confession and yet was a member of Henry Jessey's church. We also know that in March 1643 he was involved in a debate on infant baptism. See W.T. Whitley, "Debate on Infant Baptism, 1643," *Transactions of the Baptist*



*Historical Society* 1(1910):237-245. In addition, we know that he was baptised sometime before June 1645 because in that month he baptised Henry Jessey, and believer's baptism was introduced into the JLJ church.

43. Lumpkin, p.149.
44. B.R. White writes concerning the two editions of the Confession, "The 1644 edition was the primary version, but the 1646 edition was the one from which later printings were made and therefore that which provided the theological basis for the developments of the late 1640's and the 1650's" (White, "Origins and Convictions...", p.45).
45. Richard P. Belcher & Anthony Mattia, *A Discussion of the Seventeenth Century Particular Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Southbridge, MA: Crowne Publications, Inc., 1990), p.11.
46. *Ibid.*
47. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.195.
48. This is Lumpkin's contention. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.166. B.R. White believes these changes were, in fact, "more likely due to the poverty of the Baptist congregations" (White, "Origins and Convictions...", p.46).
49. Both Particular and General Baptists but mainly the latter.
50. Lumpkin, p.150.
51. *Ibid.*, p.151.
52. Robert B. Hannen, "A Suggested Source of Some Expressions in the Baptist Confession of Faith, London 1644," *The Baptist Quarterly* 12(1948):389-399.
53. Stassen, p.339. Personally, I find myself in agreement with Stassen who strongly rejects this source. It appears that Hannen was not familiar with the *True Confession* which has all the similarities of the *Aberdeen Confession* to the *London Baptist Confession*. Stassen adds, "Furthermore, the *Aberdeen Confession* contributes neither any of the special language nor any of the special emphases which appear in either the TC or the Baptist pattern of the LC."
54. Spilsbery, John. *A Treatise Concerning The Lawful Subject of Baptisme* (London, 1643?), pp.43-44. See also Lumpkin, p.145.
55. W.J. McGlothlin, "Sources of the first Calvinistic Baptist Confession of Faith," *The Review and Expositor* 13(1916):502. The Congregationalists wrote up fourteen points showing where

they differed from the national Church.

56. Lumpkin, p.81.

57. McGlothlin, "Sources...", p.502.

58. *Ibid.* For example, Article 7 in the *True Confession* reads, "That the rule of this knowledge faith & obedience, concerning the worship & service of God & all other christia-dutyes, is not the opinion, devises, lawes, or constitutions of me-, but the written word of the everlyving God, conteyned in the canonical bookes of the old and new Testament." The 1644 *London Confession* reads, "The Rule of this Knowledge, Faith, and Obedience, concerning the worship and service of God, and all other Christian duties, is not mans inventions, opinions, devices, lawes, constitutions, or traditions unwritten whatsoever, but onely the word of God contained in the Canonically Scriptures." In some Articles only one or two words might be changed, added or removed.

59. *Ibid.*, p.504.

60. *Ibid.*, p.504.

61. Lumpkin, pp.82-83.

62. *Ibid.*, p.157.

63. This Confession, therefore, espouses an infralapsarian doctrine of predestination like that of the Synod of Dort.

64. *Ibid.*

65. Lumpkin, p.146. The *True Confession* was polemical. It did not have much to say on the subject of baptism because its purpose was to point out what a true Church was, and that the Church of England was not a true Church. In addition, doctrinally they were in agreement with the Anglican Church on the subject of baptism so there was no reason to explain baptism.

66. See Stanley Nelson, "Reflecting on Baptist Origins: The London Confession of Faith of 1644," *Baptist History and Heritage* 29 No.2(1994):44. For example, Article 16 of the 1644 Confession states, "That he might be such a Prophet as thereby to be every way compleat, it was necessary that he should bee God, and withall also that he should be man; for unlesse hee had been God, he could never have perfectly understood the will of God, neither had he been able to reveale it throughout all ages; and unlesse hee had been man, hee could not fitly have unfolded it in his own person to man." Ames' *Marrow*, Book 1, Chapter 19, Article 16 states,

"In order that he might be such a prophet, it was necessary that he should be God, John 1:18 and 3:13. And it was necessary also that he should be man, Acts 3:22 (to be compared with Deut. 18:15). For if he had not been God, he would not have understood the will of God perfectly, 1 Cor. 2:11,16, and would not have been able to reveal it throughout all ages. If he had not been man, he could not have fitly set it forth to men in his own person, Heb. 1:1" (William Ames, *The Marrow of Theology* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1968, trans. by John Eusden, reprinted by Labyrinth Press, Durham, NC, 1983), p.133). Some of the differences in the texts could be due to the translation from the Latin. This translation is from John Eusden, not from one of the English editions published between the years 1638 and 1643. The other Baptist Confession Articles that match Ames' *Marrow* are: BC Art.12 and *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.19, Art.3-7; BC Art.14 and *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.19, Art.10-11; and BC Art.18 and *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.19, Art.18-19.

67. *Baptist Confession* Article 1 takes "That God as he is in himselfe, cannot be comprehended of any but himselfe, dwelling in that inaccessible light, that no eye can attaine unto, whom never man saw, nor can see," from Ames' *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.4, Art.2. BC Article 2 takes, "that God exists of himself, that is to say, not from another or of another or by another or by reason of another," from *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.4, Art.16. BC Article 3 speaks of constancy, truth, and faithfulness taken from *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.7, Art.2-6. BC Article 15 takes "The prophesie of Christ....He is called not onely a Prophet and a Doctor, and the Apostle of our profession, and the Angel of the Covenant; but also the very wisdom of God, and the treasures of wisdom and understanding" from *Marrow* Bk.1, Ch.19, Art.14. Compare with Ames, *Marrow*..., pp. 83,84,94,132.
68. See Nelson, "Reflecting...", pp.44f.
69. Stassen, pp.322-348.
70. *Ibid.*, p.342.
71. *Ibid.*, p.348.
72. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion 1536* Edition Trans. F.L. Battles (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1989), pp.95-98.
73. Nelson makes some suggestions concerning the unknown sources of Articles 21-34 of the Confession: Articles 21-23 could have been based on the Synod of Dort's Articles; that Articles 24-32 could have come from some Catechism, possibly Henry Jacob's which was written in 1604 or 1605; and that

## CHAPTER TWO

### HISTORY OF THE SECOND LONDON BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH 1689

#### A. History of the Particular Baptists from 1640 - 1689

1640 to 1660 was a period of revolution and change for all Englishmen. Not least among those greatly affected was the newly organized fellowship of churches called the Particular Baptists. For this new group of churches, politically, it was a time of liberty, theologically, it was a time of apology, and denominationally, it was a time of growth.

Politically, throughout the Interregnum the Particular Baptists benefited and used the freedoms and privileges accorded to them, but as a group remained free from political involvement. It is quite true that many Particular Baptists were involved in the political leadership of the day but as a group of churches they did not identify themselves with any government or movement. They saw their purpose for existence in spiritual things, not in political or earthly things. For example, in the 1640's numerous Baptists were sympathetic to the Leveller movement with some involved in it; but as a whole they opposed it.<sup>1</sup> Again, in the 1650's some Baptists were involved in the Fifth Monarchy movement to one degree or another but as a group they did not associate with it, particularly, its political side.<sup>2</sup> Concerning Cromwell's government and New Model Army, the Particular Baptists were strong supporters.<sup>3</sup> Many of them were members of both the government and the Army with some in places of leadership.<sup>4</sup>

Although Particular Baptists were involved in the politics of the day their influence from 1640 to 1660 politically, was minimal.<sup>5</sup> As J. F. MacGregor has said, "The Baptists[all groups] played a minor role in the political events of the English Revolution."<sup>6</sup> Among the reasons he cites, two of them are: the "Baptists' attitude to the world which inhibited them from effective political action;" and "[their] predominantly theocratic temperament". He goes on to say, "The sectarian sense that the saints were apart from the world, exacerbated by popular notions of Anabaptism, encouraged a passive response to the events of the Revolution."<sup>7</sup> The Particular Baptists' main political concern was the guarantee of their religious liberty so that they might freely worship the Lord and preach the gospel.

Theologically, during the 1640's and 50's the Particular Baptists along with other sectarian groups were accorded a measure of religious freedom. However, this did not prevent these Baptists from being charged with various heresies. In the 1640's they had to defend themselves against charges of Anabaptism<sup>8</sup>, Arminianism<sup>9</sup>, Antinomianism<sup>10</sup>, and Socinianism<sup>11</sup>. By the early 1650's these charges of heresy had waned. Nevertheless, in these years the Particular Baptists were found defending themselves against such things as the millennial radicalism of the Fifth Monarchy Men<sup>12</sup>, the infiltration of the heretical teachings of the Quakers in their ranks<sup>13</sup>, and the teachings of the Seventh-Day Baptists<sup>14</sup>. In addition, during the 1640's the Particular Baptists promoted religious toleration or liberty beyond the

limits acceptable to the majority of people in the England of their day. They desired an end to the persecution of people for their religious beliefs, as well as the disestablishment of the state church through the abolition of tithes and magisterial governance over ecclesiastical affairs.<sup>15</sup> The Presbyterian government of the 1640's, however, opposed religious toleration.<sup>16</sup> When the reigns of power changed in the 1650's the Particular Baptists continued to champion the cause of religious toleration, supporting Cromwell and his government which in principle advocated it.

Denominationally, the Particular Baptist Churches grew significantly during the 1640's and 50's. The founding seven churches of London which subscribed to the Confession came into being not only because of their theological convictions but also because of the political climate of the 1640's. The Particular Baptists along with other Dissenters were permitted to worship openly as they thought best and to freely propagate their beliefs through print and debate.<sup>17</sup> This was unprecedented in English history. In these early years their missionary efforts extended only to the surrounding counties of London. After the Civil War and the victories of the Parliamentary Armies of 1644 and 1645, the Particular Baptists took their message beyond London. Army and civilian evangelists preached the gospel and set up Baptist Churches all over England.<sup>18</sup> The main strength of the Particular Baptists lay in the south, west, and the Midlands. By 1660 they were well established in the countryside<sup>19</sup> including Wales, and

even Ireland. Leon McBeth writes:

The Baptists experienced vast growth during the years 1648-1660. Taking advantage of the relative liberty of the times and the public favor toward evangelical Protestantism, they preached publicly, formed new churches, linked them into associations, issued confessions of faith and published their views in a steady stream of tracts and books.<sup>20</sup>

One of the keys to their success was the close association between the country churches and the London churches.<sup>21</sup> In the 1650's five associations of churches were born, scattered throughout England, Wales and Ireland.<sup>22</sup> The five associations were: the Western Association<sup>23</sup>, the South Wales Association<sup>24</sup>, the Abingdon Association<sup>25</sup>, the English Midlands Association<sup>26</sup>, and the Irish<sup>27</sup> Association.<sup>28</sup> These Associations were started as a result of missionary endeavors from London.<sup>29</sup> B.R. White in his study of the Particular Baptist associational organization in the period of 1644-1660 concludes several things:

- 1) that the London leadership and theology was important to these Associations;
- 2) that the 'general meeting' of messengers was the characteristic unit of the organization;
- 3) that the local associations kept close touch with each other by personal visitation and by sharing reports of their meetings<sup>30</sup>; and
- 4) that the cement of the nation-wide organization was the leadership of Benjamin Cox, John Miles, Thomas Patient, Thomas Collier, Daniel King, and Nathaniel Strange outside of London.<sup>31</sup>

Particular Baptist Churches grew rapidly during the

period of 1640-1660, uniting together under a common Confession, supporting one another in their mission, and promoting their cause. It is estimated that there were 131 Particular Baptist Churches in the British Isles in 1650.<sup>32</sup> In their first twenty years these churches experienced tremendous growth.

The years 1660 to 1689 were quite different from the 1640's and 50's for the Particular Baptists and other Dissenters in Great Britain. Politically, it was a time of repression; theologically, it was a time of internal and external polemics; and denominationally, it was a time of persecution and perseverance for the Particular Baptist Churches.

Politically, with the return of Charles II to the throne and his failure to bring about religious toleration, persecution of Dissenters, including Baptists<sup>33</sup>, followed. At this time Thomas Venner and other Fifth Monarchists led a rebellion in London.<sup>34</sup> Many were killed, and about twenty of the main leaders were executed. The Baptists were strongly implicated in this rebellion, and in some ways they, in particular, were made a scapegoat for all the problems of church and state since 1640.<sup>35</sup>

In 1660 the Long Parliament closed, and in the following year the Cavalier Parliament was elected. Consequently Presbyterians became Dissenters with Baptists and Quakers. The Cavalier Parliament was quick to show its power over, and goals for, religion in the country. What came to be known as the Clarendon Code<sup>36</sup> was directed at those who dissented from the



Church of England. It was primarily directed at the Presbyterians but it greatly affected the Baptists.<sup>37</sup> The Conventicle Act and Five Mile Act were effective in making Baptist meetings difficult to organize and sustain. The Act of Uniformity made sure that any Baptists who were supported by the State were ejected.<sup>38</sup> This Act had little effect on the Particular Baptists who generally opposed state support.<sup>39</sup> In total there were one thousand seven hundred and sixty Dissenting ministers ejected.<sup>40</sup> Only twenty-six were ejected in 1662 and most of these came from the Welsh diocese.<sup>41</sup> Some of the ejected Particular Baptists included Paul Hobson, John Skinner, Richard Harrison, William Kaye, John Tombes, John Miles, and Vavasor Powell.<sup>42</sup> All of these men practised open communion and open membership.

During the reign of Charles II persecution waxed and waned, with the pro-Anglican parliament continually seeking to stamp out dissent by passing various Acts.<sup>43</sup>

In 1685 Charles died and James II ascended to the throne. The fears of a return to Catholicism now became a reality. It was too much for some. In parts of the west country many Dissenters gathered around the illegitimate son of Charles, the Duke of Monmouth, in order to overthrow James and place the Duke on the throne. Some Particular Baptists were a part of this Rebellion including Pastor Sampson Larke of Lyme, Abraham Holmes, Richard Rumbold, Henry Danvers, and two of William Kiffin's grandsons, Benjamin and William Hewling. When the Rebellion

failed many of these Baptists were executed." The Rebellion resulted in severe persecution of Baptists and other Dissenters. The 'Bloody Assize' under Chief Justice Jeffreys followed the Rebellion in the Western circuit. Baptist Churches in Taunton, Lyme, Honiton and Dalwood suffered severely. As Whitley says, "For two years nothing could be done but barely exist."<sup>5</sup>

The persecution continued in England until April 1687 when, surprising as it may seem, James issued a *Declaration of Indulgence* which suspended all penal laws on ecclesiastical matters. The jails were emptied and chapels were built.<sup>6</sup> Unknown to the Baptists at that time, the years of persecution were over.<sup>7</sup> Shortly after the King issued a second *Indulgence*, the Anglicans invited William of Orange to invade their country and take the throne. William landed in Torbay in November of 1688 without a fight, and the King fled.<sup>8</sup>

In January of the following year, William Kiffin led a deputation of Baptists to present an address of welcome to the new ruler. He personally gave the new King five hundred pounds to help his government over the first six months of his reign. The Baptists as well as the Anglicans were pleased with the turn of events. Baptists were hopeful that William would provide toleration for their worship. And this he did in the next months by passing the *Toleration Act* through Parliament. Its full title is *An Act of exempting their Majesties' Protestant Subjects Dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain laws.*<sup>9</sup>

Times had not only changed politically for the Particular Baptists but they had also changed theologically. During the Interregnum the Particular Baptists were defending themselves against attacks from without. They were a new group of churches who needed to establish their orthodoxy before their fellow countrymen. They were not a heretical sect but fellow Calvinists with the Presbyterians and Independents.

By 1660 the Particular Baptists were well established in England, Wales and Ireland with over one hundred churches. The Presbyterians and Independents had become Dissenters along with the Baptists. Their common foe was the Anglican Episcopal Church. Thus the external polemics used to prove their orthodoxy to the Presbyterians and Independents during the Interregnum were unnecessary. Although the Particular Baptists still had to dispute with those outside their group such as the Quakers<sup>50</sup>, Paedobaptists<sup>51</sup> and possibly Neonomists<sup>52</sup>, their polemics were primarily internal. Their internal disputations concerned such things as Arminianism<sup>53</sup>, Hyper-Calvinism<sup>54</sup>, Seventh-Day worship<sup>55</sup>, singing<sup>56</sup>, laying on of hands<sup>57</sup>, Antitrinitarianism<sup>58</sup>, and mixed communion<sup>59</sup>. Most of these were minor issues for the group as a whole, but to certain Particular Baptist people and churches they were of great concern. Some of these issues as we will see later were the reason for the writing of a new Confession in 1677.

Denominationally, Particular Baptist churches experienced freedom and growth during the Interregnum but in the Restoration period they experienced repression and persecution with little

freedom for evangelism. Evangelism did take place but not nearly to the extent it had in the early years. We know that Henry Danvers in the summer of 1672 after the *Declaration of Indulgence* engaged in preaching tours in the country. We also know that at this time "churches revived and reorganised, new books were opened, new rolls of members were prepared, Associations and Assemblies began again to meet."<sup>60</sup> For the most part, however, the Restoration period was a time of perseverance and preservation for Particular Baptists.<sup>61</sup> The persecution for the thirty years ebbed and flowed<sup>62</sup> with some years worse than others, and with certain areas of Britain experiencing more persecution than others. Several very intense times of persecution took place: from 1660 to 1667<sup>63</sup>; from 1670-72, 1673-77<sup>64</sup>; and again from 1680-1686<sup>65</sup> ending only a year into James II's reign.<sup>66</sup>

Freedom from persecution was secured in 1689, when the *Toleration Act* was passed by Parliament. In the wake of their new-found liberty the Particular Baptists of London sent out a July letter to all their churches in the country calling each to send two representatives to a General Assembly in September.<sup>67</sup>

## **B. History of the 1689 Particular Baptist Confession of Faith**

The first Particular Baptist Confession was written in 1644. During the Interregnum others followed as associations were formed in the country. On May 3, 1655, the Midland Association

of seven churches<sup>66</sup> met at Warwick. The messengers drew up sixteen Articles of faith upon which their association would be based. They approved them and called a second meeting on June 26 for formal adoption of the Articles by the churches.<sup>69</sup> In 1656 the Western Association under the leadership of Thomas Collier at their seventh meeting approved what came to be known as the *Somerset Confession*.<sup>70</sup> Also in 1656 a confession of sorts was published in Wales by the Welsh Particular Baptist Churches under the leadership of John Myles. This group of five or more churches sometime after 1652 began organizing General Meetings. At a May 1656 meeting they approved that a Confession of faith be drawn up for the Association. Due to the fact that the Confession primarily served as a refutation of Quakerism, it was entitled, *An Antidote Against the Infection of the Times*.<sup>71</sup> In fact, it should be noted that one of the main reasons for all of these Baptist Confessions in the 1650's was the heresy of Quakerism.<sup>72</sup> The hope was that these Confessions would prevent defections into this heresy.

Over twenty years passed before the Particular Baptists published another Confession. In 1675 with some relief from persecution for Dissenters, the London Particular Baptists sent out a letter to all their churches in England and Wales inviting them to gather together in London in May of the following year.<sup>73</sup> The purpose of the meeting was "to devise some means for providing an adequate ministry for the churches."<sup>74</sup> This letter was signed by William Kiffin, William Collins, and most of the

London elders. It is not known whether that meeting took place, but it is assumed that in 1677 a meeting of these churches did take place. They chose to base their new Confession on the *Westminster Confession* "finding no defect in this regard(a method as might be most comprehensive of those things which we designed to explain our sense and belief of) in that fixed on by the Assembly[Westminster]." <sup>75</sup> Since this was a Baptist Confession some obvious changes were made. The primary changes were in the articles on the Church, the Sacraments, and religious liberty. <sup>76</sup> The adaptation of the *Westminster Confession* and *Savoy Declaration* was done by William Collins and Nehemiah Coxe, pastors of the Petty France Church in London. It is possible that the members of the Petty France Church drew up the Confession on their own, and then promoted it; and by such promotion it gained wider approval. <sup>77</sup> The Confession was published anonymously, stating on the title page, "Confession of Faith put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians(baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in London and the Country." <sup>78</sup>

The Particular Baptist Churches had obvious reasons for publishing this Confession. They stated quite explicitly four prominent reasons in the Preface "To the Judicious and Impartial Reader." These were:

- 1.) This Confession would act as a defense against accusations of heterodoxy. They tell the reader that the former *Confession* of 1644 was written "for the information, and satisfaction of those

that did not thoroughly understand what our principles were, or had entertained prejudices against our Profession." The 1644 *Confession* did accomplish this, but unfortunately it was "not...commonly to be had" in 1677.<sup>79</sup> Thus, "It was [now in 1677] judged necessary by us to joyn together in giving a testimony to the world; of our firm adhering to those wholesome Principles, by the publication of this which is now in your hand."<sup>80</sup>

2.) It would help many others who "have since embraced the same truth which is owned therein" to know what Particular Baptists believed. Implicit in this is the call for heads of families to instruct their own in true religion. The Preface states:

And verily there is one spring and cause of the decay of Religion in our day, which we cannot but touch upon, and earnestly urge a redress of; and that is the neglect of the worship of God in Families, by those to whom the charge and conduct of them is committed. May not the grosse ignorance, and instability of many; with the prophaneness of others, be justly charged upon their Parents and Masters, who have not trained them up in the way wherein they ought to walk when they were young; but have neglected those frequent and solemn commands which the Lord hath laid upon them so to catechise, and instruct them, that their tender years might be seasoned with the knowledge of the truth of God as revealed in the Scriptures;... but certainly it will fall heavy upon those that have been thus the occasion thereof; they indeed dye their sins; but will not their blood be required of those under whose care they were, who yet permitted them to go on without *warning*, yea led them into the paths of destruction? and will not the diligence of Christians with respect to the discharge of these duties, in ages past, rise up in judgment against and condemn many of those who would be esteemed such now?<sup>81</sup>

3.) It would also give "a full account of ourselves to those Christians that differ from us about the subject of baptism."<sup>82</sup>

4.) In addition, the *Confession* would show their unity with

other Christians such as, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in particular; they state: "We did...conclude it best to follow their example [Westminster & Savoy Assemblies] in making use of the very same words with them both, in those articles(which are very many) wherein our faith and doctrine is the same as theirs."<sup>83</sup>

Besides these reasons, there were also doctrinal and practical ones for the making of a new Confession. This was particularly the case with the 1644 *Confession* out of print and few copies left. One of these doctrinal reasons was the continued threat of Quakerism. Throughout the 1670's the Particular Baptists were involved in fierce debates with the Quakers. They needed a clear and full statement on the authority of Scripture in order to help their churches defend themselves against the subjective 'Inner Light' heresy. In the 1644 *Confession* there was very little teaching on Scripture.<sup>84</sup> Another doctrinal reason was the threat of hyper-Calvinism. Andrew Gifford Sr.(1642-1721), pastor of the Pithay Particular Baptist Church in Bristol, knew that some ministers did not want unconverted men to pray. They also did not want ministers to exhort them to that end or to exhort them to seek spiritual blessings which one would assume included salvation. He wrote a letter to the London Churches for advice. Kiffin and others responded in January 1675 against such teaching.<sup>85</sup> This concern might have been on the minds of the framers of the 1677 *Confession*.<sup>86</sup> A third doctrinal reason for a new Confession lay



in the heterodox teaching of Thomas Collier that sprang up in the 1670's. Collier was one of the main leaders of the Particular Baptist Churches. In 1674 he published a book entitled *A Body of Divinity* where "he openly admitted that his views had changed."<sup>87</sup> In this work he taught that Christ's human nature was eternal; he rejected the Calvinist view of original sin; and he taught that Christ died for all human beings. He was clearly moving in an Arminian direction. After a failed meeting to bring him back to Calvinistic orthodoxy, Nehemiah Coxe published a refutation of Collier's view entitled *Vindicia Veritatis*(1677). Collier responded in the same year with a book replying to Coxe. The Particular Baptists' concern over this issue was their reputation as Calvinists before the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. The new Confession, based on the Calvinism of the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions* in the articles which dealt with salvation, would have affirmed their orthodoxy to their fellow Dissenters.<sup>88</sup> A further doctrinal reason for publishing a new Confession could have been the heterodox semi-Arminian(Amyeraldism) of Richard Baxter. Baxter's views were published during the Interregnum.<sup>89</sup> In 1675 he wrote *Richard Baxter's Catholick Theologie* again teaching his heterodox views on salvation and justification. Would not a well-respected Non-conformist Presbyterian be read by Particular Baptist pastors and people? This new Baptist Confession clearly countered Arminianism even to the point of being considered Antinomian in some of its Articles. It also had a section on the Law of God which clearly stated that the Law

under the Covenant of Works is the same Law as was given at Sinai and continues to be for believers "a Rule of *Life*, informing them of the Will of *God*, and their Duty,...direct[ing] and bind[ing] them, to walk accordingly discovering also the sinfull pollutions of their Natures, Hearts and Lives."<sup>90</sup> This section clearly countered Baxter's Neonomianism.

There were also some implicit practical reasons for a new Confession. Almost all the leaders who signed the 1644 *Confession* had since died; only Kiffin and Knollys were still alive. Was not the concern of the 1675 letter, which was written prior to the Confession, a call for plans to prepare men for the ministry? These new ministers coming up to assume leadership would need a Confession to follow.<sup>91</sup>

A further practical reason for a new Confession was the desire for unity among closed and open communion brethren. This desire did not exist in the Interregnum. The common plight of persecution on Dissenters taught them to major on primary matters and not on minor ones. Open or closed communion among Calvinistic Baptist brethren became less of an issue during these years of persecution. In the Appendix to the 1677 *Confession* they state that "there are some things wherein we (as well as others) are not in full accord among ourselves." For an example, they speak of the issue of communion, saying,

The known principle, and state of the consciences of diverse of us, that have agreed in this Confession is such; that we cannot hold Church-communion, with any other Baptized-believers, and Churches constituted of such; yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our spirits that

way; and therefore we have purposely omitted the mention of things of that nature, that we might concurre[sic], in giving evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves, and with other good Christians, in those important articles of the Christian Religion, mainly insisted on by us: and this not withstanding we all esteem it our chief concern,...to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace."<sup>2</sup>

Peace and harmony were important to the majority of Particular Baptists of the 1670's, based on those foundational doctrines of the Scriptures, not on the peripheral ones.

Twelve years after the anonymous 1677 *Confession* was written and published, the Act of Toleration was passed in Parliament. Very shortly afterwards, Particular Baptists called for a General Assembly. A circular letter went out on July 22, 1689, to all the churches in England and Wales signed by Kiffin, Knollys, John Harris, George Barnett, Benjamin Keach, Edward Man, and Richard Adams, calling messengers to an Assembly slated for September 3. The reason for the meeting was stated in the letter:

We cannot but bewail the present condition our churches seem to be in, fearing that much of that former strength, life, and vigour which attended us is gone; and in many places the interest of our Lord Jesus Christ seems to be much neglected which is in our hands, and the congregations to languish, and our beauty to fade away, (which thing, we have some ground to judge, you cannot but be sensible to as well as we)."

On the planned date, messengers from one hundred and seven churches met for ten days."<sup>4</sup> In total about one hundred and fifty persons attended."<sup>5</sup> The various items of business included: the calling of a general fast;"<sup>6</sup> a statement concerning the Assembly's powers;"<sup>7</sup> a vote on September 5

concerning a fund for the support of the ministry;" a statement which sought to clear themselves of reproaches cast on them because of a few;" and the acceptance of the 1677 *Confession of Faith* as the Confession of their churches.<sup>100</sup>

The Confession which they approved was the second edition of the 1677 *Confession*, which had been published in 1688. This edition was the same as the 1677 one, but without the Appendix which dealt extensively with baptism. The Confession was prefixed as follows:

We the Ministers and Messengers of, and concerned for, upwards of one hundred baptized congregations in England and Wales (denying Arminianism) being met together in London, from the third of the seventh month to the eleventh of the same, 1689, to consider of some things that might be for the glory of God, and the good of these congregations; have thought meet (for the satisfaction of all other Christians that differ from us in the point of Baptism) to recommend to their perusal the confession of our faith, which confession we own, as containing the doctrine of our faith and practice, and do desire that the members of our churches respectively do furnish themselves therewith.<sup>101</sup>

Thirty-seven people signed the Confession including William Kiffin and Hanserd Knollys.<sup>102</sup> The prefix concludes after the signatures with "In the name and behalf of the whole Assembly."<sup>103</sup>

New editions of the Confession came out in 1693, 1699, 1719, 1720, 1791 and 1809. Keach also published a condensed edition in 1697.<sup>104</sup> The full Confession was ordered by the Assembly of 1693 to be translated into Latin; unfortunately, no Latin translation has been found thus far.

The Confession begins with the teaching on the Holy Scriptures, so giving the basis of authority for the doctrines in

the rest of the Confession. Then it looks at God's Person and Work, beginning with Creation and Providence. Next the Confession examines His work of salvation, including the reason for it - our sin and fall. This work of salvation is then explained, beginning with God's Covenant and finishing with His work of Assurance in the believer's heart. This section includes the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Finally, on a more practical level, the Confession focuses on the Law of God, the Gospel, Christian Liberty, Religious Worship, Oaths, the Civil Magistrate, Marriage, Church, Communion of the Saints, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the state of Man after death, the resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment.<sup>105</sup>

#### NOTES

1. See Tolmie, *Triumph...*, pp.161-169. See also Tolmie, "General...", pp.258-297, for a fuller look at the involvement of Baptists with the Levellers.
2. Underwood, p.84. See Tolmie, "General...", pp.539-591, on Baptists and their involvement with the Fifth Monarchists.
3. One of their reasons for support was Cromwell's support for religious liberty.
4. Underwood, pp.74-77 for PBs in the Army, pp.,77-80 for PBs in the Government. See also Tolmie, *Triumph...*, pp.155-161. See also Tolmie, "General...", pp.237-258 for the years 1647-49, and pp.591-636 for the 1650's.
5. B.R. White states, "What is fairly clear about Particular Baptist political views during the Great Rebellion is that most of them loathed and abominated tithes." Some Particular Baptists were not against state support but most were. For example, in 1657 when the Hereford church looked to London for some answers to this question of tithes, it was asserted

by Kiffin and others that "every church of Christ is bound to take general care that such as minister to them be sufficiently and comfortably supplied in all good things for themselves and families and, in case of real insufficiency in any church, that that church ought to apply themselves to other churches for assistance." The London leaders went on to say to the Hereford church that if their minister persisted in receiving state support they should deal with him according to Matthew 18:15-17. They should "...withdraw from him as [a] disorderly person,..." if he does not listen to the church (White, "...Rebellion...", pp.28f).

6. J.F. MacGregor, "The Baptists: Fount of All Heresy," in *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Ed. J.F. MacGregor & B. Reay (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), p.56.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Gritz, p.126ff.
9. Featley's book *The Dippers Dipt.* (1645) asserts that the Particular Baptists held Arminian errors.
10. Those considered Antinomians include Tobias Crisp, John Saltmarsh, John Eaton, Henry Denne, and Paul Hobson. For a history of Antinomianism at this time see Gertrude Huehns, *Antinomianism in English History* (London: The Cresset Press, 1951), pp.55-88. For a doctrinal exposition of this doctrine see Huehns, pp.37-54. See also Ernest Kevan, *The Grace of Law* (Ligonier, PA: Soli Deo Gloria, 1993), pp.22-36, 146-148, 167-172. Antinomians believed: faith is a consequence not a condition of one's justification; the Holy Spirit comes into the person before he believes; for assurance the believer looks to Christ not to himself and his works; the moral law does not prepare the person for faith; all covenantal conditions between God and man were fulfilled by Christ; they did not hold to the federal-covenantal approach to salvation and living. See Gritz, p. 245. Gritz says, "The Antinomians focused on an intimate relationship of oneness or union with Christ, which the Holy Spirit revealed to the person in an immediate experience of faith" (Gritz, p.241).
11. Socinianism taught that Jesus was a created person who only had a human nature; the Spirit is God's power; salvation is by works; and the wicked are annihilated. For Socinianism in England see H. John McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1951). It was through Baillie's book *Anabaptism* that Particular Baptists were associated with Socinianism.
12. White, *English Baptists...*, pp.82-86.

13. As the Quakers grew they took members from both General and Particular Baptist Churches. The Particular Baptist Churches of Hexham, Newcastle, Kensworth, Oxford, and Newbury lost members to the Quakers (White, *Association Records...*, pp.192,194,204). The Tiverton Church warned against those "who lay aside Christ, Scripture, and obedience all at once, subjecting themselves to a suggestion or voice within them more than to the mind of God written in the holy scriptures" (Geoffrey Nuttall, "The Baptist Western Association 1653-1658," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 11(1960):217). At Kent the Particular Baptist Luke Howard became a leader in the Quaker movement (Craig W. Horle, "Quakers and Baptists 1547-1660," *The Baptist Quarterly* 26(1975,76):347). In 1650 the Particular Baptist leaders published a pamphlet against the Ranters and Quakers entitled *Heart bleedings for Professors' Abominations*. It was signed by Spilsbury, Kiffin and fourteen others. The Quaker movement was of such a concern that this pamphlet reprinted with the 1651 and 1652 edition of the 1644 *Confession*. The pamphlet warned against the teaching that the Cross of Christ was a 'mere history and shadow', that the Scriptures were but a letter, that the ordinances were but fleshly forms, and that the traditional standards of holy living were no longer applicable (White, *English Baptists...*, p.78). Paul Hobson and Henry Jessey also reported and spoke against the Quakers (Horle, p.349).
14. A minor problem for the Particular Baptists was the issue of the Seventh Day Sabbath. A number of churches were Seventh-Day Baptists in the 1650's (Thomas Tillam became a Seventh Day Baptist in 1657; see Novak, pp.410f). The Watford church of Hertfordshire lost some members to the Seventh-Day men. The Abingdon Association discussed the subject in 1659. They concluded: "It was desired by diverse of the messengers yt in case nothing else should be found amisse but the bare observing of the 7th Day Sabbath, then the saying of the Apostle in Rom. 14:1-5f; might be well minded (White, *Association Records...*, p.195). It appears that this never became a major issue with the Particular Baptists and so did not cause any real problems for the group.
15. Gritz, pp.296-301.
16. Gritz, p.294.
17. Concerning pamphlets during the Revolution see Reay, "Radical Religion...", in *Radical Religion...*, p.13. From Arthur S. Langley's article "Seventeenth Century Baptist Disputations," in *Transactions* 6(1919), pp.216-243, we see that there were at least 79 disputations between Baptists and others during the years 1641-1660. Kiffin, Tombes, Jessey,

and Blackwood are a few Particular Baptists who took part. The greatest number of disputations were on the subjects of baptism and Quakerism.

18. See Tolmie, "General...", pp.298-347, for details of the stability, organization, and expansion of the Particular Baptists from 1649-1657.
19. MacGregor, "Baptists...", p.36.
20. H. Leon McBeth, *The Baptist Heritage* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1987), p.111.
21. The central Association of the Particular Baptist group of churches was the London association. This group committed themselves to one another in their like precious faith, united upon the 1644 *Confession*. The leadership of the London Particular Baptist Churches included Paul Hobson, Thomas Patient, John Spilsbury, Thomas Kilcop, Samuel Richardson, Hanserd Knollys, Benjamin Cox, Edward Harrison, John Miles, John Pendaveres, and Christopher Blackwood (B.R. White, "The London Calvinistic Baptist Leadership 1644-1660," *The Baptist Quarterly* 32(1987,88):36ff).  
 Why were the London churches so important to the Particular Baptist church movement? B.R. White states that the London Baptist community appeared to have fulfilled several important functions for the whole group:
  - 1) they provided the doctrinal standards for all the churches in the country at large by means of the 1644 *Confession* and its later editions;
  - 2) they provided a clearinghouse for ideas and a center for consultation for those churches;
  - 3) they initiated evangelistic missions in various parts of the British Isles (White, "Leadership...", pp.43f).
22. Churches also associated in the north of England through the commissioning of the London church in Swan Alley. But these churches did not become an association in these early years because of conflict over the subject of the laying on of hands and open communion (B.R. White, "The Organization of the Particular Baptists 1644-1660," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 17(1966), pp.214-216). For an account of Tillam's career, see E.A. Payne, "Thomas Tillam," *The Baptist Quarterly* 17(1957,58). For a history of one of those North England churches, see W.T. Whitley, "Hill Cliff in England Parts 1 & 2," *Review and Expositor* 6(1909), pp.274-284, 424-435.
23. The Western Association was founded probably through the work of Thomas Collier, and had a close association with the London leaders and their theology. This Association's



activities include: days spent in waiting upon God; the resolution of queries submitted by the churches of the Association; and the issuing of circular letters of exhortation to the churches (Nuttall, "Baptist Western...", "pp.213ff).

24. The first provincial Association traced its beginnings to John Miles who in 1649 was sent from London to South Wales along with Thomas Proud. There they founded a church in Ilston in Glamorgan in October of the same year. Another Church was started in Llanigon in early 1650. And a third church began that summer in Llanharan in East Glamorgan (B.R. White, "The Organisation of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 17(1966):210). A fourth church (1651) and a fifth (1652) were founded in Carmarthen and in Abergavenny, respectively. These churches were all formed upon the doctrine of closed communion.
25. In October 1652 representatives from Reading, Abingdon, and Henly met together and formed the Abingdon Association. In October 1652 representatives from the churches met together and agreed upon matters requiring intercongregational collaboration, and decided they would meet for mutual advice, financial support, and the carrying out of the work of God. Two other churches joined them from Kensworth and Eversholt. In March 1653 all five churches met together and signed *The Agreement of the Churches* which stated their purpose for meeting together. It was made clear that any recommendations at the associational level needed individual church approval before being returned for confirmation at the next Association meeting. A major concern for this Association was to remain in close contact with the London Churches. This Association continued to grow adding to its number in 1655 the churches of Wantage, Wallington, Kingston, Hoddenham and Pyrton. In 1656 Oxford, Hemel Hempstead, and North Warnborough joined the Association (White, "Organisation...", "pp.216f).
26. The Midland Association had its beginning in June 1655 uniting upon the basis of a *Confession of Faith in Sixteen Articles* and an *Agreement* of the churches much like that of the Abingdon Association. Daniel King was probably the founder of some of the congregations that made up this Association. The first congregations of the Association were: Warwick, Moreton-in-the-Marsh, Bourton-on-the-Water, Tewkesbury, Hook Norton, Derby, and Alcester. The first meeting dealt with the lawfulness of state payment of the minister. The messengers voted against such payment. Other meetings dealt with the subjects of: closed communion; attending the preaching of national ministers; and the Fifth Monarchy. Concerning this latter issue it was made clear

that violence and force were not to be used but to wait with patience and quietness for the time (White, "Organisation....,pp.223ff).

27. The Irish Association traced its beginnings to a letter, dated June 1653, sent from Waterford to the London churches. Ten congregations in Ireland, composed mainly of the Army men stationed in Ireland, had already met together at least once; and with this letter, among other things, they were calling other Calvinistic Baptists in England and Wales to special times of prayer and fasting. The London churches passed the Irish letter on to other congregations with which they were in contact (White, "Organisation....,pp.220f).
28. This does not include the main association of London Churches.
29. R. Dwayne Conner gives five contributing factors for the forming of Baptist Associations: 1) security and fellowship; 2) demonstration of orthodoxy; 3) preservation of unity; 4) evangelism; and 5) expansion and institutionalization. He gives five aspects of associational life: 1) fellowship; 2) ordination; 3) discipline; 4) evangelism; 5) benevolence ("Early English Baptist Associations," *Foundations* 15(1972),pp.167-175).
30. See, for example, White, "Organisation....,"p.222.
31. *Ibid.*,p.226. These churches who sent these men out held to the principle of closed communion.
32. Underwood,p.85. For a list of Particular and General Baptist Churches in England until 1660 see "Baptist Churches till 1660," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 2(1911),pp.236-254.
33. White, *English Baptists....*,pp.94f.
34. The Rebellion took place in January of 1661 and lasted four days. See B.S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*(London:Faber and Faber, 1972),pp.199f.
35. It was true that the Baptists had some connections with the Fifth Monarchy as we have shown in the first part of this chapter but they were almost all against violence and rebellion. For a study of the Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy movement see Louise Fargo Brown, *The Political activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*(Washington: American Historical Association, 1912). To show their opposition to Venner's Rebellion and anything like it, several tracts were published by Baptists.

One of those tracts was issued by William Kiffin and other Baptists, both General and Particular, entitled *The Humble Apology of Some Commonly Called Anabaptists* (1661). The purpose of this tract was to distance themselves from the Fifth Monarchy radicals.

36. The four Acts passed against dissent were: the Coronation Act(1661) which allowed only those who conformed to the state Church to hold public office; the Act of Uniformity(1662) which permitted only ministers who believed the doctrines and worship of the Anglican church to be in Church of England pulpits; the Conventicle Act of 1664 which set severe penalties for holding unauthorized worship services with more than five people beyond the immediate family; and the Five Mile Act(1665) which forbade ejected ministers from preaching, teaching or residing within five miles of the town from which they had been ejected. The Clarendon Code made all religious dissent illegal. This made all Baptist meetings illegal, and opened the door for persecution.
37. See W.T. Whitley, "Militant Baptists 1660-1672," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1(1909),pp.148-155. This article shows the involvement of General and Particular Baptists in the planning of insurrections and plots.
38. See W.T. Whitley, "The Relation of Baptists to the Ejectment," in *The Enactment of 1662 and the Free Churches*(London:National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, n.d.),pp.75-96.
39. Only 90 Baptists(General and Particular) held posts in Cromwell's state church before the Restoration.
40. About 20% of the total clergy.
41. See Whitley, *British Baptists*,p.160.
42. Powell was involved with the Welsh Particular Baptists during the 1650's. Sometime in the 1650's he became a General Baptist. His doctrines after joining the latter group were written down and preserved. A copy of the manuscript was edited by Champlin Burrage, "Early Welsh Baptist Doctrines," *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* 1(1908),pp.3-20.
43. E.g. Conventicle Act of 1670. Test Act of 1673(An Act for the preventing dangers which happen from popish recusants).
44. Danvers was at least one who escaped. He fled to Holland (White, *English Baptists...*,pp.133f).

45. Whitley, *British Baptists...*, p.149.
46. For example, Henry Forty and church, White, *English Baptists...*, p.134.
47. On Toleration and James II see S.H. Mayor, "James II and the Dissenters," *The Baptist Quarterly* 34(1991,92). See also Douglas C. Sparkes, "The Test Act of 1673 and its Aftermath," *The Baptist Quarterly* 25(1973,74):pp.77f.
48. Christopher Hill gives some reasons for James' failure (pp.205-209). Hill says, "His actions did everything to unite the propertied class against him and to heal the split between Whigs and Tories which had appeared to threaten civil war in 1681" (p.205).
49. This Act, though a great blessing to Dissenters, did not give them full religious liberty, and it gave no liberty at all to Jews and Roman Catholics. The Act, however, did give Dissenters the right to worship separately from the Established church. The Act even made a special concession for Baptists that read:  
 And whereas some dissenting protestants scruple the baptizing of infants; be it enacted....that every person in pretended holy orders, or pretending to holy orders, or preacher, or teacher, that shall subscribe the aforesaid articles of religion, except before excepted, and also except part of the seven and twentieth article touching infant baptism and shall take the said oaths, and make and subscribe the declaration aforesaid,....every such person shall enjoy all the privileges, benefits, and advantages, which any other dissenting minister, as aforesaid, might have or enjoy by virtue of this Act (Sparkes, pp.78f).  
 This Act, as was mentioned above, did not give Baptists and other Dissenters full religious liberty. They still had to pay tithes to the Church of England, and register their meetings with Anglican Bishops; their ministers were to subscribe to certain Anglican Articles(Art. 36 & 39), and if a Dissenter desired to hold public office he had to pass the Sacramental Test . Whatever were the motives behind the Act of Toleration, it accomplished two things: one, it brought about needed national unity and safety; and two, it gave Baptists and other Dissenters freedom to worship without fear of persecution. The thirty hard years of persecution for the Particular Baptists were over. They were very pleased with the measure of toleration they received. This can be seen in Benjamin's Keach's response to William and Mary in his preface to *Distressed Zion Relieved* where he says,  
 And all the time in England you have been,  
 What strange amazing wonders have we seen?  
 A poor sick Land divided; by Christ's power

Made whole and all united in one hour (McBeth,p.121).

50. The greatest external challenge to the Particular Baptists as in the 1650s continued to be the Quaker movement. During this period Particular and General Baptists wrote at least 27 works against the Quakers (White, *English Baptists...*, p.107). Particularly, the seven years after the *Declaration of Indulgence* of 1672, "the feud between the Baptists and Quakers...blazed forth" (Whitley, *British Baptists*,p.127). Quakers continued to cause problems for Baptist Churches during the Restoration years, shattering some of them, taking ministers and members over to the Quaker teaching of the "Inner light".
51. Particular Baptists had to defend their position against Paedobaptists. There were at least 28 works written by Baptists on the subject of Baptism during the Restoration period (White, *English Baptists...*,p.107). From 1674 Particular Baptists such as Henry Danvers, John Tombes, Hanserd Knollys, William Kiffin, and Benjamin Keach wrote on polemically on the subject (W.T. Whitley, *A Baptist Bibliography*(London: The Kingsgate Press, 1916), pp.105,122,123,125). The issue of believer's baptism verses paedobaptism was not dead.
52. Another external concern for all Calvinistic Dissenters including the Particular Baptists of this time was Richard Baxter's doctrine of justification which tended toward a salvation by works and legalism. Baxter's views were published in his *Aphorisms of Justification*(1649), *Richard Baxter's Confession of His Faith*(1655), and *Richard Baxter's Catholick Theologie*(1675). He was singled out as Amyraut's 'only proselyte in England.' Baxter believed that the true believer participated in his justification by obedience to the new law of grace. Neonomianism and his doctrine of Justification were challenged by Isaac Chauncy, Robert Traill, Thomas Edwards, John Owen, William Eyre, and John Crandon. During these Restoration years he lived in Moorfields and in Acton(Middlesex). From these places his influences in writing and preaching on this issue must have disturbed the Calvinistic Baptists, particularly those who leaned toward Hyper-Calvinism. See James I. Packer, "The Redemption and Restoration of Man in the Thought of Richard Baxter"(unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Oxford University, 1954),pp.298-306, C.F. Allison, *The Rise of Moralism* (London:S.P.C.K., 1966,pp.154-177, and Ernest F. Kevan, *The Grace of Law*(Ligioner,PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publ., 1993 reprint of Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., n.d.),pp.203-207.
53. Just prior to the preparation of the 1677 *Confession*, Thomas Collier, a member of Kiffin's church and an evangelist of

England's southwest, defected from the Particular Baptists. In 1674 he published a work entitled *A Body of Divinity* which: denied the Calvinistic doctrine of original sin; taught that Christ died for all men; and stated that Christ's humanity was eternal. Particular Baptist ministers including Kiffin and Nehemiah Coxé met with Collier to clear up the matter. The meeting failed to change or satisfactorily explain Collier's views, and Collier was accused of heresy. In 1677 Coxé responded to Collier's teaching in order to show non-Particular Baptists that Collier was not espousing Particular Baptist doctrine. His response was an extensive written rebuttal. See Michael Haykin, "The 1689 Confession: A Tercentennial Appreciation 1," *Reformation Canada* 13, No. 4(1990):25, Ivimey, Vol.II, pp.403-407, and Richard D. Land, "Doctrinal Controversies of English Particular Baptists(1644-1691) as Illustrated by the Career and writings of Thomas Collier," (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Oxford University, 1979), pp.264-286.

54. An example of this teaching among Particular Baptists came from the southwest of England. Andrew Gifford Sr.(1642-1721), pastor of the Pithay Particular Baptist Church in Bristol, believed that "some ministers who were of the opinion that as none could pray acceptably without the influences of the Holy Spirit, and unconverted men being destitute of those influences, that therefore it was not their duty to pray, nor the duty of ministers to exhort them to seek spiritual blessings" (Ivimey, Vol.I, p.416). Gifford wrote to the London Particular Baptists asking for their opinion on this matter. In January of 1675 William Kiffin and others responded saying, "Prayer is a part of that homage which everyman is obliged to give God...[and] the want of the spirit's immediate notions to, or it's assistance in the duty, doth not take off the obligation to the duty....If the obligation to this and other duties were suspended merely for want of such motions or assistance, then unconverted persons are so far from sinning in the omission of such duties, that it is their duty to omit them" (*Ibid.*, pp.417f).
55. In this period nine works were written by Baptists debating the 7th Day Sabbath. We know that a certain Mr. Belcher, a bricklayer, of the Particular Baptists, practiced Seventh Day Worship. The 1677 *Confession* does state that "from the resurrection of Christ (the sabbath) was changed into the first day of the week, which is called the Lord's Day." Since the *Confession* was the basis of fellowship for Particular Baptists it appears that this issue was not much of a problem among them.
56. At the Horsleydown Church where Benjamin Keach was pastor, Keach introduced hymn singing into the worship somewhere

between 1673 and 1675. Keach faced opposition from a group within his own church as well as with some of the London Particular Baptist leaders. The printed debate began in 1690 with another Particular Baptist, Isaac Marlow. Keach had defended hymn-singing in two prior books entitled *Tropolagia*(1681) and *Gold Refin'd*(1689). Hercules Collins also defended corporate singing in 1680. The 1677 *Confession* appears to endorse hymn singing when in Chapter 22 entitled, "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day", it states, "Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs...are...parts of religious worship of God, to be performed in obedience to him." This is an ambiguous endorsement, however, since it is simply quoting Scripture. This controversy did not really get underway until the 1690s, and so it was not formally a major issue during the Restoration years for Particular Baptists. See J. Barry Vaughn, "Public Worship and Practical Theology in the Work of Benjamin Keach(1640-1704)," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of St. Andrews, 1989), pp.131-143 for the history of this controversy.

57. In 1676 the Particular Baptist Henry Danvers wrote a tract on the ordinance of laying on of hands in a supplement to a revised edition of his *Treatise on Baptism*. The new Particular Baptist Benjamin Keach responded to him. Keach before he came to the Particular Baptists strongly defended the practice. See Vaughn, "Public Worship...", pp.67-75, and Whiting, pp.121f. Also see J.K. Parrett on Keach and this subject in, "An Early Baptist on the Laying on of Hands," *The Baptist Quarterly* 21(1965,66), pp. 325-327,320.
58. A Particular Baptist pastor of Ashford in Kent in his work entitled *The Veil Turned Aside* stated that most of the Baptists in Kent and Sussex: denied the doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's satisfaction, God's omnipresence; taught soul-sleep; and proclaimed that God has the form of a man. A hostile witness stated that "out of the multitude of Anabaptists(Baptists) that I have known, I cannot mind one that stopped there: They are Separatists, Arminians, Antinomians, Socinians, Libertines, Seekers, Familists" (Whiting, p.90). Socinianism was Anti-Trinitarian, it is possible that some Particular Baptists in Kent and Sussex were reading Socius' teachings.
59. This was one of the most controversial issues that continued to haunt this Baptist group was that of open communion and open membership. For some of the history of this see E.P. Winter, "The Lord's Supper: admission and exclusion among the Baptists of the Seventeenth century," *The Baptist Quarterly* 17(1957,58):pp.272-281 and B.R. White, "Open and Closed Membership among English and Welsh

Baptists," *The Baptist Quarterly* 24(1971,72):330-334,341. The Particular Baptist views on this issue made clear in the Appendix to the 1646 revision of the 1644 *Confession*, saying, "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 the contrary to order" (From Article 20 taken from Underhill,p.59). The communion issue was not resolved during the Restoration years but we should note that in the Appendix to the *Confession* of 1677 the Particular Baptists decided not to make this an issue in their agreement on "those important articles of the Christian religion." They acknowledged their differences on mixed communion but would not allow it to divide them on the fundamental issues.

60. Whitley, *British Baptists...*,p.128. We know that the Petty France church in London baptized 108 people from August 1675 to October 1684. Dowley,pp.233f.
61. Baptists were even experiencing persecution before Charles II began to rule. Henry Jessey's book *The Lord's Loud Call to England*(1660) gave examples of persecution upon the Baptists and Congregationalists.
62. Whiting,p.113.
63. During the first period of intense persecution, it is recorded at the end of 1662 in the Domestic State Papers that 289 Baptists were in Newgate Prison and 18 were in the Tower (Underwood,p.97). Baptist meeting houses were raided and destroyed. For example, the church in Brick Lane near Whitechapel was raided six times: "the soldiers smashed the pulpit to pieces, and on July 27th a multitude of butchers out of Whitechapel, together with the bailiff's followers and a number of boys smashed the forms, windows, and doors" (Whiting,p.111). In addition, Baptist pastors were often put in prison. One such pastor was Thomas Ewins in 1661 in Bristol. He was imprisoned for preaching, under the Corporation Act. Another pastor, Abraham Cheare of a Particular Baptist Church at Plymouth, was imprisoned for most of the time from 1660 to his death in 1668. During these years he published a book of his letters entitled *Words in Season*(1668) which reflected "a very clear theology of suffering under persecution and his concern for growth in holiness among his correspondents" (White, *English Baptists...*,p.113). By 1665 the fires of persecution were waning. In 1667 Clarendon fell from power.
64. Persecution picked up again in the 1670's with the renewing of the Conventicles Act. We have an example of persecution during this period from the Broadmead Baptist Church in



Bristol. In 1674 Guy Carleton, the Bishop of Bristol, Ralph Ollive(the Mayor), and John Hellier(a constable for the parish) made a determined attack upon the Dissenters of Bristol. Pastors were the main targets of the authorities; if they could imprison them or discourage them, the meetings might cease. Thomas Hardcastle, Broadmead's pastor, was imprisoned seven different times during these years but the church continued to meet. In order to arrest the pastor the authorities would raid a Dissenting conventicle gathered in a private home. In July of 1675 the authorities fell upon a Bristol Baptist meeting but they "could not find ye Bro. that spoke, for wee had conveyed him downe into a roome under, through a Trap made like a Biffet-Bench against ye Wall in a seate or pue enclosed" (McBeth,p.118). In light of this danger these clandestine Baptist meetings were set up at different times and places. Also the Dissenting parishioners wore plain clothing to the meetings in order not to raise any suspicion. The Records tell us the people were "taking a great deal of Care in going and coming, ye Women wearing neither White aprons nor Pattens." In addition, in case of a potential raid on a meeting in a home they agreed,

to appoint some youth, or two of them, to be out at ye door every meeting, to Watch when...informers or officers were coming, and soe to come in, one of them and give us notice thereof. Alsoe, some of ye hearers, women and Sisters, would sitt and Crowde in ye Staires, when we did begin ye Meeting with and Exercise, that soe ye Informers might not too Suddainely come in upon us; by reason of which they were prevented divers times (*Ibid.*,pp.118f).

The Broadmead church not only had to watch out for sudden raids upon their meetings but also for informers in their meetings. One way to deal with this was to curtain off a section of the gathering where only the pastor and a few trusted members would sit. The curtain was closed while the preacher spoke. When the message was concluded the preacher sat down, the curtain was opened, and those sitting outside the curtain were not able to tell who had preached. The informer would not know whom to accuse.

The Broadmead Particular Baptist Church went through hard times in these years. They described their plight in 1674 as follows:

Our Ministers being taken from us, one dead, and ye rest Imprissoned, and we feared their death likewise in such a Bad Prisson, and we being pursued closely...by ye Bishop's men....For our Partes, at our Meeting, we presently made use of our ministering gifts in ye Church,(as we did in former persecutions, Contenting ourselves with meane gifts and coarse fare in ye want of Better). Wherefore we considered which way to Maintaine our Meetings, by preserving our Speaker (*Ibid.*,p.119).

Persecution like this also took place in other places in

Britain.

65. In the 1680's the Baptists probably experienced the worst years of persecution since the Restoration. Fears concerning Charles Catholic brother James coming to the throne sparked persecution against all anti-Anglicans. From 1681 to 1686 persecution was fierce. One informer in 1682 claimed to have fifty men working for him to track down conventicles every Sunday (White, *English Baptists...*, p.130). Because of the intense persecution, the Broadmead church decided to stop meeting together publicly and break up into small groups in order to fall in line with the *Conventicle Act*.

The church at a later time had circular meetings at five different places with a lay leader preaching at each location. They would meet at different times. Within five weeks they would hear all the lay leaders and see all of its members even though only five of them met at each place. Before Pastor Fownes was imprisoned, the church would meet in the woods to avoid being caught under the *Conventicle Act*.

The Church records in 1681 read:

On Ld's day, ye 11th, Br. Fowned [the pastor], being come from London, but daring to come into ye City because of ye Corporation Act, met with us and preacht in K's Wood, near Scruze Hole, under a Tree, and endured ye Rain (McBeth, p.120).

A few days later, "Our Pastor preacht in another place in ye Wood" (*Ibid.*) In 1686 James reversed his earlier policy and let Dissenters out of prison issuing his first *Declaration of Indulgence*. Although Anglicans continued to harass them, from this time on the Dissenters never experienced again the persecution of the former years.

66. How did persecution affect the Particular Baptists? Did persecution cause their numbers to decrease? Generally speaking the answer is "no". Although persecution slowed down the growth of the Particular Baptists, growth still occurred with little loss through defection or excommunication. The Broadmead church, for example, grew from 100 members in 1671 to 166 members in 1679 with "only one case of a person excluded or refused membership for conformity to the established church" (Watts, p.242).

Were there any benefits? Yes, the persecution brought the Dissenters together as never before in their common faith. In Bristol, the Presbyterians, Baptists, General & Particular, and Congregationalists: formed a committee which sought for ways to legally resist persecution; united in prayer; and organized their individual meetings on different nights of the week (*Ibid.*, p.243). In different places "Presbyterians and Anabaptists" were found worshipping together. Persecution also resulted in Particular Baptist teaching going beyond the borders of England and Wales. John

Miles of Swansea and a large part of his church went to New England in the 1660's at first settling in Seekonk. Some people from Stead's church at Dartmouth and Kiffin's church at London went to the Boston area and won people to their views. In 1665 this group baptized people and constituted a church. Several Baptists from Somerton in Somersetshire first went to Maine and then to Carolina. Near Charlestown they met another group from England including the ardent Baptist, the widowed Lady Axtell, and her daughter. They were the first to erect a meeting-house in Charlestown. A third group joined them in 1686 and "thus the Church at Charlestown became strong" (Whitley, *British Baptists*, pp.155ff).

Maybe the greatest benefit of persecution was the opportunity for spiritual growth it afforded the Dissenters. The Broadmead Church Records witness Pastor Thomas Hardcastle's view of the relationship between persecution and the church. From prison he wrote 22 letters to the congregation which were read to them on Sunday instead of the sermon. The Records tell us:

Hardcastle understood the situation demanded a close look at the congregation's attitude to worship, and the inner drives which motivated the congregation. He believed it was good that persecutions should come because they would not only deepen faith and patience, but they would eventually bring about the conversion of many. Hardcastle did not see a quick end to the persecutions and said that greater trials and troubles would come; 'these are but the footmen you have been running with; these are but the little figures of Anti-Christ'.

This brought Hardcastle to a lengthy discussion of the nature of Christian faith at its deepest point. He talks of the precious gift of faith in God as a veritable shield in danger. This is the kind of faith by which the just shall be able to live: a faith which brings a deep and lasting joy. Such faith takes the warnings which God's judgments provide, looks upon life as a pilgrimage to God, and is capable of overcoming the world. When Christians are obedient to Christ, then despite all outward factors, they will enter into the very presence of God (Hayden, p.57). During these days Particular Baptists were tried in their faith, and for the most part they persevered and grew in their faith.

67. The purpose of the meeting was to "giv[e] fit and proper encouragment for the raising up of an able and honourable ministry for the time to come" (Underwood, p.129). More than a hundred churches from Wales and England attended the Assembly. In the "Narrative of their Proceedings" they declared the Assembly had no power over individual congregations and that "their intendment being to be helpers

together of one another by way of counsel and advice" (Crosby, Vol.III, pp.246ff). This meeting decided several things:

1.) to accept into membership churches which practiced open communion but not open membership; 2.) to establish a fund to help weaker churches maintain their pastors; 3.) to send preachers "where the Gospel hath or hath not yet been preached, and to visit churches"; 4.) to assist pastoral trainees in attaining a knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew; 5.) to suggest that smaller churches join together for better support of their ministry and for edification; 6.) to endorse the 1677 *Confession*; and 7.) to agree to meet yearly as an Assembly (*Ibid.*)

68. There were fourteen churches in the eight counties but only seven desired to associate.
69. See Lumpkin, pp.195-198 for the history of the confession, and pp.198-200 for the Articles.
70. The Association began formal meetings in Nov. 1653. See Lumpkin, pp.200-202 for the history of the Confession, and pp.203-216 for the Confession itself.
71. See Lumpkin, pp.216-218 for the history of the *Antidote*.
72. Some Particular Baptists had defected to the the Quakers.
73. Letter dated Oct. 2, 1675.
74. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.216.
75. Taken from the "To the...Reader" of the 1677 *Confession* quoted out of *Ibid.*, p.224.
76. The preface reads, "Some things, indeed, are in some places added, some terms omitted, and some few changed." *Ibid.*, p.224.
77. See Robert Oliver, "Baptist Confession Making of 1644 And 1689," (paper presented to the Strict Baptist Historical Society, March 1989), p.16. On August 26th, 1677, the Petty France minute book reads, "It was agreed, that a Confession of Faith, with Appendix thereunto, having been read and considered by the brethren, should be published." This could have merely been the approval of the church after a General Meeting of all the churches, or it could have been the motion that started the ball rolling for the 1677 *Confession* that was later approved by a General meeting of the Particular Baptist Churches.

78. Lumpkin, p.241.
79. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.223.
80. *Ibid.*, p.223.
81. *Ibid.*, pp.226f.
82. *Ibid.*, pp.223f.
83. *Ibid.*, p.224. They go on to say, "And this we did, the more abundantly to manifest our consent with both, in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, as also with many others whose orthodox confessions have been published to the World, on the behalf of the protestants in diverse nations and cities; and also to convince all that we have no itch to clog religion with new words, but to readily acquiesce in that form of sound words which hath been, in consent with the holy scriptures, used by others before us; hereby declaring our hearty agreement with them, in that wholesome protestant doctrine, which, with so clear evidence of scriptures they have asserted" (*Ibid.*, p.224). Again near the end of the preface they state: "There is one thing more which we sincerely desire credence in, viz., that contention is most remote from our design in all that we have done in this matter....And oh that other contentions being laid asleep, the only care and contention of all upon whom the name of our blessed Redeemer is called, might for the future be, to walk humbly with their God, and in the exercise of all Love and Meekness towards each other, to perfect holyness in the fear of the Lord, each one endeavouring to have his conversation such as becometh the Gospel; and also, suitable to his place and capacity, vigorously to promote in others the practice of true Religion and undefiled in the sight of God and our Father. And that in this backsliding day, we might not spend our breath in fruitless complaints of the evils of others; but may every one begin at home, to reform in the first place our own hearts, and wayes; and then to quicken all that we may have influence upon, to the same work" (*Ibid.*, pp.225f).
84. Oliver, pp.12f.
85. See the footnote in the section 'History of the Particular Baptists 1640-1689' in this chapter for the details of this event.
86. If this is so, as we will see in the section dealing with the Atonement in the next chapter, the writers certainly kept the door open for hyper-Calvinism. Although the document is infralapsarian, it does not state anywhere, explicitly, that

the gospel is to be preached to all people.

87. Oliver, p.13.
88. *Ibid.*, p.14.
89. See subsection A. in this chapter for more of the details of this event.
90. See Lumpkin, pp.275-277.
91. White, *English Baptists...*, p.128.
92. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.287.
93. Haykin, "The 1689 Confession: A Tercentennial Appreciation 2," *Reformation Canada* 14 No.1(1991), p.13.
94. Sept.3-12.
95. Crosby, *Vol.III*, p.249.
96. *Ibid.*, pp.246-249.
97. *Ibid.*, pp.249-251.
98. *Ibid.*, pp.252-255.
99. *Ibid.*, pp.255-258.
100. *Ibid.*, p.258.
101. Lumpkin, pp.238f.
102. Kiffin signed the 1644 *Confession* and 1646 revision. Knollys signed the 1646 revision.
103. See Lumpkin, p.239 for the signatories.
104. For more details see Lumpkin, pp.239f.
105. See Lumpkin, pp.242f.

### CHAPTER THREE

#### COMPARISON OF THE TWO PARTICULAR BAPTIST CONFESSIONS

Having reviewed the histories of the two major Particular Baptist Confessions, we will now see if we can detect any significant doctrinal differences between them. Forty-five years separated these Confessions; did the intervening years result in any changes? We know the authors of the 1689 *Confession* believed that the 1644 *Confession* accomplished its end, and that one of the reasons for a new *Confession* was that the old one "is not now commonly to be had;" and also that "many others have since embraced the same truth which is owned therein."<sup>1</sup> From this we can assume the authors of the new *Confession* believed that the two were in fundamental agreement.

It is true that there were other reasons for writing the 1689 *Confession* which we have already mentioned in the last chapter. These reasons, however, do not imply doctrinal changes in the Confessions. It is obvious from reading the two Confessions that the organization, breadth, and methodology is different. The 1644 *Confession* is shorter, treats fewer subjects, and is not as comprehensive as the 1689 *Confession*. It essentially expounds only five subjects: God, Christ, the believer's conversion and life, the Church, and the Magistrate. The first section of the 1644 *Confession*, the initial eight Articles, briefly touch on God, His Decrees, Creation, the Fall,

and Scripture. In a large section from Articles nine through twenty-one the authors explain the Person and Work of the Mediator Jesus Christ. Another large section, Articles twenty-two through thirty-two, deals with the salvation and life of the believer in Christ. Articles thirty-three to forty-seven look at the important subject of the Church. Articles forty-eight to fifty-three touch on the believer's relationship to the Magistrate. This Confession is clearly Christocentric, Calvinistic, soteriological, and Scriptural.<sup>2</sup> It was not meant to be a full account of what the Particular Baptists believed; its purpose was to show their Calvinistic brethren that they were not Anabaptists in theology or practice. The Confession seems to have accomplished its purpose; but was it a sufficient expression of Particular Baptist faith?

It is not surprising that Particular Baptists after thirty-three years produced a new Confession. We need to remember that by 1677 there were approximately three hundred Particular Baptist churches throughout the country. Furthermore, these intervening years of growth, maturity, and persecution gave them time to think through their beliefs; this enabled them to present to the public a more comprehensive statement of their faith. Above all, we need to realize that the circumstances for writing were different; the time for unity and harmony with other Christians was a major concern to these Baptists; and this unity could be encouraged confessionally. The mature *Westminster Confession*, which took three years to hammer out, was in most



points an excellent expression of Puritan Calvinistic faith. It was detailed, and touched on almost all the important areas of the faith.<sup>3</sup> As persecution drew the Calvinists together it was logical for the Particular Baptists to use it as a basis for a new Confession just as the Congregationalists had in 1658. The 1689 *Confession* which was based at least in part on the *Westminster*, retained a Christocentric, Calvinistic, and soteriological emphasis as had the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>4</sup> The 1689 *Confession*, however, expands and adds to the 1644 *Confession*. It expands on the subject of the Godhead, particularly concerning the Persons of the Trinity.<sup>5</sup> It is also more detailed on the work of salvation in the believer's life, following the mature Reformed thinking of *Westminster*. In addition, the 1689 *Confession* emphasizes the work of the Holy Spirit in a much greater way in the salvation and life of the believer<sup>6</sup>, including the use of the Law of God in the Christian's life.<sup>7</sup> It expands on life after death and on the last judgment.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, it contains chapters on the Sabbath, Divine Providence, free will, and marriage. It virtually adds the teaching of the Lord's Supper to what was in the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>9</sup> All of these additions and expansions are the result of maturity and different circumstances, not changes of doctrine. This will be seen more clearly as the two Confessions are compared with regard to the atonement, baptism, the Church and religious liberty.<sup>10</sup> In sum, the 1689 *Confession* is doctrinally the same as the 1644 *Confession*, albeit a more comprehensive treatment of Particular

Baptist belief than the latter. In order to see that these two Confessions are in essential agreement on the important doctrines of atonement, baptism, the Church and religious liberty we will now compare them in these areas.

### **Atonement**

The subject of the Atonement relates specifically to the death of Jesus Christ on the cross for the redemption of humankind. Did Christ die for everyone or did he die for certain ones only? In the 1644 *Confession*, Article 21 states: "That Christ Jesus by his death did bring forth salvation and reconciliation onely for the elect." In Article 17, the *Confession* again declares: "Touching his Priesthood, Christ...hath fully performed and suffered all those things by which God, through the blood of that his Crosse in an acceptable sacrifice, might reconcile his elect onely." These two statements explicitly teach limited atonement or particular redemption. Other statements throughout the *Confession* imply this teaching. For example, Article 3 says, "God had in Christ before the foundation of the world according to the good pleasure of His will, foreordained some men to eternal life through Jesus Christ." In Article 19 Christ as our risen King "appl[ies] the benefits, vertue, and fruit of his Prophsie and Priesthood to his elect." Regarding faith, the *Confession* states, it is wrought "without respect to any power or capacitie in the creature, but

it is wholly passive,"<sup>11</sup> and it "is the gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Spirit of God."<sup>12</sup>

While this Confession is clearly Calvinistic in its doctrine of the Atonement, it is not, however, supralapsarian as we can see from Article 3.<sup>13</sup> After stating that "God... foreordained some men to eternal life," concerning the reprobate, it continues simply by saying "leaving the rest in their sinne to their just condemnation, to the praise of His Justice." This Article does not say that the reprobate are foreordained to eternal judgment, but only that those who are *not* foreordained to eternal life are *left in their sin to their just condemnation*.<sup>14</sup> In addition, this Confession is also not hyper-Calvinistic.<sup>15</sup> In fact, Article 21 in passing maintains that "the Gospel...is to be preached to all men."

This Confession does leave itself open, however, to the charge of Antinomianism. In Article 25, it claims:

That the tenders of the Gospel to the conversion of sinners, is absolutely free, no way requiring, as absolutely necessary, any qualifications, preparations, terrors of the Law, or preceding Ministry of the Law, but onely and alone the naked soule, as a sinner and ungodly to receive Christ.

Puritan conversion morphology saw the work of the Law as a prerequisite to conversion.<sup>16</sup>

The 1689 Confession also teaches the Calvinistic doctrine of limited atonement or particular redemption. In chapter 11.4 it asserts, "Christ did in the fulness of time die for their sins[the Elect]." In the chapter on Christ the Mediator<sup>17</sup> it

says,

The Lord Jesus by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the Eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the Justice of God, procured reconciliation, and purchased and Everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom of Heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.

In chapter 30:2 on the Lord's Supper the Confession states:

"Christ's own only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the Elect." It is not only evident from these statements in the Confession that the 1689 Particular Baptists held to limited atonement, but many other statements imply this belief. For example, in Chapter 3 on the Decrees of God it states: "Some men...are predestined, or foreordained to Eternal Life, through Jesus Christ....These...Men thus predestinated, and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is certain, and definite, that it cannot be either increased, or diminished."<sup>18</sup> This chapter also says: "Those of mankind that are predestined to life, God...hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love....Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, or effectually called, justified...and saved, but the Elect only."<sup>19</sup> In the Chapter on Effectual Calling it also declares:

This Effectual Call is of God's free, and special grace alone not from anything at all foreseen in man...the Creature being wholly passive therein...until quickened renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer the call, and to embrace the Grace offered and conveyed in it,...Others not elected...cannot be saved.<sup>20</sup>

In the Chapter on Saving Faith, the Confession states: "The Grace of Faith, whereby the Elect are enabled to believe to the saving

of their souls, is the work of the *Spirit of Christ* in their hearts."<sup>21</sup> And again in Chapter 20 we read: "There is...necessary, an effectual, insuperable work of the Holy Spirit upon the whole Soul, for the producing in them a new Spiritual Life, without which no other means will effect their Conversion unto God."<sup>22</sup>

There are no fundamental differences between the 1644 and the 1689 *Confessions* concerning the doctrine of the atonement. The differences that appear are not substantive but only relate to emphasis.<sup>23</sup> The 1689 *Confession's* Calvinism in some places is more explicit or clear.<sup>24</sup> However, the 1689 *Confession* leaves the door open to hyper-Calvinism in that there is no explicit statement concerning the preaching of the Gospel to all people as in the 1644 *Confession*. The two *Confessions* do, nevertheless, agree concerning the reprobate or unsaved. They both teach the predestination of the elect but, upholding infralapsarianism, they speak of the non-elect as being left in their sins, not predestinated to condemnation.<sup>25</sup>

### **Baptism<sup>26</sup>**

Both the 1644 and 1689 *Confessions* explicitly teach that the recipients of baptism are believers, and the mode of baptism is immersion. In the 1644 *Confession*, Article 39 says, "Baptisme is...to be dispensed onely upon persons professing faith or that are Disciples."<sup>27</sup> Article 40 states, "The way and manner of the

dispensing of this Ordinance the Scripture holds out to be dipping or plunging the whole body under water."<sup>28</sup>

The 1689 *Confession's* chapter on Baptism declares that "those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in and obedience, to our Lord Jesus, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance."<sup>29</sup> It goes on to say in the same chapter, "Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance."<sup>30</sup>

A comparison of these two Confessions on the subject of baptism reveals a sharpening of clarity and emphasis in the latter Confession. The 1689 *Confession* is clearer and more emphatic, particularly when we compare it with the 1646 revision of the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>31</sup> In addition, there are other similarities on this subject between the Confessions. For example, contrary to prevailing Puritan Calvinistic teaching, baptism is called an ordinance and not a sacrament.<sup>32</sup> Also, in both Confessions baptism is considered a sign. In the 1644 and 1689 *Confessions* the signification of the sign is given.<sup>33</sup> Aside from these similarities there is, however, one difference in the Confessions; it concerns the dispensing or administration of baptism. The 1644 *Confession* is ambiguous when it says,

The persons designed by Christ to dispense this Ordinance, the Scriptures hold forth to be a preaching Disciple, it being no where tyed to a particular Church, Officer, or person extraordinarily sent, the Commission injoyning the administration being given to them under no other consideration, but as considered Disciples.<sup>34</sup>

There is no ambiguity concerning the dispensing of baptism in the 1689 *Confession*. It reads in Chapter 26 on the Church, "A

particular Church...consists of Officers....And the Officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church (so called and gathered) for the Administration of Ordinances."<sup>35</sup> And again in Chapter 28 it states, "These holy appointments [the ordinances] are to be administered by those only, who are qualified and thereunto called according to the commission of Christ."<sup>36</sup> The "qualified" and "called" were the Officers of the church. To sum up, the two Confessions concerning the subject of baptism are the same except for possibly the administration of the ordinance.<sup>37</sup>

## Church

In both Confessions there are several Articles or chapters on the Church.<sup>38</sup> Both Confessions teach that the Church consists of visible saints.<sup>39</sup> The 1644 *Confession* states that the Church is "a company of visible Saints, called and separated from the world...to the visible profession of the Gospel in being baptized unto that faith."<sup>40</sup> The 1689 *Confession* reads:

All persons throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel, and obedience unto God by Christ, according unto it; not destroying their own profession by any Errors, everting the foundation, or unholyness of conversion, are and may be called visible Saints; and such ought all particular Congregations to be constituted.<sup>41</sup>

It is noteworthy that the 1689 *Confession* does not make believer's baptism essential to membership in the visible church, whereas the 1644 *Confession* does. The *Appendix* to the 1646 revision was quite explicit in support of closed communion. The

1689 confessors, however, wanted their Confession to be open-ended on this issue so as to allow their open communion brethren to accept the Confession.<sup>42</sup>

Both Confessions declare that Jesus Christ is the Head and King of the Church.<sup>43</sup> Both espouse the practice of inter-church association for the mutual help of one another.<sup>44</sup> Although implicit in the 1644 *Confession*, the 1689 *Confession* explicitly states that the messengers at association meetings "are not entrusted with any Church-power properly so called; or any jurisdiction over the Churches themselves, to exercise any censures either over any Churches, or Persons: or to impose their determination on the Churches, or Officers."<sup>45</sup> Both the Confessions, therefore, profess the autonomy of the local church.<sup>46</sup>

Concerning leadership in the Church, both Confessions teach that the Officers are to be called by the Church, each officer having been qualified by Christ for the Office.<sup>47</sup> Only the later Confession calls for the imposition of hands by the established eldership of the Church. Both Confessions hold that the officers of the Church should be elders and deacons.<sup>48</sup> Both Confessions essentially agree on the function of the officers. The 1644 *Confession* states that the Officers are appointed by Christ "for the feeding, governing, serving and building up of his Church."<sup>49</sup> And again, in Article 44, it says, "Christ for the keeping of his Church in holy and orderly Communion, placeth some speciall men over the Church, who by their office are to



governe, oversee, visit and watch." The 1689 *Confession* is more explicit when it says, "[The Officers are] set apart...for the peculiar Administration of Ordinances, and Execution of Power, or Duty, which he intrusts them with, or calls them to."<sup>50</sup> Both *Confessions* teach that others in the Congregation are gifted and ought to preach.<sup>51</sup> Both *Confessions* agree that the Officers should live by the Gospel and be maintained by the Church.<sup>52</sup> There is no mention at all about the Lord's Supper in the 1644 *Confession*.<sup>53</sup> The 1689 *Confession* has a chapter on it, calling it an ordinance not a sacrament. It is to be administered by the "Ministers" or "by those only, who are qualified and thereunto called."<sup>54</sup> There is also no mention of baptism as a prerequisite to partaking of the Lord's Supper.<sup>55</sup> The revision of the 1644 *Confession* that appeared in 1646, however, states in one of its Articles on baptism: "Disciples...who upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized and after to partake of the Lord's Supper."<sup>56</sup> This implies that baptism was a prerequisite for the Lord's Supper.<sup>57</sup>

It is interesting to note that the Lord's Supper has a Calvinistic flavour in the 1689 *Confession*. For example, it definitely states:

Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible Elements in this Ordinance, do then also inwardly by faith really and indeed, yet not carnally, and corporally, but spiritually receive, and feed upon Christ crucified and all the benefits of his death: the Body and Blood of Christ, being then not corporally, or carnally, but spiritually present to the faith of Believers, in that Ordinance, as the Elements themselves are their outward senses.<sup>58</sup>

Again, in chapter 30, it is maintained that "his Ministers (are)

to Pray, and bless the Elements of Bread and Wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use."<sup>59</sup> We see in these statements a tendency toward a form of sacramentalism.

Lastly, it should be noted that both Confessions place the final human authority of the church in the hands of the congregation. The 1644 *Confession* does not state this explicitly, but clearly presupposes it in a number of its Articles. For example, in the Article on the choosing of pastors it says, "Every Church has power given them from Christ for their better well being, to choose to themselves meet persons."<sup>60</sup> Article 42 on excommunication says, "Christ has likewise given power to his whole Church to receive in and cast out,...and this power is given to every particular Congregation, and not one particular person, either member or Officer, but the whole." The 1689 *Confession* explicitly teaches congregational authority in Chapter 26 on the Church when it says:

To each of these Churches thus gathered, according to his mind, declared in his work, he hath given all that power and authority, which is in anyway needful for the carrying on that order in worship and discipline, which he hath instituted for them to observe; with commands and rules for the due and right exerting, and executing of that power.<sup>61</sup>

In the 1644 *Confession* this power is to be used in the disciplining of its members.<sup>62</sup> In the 1689 *Confession* there are only two passing references to discipline with no elaboration.<sup>63</sup> Except for a few areas the doctrine of the Church in the two Confessions is essentially the same.<sup>64</sup>

## Religious Liberty

It is interesting that in neither Confession is the notion of religious liberty fully stated.<sup>64</sup> Both Confessions declare their submission to the Magistrate in all Secular areas.<sup>65</sup> It is explicitly stated in the 1644 *Confession* that they are not to submit to Ecclesiastical Laws "which we for the present could not see, nor our consciences could submit unto."<sup>66</sup> It goes on to make clear that if the Magistrate sees fit to punish them for not obeying the Laws, "are we bound to yeeld our persons to their pleasure." None of this is written in the 1689 *Confession*.

The 1644 *Confession* also teaches the separation of Church and State in several places. In Article 37 the ministers are to be lawfully called by the Church. Article 38 states that ministers are to live by the Gospel supported by the local church and not the state.<sup>68</sup> Article 36 dealing with the choosing of officers states, "that none other[only the Church and not the State, etc.] have power to impose them[Ministers], either these or any other." This again is an allusion to the State's involvement in the affairs of the local church, imposing on the Church, officers of its own choosing, not the Church's. From these articles of the 1644 *Confession* we can see that it does at least allude to religious liberty. The *Confession* from 1689 however, is almost silent about this issue. It does teach that the Church is to appoint its officers, and that it is to support

them, but other than these minor allusions, it is rather silent on the subject of religious liberty.<sup>69</sup> Most likely this reflects the circumstances and times in which the Confession was published. It was written in the midst of persecution (1677); it would make sense that the authors did not want to further inflame the pro-Anglican Government against them.

Even though we might have expected more on the subject of religious liberty in these two Confessions, in order to make a fairer judgment we need to note what they did not say. Both Confessions were based on preceding Confessions; the 1644 on the *Separatist True Confession* of 1596, and the 1689 *Confession* on the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions*. The Baptist Confessions left out a number of statements concerning the relationship between the Church and State made in the other confessions. For example, the 1644 *Confession* was not as virulently against the Established Church as was the *True Confession*. It toned down some of that rhetoric. The Presbyterians were in power at the time of the 1644 *Confession's* publication, and although they allowed Dissenters like the Baptists to worship, they still sought to work within an Erastian style of ecclesiology. The 1644 *Confession* on Religious Liberty reflects the Baptist desire to keep the freedom they had, and not allow the Presbyterians to infringe upon it; and at the same time not incense them by inflammatory rhetoric concerning religious liberty. They already had enough strikes against them, having been associated with Continental Anabaptism; they knew better than to encourage more

opposition by such rhetoric in their Confession. Their Confession was written to appease the Presbyterians, not incite them.

While the 1644 *Confession* was based on the *True Confession*, the 1689 *Confession* was based on the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions*. It is important to note what the 1689 *Confession* omits from *Savoy* and *Westminster* on the subject of religious liberty and the separation of Church and State. Where these Confessions teach the State's involvement in the Church, the Particular Baptists remove those statements from their Confession. These things need to be noted, as well as do the reasons behind the silence on this subject in these Confessions, in order to judge them fairly. These omissions and the reasons for them will be addressed in the next chapter on this same subject when we compare the 1689 Baptist Confession with the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions*. To sum up, these two Confessions on the subject of religious liberty say very little and so are in essential agreement on it.

#### NOTES

1. Taken from the "To the Judicious and Impartial Reader" of the Confession. Lumpkin, p.244.
2. When one reads this Confession it is obvious that the authors wanted to be as Scriptural as possible. For example, much of the Confession is simply quotations from Scripture. This may also be why non-Scriptural terms like "Trinity" are not used in the Confession.

3. I am thankful to Dr. Michael Haykin for pointing out to me that this Confession does not have an article on the Holy Spirit. The work of the Holy Spirit was important to Calvin and the Puritans.
4. Only one chapter (8) is directly related to Christ but throughout the Confession Christ is prominent and central. This is particularly so in the chapters concerning the salvation and life of the believer(10-19), and the chapters dealing with the Church(26-30).
5. See Chapter 3 of the Confession.
6. See Haykin, "The 1689 Confession: A Tercentennial Appreciation 2," *Reformation Canada* 14 No.1(1991),pp.16-21.
7. Chapter 19 of the Confession.
8. Chapters 31,32 of the Confession.
9. Nothing is said about the Lord's Supper in the 1644 *Confession*, and next to nothing in the 1646 revision.
10. See Novak,pp.236-242,290-293 and Chapter 3 to see the Particular Baptist hermeneutic for their teachings on baptism, the church, and religious liberty. The P.B.'s emphasis is on the New Testament. Novak writes, "[The] New Testament...wholly replace[s] the types and shadows of Moses with the final and exclusive model of doctrine, worship, and polity for the Gospel church....They[Particular Baptists] stress that He[Christ] died expressly to enable the faithful in all of their religious duties to offer God the true spiritual service which will reflect rather than earn his mercy in choosing them. To preserve any remnant of the outward order of the Old Covenant or to present God service based in any way on the principle of works also therefore constitutes a denial of the larger purposes which He embodied in the personal mission and Covenant of His Son. The order of the Gospel church, they conclude, must then be framed in precise accord with those exclusive principles by which the New Covenant transcends its predecessor....They[Particular Baptists] feel themselves bound by Christ Himself to yield literal obedience to every detail of the New Testament model. Moreover, they feel that the instructions which He has provided must not be clarified by reference either to the practices of the Old Covenant or to Christian tradition, each of which is in its own way less pure than the New Testament itself. The sole interpretive criterion by which each precedent must be judged is whether it directs the faithful to present to God that true inward obedience which He requires in the New Covenant. These authors[Particular

Baptists] thus insist that in their reconstruction of the true church the faithful must yield immediate obedience to all ordinances through which the literal model of the New Testament directs them to serve God in spirit. By the same standards they must abandon all practices which violate either the pure forms or the true principles of Gospel service" (pp.240f).

11. Article 24.
12. Article 22.
13. The Particular Baptists of the Interregnum were clearly Calvinistic. See Novak, pp.300-318 where under the title, 'The Process of Conversion and the Effects of Faith', we see the Calvinism of the authors Novak quotes. Also see Gritz, pp.199-230 for the Calvinism of one of the Particular Baptist leaders, Samuel Richardson.
14. Italics are mine.
15. Hyper-Calvinists maintain with Calvinists that it is only the Holy Spirit Who draws people to Christ. However, the former also believe that since there is no human involvement in a sinner's salvation then the gospel should not be offered to the sinner. He should not be called to salvation because he is unable to respond by himself.
16. For a Puritan understanding of conversion see L. Baird Tipson Jr., "The Development of a Puritan Understanding of Conversion" (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Yale University, 1972), pp.189-261. Also see Gritz, pp.254f and Novak, pp.300-303, 430n 4. Several of those Particular Baptists who signed the 1644 or 1646 revision of the Confession had Antinomian tendencies, e.g. Richardson, Hobson, Knollys. For Richardson's Antinomianism see Gritz, pp.263-290.
17. Chapter 8.5.
18. Chapters 3.3 and 3.4.
19. Chapters 3.5 and 3.6.
20. Chapters 10.2 and 10.4.
21. Chapter 14.1.
22. Chapter 20:4. Other places in the Confession that imply particular redemption include 7:2, 10:5, 17:1f.

23. The danger is how these differences are played out in the lives and churches of these Baptists. We know that the Particular Baptists became hyper-Calvinistic after 1689. Could the reading of this Confession have encouraged this?
24. For example, Chapter 3.4,6.
25. Article 3 in the 1644 *Confession*, and Chapter 3.3 in the 1689 *Confession*.
26. For a full discussion of what Particular Baptists believed regarding believer's baptism in the formative years of the denomination see Novak, pp.262-277. For them believer's baptism was based on the *precept* and *precedent* of the New Testament. Therefore, only the spiritual remade people should be baptized. They saw baptism as a spiritual service to God. God's larger purpose fulfilled in the New Covenant is for His people to render Him spiritual service. This is why Christ came into the world. Therefore, baptism of infants is contrary to this purpose because they are not spiritual people; and the practice of infant baptism is falling back on to Old Covenant forms, and thus it denies the very mission of Christ. The Particular Baptists also saw infant baptism as dangerous because it gave false hope to the recipients; and they may not look for the work of regeneration later in their lives. Baptism, for Particular Baptists, was a means of declaring to the world the work of grace in the heart of the believer.
27. The word "onely" was removed from the 1646 revision because of Daniel Featley's criticism(see Chapter one of this thesis for more on Featley and his criticism).
28. Because of Featley's criticism the phrase "The Scripture holds out to be" was omitted in the 1646 revision.
29. Chapter 29.2.
30. Chapter 29.4.
31. Because of the removal of some of the words due to Featley's criticisms.
32. See E. Brooks Holifield, *The Covenant Sealed: The Development of Puritan Sacramental Theology in Old and New England, 1570-1720*(New Haven:Yale University Press, 1974). He looks at the Sacramental doctrine of the early Puritans in pages 27-74, and the Baptist challenge to sacramentalism in the area of baptism in pages 75-108.



33. Article 40 in the 1644 *Confession*, and Chapter 29.1 in the 1689 *Confession*.
34. In Article 41 in the 1644 *Confession*, "a preaching Disciple" was changed to "a Disciple" in the 1646 revision, and "being men able to preach the Gospel" was added at the end. Also "Church, Officer" was changed to "Church-Officer". Both of these changes were due to Featley's criticism.
35. Chapter 26.8.
36. Chapter 28.2.
37. A possible reason for this ambiguity in the 1644 *Confession* could have been the concern of the authors to keep the power of decision and authority with the congregation and not with a leadership elite like that of the Presbyterians.
38. Articles 33-47 in the 1644 *Confession*, and Chapters 26-30 in the 1689 *Confession*.
39. See Novak, pp.244-256, for the reasons why the Particular Baptists believed this, and how they differed from other Separatists. These are the reasons: 1) the New Testament taught it; 2) the nature of the New Covenant is a work of God in the heart (regeneration); 3) the purpose of Christ is to make a people to obey and glorify God; 4) mixed communion constitutes a new form of anti-Christian darkness; 5) Christ is above Moses - by obeying Christ we establish the Incarnation; and 6) only by organizing the church, following the apostolic forms and the matter of spiritual saints, can a church be called a true church.
40. Article 33.
41. Chapter 26.2. See also Chapter 26.6.
42. See the *Appendix* to the 1677 edition of the *Confession*, McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, p.287.
43. Article 33 in 1644; Chapter 26.4 in 1689.
44. Article 47 in 1644 *Confession*. See also B.R. White, "The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644," *Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, 19(1968):585; Chapter 26.14,15.
45. Chapter 26.15. Particular Baptists contrary to the General Baptists held this position throughout the 17th century. In the General Assembly of Particular Baptist churches in 1689 the first issue that was resolved was associational

authority. The first rule states, "We disclaim all manner of 'superiority' and 'superintendency' over the churches, and that we have no 'authority' or 'power' to prescribe or impose any thing upon the faith or practice of any of the churches of Christ. Our whole intendment is to be helpers together of one another, by way of counsel and advice." The next seven rules were designed to protect the first rule. See Wamble, "The Beginning of Associationalism...", pp.556f.

46. Article 38 in 1644, and Chapter 26.15 in 1689.
47. Article 36 in 1644, and Chapter 26.8,9 in 1689.
48. Article 36 in 1644, and Chapter 26.8 in 1689. The 1644 *Confession* stated that the Officers were "Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons" but the 1646 revision omitted the first two offices. During the Interregnum there were differences of opinion on whether apostles, prophets, and evangelists still existed in the church. Collier, Blackwood and Tillam affirmed their existence; King and Purnell disagreed. See Novak, pp.411f. See also the article "The Office of Messenger amongst British Baptists in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *The Baptist Quarterly* 17(1957,58), pp.206-215, for a discussion of the term "messenger".
49. Article 36.
50. Chapter 26.8.
51. Article 41,45 in 1644, and Chapter 26.11 in 1689. The latter *Confession* is more explicit on this account.
52. Article 38 in 1644, and Chapter 26.10 in 1689. The latter *Confession* is clearer when it states that those officers who are to live by the Gospel are "Pastors".
53. Except in the 1646 revision, Article 39, where "and after to partake of the Lord's Supper" was added.
54. Chapter 28.2, 30.3.
55. See Chapter 30.7,8.
56. Article 39.
57. This is in agreement with the closed-communion doctrine of the majority of the early Particular Baptists. The Particular Baptists during the Interregnum say remarkably little in their writings on the Lord's Supper. They do say, however, that only true believers are to partake of it (Novak, pp.256-260.) Their teaching on the Lord's Supper is Calvinistic. See

Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England, Vol.2* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970?), pp.408,507.

58. Chapter 30.8. See Stan Fowler's unpublished paper, "'By Water and Spirit': Sacramental Theology in Early Baptist Thought," on Baptist sacramentalist baptismal theology. It appears the Puritan sacramentalist theology was still somewhat present. See E.P. Winter, "Calvinist and Zwinglian Views of the Lord's Supper of the Seventeenth Century," *The Baptist Quarterly* 15(1953,54), pp.325-329. He says, "Both 'Calvinist' and 'Zwinglian' approaches (to the Lord's Supper) are found among the Particular Baptists." See also Michael G. Haykin, "The Nature and Purpose of the Lord's Supper according Early Calvinistic Baptist Thought"(unpublished paper, 1995). The 1689 *Confession* definitely takes a Calvinistic approach to the Lord's Supper as do a number of its authors in their writings. See also Chapter four, footnote 111 for the similarities among the *Westminster*, *Savoy* and *London 1689 Confessions*.
59. Chapter 30.3.
60. Article 36.
61. Chapter 26.7.
62. Articles 42,43 of the 1644 *Confession* which deal with discipline, make no mention of Officer involvement.
63. There is also possibly the phrase "Execution of Power" in Chapter 26.8. Does this allude, at least in part, to this function for the Officers?
64. The differences on the Church between these Confessions are: believer's baptism is not essential to membership in the visible church(1689), imposition of hands on elders(1689), and sacramentalism of Lord's Supper(1689). These difference are somewhat significant but do not mark a major shift in the doctrine of the Church. Two possible explanations for the changes are: unimportant at the time of publication(e.g sacramentalism of Lord's Supper in 1644), and mature reflection on these subjects(e.g. believer's baptism is not essential in 1689). The imposition of hands could be explained by either of these two explanations.
65. Many Baptists, particularly by 1677 and 1689, believed in religious liberty. See H. Leon McBeth, *English Baptist Literature on Religious Liberty to 1689*(New York:Arno Press, 1980),pp.200-274. See also Novak,pp.278-290, for what the Particular Baptists of the Interregnum believed on this

subject. In keeping with their hermeneutic based on the New Testament, they saw no place for the sword or magistrate in the church. They believed that Christ was King and had sole authority over the church. The Particular Baptists disagreed with their Presbyterian and Congregational brethren on the place of the Old Testament in the Church. Therefore, using the Old Testament to justify the compelling of people to worship or any such thing, does not serve God's ends in the New Covenant. Christ's kingdom is a spiritual kingdom; the magistrate cannot effect a spiritual kingdom, only a civil one. Only Christ can effect a spiritual kingdom. The magistrate must protect the right of all people to follow their conscience.

66. Article 48 in 1644, and Chapter 24.3 in 1689.

67. Article 49.

68. The 1644 *Confession*, Article 38, reads, "They that preach the Gospel should live on the Gospel and not by constraint to be compelled from the people by a forced Law." This is an allusion to a tax used to support the state church.

69. More so than the 1644 *Confession*.

## CHAPTER FOUR

## COMPARISON OF THE SECOND LONDON BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH OF 1689 WITH THE WESTMINSTER AND SAVOY CONFESSIONS

In the last chapter we established that the two Particular Baptist Confessions are doctrinally similar; we must now go on to compare the *Second London Baptist Confession* with the other two important seventeenth century English Confessions, the *Westminster Confession* and *Savoy Declaration*. The three Confessions are quite similar because the *Savoy* and *London Confessions* are based on the *Westminster*. They are, therefore, clearly Calvinistic, and each espouses to one degree or another federal covenant theology. There are, however, a number of differences. *Savoy* made a number of changes to the *Westminster Confession*, not the least, and most important of which, was the addition of their Platform of Church Polity appended to the Confession. Moreover, the *London* authors incorporated into their Confession a number of the changes *Savoy* made to *Westminster*. However, the chapters on baptism, the Church, and religious liberty in *Savoy* were significantly altered by *London*.

Since the *London Confession* is our primary concern, it is important to understand where its content has come from. Most scholars agree that the entire Confession has drawn on three sources:

- 1) the Confessions of their Calvinistic brethren, the Presbyterian and Congregationalists. They chose to follow these Confessions out of their desire to show their agreement with

them;<sup>1</sup>

2) the Scriptures, upon which this and the other Confessions based their own content. The Particular Baptists based their Confessional differences with their Calvinistic brethren upon their own understanding of Scripture;<sup>2</sup> and

3) their Biblical response to their theological opponents within and without the Particular Baptist community. A number of changes made to the *Westminster Confession* by the authors of the *Savoy Declaration* were polemical, dealing with issues the Congregationalists were facing at the time. The same can be said for the changes that were made to the *Savoy Confession* by the authors of the *London Confession*. Since our prime concern is with the historical background to the *London Confession* and its comparison to the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*, we will expand on this third point. We will look at the Baptist Confession, and give some examples of changes that were made in response to the opponents these English Baptists were facing at the time.<sup>3</sup>

For the first example, we will take the problem of Quakerism. This was a concern for the authors of the *Savoy Declaration*. In Chapter one, Article ten, of *Westminster* we read:

The Supreme Judge by which all controversies of Religion are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, Opinions of ancient Writers, Doctrines of men and private Spirits, are to be examined, and in whose Sentence we are to rest, can be no other, but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures.

Because the last phrase could allow for the Quaker teaching of the Inner Light as the means of examination, the Savoy authors clarified it by saying, "but the holy Scripture delivered by the Spirit, into which Scripture so delivered, our Faith is finally resolved." This replacement prohibited the interpretation of the Inner Light as judge, and made it clear that the Scriptures in themselves are the only judge. Since the Particular Baptists were still doing battle with the Quakers in 1677, they retained this last statement from Savoy.<sup>4</sup> Again in Savoy, Quakerism was refuted in Chapter eight, Article four, concerning Christ's payment for the satisfaction of sin. Quakers believed that God could remit sin simply out of His love, if He so chose, without satisfaction.<sup>5</sup> The Savoy authors, therefore, added to the *Westminster Confession*, "and [Christ] underwent the punishment due to us, which we should have born[sic] and suffered, being made sin and a curse for us." The London authors, again, simply followed Savoy because Quaker writings concerning this issue were prevalent at the time.<sup>6</sup> Other changes were made to *Westminster* by Savoy and followed by London in order to refute Quaker teachings.<sup>7</sup>

Not only did the *London Confession* seek to refute Quakerism, it also made clear its opposition to the Arminianism of their "Anabaptist" brethren, in particular, the General Baptists. The General Baptists in their *Standard Confession* of 1660 state in Article eighteen:

That such who are true believers, even Branches in Christ the Vine, (and that in his account, whom he exhorts to abide

in him, John 15:1,2,3,4,5) or such who have charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of Faith unfeigned, I Tim.1:5 may nevertheless for want of watchfulness, swerve and turn aside from the same, Vers. 6,7. and become as withered Branches, cast into the fire and burned. John 15:6.<sup>8</sup>

The *London Confession* refutes this, adding to both the *Savoy* and *Westminster* a long section on the 'Perseverance of the Saints' in chapter seventeen, article one. This section not only states that God's people "can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved," but also goes on to say,

Seeing the gifts and callings of God are without repentance...from all Eternity...and though many floods arise and beat against them, yet they shall never be able to take them off that foundation and rock which by faith they are fastened upon: notwithstanding through unbelief and the temptations of Satan the sensible sight of the light and love of God, may for a time be clouded, and obscured from them, yet he is still the same, and they shall be sure to be kept by the power of God unto salvation, where they shall enjoy their purchased possession.<sup>9</sup>

This elaboration is both doctrinal and pastoral. But it clearly declares that the believer is "kept by the power of God" even in "unbelief" whereas the *Standard Confession* states that only those "who add unto their Faith Vertue, and unto Vertue Knowledge...shall never fall...for they are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation."<sup>10</sup>

The *London Confession* also answered the recent development of Arminianism within their own ranks in the person of Thomas Collier. Collier declared in his writings of the 1670's his rejection of the Calvinistic doctrines of election and total depravity.<sup>11</sup> The Calvinistic teachings of total depravity



and effectual calling are stated in the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions* but are elaborated in the *London Confession*, Chapter ten, Article two. Here, instead of "[man] who is altogether passive therein [regarding his effectual call]", it has, "[the effectual call is not] from any power or agency in the Creature coworking with his special Grace, the creature being wholly passive therein, being dead in sins and trespasses."<sup>12</sup> This change could have been a general refutation of Arminianism. However, why change the adequate statement in *Savoy*? Could it have been to strengthen the important doctrines of total depravity and effectual calling in the midst of the Collier controversy?

Collier's heresy of the eternal existence of the human nature of Christ is also answered in *London*.<sup>13</sup> It adds to *Savoy's* and *Westminster's* Chapter eight, Article two, on Christ the Mediator, saying,

(Christ being conceived by the Holy Spirit, in the Womb of the Virgin Mary), the Holy Spirit coming down upon her, and the most Hight overshadowing her, and was so made of a Woman, of the Tribe of Judah, of the seed of Abraham, and David according to the Scriptures.'

This clearly taught that Christ's human nature had a beginning.

The *London Confession* also addresses the controveries of antinomianism and neonomianism with additions to *Savoy* and *Westminster*. Baxter's Neonomianism is essentially answered by *Westminster's* chapter nineteen on the Law of God; and it is strengthened by the additions made by *Savoy* to the Chapter.<sup>15</sup> The *London Confession*, however, in order to help the readers see

that the law in the Covenant of Works has not changed for mankind after the Fall, instead of saying, "This Law so written in the heart continued to be a perfect Rule of Righteousness after the fall of man,..." adds the word "same" to it, saying, "The same law...."<sup>16</sup> There is no new law in the Covenant of Grace for believers to follow in order to be accepted by God, as Baxter taught, but the "same law" as in the Covenant of Works.

Concerning the antinomianism of the time, the *London Confession* simply follows the addition of the *Savoy* to the *Westminster Confession* in Chapter twenty-one, Article three, to answer it. *Westminster* stated: "They who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, do practice any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty." *Savoy* and *London* say more, adding, "Or cherish any lust; as they do thereby pervert the main design of the Grace of the Gospel to their own destruction."<sup>17</sup> This is a much stronger statement against antinomianism. The authors believed that the antinomian is walking in the path of destruction when he continues to live in sin, and so is really lost even if he claims to be saved by grace.

One last example that illustrates the polemical nature of some of the wording in the *London Confession* has to do with the teachings of Socinianism<sup>18</sup> and Deists.<sup>19</sup> These groups had a broader concept of salvation than the Calvinists. Implicitly they taught that it was possible for people to be accepted by God or to receive salvation without Christ. Maybe this is why the

*London* authors added to *Savoy's* Chapter ten, Article four, on 'Effectual Calling' where it says, "Others, not elected,...they neither will nor can truly come to Christ; and therefore cannot be saved." *London* adds: "Much less can men that receive not the Christian Religion be saved."<sup>20</sup>

One can see from these examples that the *London Confession* adapted its Confession to address the theological concerns Particular Baptists were facing in 1677.

Specific examination of the four areas of atonement, baptism, the Church, and religious liberty will reveal the similarities and differences between the *London Confession* and the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*.

### **Atonement**

As we stated in chapter three, the atonement relates to the death of Christ on the cross for the redemption of mankind. The Calvinistic doctrine of the atonement, sometimes called limited atonement or particular redemption, states that Jesus Christ died on the cross for the redemption of the Elect only.

All three of the Confessions we are examining in this study explicitly teach this doctrine. For example, all three in Chapter eleven, Article four, on 'Justification', state: "God did from all eternity decree to justify all the Elect, and Christ did in the fulness of time dye for their sins."<sup>21</sup> Again, we see this doctrine in all three Confessions in Chapter eight, Article

five, on 'Christ the Mediator', where it says,

The Lord Jesus by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which be through the Eternal Spirit, once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the Justice of God, and purchased not onely reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom(e) of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.<sup>22</sup>

Again, Chapter thirty, Article two<sup>23</sup> on the 'Lord's Supper', states: "That the Popish Sacrifice of the Mass...is injurious to Christ's own onely Sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of the Elect."<sup>24</sup>

In addition, all the Confessions imply the doctrine of limited atonement in various ways and places. For example, chapter 3 on the 'Decrees of God', states that

some men...are predestinated, or fore-ordained to Eternal Life, through Jesus Christ,...These...Men thus predestinated, and fore-ordained, are particularly, and unchangeably designed, and their number is certain, and definite, that it cannot be either increased, or diminished...Those of mankind that are predestined to life, God...hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his meer(sic) free grace and love;...neither are any other redeemed by Christ, or effectually called, justified...and saved, but the Elect only.<sup>25</sup>

In the Chapter on 'Effectual Calling', it is maintained that

this Effectual Call is of God's free, and special grace alone not from anything at all foreseen in man...(man being passive)...untill quickned, and renewed by the holy Spirit he is thereby enabled to answer this Call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it....Others not elected...cannot be saved.<sup>26</sup>

In the Chapter on 'Saving Faith' the Confessions state: "The Grace of *Faith*, whereby the Elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the *Spirit of Christ* in their hearts."<sup>27</sup> These are the similarities between the three

Confessions on the doctrine of the atonement. There are, however, some differences.

As we study the *Westminster* and the *Savoy Confessions*, we see a strengthening of Calvinism in the latter. In his book *Puritans and Calvinism*, Peter Toon compares the two Confessions and their Calvinism.<sup>28</sup> He notes in the Chapter on 'Repentance' that the authors of *Savoy*, changing and adding to *Westminster*, were "enthusiastic to maintain the sovereignty of the grace of God," but "failed to emphasise adequately the equally important responsibility of men to God."<sup>29</sup> He says the same thing for Chapter twenty of *Savoy*, on the 'Gospel'.<sup>30</sup> Their emphasis in this chapter is clearly on the sovereignty of God in salvation.<sup>31</sup> In addition, he sees an over-emphasis on federal theology in *Savoy*, in the Chapters on the 'Fall of man' and 'Christ the Mediator'.<sup>32</sup> Toon believes the *Savoy* authors strongly emphasized the sovereignty of the grace of God in 1658, because Congregationalists were under attack from other Calvinists; as a result, they overstated their Calvinism.<sup>33</sup>

What is significant for this study is that the London Particular Baptists employed the stronger Calvinistic *Savoy Confession* as the base for their Confession, rather than the more balanced *Westminster Confession*. There are a few examples where the Calvinism of *Westminster* is strengthened in both the *Savoy* and *London Confessions*. One is found in Chapter five, Article four on 'Providence', where it asserts:

The Almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God so far manifest themselves in his

Providence, that his determinate Council extendeth itself even to the first fall, and all other sinful actions both of Angels and Men;(permission,) which also he most wisely and powerfully boundeth and otherwise ordereth, and governeth in a manifold dispensation, to his most holy ends; yet so, as the sinfulness of their acts proceedeth only from the Creatures, and not from God; who, being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author or approver of sin.<sup>34</sup>

Again, in Chapter ten, Article four, where Savoy and London strengthen the Calvinism of Westminster, it states: "Others, not elected, although they may be called by the Ministry of the Word, and may have some common operation of the Spirit, yet not being effectively drawn by the Father, they neither will nor can truly come to Christ."<sup>35</sup>

As mentioned before, Savoy differs much from Westminster in its chapter on 'Repentance'. Both Confessions are clearly Calvinistic but the emphasis in Westminster is on our responsibility to repent; in Savoy, the emphasis is on God and His part in our repentance. Moreover, repentance in the Savoy is seen in the light of federal theology, and God's eternal purposes. Both Westminster and Savoy do state that "it is every man's duty to endeavour to repent of his particular sins, particularly". Westminster puts it in a universal context, whereas Savoy puts it in the context of the redeemed throughout their lives.<sup>36</sup> Interestingly, London follows Savoy word for word, and so, along with Savoy, emphasizes and strengthens the Calvinism of Westminster.<sup>37</sup>

The same is true of Chapter twenty of Savoy, which is not found in Westminster entitled, 'Of the Gospel'. This chapter

also emphasizes the sovereignty of God in our salvation and not the responsibility of humans to believe the Gospel. This whole chapter was incorporated into the *London Confession*.<sup>38</sup>

As noted above, the Calvinistic federal theology of *Westminster* was strengthened or emphasized by the additions that the Savoy authors made in their Confession.<sup>39</sup> This can be seen in Chapter six in the first three Articles of Savoy.<sup>40</sup> It can also be seen in Chapter fifteen on 'Repentance' in Articles two and five<sup>41</sup>; and again, in Chapter twenty, Article one, on the 'Gospel'.<sup>42</sup> It can also be seen in Chapter eight, Article one, on 'Christ the Mediator', where *Westminster* says: "It pleased God...to chuse and ordain the Lord Jesus his onely begotten Son,...", Savoy adds, "according to a Covenant made between them both," emphasizing federal theology.

All of these additions to *Westminster* by the Savoy authors were borrowed by the London Baptists for their Confession.<sup>43</sup> They also, along with the Congregationalists, wanted to clearly state their adherence to federal theology. Although this is true, there are a few places where the *London* authors removed some federal theology statements from both the Savoy and *Westminster Confessions*. For example, in Chapter six, Article one, *London* takes out all the explicit statements regarding the Covenant of Works that Savoy added to *Westminster*.<sup>44</sup> In this expanded chapter on sin and the Fall, *London* follows the *Westminster Confession* in being a less theological, and more practical statement of the doctrine.

Again, *Savoy's* and *Westminster's* Article two in the Chapter on 'God's Covenant with Man' is excluded from *London*.<sup>46</sup> In Article 3<sup>46</sup> of the same chapter, the Covenant perceptions of *Savoy* and *Westminster* differ from *London*. The former two are more theological, explaining the Covenants of Works and Grace; whereas, the *London Confession* is more practical, showing the continuity of God's covenant relationship with humankind from the beginning to the end. One wonders why there was this ambivalence in the *London Confession*. It appears to follow the strengthened federal theology of *Savoy* in some areas, and then in others, it shies away from the federal theology statements of both *Westminster* and *Savoy*. Maybe the reason for this lies in the *London* authors' New Testament hermeneutic. This hermeneutic emphasises the unity of God's work of grace, and seeks to keep this work centred in Christ, through whom we are governed by the New Covenant.<sup>47</sup>

A significant difference between the *Westminster*, *Savoy* and *London Confession*, is each Confession's statement on the non-elect in the chapter on the 'Decrees of God'. *Westminster* and *Savoy* say in Article 3, "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death." And again, in Article 7 of both Confessions, it says:

The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as he pleaseth for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by; and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice.



Whereas, in Article 3 of the same Chapter, the *London Confession* states:

By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and Angels are predestinated, or fore-ordained to Eternal Life, through Jesus Christ, to the praise of his glorious grace; others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of his glorious justice.<sup>48</sup>

*Westminster's* and *Savoy's* Calvinism is supralapsarian, following the theology of William Perkins and William Ames. But the *London* authors chose to remove these statements and follow the infralapsarian teaching on the destiny of the reprobate, taken from the Articles of Dort. We might ask why the *London* authors do not follow the stronger Calvinistic teaching in the other Confessions when they appear to be emphasizing their Calvinism in other places of the Confession? The answer might simply be, that the purpose of their Confession in 1677 was to declare to their Calvinistic brothers that they were full-blooded Calvinists; but this did not mean they would move from their infralapsarian position stated in their 1644 *Confession*.<sup>49</sup>

In conclusion, we can see that the three Confessions on the Atonement are in essential agreement. There is no doubt that the Calvinism of *Savoy* is more explicit than that of *Westminster*. But we need to remember, the *Westminster* divines in 1645 were the English Calvinists of the day. They did not need to defend their Calvinism in their Confession, nor did they seek to. This was not so for the Congregationalists and Particular Baptists. Both groups, even when free to worship during the Interregnum, felt inferior, and were considered quasi-orthodox. How could the

Congregationalists show their orthodoxy? Would it not be by making a strong Calvinistic statement in their Confession? This was certainly one of the main reasons for writing their Confession. And what about those questionable Particular Baptists who were sometimes confused with Anabaptists and General Baptists even thirty years after their genesis? How could they show their orthodoxy to their Calvinist brethren? Would their orthodoxy not be demonstrated by borrowing from the Calvinistic Confession of *Westminster*, and the even stronger Calvinistic Confession of *Savoy*? Both Congregationalists and Baptists wanted to be perceived by their Calvinistic Presbyterian brethren and others, as orthodox; borrowing from these two English Calvinistic Confessions was a good way for the Particular Baptists to be seen as such.

I agree, however, with Peter Toon that the strong Calvinism of these two Confessions probably played a part in the development of hyper-Calvinism in both denominations in the eighteenth century. *Westminster* seems to be a more balanced Confession concerning the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man.<sup>50</sup>

### **Baptism<sup>51</sup>**

In the previous section on the Atonement we saw that the three Confessions are in fundamental agreement; the differences are in degree, not in substance. This is not the case when we

compare the three Confessions on the subjects of baptism, the Church, and religious liberty. Although the Congregationalists came closer to the teaching of the Particular Baptists than did the Presbyterians in these areas, it was on these subjects that these Calvinistic brethren parted ways. This is exactly why the subjects of baptism, the Church, and religious liberty in the Confessions need to be studied; so that we might understand the differences between Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Particular Baptists in the seventeenth century; and in particular, that we might see the unique teachings of the Particular Baptists in the history of doctrine.

The first subject that will be examined is baptism. The articles in the Chapter on the Sacraments in the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions* are essentially identical. The only major difference is found in Article four which speaks of the administration of the sacraments. The *Westminster* states that they are to be "dispensed by...a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained." The *Savoy* replaces "ordained" with "called." The Congregationalists did not emphasize ordination to the same degree as the Presbyterians, and so the change.<sup>52</sup> This difference, however, is insignificant.

With the exception of three minor differences, the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* are also essentially identical in the chapter on baptism. Although *Savoy* calls baptism a "sacrament" in the first part of Article one, it replaces the *Westminster's* word, "sacrament", in the latter part of Article one and in

Article two, with the term, "ordinance." *Westminster* states in Article one that baptism is "for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church." *Savoy* excludes this statement. The omission will be significant when we come to compare these two Confessions with the *London Confession*. In Article four *Westminster* says, "Also the Infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." *Savoy* adds at the end, "And those onely." The *Savoy* authors wanted to make it clear that only those children whose parent(s) are in the Covenant of Grace can be baptized. Did *Westminster* simply assume this?

We must now see how the *London Baptist Confession* differs from *Savoy* and *Westminster* on baptism. The first thing to notice is that the chapter title of the latter two, 'Of the Sacraments', is changed to 'Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper'. The Baptists in their Confession never use the term "sacrament" for the Lord's Supper or baptism; they are always called "ordinances". Although the Baptists did not totally dismiss sacramentalism, they certainly wanted to distance themselves from any strong sacramentalist theology. The second obvious difference between the Confessions is that the two chapters dealing with baptism in the *London Confession*<sup>53</sup> are almost completely changed from both *Savoy* and *Westminster*. Four of the Articles were totally rewritten; one Article is the same except for the removal of one phrase<sup>54</sup>, and another borrows a few phrases from *Westminster* and *Savoy*.<sup>55</sup> The alterations are understandable. If there was a

point of difference between these Calvinists, it was on the subject of baptism. What precisely were the differences?

One of the significant differences has to do with the sacramentalism of the ordinance. *Westminster* and *Savoy* call baptism a "signe and seal of the Covenant of Grace."<sup>56</sup> In the Chapter on the Sacraments, they say, "There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation; or sacramental union between the signe and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other."<sup>57</sup> Article three goes on to say:

The grace which is exhibited in or by the Sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them, neither doth the efficacy of the Sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of Institution, which contains together with a Precept authorizing the use thereof, a Promise of benefit to worthy receivers.<sup>58</sup>

Again, in the chapter on 'Baptism', Article six, we read:

By the right use of this Ordinance, the grace promised is not onely offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the holy Ghost to such(whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own Will in his appointed time.<sup>59</sup>

The sacramentalist theology of baptism is obvious from these statements.<sup>60</sup>

The *London Confession* makes no mention of sacrament or sacramentalism in its two chapters on baptism; in fact, it makes no allusion, whatsoever, to sacramentalism in these chapters. There is no mention that baptism is a seal of the Covenant of Grace; it is called a sign. The word "seal" connotes that the act of baptism in some way confers grace upon the recipient.

Although a number of Particular Baptists were not against sacramentalism<sup>61</sup>, the reason they chose not to use 'seal' was their strong opposition to infant baptism, and its place in Covenant theology. Could it not be that the Particular Baptists desired to separate baptism from the sacramentalism of the Covenant in their Confession in order that it be understood that baptism does not confer grace on infants apart from faith? For them baptism was a sign, and for at least some a seal, of God's grace upon a *believer*, not a seal conferring grace upon an infant.<sup>62</sup>

A second difference between the *London Confession* and the other two has to do with the sign of circumcision in the Old Testament and the sign of baptism in the New Testament. For the *Savoy* and *Westminster* authors these signs, at their appointed times, had the same significance before God. In Article five, in the Chapter on the 'Sacraments', both of these Confessions declare: "The Sacraments of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were for substance the same with those of the New."<sup>63</sup> The *London Confession* does not use this Article, nor refute it. For the authors of the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*, entrance into the Covenant of Grace in the Old Testament was by means of circumcision and entrance into the same Covenant in the New Testament is by means of baptism. In fact, this is explicitly stated in the *Westminster Confession* when in its chapter on baptism this rite is said to be "for the solemn admission of the

party baptized into the visible church."<sup>64</sup> This refers to either infants or adults. The Baptists make clear in their Appendix to the 1677 Confession that baptism and circumcision under their respective dispensations are not the same, and that it is the indwelling of the Spirit that gives one admission into the visible church. They write:

If our brethren do suppose baptism to be the seal of the Covenant which God makes with every believer (of which the Scriptures are altogether silent) it is not our concern to contend with them herein; yet we conceive the seal of that Covenant is the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ in the particular and individual persons in whom he resides, and nothing else, neither do they or we suppose that baptism is in any such manner substituted in the place of circumcision, as to have the same (and no other) latitude, extent, or terms, then circumcision had; for that was suited only for the Male children, baptism is an ordinance suited for every believer, whether male, or female. That extended to all the males that were born in Abrahams house, or bought with his money, equally with the males that proceeded from his own loynes; but baptisme is not so far extended in any true Christian Church that we know of, as to be administered to all the poor infidel servants, that the members thereof purchase for their service, and introduce into their families; nor to the children born of them in their house.<sup>65</sup>

Entrance into the Covenant of Grace in the Old Testament was by circumcision, but it was not a means of conferring grace upon the recipients, for not all were circumcised. Entrance into the Covenant of Grace in the New Testament is by a work of grace in the heart of the elect brought about by the Holy Spirit. Baptism was a sign of that work. The *London Confession* thus maintains: "Baptism is...(to) the party Baptized, a sign of his fellowship with him,...of his being engrafted into him,...of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to live and walk in newness of life."<sup>66</sup>

A third difference between the *London Confession* and the other two has to do with the recipients of baptism. We have already mentioned that the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* teach Infant Baptism. This is explicitly stated in Article four in the Chapter on 'Baptism' where it says, "The Infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized."<sup>67</sup> The *London Confession* does not explicitly deny infant baptism, but does imply it when in Article two of the same Chapter on 'Baptism', it says, "Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience, to our Lord Jesus, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance."<sup>68</sup>

A final difference has to do with the mode of baptism. In article three, the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* state: "Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary, but Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person."<sup>69</sup> Although they do not rule out immersion as a mode of baptism, they state it is not necessary. The *London Confession*, on the other hand regards it as necessary. It unequivocally states: "Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance."<sup>70</sup> One of the reasons the Particular Baptists felt immersion was necessary had to do with their theology of baptism. Baptism was a sign, and was to correspond to the thing signified which, according to their Confession, was "fellowship with him[Christ], in his death, and resurrection."<sup>71</sup> The believer dies to sin with Christ, and rises with him to new life.



Immersion symbolized this experience; sprinkling did not.

There are at least two similarities on the subject of baptism in all three Confessions; they agree that the ordinances are to be administered by the Officers of the Church<sup>72</sup>, and that the outward element of baptism is water.<sup>73</sup>

#### Church<sup>74</sup>

Although there are obvious differences in the Confessions concerning the subject of the Church, the primary differences are between the *Westminster Confession*, on the one hand, and the *London* and *Savoy Confessions*, on the other. The latter two focus on the local church more than the former, and thus in various ways they differ in the working out of their doctrine of the Church.

Before looking at the differences between these three Confessions, their similarities should be noted. All three Confessions state that the "universal Church" is "invisible" and "consists of the whole number of the 'Elect' that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ."<sup>75</sup> In all three of the Confessions the Church is more than simply the local body of believers; it is universal including all of the Elect throughout history. All three Confessions also declare that the visible church consists of all those throughout the world who profess the true religion or faith of the Gospel.<sup>76</sup> Moreover, they state that Christ is the Head of the Church universal.<sup>77</sup> They also

agree in arguing that the Pope of Rome is not "in any sense the Head" of the Church. He "is that AntiChrist, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God."<sup>78</sup> In addition, all three texts hold that "the purest Churches under heaven are subject to mixture, and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan."<sup>79</sup> They are certain that local churches are not perfect in holiness or doctrine, and some even become places of wickedness and falsehood. By taking this position, the Baptists and Congregationalists are definitely distancing themselves from their forefathers who wrote the *True Confession* of 1596. In that Confession the English Church is described as an "AntiChristian State" with "False Offices", and with a "false and antiChristian constitution."<sup>80</sup> In the Preface it is stated: "This..Church of England, wee[sic] have both by word and writing, proved it unto them to bee false and counterfeit."<sup>81</sup> Also it is maintained that "the Metropolitane Sinagoge of Rome, from when they[Anglicans] have feched [sic] the very patterne nnd[sic] mould of their Church, Ministerie, Service & Regiment, even the very express Character and Image of that first wild beast of Italy."<sup>82</sup>

Turning now to the chief differences between the *Westminster Confession*, and the *Savoy* and *London Confessions*. The latter two state that the visible members of the universal church ought to gather themselves into local congregations.<sup>83</sup> They teach that the visible Church is made up of those people who

are "profess[ing] the faith of the Gospel and obedience unto God by Christ, according unto it."<sup>84</sup> They also say:

The Members of these Churches are Saints by calling, visibly manifesting and evidencing (in and by their profession and walking) their obedience unto that call of Christ; and do willingly consent to walk together according to the appointment of Christ, giving up themselves, to the Lord & one to another by the will of God, in professed subjection to the Ordinances of the Gospel.<sup>85</sup>

Neither of these latter two points are made in the *Westminster Confession*.

Both the *Savoy* and *London Confessions* declare that each local church possesses its own authority in its membership under Christ.<sup>86</sup> *Westminster*, on the other hand, teaches that Christ's authority is mediated through the Officers of the Church and through Synods and Councils.<sup>87</sup> Both *Savoy* and *London* teach that synods and councils have no power or authority over any local church.<sup>88</sup> Both therefore teach the autonomy of the local church in contradistinction to the *Westminster Confession*. Did this mean that there was no place for the assembling of churches of like faith and practice for Congregationalists and Particular Baptists? The answer is No. Both encouraged it; they taught that they "ought to hold communion amongst themselves for their peace, increase of love, and mutual edification."<sup>89</sup> These Assemblies could help Churches "in cases of difficulties or differences, either in point of Doctrine, or Administration" or they could help individual members who were "injured in or by any proceedings in censures not agreeable to truth, and order." The Assembly of messengers from various churches could help by

considering the matter, and giving their "advice in, or about the matter of difference."<sup>90</sup>

Concerning the subject of Church Officers in the *Savoy* and *London Confessions*, there are a number of distinct similarities. For example, both taught that each local church had the power to elect its own Officers. In the words of the *Savoy*: "The Lord Christ having given to his called ones...Liberty and Power to choose Persons filled by the holy Ghost for that purpose, to be over them, and to minister to them in the Lord."<sup>91</sup> *London* concurs saying, "The Officers [are] to be chosen and set apart by the Church."<sup>92</sup> Both say: "[The] Elder...is... chosen...by the common suffrage of the Church itself."<sup>93</sup> They both teach that the work of the Officers is "the peculiar administration of Ordinances, and execution of Power or Duty."<sup>94</sup> Both teach that pastors are to preach, "yet the work of Preaching the Word, is not peculiarly confined to them; but that others also gifted, and filled by the Holy Spirit for it, and approved, and called by the Church may and ought to perform it."<sup>95</sup>

There is no express statement in either of these Confessions regarding the power of the Officers in the Church. They do say that the Officers are to execute "Power, or Duty which he[Christ] intrusts them with," but this is the only reference to their authority in the church. The *Westminster Confession*, on the other hand, concerning the power of the officers states that "the Lord Jesus, as king and head of the church, hath herein appointed a government, in the hand of church

officers...to these officers the keys of the kingdom are committed."<sup>96</sup>

As far as the choosing of pastors or elders is concerned, the *Westminster Confession* is silent. The *Form of Presbyterial Church-Government*, also written by the Westminster Assembly, states that "ordination is the act of a presbytery" which means "that no single congregation...[does] assume to itself all and sole power in ordination."<sup>97</sup> The presbytery is made up of elders from various congregations and they choose who ought to be ordained, and, to a certain degree, who could be minister of what church.

While there are many similarities between the *Savoy* and *London Confessions* there are also some key differences. For instance, one of the differences is found in Chapter twenty-six, Article one of the *London Confession* which states that the "universal Church which (with respect to internal work of the Spirit, and truth of grace) may be called invisible."<sup>98</sup> The section in parentheses is an addition to both the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions*. The probable reason for this addition is the Particular Baptist belief that the Church consists of regenerate people. This is assumed by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, but not by the Anglicans and Church of Rome. The *London* authors are simply making explicit what is implicit in the other Confessions.

We see another difference between *Savoy* and *London* concerning the number of Officers in the church. *London* states

that the Officers "are Bishops or Elders and Deacons."<sup>99</sup> In another place it speaks of "the Bishops or Pastors of the Churches to be instant in Preaching the Word."<sup>100</sup> Savoy, on the other hand, states in Article ten: "The Officers,...are Pastors, Teachers, Elders and Deacons." We see that the Savoy authors believed in the Calvinist teaching of four offices in the church. The *London* authors only held to two offices. They considered the Pastor, Bishop, and Elder to be one office. This position was probably informed by their study of Scripture, choosing rather to follow it than the church model in Calvin's Geneva on this subject.<sup>101</sup>

A significant difference between the Confessions concerning the Officers has to do with their remuneration. The *London Confession* states that

it is incumbant on the Churches to whom they Minister, not only to give them all due respect, but also to communicate to them of all their good things according to their ability, so as they may have a comfortable supply, without themselves entangled in Secular Affairs...and this is required by ...the Express order of our Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>102</sup>

The Savoy Platform says something different. "They who are ingaged in the work of Publique Preaching, and enjoy the Publique Maintenance upon that account are not therefore obliged to dispense the Seals."<sup>103</sup> We know that during the Interregnum the Congregationalists freely received State money for their labours. This was not acceptable to the *London* authors whose denomination throughout its short history discouraged its churches from receiving state support.

The *London Confession*, moreover, has a statement of what

the duties of the Pastors are to be. It declares: "The work of Pastors being constantly to attend the Service of Christ, in his Churches, in the Ministry of the Word, and Prayer, with watching for their souls, as they that must give an account to him."<sup>104</sup> We see a pastoral element in this statement of the Confession, which, incidentally, is not found in Savoy.

Something that is quite evident in the Savoy and *Westminster Confessions* but relatively lacking in *London* is the subject of censure or discipline. *Westminster* devotes a whole Chapter to discipline<sup>105</sup>; and Savoy treats it in four Articles of its Platform.<sup>106</sup> The *London Confession*, however, only mentions discipline in two of its Articles.<sup>107</sup> These Articles are also found in Savoy in its Platform. For some reason the *London* authors chose not to elaborate at all on discipline in their Confession.<sup>108</sup>

There were a few things in Savoy which the *London* authors in their explication of the Church omitted. For example, *London* left out Article five of Savoy's Chapter on the Church which teaches the eschatology of postmillennialism.<sup>109</sup> It states,

As the Lord in his care and love towards his Church, hath in his infinite wise providence exercised it with great variety in all ages, for the good of them that love him, and his own Glory: so according to his promise, we expect that in the later days, Antichrist being destroyed, the Jews called, and the adversaries of the Kingdom of his dear Son broken, the Churches of Christ being enlarged, and edified through a free and plentiful communication of light and grace, shall enjoy in this world a more quiet, peaceable and glorious condition than they have enjoyed.<sup>110</sup>

This statement was added in 1658 when the teachings of Fifth Monarchism and postmillennialism were prominent among the

Puritans. Both notions were left out of the *London Confession* in 1677 because the events of the Restoration squelched, or at least delayed, the imminence of the millennium for English Calvinists. Moreover, Particular Baptists were not all in agreement on eschatology; therefore, the Confession remained silent on the subject.

Something that should be noted is the ecumenism of Savoy in Articles 29 and 30 of its Platform. It opens the way for Congregationalists to fellowship with other Calvinistic churches, saying:

XXIX. Such reforming Churches as consist of Persons sound in the Faith and of Conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to refuse the communion of each other, so far as may consist with their own Principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same Rules of Church-Order.

XXX. Churches gathered and walking according to the minde of Christ, judging other Churches (though less pure) to be true Churches, may receive unto occasional communion with them, such Members of those Churches as are credibly testified to be godly, and to live without offence.<sup>111</sup>

Such openness to other churches is missing in both *Westminster* and *London*. Possibly the *London* authors simply did not regard this openness as necessary for their Confession, and thus did not mention it.<sup>112</sup> Perhaps they feared that adding them to their Confession would compromise their doctrinal position in some way.<sup>113</sup>

There are other distinct differences between the Confessions which we have not yet noted.<sup>114</sup> One difference worth mentioning, is the way each perceives the Church. The Presbyterian Confession, when referring to the Church, emphasises



the universal aspect rather than the particular and local aspect. The Congregationalists move away from this emphasis without giving it up, preferring to give greater attention to the local church.<sup>115</sup> The *London Confession* is further removed from the *Westminster Confession* even yet in its treatment of the universal church. It does mention the universal church in Chapter twenty-six, Article one, but in the rest of the Articles speaks of the Church in terms of its local aspect.<sup>116</sup> The emphasis is clearly on the local church in this Chapter. As far as the Particular Baptists were concerned, when the Church is considered it must be primarily thought of in terms of what we see; and that is the local visible church, not the universal church. For them, the local church, because it consisted of visible Saints, was a microcosm of the universal church; all instruction was directed to the local church, with Christ as the Head over it. It was proper to speak of the universal church, but instruction in a Confession must be given concerning the local church where the universal church is manifested.

### **Religious Liberty<sup>117</sup>**

The chapters on Christian Liberty in the *Savoy* and *London Confessions* are almost identical.<sup>118</sup> Several phrases are added by both to the *Westminster Confession* in a few places. The most significant changes are in Article three which states: "They who upon pretense of Christian liberty do practice any sin,...,

as they do thereby pervert the main designe of the Grace of the Gospel to their own destruction." This was an anti-antinomian statement made by the Savoy authors in the face of Ranterism and Quakerism; it was kept by the London authors in their Confession.

Both Savoy and London leave out the whole of *Westminster's* Article four, which says that "they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God."<sup>119</sup> It goes on to teach that the church or magistrate may bring to account anyone who publishes or practices erroneous teachings that are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ has established in the Church.<sup>120</sup>

Both Congregationalists and Particular Baptists removed this Article probably because it implied a State-Church structure, which could promote the control of religion in the country, not allowing groups, like themselves, to worship as they saw fit. For the Particular Baptists this was contrary to their belief of the separation of Church and State which they preached, published, and confessed since their genesis.

In the chapter on the 'Magistrate' we see a significant change made in all three Confessions. The first two Articles are virtually the same. But Article three of *Westminster* is completely changed by *London* and *Savoy*, which, in turn differ from each other. Article four of *Savoy* and *Westminster* are the same; *London* does not have a fourth Article. In this Chapter the

significant difference between the *London Confession* and, particularly, the *Savoy Confession*, is *London's* silence on the involvement of the State in the life of the Church. The *London Confession* teaches: 1) that God has ordained the Magistrates<sup>121</sup>; 2) that Christians can be Magistrates<sup>122</sup>; and 3) that Christians are to be in "subjection in all lawful things commanded by them," and they "ought to be yielded by us, in the Lord."<sup>123</sup> There is no explicit statement on the separation of church and state in this chapter or anywhere in the Confession. Nevertheless, the authors of *London* have removed the words from *Savoy* and *Westminster* that explicitly teach the involvement of the State in the Church. *Savoy* on this subject in Article three in the Chapter on the 'Magistrate', states:

Although the Magistrate is bound to incourage, promote, and protect the professor and profession of the Gospel, and to manage and order civil administrations in a due subserviency to the interest of Christ in the world, and to that end to take care that men of corrupt mindes and conversations do not licentiously publish and divulge Blasphemy and Errors in their own nature, subverting the faith, and inevitably destroying the souls of them that receive them: Yet in such differences about Doctrines of the Gospel, or ways of the worship of God, as may befall men exercising a good conscience, manifesting it in their conversation, and holding the foundation, not disturbing others in their ways or worship that differ from them; there is no warrant for the Magistrate under the Gospel to abridge them of their liberty.<sup>124</sup>

The *Westminster Confession* in its chapter on the 'Magistrate', Article three, similar to the *Savoy Confession*, states:

Yet as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without

violence or danger.<sup>125</sup>

What conclusions can be drawn from these three Confessions on the subject of religious liberty? Both the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* explicitly teach the proper involvement of the State in the protection of the Christian religion, and the proceeding against those who do promote heresy and blasphemy. This is significant when compared to the *London Confession*. The *London Confession* says nothing about the State's involvement in the church, either for, or against it. We know from their individual writings that they were strong supporters of religious liberty during the Interregnum and Restoration period<sup>126</sup>, but in their Confession they chose not to express their views. When the authors of *Westminster* and *Savoy* wrote their Confessions during the Interregnum they were supported by the State government and believed that State involvement in the Church was necessary for the Church's well-being. The Particular Baptists did not agree with this at any time. They did not express their beliefs on religious liberty in their 1677 *Confession* because they did not want to further aggravate the State against them. Although the Restoration period was a time of persecution in general for the Particular Baptists, they experienced a greater measure of freedom in 1677. They did not want to lose what freedom they had by teaching in their Confession what might be considered "Anabaptist" doctrines concerning the relationship of church and state.

## NOTES

1. In the preface "To the Judicious and Impartial Reader" we read: "And therefore we did conclude it necessary to express ourselves the more fully and distinctly, and also to fix on such a method as might be most comprehensive of those things which we designed to explain our sense and belief of; and finding no defect in this regard in that fixed on by the Assembly, and after them by those of the Congregational way, we did readily conclude it best to retain the same order in our present Confession. And also when we observed that those last mentioned did, in their Confession (for reasons which seemed of weight both to themselves and others), choose not only to express their mind in words concurrent with the former in sense, concerning all those articles wherein they were agreed, but also for the most part without any variation of the terms, we did in like manner conclude it best to follow their example in making use of the very same words with them both, in making those articles (which are very many) wherein our faith and doctrine is the same with theirs. And this we did, the more abundantly to manifest our consent with both, in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, as also with many others whose orthodox confessions have been published to the World, on the behalf of the protestants in diverse nations and cities; and also to convince all that we have no itch to clog religion with new words, but to readily acquiesce in that form of sound words which hath been, in consent with the holy scriptures, used by others before us; hereby declaring before God, angels, and men, our hearty agreement with them, in that wholesome protestant doctrine, which, with so clear evidence of scriptures they have asserted" (Lumpkin, p.245).
2. From the preface we read, "We have also taken care to affix texts of scripture in the margin for the confirmation of each article in our Confession; in which word we have studiously endeavored to select such as are most clear and pertinent for the proof of what is asserted by us; and our earnest desire is, that all into whose hands this may come would follow that (never enough commended) example of the noble Bereans, who searched the scriptures daily that they might find out whether the things preached to them were so or not.  
There is one thing more which we sincerely profess, and earnestly desire credence in, viz., that contention is most remote from our design in all that we have done in this matter; and we hope the liberty of an ingenuous unfolding our principles and opening our hearts unto our brethren, with the scripture-grounds on which our faith and practice leans, will by none of them be either denied to us, or taken ill from us" (Lumpkin, p.246).

For the Particular Baptist understanding of Scripture see chapter three, footnote ten.

3. In Chapter Two we noted some reasons for the making of the 1689 *Confession* which are reused here. The purpose for reusing some of those examples in this chapter is to show specifically **how** the *London Confession* borrowed from the *Savoy Declaration* in answer to the problems the PBs were facing at the time of the writing of this new *Confession*; and in so doing see **why** they used the changes made to *Westminster* by *Savoy*.
4. See Chapter one, Article 10, in Lumpkin, p.252.
5. Richard L. Lindberg, "The Westminster and Second London Baptist Confessions of Faith: A Historical-Theological Comparison," (unpublished M.Th. thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1980), p.48. William Penn attacked the doctrine of satisfaction in his 1668 publication, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*.
6. See Lindberg, pp.47-49 for the Quakers William Penn's and Robert Barclay's views.
7. For example, the issue of assurance based on the work of Christ. The Quakers believed assurance was based on works viewed as condign merit, and that justification was based on Christ formed within us. This allowed assurance to be based on what I do and feel. The *Savoy* and *London Confessions* changed *Westminster* chapter 18, Article 2, on Assurance to explicitly state that assurance is to be founded upon "the blood and righteousness of Christ, revealed in the Gospel." *Westminster* had simply said, that it was to be founded upon, "the divine truth of the promises of salvation." See Lindberg, pp.72f. For another example, see Chapter 11:1,3 on Justification where *Savoy* and *London* added explicit statements concerning the imputation of Christ's righteousness to His people for their justification. The Quakers objected to this. See Lindberg, pp.57-62.
8. Lumpkin, p.230.
9. Lumpkin, p.273.
10. Lumpkin, p.230.
11. See Land, pp.310-318.
12. Lumpkin, p.265.
13. Land, pp.303-306.

14. Lumpkin,p.261.
15. For the addition see Walker,p.386, where it says, "[A Law] of universal obedience written in his heart," and again, "[This law] so written in the heart." There is no new law after the Fall, but the one universal law in our hearts before and after the Fall.
16. Lumpkin,p.276.
17. Lumpkin,p.280.
18. As espoused by the Englishman John Biddle who died in 1662.
19. One of the chief names among the early Deists is Lord Herbert(1583-1648).
20. Lumpkin,p.265.
21. Walker,p.379.
22. *Ibid.*,p.376.
23. Chapter twenty-nine in *Westminster*.
24. Walker,p.399; the word "own" replaces *Westminster's* "one" in both *Savoy* and *London*.
25. Lumpkin,p.254f.
26. Walker,p.378.
27. *Ibid.*,p.381.
28. Peter Toon, *Puritans and Calvinism*(Swengal,PA:Reiner Publications, 1973),pp.77-83.
29. *Ibid.*,p.80.
30. This was a whole new chapter inserted into *Savoy*, not found in the *Westminster Confession*.
31. The emphasis is not on the responsiblity of man to respond to the Gospel, but on the sovereignty of God's grace in the Gospel. See Walker,pp.387f.
32. Toon,p.82.
33. *Ibid.*,p.83.

34. Lumpkin, p.257. Bold letters signify the Savoy and London additions.
35. Lumpkin, p.265. Bold letters signify the Savoy and London additions.
36. See Walker, pp.381f.
37. See Lumpkin, pp.269f.
38. Lumpkin, pp.278f.
39. The places where the federal theology of *Westminster* is repeated in Savoy include Chapters 7:2,3; 8:1; 19:1.
40. See Walker, pp.373f. "I. God having made a Covenant of Works and Life, thereupon, with our first parents and all their posterity in them, they being seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan did wilfully transgress the Law of their Creation, and break the Covenant in eating the forbidden fruit. II. By this sin they, and we in them, fell from original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. III. They being the Root, and by God's appointment standing in the room and stead of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed." Savoy additions to *Westminster Confession* are in bold letters.
41. Walker, p.382. *Westminster* reads: "II. By it[repentance] a sinner, out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for, and hates his sins, as to turn from them all unto God, purposing and endeavoring to walk with him, in all the ways of his commandments....V. Men ought not to content themselves with a general repentance, but it is every man's duty to endeavour to repent of his particular sins, particularly.  
Savoy reads: "II. Whereas there is none that doth good, and sinneth not, and the best of men may through the power and deceitfulness of their corruptions dwelling in them, with the prevalency of temptation, fall into great sins and provocations; God hath in the Covenant of Grace mercifully provided, that Believers so sinning and falling, be renewed through repentance unto Salvation....V. Such is the provision which God hath made through Christ in the covenant of Grace, for the preservation of Believers unto salvation, that although there is no sin so small, but it deserves damnation; yet there is no sin so great, that it shall bring damnation on them who truly repent; which makes covenant preaching of



Repentance necessary."

42. Walker, pp. 387f. *Savoy* reads: "I. The Covenant of Works being broken by sin, and made unprofitable unto life, God was pleased to give unto the Elect the promise of Christ, the seed of the woman, as the means of calling them, and begetting in them Faith and Repentance: In this promise the Gospel, as to the substance of it, was revealed, and was therein effectual for the conversion and salvation of sinners."
43. *London* even adds the doctrine of the Covenant of Redemption between the Father and Son as the basis for the redemption of man in the Covenant of Grace in Chapter seven, Article three.
44. See Lumpkin, pp. 258f, and Walker, pp. 373f.
45. *Savoy* Chapter seven, Article two reads: "The first Covenant made with man, was a Covenant of Works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personel obedience" (Walker, p. 374).
46. Articles 3-5 in *Westminster* and *Savoy*.
47. See Chapter three of this thesis for the quotes taken from Michael Novak's Dissertation on this subject of the Particular Baptist's hermeneutic. See especially footnote ten.
48. Lumpkin, p. 254.
49. See Article 3 of the 1644 *Confession*, Lumpkin, p. 157.
50. Sometimes this is not so. In the Chapter on Perseverance, Chapter 17, *London* looks at it from the human side by its additions, whereas *Savoy* and *Westminster* look at it from the Divine side. There are, therefore, some places where *London* is more balanced than *Savoy*, and even *Westminster*.
51. See Appendix A for a tabular comparison of the three Confessions on the sacraments. See Appendix B for a comparison of the Confessions on baptism.
52. This was according to their Congregational church polity. See their Platform, Articles 15 appended to their Confession. (Walker, p. 405, or Appendix E in this thesis).
53. The two chapter titles are 'Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper' and 'Of Baptism'.

54. Chapter 29, Article 3.
55. Chapter 29, Article 1.
56. Chapter 29, Article one in *Savoy*, and 28:1 in *Westminster*. Walker, p.398.
57. Chapter 28, Article two in *Savoy*, and 27:2 in *Westminster*. Walker, p.397.
58. Walker, p.397.
59. Walker, p.398.
60. The basis of the *Westminster* and *Savoy* teaching on sacraments and baptism come from Calvin. He says, "In the sacraments the reality is given along with the sign," and again, "The true effect is conjoined with the external sign." Ronald Wallace says, "The sacraments [in Calvin's theology] thus deserve to be ranked along with the Word as true means of grace, and along with the Word of the Gospel can be called the power of God unto salvation." Calvin states: "We are not so raw as not to know that the sacraments, inasmuch as they are helps of faith, also offer us righteousness in Christ. Nay, as we are perfectly agreed that the sacraments are to be ranked in the same place as the Word, so while the Gospel is called the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, we hesitate not to transfer the same title to the sacraments." All quotes are taken from Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and the Sacraments* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1957), pp.159f. Concerning baptism Calvin states in his commentary regarding Simon Magus' baptism, "It appears plainly, by this example of Simon, that all men have not that grace given them in Baptism which is ther figured." Quoted from *Ibid.*, p.184. Calvin believes that baptism is a means of grace, grace is conferred upon the recipient of baptism when they receive it by faith. So how does this work for infant baptism? One can see the tension here in Calvin's baptismal theology. This why I believe the Baptists steered clear of sacramentalist terminology in their Confession. Only those with faith could receive baptism, the seal of regeneration and salvation. Only they could be assured of the promise of regeneration and salvation.
61. See Stan Fowler on the sacramentalism of baptism among Baptists referred to in the last chapter.
62. In both the *Westminster* and *Savoy Confessions* baptism is a "seal...of regeneration." This Particular Baptists strongly opposed. They not only removed this phrase from their Confession, but they also wanted to stay clear of any

form of sacramentalism that taught such things for infants.

63. Walker, p.398.
64. Chapter 28, Article one.
65. McGlothlin, *Baptist Confessions...*, pp.278f.
66. Lumpkin, p.291.
67. Savoy adding at the end, "and those onely."
68. Lumpkin, p.291.
69. Walker, p.398.
70. Chapter 30, Article 4. Lumpkin, p.291.
71. Chapter 30, Article one.
72. Savoy says that baptism is to be administered "by...a Minister of the Word lawfully called." *Westminster* says, "by...a Minister of the Word lawfully ordained." *London* says, "by those only, who are qualified and thereunto called according to the commission of Christ." These statements are taken from the Chapter 'Of the Sacraments' or in the case of the *London Confession*, 'Of Baptism and the Lord's Supper'. The *London Confession* in Chapter twenty-six, Article eight, on the Church, states that "the Officers (are)...chosen and set apart by the Church...for the Administration of Ordinances." From these statements we see that the Confessions essentially agree on this point.
73. *London* 29:3; *Savoy* 29:2; *Westminster* 28:2. This a word against those who do not believe there is a need for water baptism; the only thing needed is Spirit baptism, e.g. the Quakers. All three Confessions make clear the necessity of water baptism.
74. See Appendix C for a tabular comparison of the three Confessions on the Church. See Appendix E for the Savoy Platform of Church Polity.
75. *London* 26:1, *Savoy* 26:1 *Westminster* 25:1.
76. *Savoy* 26:2, *Westminster* 25:2, and *London* 26:2.
77. *London* 26:1,4, *Savoy* 26:1, and *Westminster* 25:1.
78. *London* 26:4, *Savoy* 26:4, and *Westminster* 25:4. There was a strong Puritan polemic against the Pope and the Catholic

Church that began in the sixteenth century and continued into the seventeenth. The Puritans feared the return of popery to England. This is why these Confessions make such a strong statement against the Pope.

79. *Westminster* 25:3, *Savoy* and *London* 26:3.
80. See Walker, p.69, Article 32.
81. Walker, p.51.
82. *Ibid.*, p.51.
83. See *Savoy Platform*, Article 3, and *London* 26:2.
84. *Savoy* and *London* 26:2.
85. *Savoy Platform*, Article 8, and *London* 26:6.
86. See *London* 26:5,7, and *Savoy Platform*, Articles 4-6.
87. See 30:1; 31:1,2.
88. *London* 26:15, and *Savoy Platform*, Article 22,26,27.
89. *Savoy Platform*, Article 25, and *London* 26:14.
90. *Savoy Platform*, Article 26, and *London* 26:15.
91. *Savoy Platform*, Article 7.
92. Chapter 26, Article 8.
93. *London* 26:9, and *Savoy Platform*, Article 11.
94. *Savoy Platform*, Article 9, and *London* 26:8.
95. *London* 26:11, *Savoy Platform*, Article 13, says,  
"may...perform it" instead of "ought to perform it."
96. Chapter 30:1,2.
97. *Westminster Confession...*, p.411.
98. Lumpkin, p.285.
99. Chapter 26:8.
100. Chapter 26:11.

101. Calvin believed that the bishop, pastor and elder were one office (*Institutes* 4.3.8). However, in his Ecclesiastical Ordinances of 1541 he distinguishes between four ministries in the Church: pastors, teachers, elders and deacons. See Francois Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. by Philip Mairet (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1987), pp.303-305. This fourfold ministry is what Savoy, following Calvin, held to. See also T.H.L. Parker, *Calvin: An Introduction to His Thought* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1995), pp.139f. It should also be noted that *The Form of Presbyterial Church Government* appended to the Westminster Confession teaches a fourfold ministry as well (*Westminster*, pp.401-403). English Calvinism embraced this fourfold ministry model. The Particular Baptists wanted their Confession to express only what Scripture taught.
102. Chapter 26:10.
103. Article 14.
104. Lumpkin, p.287, Article 10.
105. Chapter 30.
106. Articles 18,19,20,22.
107. Articles 7 and 12.
108. This subject was addressed by Particular Baptists. We know, for example, that Benjamin Keach in his work entitled, *Glory of a True Church* devotes much space to this subject. I am thankful to Michael Haykin for pointing this out to me.
109. Chapter 26.
110. Walker, p.396.
111. Articles 29 and 30.
112. Perhaps they felt Article 14 sufficiently alluded to this openness. Or possibly they simply did not want to add things that were not necessary. One could keep adding to a Confession *ad infinitum*. Their chapter on the Church was already longer than any other in the Confession, and longer than both *Westminster's* and *Savoy's* on the same subject.
113. Possibly some of their people while associating with other churches would fall away from Baptist convictions.

114. There were also similarities and differences among the Confessions on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* are almost identical. There were, however, a few changes made by the *Savoy* authors. For example, in Article one, *Savoy* says, the Lord's Supper is "to be observed in his[Christ's] Churches," and not "Church" as in *Westminster* (*West*.29:1; *Sav*.30:1). This change was due to their emphasis on the local church as opposed to the universal church. *Savoy* also changed a reference to the Supper as "onely a memorial of that one offering up of himself," instead of the *Westminster's* "commemoration of that one offering" (*West*.29:2; *Sav*.30:2). In addition, Article eight is rewritten by the *Savoy* authors, but it says essentially the same thing as *Westminster* (Walker, p.400). The differences between these two Confessions on the Lord's Supper are insignificant.

The *London Confession* differed with the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*, as it did with the other chapters on the Sacraments, by replacing "sacrament" with "ordinance" wherever the former was found (six times). *London* also removed the phrase "the sealing of all benefits thereof unto all true believers," as a function of the Lord's Supper, and replaced it with "confirmation of the faith of believers" (*Sav*.30:1; *Lon*.30:1). This latter phrase better suited their anti-sacramentalist teaching on the ordinances which we have noted before. In addition, *London* agreed with *Savoy's* replacement of "commemoration" with "memorial" when considering the purpose of the Supper (Art.2). The *Savoy* and *London* authors seem to have been endorsing a Zwinglian interpretation of the Supper here. This interpretation later became the preferred teaching on the Supper for Baptists. Moreover, *London* agreed with *Savoy* and *Westminster* that appointed Ministers were to administer the Lord's Supper (*Lon*.30:3; *Sav*.30:3; *West*.29:3).

*Savoy* and *Westminster*, at the end of Article three, state that the ministers are "to give both (Elements) to the Communicants, but to none who are not then present in the Congregation." The *London* authors removed the latter part of the sentence.

One of the key differences between the *London Confession* and the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions* has to do with the sacramentalism of the Supper. In Article five, *London* replaced "yet sacramentally onely" with "although in terms used figuratively" when it said, "The outward Elements in this Ordinance...have such relation to him Crucified, as that truely, although in terms used figuratively." It appears, again, that the *London* authors wanted to remove any obvious sacramentalism from their Confession, and, in particular, from this chapter. Having said this, however, the *London* authors did not remove some of the sacramentalist language from it. For example, in Article three, we read

that the "Ministers [are] to Pray, and bless the Elements of Bread and Wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use." Again, in Article seven, it states:

Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible Elements in this Ordinance, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally, and corporally, but spiritually receive, and feed upon Christ crucified & all the benefits of his death: the Body and Blood of Christ being then not corporally, or carnally, but spiritually present to the faith of Believers, in that Ordinance, as the Elements themselves are to their outward senses (Lumpkin,p.293).

It appears that the *London* authors sought to distance themselves from an obvious sacramentalism in the ordinances, but could not break away completely from Calvin's teachings on this subject. As we have mentioned before, a number of Particular Baptists were Calvinistic in their interpretation of the Lord's Supper. See Winter,pp.325-329.

115. Note that Chapter 26 in the Confession looks at the Church from the universal perspective, whereas, the Platform appended to the Confession looks at the Church from the local perspective.
116. It is true that Article two continues the thought of the universal Church, and Article four could be interpreted either speaking of the universal church or the local church. But the emphasis is overwhelmingly on the local church.
117. See Appendix D for a tabular comparison of the three Confessions on religious liberty.
118. Chapter twenty-one, Article one, in both Confessions. *London* removes the phrase "the whole legal administration of the Covenant of Grace," from *Savoy*, when it is speaking of the Ceremonial Law. This is merely explication and no change in doctrine or emphasis.
119. *Westminster Confession...*,p.87.
120. *Westminster* Chapter 20.
121. Article One.
122. Article two.
123. Article three.
124. Chapter 24, Article 3. Walker,p.393.
125. Walker,p.394.

126. See McBeth, "*English Baptist Literature on Religious Liberty....*"



## CONCLUSION

There are several things we can learn about the Particular Baptists both historically and confessionally from this brief study of their confessional statements.

We can see that Confessions were very much a part of early Baptist history. The two branches of English Baptists, General and Particular, confessed their faith in confessional form. It was within the first six years of their existence that the Particular Baptists put out their first Confession in 1644. Other editions and confessions followed in the 1640's and 50's. When editions of the 1644 *Confession* were not available in the 1670's, a new Confession was written and published in 1677 entitled, *The Second London Baptist Confession of Faith*. This became the most popular Confession in Baptist history. Confessions, generally, became less popular in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries among Baptists. This has occurred, partly because Baptists have felt the Bible is their Confession, and partly because Confessions are timebound. Nevertheless, since Baptist beginnings were confessional, Baptists today should not feel that they need to shun Confessions.

In addition, we can see from this study that Particular Baptists did not give up their convictions when they faced heresy and persecution in their formative years. The Quakers were a powerful sect that drew away members from various groups of churches. The Particular Baptists lost some people, but not as

many as the General Baptists. They also experienced persecution from the Presbyterians in the 1640's and the Anglicans in the 1660's to 1680's, but did not relinquish their Baptist convictions, as demonstrated in their two Confessions. In fact, during the first twenty years they grew rapidly, and even during the persecution of the Restoration period they continued to grow. Particular Baptist convictions based on the Bible, and reflected in their Confessions, gave them a firm foundation to stand on during these formative years.

Confessionally, this study has shown that Particular Baptists were Calvinists in their doctrine of atonement along with their Presbyterian and Congregationalist brethren. In fact, the *Second London Baptist Confession* and the *Savoy Declaration* in some places are stronger statements of Calvinism than the *Westminster Confession*. These Baptists were Puritans, having their roots in the separatist wing of the Puritan family. The Particular Baptists did not separate from their brethren in the 1640's over the fundamentals of the gospel, but over their interpretation of the Bible, particularly, in the areas of baptism and the Church.

Our study has also shown that the Baptist doctrines of baptism, the Church, and religious liberty were unique to English Calvinism. They were born out of their study of the Bible based on a hermeneutic that stressed the New Testament above the Old. Particular Baptists sought to obey the New Testament, for in it was contained the New Covenant given by Christ. For them the Old

Testament forms had passed away and were now replaced by the pure forms of the Gospel. Hence, the doctrine of baptism is to be determined from a study of the New Testament only. Since all the explicit accounts of baptism show believers as the recipients of baptism, then they alone should be baptized. And if the Biblical word for 'baptism' means 'immerse', and the thing signified in baptism is death, burial and rising up to newness of life with Christ, then baptism must be by immersion and not sprinkling. In addition, if Jesus and Paul did not mingle the affairs of the Church with the State, and implied a separation of the two, then the State should not have its hand in the Church. The example of Israel's political involvement in the religious life of the nation in the Old Covenant is irrelevant, because the New Covenant supersedes the Old on this issue. The Particular Baptists took their New Testament hermeneutic to its logical end; that is, they did not let the Old Testament or any ecclesiastical tradition stop them from accepting what the New Testament clearly taught. And in the first fifty years of their existence they did not change their position, while over these same years other English people who came in contact with the Particular Baptists embraced it.

## APPENDIX A'

*Westminster  
Confession*  
Chapter XXVII - Of  
the Sacraments<sup>1</sup>

I. Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him; as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word.

II. There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.

III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution; which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.

IV. There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord; neither of which may be dispensed by any but by

*Savoy Declaration*

Chapter XXVIII -  
Of the Sacraments<sup>1</sup>

I. Sacraments are holy Signs and Seals of the Covenant of Grace, immediately instituted by Christ, to represent him and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him, and solemnly to engage us to the service of God in Christ, according to his Word.

II. There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the signe and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.

III. The grace which is exhibited in or by the Sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a Sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of Institution; which contains, together with a Precept authorizing the use thereof, a Promise of benefit to worthy receivers.

IV. There be onely two Sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a

*Second London  
Baptist Confession*  
Chapter XXVIII Of  
Baptism and the  
Lord's Supper<sup>4</sup>

1. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of positive, and soveraign(sic) institution; appointed by the Lord Jesus the only Law-giver, to be continued in his Church to the end of the world.

2. These holy appointments are to be administered by those only, who are qualified and thereunto called according to the commission of Christ.

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXVII - Of  
the Sacraments*

a minister of the word,  
lawfully ordained.

V. The sacraments of the Old  
Testament, in regard of the  
spiritual things thereby  
signified and exhibited, were,  
for substance, the same with  
those of the New.

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XXVIII -  
Of the Sacraments*

Minister of the Word, lawfully  
called.

V. The Sacraments of the Old  
Testament, in regard of the  
spiritual things thereby  
signified and exhibited, were  
for substance the same with  
those of the New.

1. Quoting from the *Westminster Confession of Faith* re-issued by the Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.
2. Bold print will highlight significant words, phrases or articles that the authors of the *London Baptist Confession* have not borrowed from the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*.
3. Quoting from Williston Walker's *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*.
4. Quoting from W.L. Lumpkin's *Baptist Confessions of Faith*.

APPENDIX B<sup>2</sup>

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXVIII -  
Of Baptism<sup>1</sup>*

I. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world.

II. The outward element to be used in this sacrament is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the gospel, lawfully called thereunto.

III. Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.

IV. Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.

V. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XIX - Of  
Baptism<sup>3</sup>*

I. Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptized a signe and seal of the Covenant of Grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which Ordinance is, by Christs appointment, to be continued in his Church until the end of the world.

II. The outward Element to be used in this Ordinance is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost, by a Minister of the Gospel, lawfully called.

III. Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary, but Baptism is rightly administred by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person.

IV. Not onely those that do actually profess faith in, and obedience unto Christ, but also the Infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized, and those onely.

V. Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this Ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XIX Of  
Baptism<sup>4</sup>*

1. Baptism is an Ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party Baptized, a sign of his fellowship with him, in his death, and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins; and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life.

3. The outward element to be used in this ordnance is water, wherein the party is to be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

4. Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance.

2. Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience, to our Lord Jesus, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance.

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXVIII -  
Of Baptism*

that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

VI. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time.

VII. The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person.

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XIX - Of  
Baptism*

that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

VI. The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administred, yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this Ordinance, the grace promised is not onely offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own Will, in his appointed time.

VII. Baptism is but once to be administered to any person.

1. Taken from the *Westminster Confession of Faith* re-issued by the Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, 1976.
2. Bold print will highlight significant words, phrases or articles that the authors of the *London Baptist Confession* have not borrowed from the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*.
3. Taken from Williston Walker, *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*.
4. Taken from W.L. Lumpkin's *the Baptist Confessions of Faith*.

APPENDIX C<sup>2</sup>

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXV - Of  
the Church<sup>1</sup>*

I. The catholick or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

II. The visible church, which is also catholick or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

III. Unto this catholick visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church<sup>3</sup>*

I. The Catholique or Universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the Elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one under Christ, the Head thereof, and is the Spouse, the Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

II. The whole body of men throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel and obedience unto God by Christ according unto it, not destroying their own profession by any Errors everting the foundation, or unholiness of conversation, are, and may be called the visible Catholique Church of Christ, although as such it is not intrusted with the administration of any Ordinances, or have any officers to rule or govern it, or over the whole Body.

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church<sup>4</sup>*

1. The Catholick or universal Church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him, that filleth all in all.

2. All persons throughout the world, professing the faith of the Gospel, and obedience unto God by Christ, according unto it; not destroying their own profession by any Errors everting the foundation, or unholyness of conversation, are and may be called visible saints; and of such ought all particular Congregations to be constituted.



*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXV - Of  
the Church*

IV. This catholick church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and publick worship performed more or less purely in them.

V. The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a church on earth to worship God according to his will.

VI. There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God.

*Savoy Declaration  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church*

III. The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, Christ hath had, and ever shall have a visible Kingdom in this world, to the end thereof, of such as believe in him, and make profession of his name.

IV. There is no other Head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be Head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God, whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

V. As the Lord in his care and

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church*

3. The purest Churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error; and som(sic) have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan; nevertheless, Christ always hath had, and ever shall have a Kingdome, in this world, to the end thereof, of such as believe in him and make profession of his Name.

4. The Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church, in whom by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order or Government of the Church, is invested in a supream(sic) & soveraigne(sic) manner, neither can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is the Antichrist, that Man of sin, and Son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God; whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

*Savoy Declaration*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

love towards his Church, bath in his infinite wise providence exercised it with great variety in all ages, for the good of them that love him, and his own Glory: so according to his promise, we expect that in the later days, Antichrist being destroyed, the Jews called, and the adversaries of the Kingdom of his dear Son broken, the Churches of Christ being enlarged, and edified through a free and plentiful communication of light and grace, shall enjoy in this world a more quiet, peaceable and glorious condition then(sic) they have enjoyed.

See Articles II and III of the *Institution of the Churches* in Appendix E.

See Article VIII of the *Institution of the Churches* in Appendix E.

*Second London Baptist Confession*  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

5. In the execution of this power wherewith he is intrusted, the Lord Jesus calleth out of the world unto himself, through the Ministry of his word out by his Spirit, those that are given unto him by His Father; that they may walk before him in all the ways of obedience, which he prescribeth to them in his Word. Those thus called he commandeth to walk together in particular societies, or Churches, for their mutual edification; and the due performance of that publick worship, which he requireth of them in the World.

6. The Members of these Churches are saints by calling, visibly manifesting and evidencing (in and by their profession and walking) their obedience unto that call of

*Savoy Declaration*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

See Article IV of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

See Articles VII and IX of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

See Article XI of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

*Second London  
Baptist Confession*  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

Christ; and do willingly  
consent to walk together  
according to the appointment of  
Christ, giving up themselves,  
to the Lord & one to another by  
the will of God, in professed  
subjection to the Ordinances of  
the Gospel.

7. To each of these Churches  
thus gathered, according to his  
mind, declared in his word, he  
hath given all that power and  
authority, which is any way  
needfull, for the carrying on  
of that order in worship, and  
discipline, which he hath  
instituted for them to observe;  
with commands, and rules for  
the due and right exerting and  
executing of that power.

8. A particular Church  
gathered, and compleatly  
Organized, according to the  
mind of Christ, consists of  
Officers, and Members; And the  
Officers appointed by Christ to  
be chosen and set apart by the  
Church (so called and gathered)  
for the peculiar administration  
of Ordinances, and Execution  
of Power, or Duty, which he  
intrusts them with, or calls  
them to, to be continued to the  
end of the World, are Bishops  
or Elders and Deacons.

9. The way appointed by Christ  
for the Calling of any person,

*Savoy Declaration*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church*Second London  
Baptist Confession*  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

fitted, and gifted by the Holy Spirit, unto the Office of Bishop, or Elder, in a Church, is, that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrage of the Church it self; and Solemnly set apart by Fasting and Prayer, with imposition of hands of the Eldership of the Church, if there be any before Constituted therein; And of a Deacon that he be chosen by the like suffrage, and set apart by Prayer, and the like Imposition of hands.

10. The work of Pastors being constantly to attend the Service of Christ, in his Churches, in the Ministry of the Word, and Prayer, with watching for their Soul, as they that must give an account to him; it is incumbent on the Churches to whom they Minister, not only to give them all due respect, but also to communicate to them of all their good things according to their ability, so as they may have a comfortable supply, without being intangled in Secular Affairs; and many also be capable of exercising Hospitality towards others; and this is required by the Law of Nature, and by the Express order of our Lord Jesus, who hath ordained that they that preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel.

See Article XIII of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

11. Although it be incumbent on the Bishops or Pastors of the Churches to be instant in Preaching the Word, by way of Office; yet the work of

*Savoy Declaration*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

See Article XX of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

See Article XXI of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

See Article XXV of the  
*Institution of the  
Churches* in Appendix E.

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church*

Preaching the Word, is not so  
peculiarly confined to them;  
but that others also gifted,  
and fitted by the Holy Spirit  
for it, and approved, and  
called by the Church, may  
and ought to perform it.

12. As all believers are bound  
to joyn themselves to  
particular Churches, when and  
where they have opportunity so  
to do; So all that are admitted  
unto the priviledges of a  
Church, are also under the  
Censures and Government  
thereof, according to the Rule  
of Christ.

13. No church-members upon any  
offence taken by them, having  
performed their Duty required  
of them towards the person they  
are offended at, ought to  
disturb any Church order, or  
absent themselves from the  
Assemblies of the Church, or  
Administration of any  
Ordinances, upon the account  
of such offence at any of their  
fellow-members; but to wait  
upon Christ, in the further  
proceeding of the Church.

14. As each Church, and all the  
Members of it are bound to pray  
continually, for the good and  
prosperity of all the Churches  
of Christ, in all places; and  
upon all occasions to further  
it (every one within the bounds  
of their places, and callings,  
in the Exercise of their Gifts  
and Graces) so the Churches  
(when planted by the providence  
of God so as they may enjoy  
opportunity and advantage for

*Savoy Declaration*Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

See Article XXVI of the  
*Institution of the  
Savoy Declaration*  
Churches in Appendix E.

*Second London  
Baptist Confession*  
Chapter XXVI Of  
the Church

it) ought to hold communion  
amongst themselves for their  
peace, increase of love, and  
mutual edification.

15. In cases of difficulties or  
differences, either in point of  
Doctrine, or Administration;  
wherein either the Churches in  
general are concerned, or any  
one Church in their peace,  
union, and edification; or any  
member, or members, of any  
Church are injured in or by any  
proceedings in censures not  
agreeable to truth, and order;  
it is according to the mind of  
Christ, that many Churches  
holding communion together, do  
by their messengers meet to  
consider, and give their advice  
in, or about that matter in  
difference, to be reported to  
all the Churches concerned;  
howbeit these messengers  
assembled, are not entrusted  
with any Church-power properly  
so called; or with any  
jurisdiction over the Churches  
themselves, to exercise any  
censures either over any  
Churches, or Persons: or to  
impose their determination on  
the Churches, or Officers.

1. Taken from the *Westminster Confession of Faith* re-issued by  
The Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of  
Scotland, 1976.
2. Bold print will highlight significant words, phrases or  
articles that the authors of the *London Baptist Confession*  
have not borrowed from the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*.

3. Taken from Williston Walker's *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*.
4. Taken from W.L. Lumpkin's *Baptist Confessions of Faith*.

APPENDIX D<sup>2</sup>

*Westminster  
Confession Chapter  
XX - Of Christian  
Liberty, and  
Liberty of  
Conscience<sup>1</sup>*

I. The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel, consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law; and in their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin, from the evil of afflictions, the sting of death, the victory of the grave, and everlasting damnation; as also in their free access to God, and their yielding obedience unto him, not out of slavish fear, but a child-like love, and willing mind. All which were common also to believers under the law; but under the new testament, the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace, and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than believers under the law did ordinarily partake of.

II. God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters

*Savoy Declaration  
Chapter XXI Of  
Christian Liberty,  
and Liberty of  
Conscience<sup>1</sup>*

I. The Liberty which Christ hath purchased for Believers under the Gospel, consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the rigor and curse of the Law; and in their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin, from the evil of afflictions, the fear and sting of death, the victory of the grave, and everlasting damnation; as also in their free access to God, and their yielding obedience unto him, not out of slavish fear, but a child-like love, and willing minde: All which were common also to Believers under the Law, for the substance of them; but under the New Testament, the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the Ceremonial Law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected, and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace, and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than Believers under the Law did ordinarily partake of.

II. God alone is Lord of the Conscience, and hath left it free from the Doctrines and Commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXI Of  
Christian Liberty,  
and Liberty of  
Conscience<sup>1</sup>*

I. The Liberty which Christ hath purchased for Believers under the Gospel, consists in their freedom from the guilt of Sin, the condemning wrath of God, the Rigour and Curse of the Law; and in their being delivered from this present evil World, bondage to Satan, and Dominion of Sin; from the Evil of Afflictions; the Fear, and Sting of Death, the Victory of the Grave, and Everlasting Damnation; as also in their free access to God; and their yielding Obedience unto him, not out of slavish fear, but a Child-like love, and willing minde. All which were common also to Believers under the Law, for the substance of them; but under the new Testament, the Liberty of Christians is further enlarged in their freedom from the yoke of the Ceremonial Law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected; and in greater boldness of access to the throne of Grace, and in fuller Communications of the Free Spirit of God, than Believers under the Law did ordinarily partake of.

II. God alone is Lord of the Conscience, and hath left it free from the Doctrines and Commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his Word, or not contained in it.



*Westminster  
Confession Chapter  
XX - Of Christian  
Liberty, and  
Liberty of  
Conscience*

of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience: and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also.

III. They who, upon pretence of Christian liberty do practise any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of liberty; which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

IV. And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light

*Savoy Declaration  
Chapter XXI Of  
Christian Liberty,  
and Liberty of  
Conscience*

Word, or not contained in it; So that to believe such Doctrines, or to obey such Commands out of conscience, is to betray true Liberty of Conscience; and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blinde obedience, is to destroy Liberty of Conscience, and Reason also.

III. They who, upon pretence of Christian Liberty do practise any sin, or cherish any lust, as they do thereby pervert the main designe of the Grace of the Gospel to their own destruction; so they wholly destroy the end of liberty; which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXI Of  
Christian Liberty,  
and Liberty of  
Conscience*

So that to Believe such Doctrines, or obey such Commands out of Conscience, is to betray true Liberty of Conscience; and the requiring of an implicit Faith, and an absolute and blind Obedience, is to destroy Liberty of Conscience, and Reason also.

III. They who upon pretence of Christian Liberty do practise any sin, or cherish any sinfull lust, as they do thereby pervert the main design of the Grace of the Gospel to their own Destruction; so they wholly destroy the end of Christian Liberty, which is, that, being delivered out of the hands of our Enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in Holiness, and Righteousness before him, all the days of our Life.

*Westminster  
Confession Chapter  
XX - Of Christian  
Liberty, and  
Liberty of  
Conscience*

of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or to the power of godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church; they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the church, and by the power of the civil magistrate.

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXIII - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

I. God, the supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him over the people, for his own glory, and the publick good; and, to the end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil-doers.

II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate, when called thereunto; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

I. God, the supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil Magistrates to be under him over the people for his own glory and the publique good; and to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that do good, and for the punishment of evil doers.

II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the Office of a Magistrate, when called thereunto: in the management whereof, as they ought specially to maintain Justice and Peace, according to

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

I. God, the supream(sic) Lord, and King of all the World, hath ordained Civil Magistrates to be under him, over the people, for his own glory, and the publick good; and to this end hath armed them with the power of the Sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that do good, and for the punishment of evil doers.

II. It is lawful for Christians to Accept, and Execute the Office of a Magistrate, when called thereunto; in the management whereof, as they ought especially to maintain Justice and Peace, according to

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXIII - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth; so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions.

III. The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven: yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.

*Savoy Declaration  
Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

the wholesome Laws of each Commonwealth; so for that end they may lawfully now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasion.

III. Although the Magistrate is bound to encourage, promote, and protect the professor and profession of the Gospel, and to manage and order civil administrations in a due subserviency to the interest of Christ in the world, and to that end to take care that men of corrupt mindes and conversations do not licentiously publish and

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

the wholesome Laws of each Kingdome, and Commonwealth: so for that end they may lawfully now under the New Testament wage war upon just and necessary occasions.

*Westminster  
Confession  
Chapter XXIII - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

*Savoy Declaration*

*Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

divulge Blasphemy and Errors in their own nature, subverting the faith, and inevitably destroying the souls of them that receive them: Yet in such differences about the Doctrines of the Gospel, or ways of the worship of God, as may befall men exercising a good conscience, manifesting it in their conversation, and holding the foundation, not disturbing others in their ways or worship that differ from them; there is no warrant for the Magistrate under the Gospel to abridge them of their liberty.

IV. It is the duty of people to pray for magistrates, to honour their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority for conscience' sake.

Infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free people from their due obedience to him: from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted; much less hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people; and least of all to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be hereticks, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.

IV. It is the duty of people to pray for Magistrates, to honour their persons, to pay them Tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their Authority for conscience sake.

Infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the Magistrates just and legal Authority, nor free people from their(sic) obedience to him: from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted, much less hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people, and least of all to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be Hereticks, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.

3. Civil Magistrates being set up by God, for the ends aforesaid; subjection in all lawful things commanded by them, ought to be yielded by

*Second London  
Baptist Confession  
Chapter XXIV - Of  
the Civil  
Magistrate*

us, in the Lord; not only for  
wrath but for Conscience  
sake; and we ought to make  
supplications and prayers for  
Kings, and all that are in  
Authority, that under them we  
may live a quiet and peaceable  
life, in all godliness and  
honesty.

1. Taken from the *Westminster Confession of Faith* re-issued by the Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, 1976.
2. Bold print will highlight significant words, phrases or articles that the authors of the *London Baptist Confession* have not borrowed from the *Savoy* and *Westminster Confessions*.
3. Taken from Williston Walker's *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*.
4. Taken from W.L. Lumpkin's *Baptist Confessions of Faith*.

## APPENDIX E

Of the INSTITUTION of CHURCHES, And the ORDER Appointed in them  
by JESUS CHRIST.<sup>1</sup>

By the appointment of the Father all Power for the Calling, Institution, Order, or Government of the Church, is invested in a Supreme and Sovereign maner in the Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head thereof.

II. In the execution of this Power wherewith he is so entrusted, the Lord Jesus calleth out of the World unto Communion with himself, those that are given unto him by his Father, that they may walk before him in all the ways of Obedience, which he prescibeth to them in his Word.

III. Those thus called (through the Ministry of the Word by his Spirit) he commmandeth to walk together in particular Societies or Churches, for their mutual edification, and the due performance of that publique Worship, which he requireth of them in this world.

IV. To each of these Churches thus gathered, according unto his minde declared in his Word, he hath given all that Power and Authority, which is any way needfull for their carrying on that Order in Worship and Discipline, which he hath instituted for them to observe with Commands and Rules, for the due and right exerting and executing of that Power.

V. These particular Churches thus appointed by the Authority of Christ, and intrusted with power from him for the ends before expressed, are each of them as unto those ends, the seat of that Power which he is pleased to communicate to his Saints or Snbjects[sic] in this world, so that as such they receive it immediately from himself.

VI. Besides these particular Churches, there is not instituted by Christ any Church more extensive or Catholique entrusted with power for the administration of his Ordinances, or the execution of any authority in his name.

VII. A particular Church gathered and compleated according to the minde of Christ, consists of Officers and Members: The Lord Christ having given to his called ones (united according to his appointment in Church-order) Liberty and Power to choose Persons fitted by the holy Ghost for that purpose, to be over them, and to minister to them in the Lord.

VIII. The Members of these Churches are Saints by Calling, visibly manifesting and evidencing (in and by their profession

further known to each other by their confession of the Faith wrought in them by the power of God, declared by themselves or otherwise manifested, do willingly consent to walk together according to the appointment of Christ, giving up themselves to the Lord, and to one another by the will of God in professed subjection to the Ordinances of the Gospel.

IX. The Officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church so called, and gathered for the peculiar administration of Ordinances, and execution of Power or Duty which he intrusts them with, or calls them to, to be continued to the end of the world, are Pastors, Teachers, Elders, and Deacons.

X. Churches thus gathered and assembling for the Worship of God, are thereby visible and publique, and their Assemblies (in what place soever they are, according as they have liberty or opportunity) are therefore Church or Publique Assemblies.

XI. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person, fitted and gifted by the holy Ghost, unto the Office of Pastor, Teacher or Elder in a Church, is, that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrage of the Church it self, and solemnly set apart by Fasting and Prayer, with Imposition of Hands of the Eldership of that Church, if there be any before constituted therein: And of a Deacon, that he be chosen by the life suffrage, and set part by Prayer, and the like Imposition of Hands.

XII. The Essence of this Call of a Pastor, Teacher or Elder unto Office, consists in the Election of the Church, together with his acceptation of it, and separation by *Fasting and Prayer*: And those who are so chosen, though not set apart by Imposition of Hands, are rightly constituted Ministers of Jesus Christ, in whose Name and Authority they exercise the Ministry to them so committed. The Calling of Deacons consisteth in the like Election and acceptation, with separation by *Prayer*.

XIII. Although it be incumbent on the Pastors and Teachers of the Churches to be instant in Preaching the Word, by way of Office; yet the work of Preaching the Word is not so peculiarly confined to them, but that others also gifted and fitted by the holy Ghost for it, and approved (being by lawful ways and means in the Providence of God called thereunto) may publicquely, ordinarily and constantly perform it; so that they give themselves up thereunto.

XIV. However, they who are ingaged in the work of Publique Preaching, and enjoy the Publique Maintenance upon that account, are not thereby obliged to dispense the Seals of any other then such as (being Saints by Calling, and gathered according to the Order of the Gospel) they stand related to, as Pastors or Teachers; yet ought they not to neglect others living within

their Parochial Bounds, but besides their constant publique Preaching to them, they ought to enquire after their profiting by the Word, instructing them in, and pressing upon them (whether young or old) the great Doctrines of the Gospel, even personally and particularly, so far as their strength and time will admit.

XV. Ordination alone without the Election or precedent consent of the Church, by those who formerly have been Ordained by vertue of that Power they have received by their Ordination, doth not constitute any person a Church-Officer, or communicate Office-power unto him.

XVI. A Church furnished with Officers (according to the minde of Christ) hath full power to administer all his Ordinances; and where there is want of any one or more Officers required, that Officer, or those which are in the Church, may administer all the Ordinances proper to their particular Duty and Offices; but where there are no teaching Officers, none may administer the Seals, nor can the Church authorize any so to do.

XVII. In the carrying on of Church-administrations, no person ought to be added to the Church, but by the consent of the Church it self; that so love (without dissimulation) may be preserved between all Members thereof.

XVIII. Whereas the Lord Jesus Christ hath appointed and instituted as a means of Edification, that those who walk not according to the Rules and Laws appointed by him (in respect of Faith and Life, so that just offence doth arise to the Church thereby) be censured in his Name and Authority: Every Church hath Power in it self to exercise and execute all those Censures appointed by him in the way and Order prescribed in the Gospel.

XIX. The Censures so appointed by Christ, are Admonition and Excommunication: and whereas some offences are or may be known onely to some, it is appointed by Christ, that those to whom they are so known, do first admonish the offender in private: in publique offences where any sin, before all; or in case of non-amendment upon private admonition, the offence being related to the Church, the offender not manifesting his repentance, he is to be duely admonished in the Name of Christ by the whole Church, by the Ministry of the Elders of the Church; and if this Censure prevail not for his repentance, then he is to be cast out by Excommunication with the consent of the Church.

XX. As all Believers are bound to joyn themselves to particular Churches, when and where they have opportunity so to do, so none are to be admitted unto the Priviledges of the Churches, who do not submit themselves to the Rule of Christ in the Censures for the Government of them.

XXI. This being the way prescribed by Christ in case of offence,



no Church-members upon any offences taken by them, having performed their duty required of them in this matter, ought to disturb any Church-order, or absent themselves from the publique Assemblies, or the Administration of any Ordinances upon that pretence, but to wait upon Christ in the further proceeding of the Church.

XXII. The Power of Censures being seated by Christ in a particular Church, is to be exercised onely towards particular Members of each Church respectively as such; and there is no power given by him unto any Synods or Ecclesiastical Assemblies to Excommunicate, or by their publique Edicts to threaten Excommunication, or other Church-censures against Churches, Magistrates, or their people upon any account, no man being obnoxious to that Censure, but upon his personal miscarriage, as a Member of a particular Church.

XXIII. Although the Church is a Society of men, assembling for the celebration of the Ordinances according to the appointment of Christ, yet every Society assembling for that end or purpose, upon the account of cohabitation within any civil Precincts and Bounds, is not thereby constituted a Church, seeing there may be wanting among them, what is essentially required thereunto; and therefore a Believer living with others in such a Precinct, may joyn himself with any Church for his edification.

XXIV. For the avoiding of Differences that may otherwise arise, for the greater Solemnity in the Celebration of the Ordinances of Christ, and the opening a way for the larger usefulness of the Gifts and Graces of the holy Ghost; Saints living in one City or Town, or within such distances as that they may conveniently assemble for diving Worship, ought rather to joyn in one Church for their mutual strengthning and edification, then to set up many distinct Societies.

XXV. As all Churches and all the Members of them are bound to pray continually for the good or prosperity of all the Churches of Christ in all places, and upon all occasions to further it; (Every one within the bounds of their Places and Callings, in the exercise of their Gifts and Graces) So the Churches themselves (when planted by the providence of God, so as they may have opportunity(sic) and advantage for it) ought to hold communion amongst themselves for their peace, increase of love, and mutual edification.

XXVI. In Cases of Difficulties or Differences, either in point of Doctrine or in Administrations, wherein either the Churches in general are concerned, or any one Church in their Peace, Union, and Edification, or any Member or Members of any Church are injured in, or by any proceeding in Censures, not agreeable to Truth and Order: it is according to the minde of Christ, that many Churches holding communion together, do by their Messengers

meet in a Synod or Council, to consider and give their advice in, or about that matter in difference, to be reported to all the Churches concerned; Howbeit these Synods so assembled are not entrusted with any Church-Power, properly so called, or with any Jurisdiction over the Churches themselves, to exercise any Censures, either over any Churches or Persons, or to impose their determinations on the Churches or Officers.

XXVII. Besides these occasional Synods or Councils, there are not instituted by Christ any stated Synods in a fixed Combination of Churches, or their Officers in lesser or greater Assemblies; nor are there any Synods appointed by Christ in a way of Subordination to one another.

XXVIII. Persons that are joyned in Church-fellowship, ought not lightly or without just cause to withdraw themselves from the communion of the Church whereunto they are so joyned: Nevertheless, where any person cannot continue in any Church without his sin, either for want of the Administration of any Ordinances instituted by Christ, or by his being deprived of his due Priviledges, or compelled to any thing in practice not warranted by the Word, or in case of Persecution, or upon the account of conveniency of habitation; he consulting with the Church, or the Officer or Officers thereof, may peaceably depart from the communion of the Church, wherewith he hath so walked, to joyn himself with some other Church, where he may enjoy the Ordinances in the purity of the same, for his edification and consolation.

XXIX. Such reforming Churches as consist of Persons sound in the Faith and of Conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to refuse the communion of each other, so far as may consist with their own Principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same Rules of Church-Order.

XXX. Churches gathered and walking according to the minde of Christ, judging other Churches (though less pure) to be true Churches, may receive unto occasional communion with them, such Members of those Churches as are credibly testified to be godly, and to live without offence.

FINIS.

1. Taken from Williston Walker's *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp.403-408.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ames, William. *The Marrow of Theology*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1968, translated from the Latin with an introduction by John Dykstra Eusden, reprinted by Labyrinth Press, Durham, NC, 1983.
- Ban, Joseph D. "Were the Earliest English Baptists Anabaptists," In *In the Great Tradition*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1982.
- Belcher, Richard P. and Anthony Mattia. *A Discussion of the Seventeenth Century Particular Baptist Confessions of Faith*. Southbridge, MA: Crowne Publications, Inc., 1990.
- Brackney, William H. ed. *Baptist Life and Thought 1600-1980*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Baptists*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc, 1988.
- Burrage, Champlin. *The Early English Dissenters Vol. 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Restoration of Immersion by the English Anabaptists and Baptists (1640-1700)." *The American Journal of Theology* 16 (1912): 70-89.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion 1536 Edition*. Trans. F.L Battles. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1989.
- Capp, Bernard Stuart. *Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth Century English Millenarianism*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
- Dexter, H.M. *Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years*. New York: n.d.
- Duncan, Pope A. *Hanserd Knollys: Seventeenth-Century Baptist*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1965.
- Fowler, Stanley. "'By Water and Spirit': Sacramental Theology in Early Baptist Thought." Unpublished paper.
- George, Timothy. *John Robinson and the English Separatist Tradition*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Between Pacifism and Coercion: The English Baptist Doctrine of Religious Toleration." *Mennonite Quarterly* 58 (1984): 30-49.
- Grislis, Egil. "Calvin's Doctrine of Baptism." *Church History*

31(1962):46-65.

Gritz, Paul Linton. "Samuel Richardson and the Religious and Political Controversies Confronting the London Particular Baptists, 1643 to 1658." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1987.

Hannen, Robert B. "A Suggested Source of Some Expressions in the Baptist Confession of Faith, London 1644," *The Baptist Quarterly* 12(1948):389-399.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Historical Notes on the Name 'Baptist'." *Foundations* 8(1965):62-71.

Huehns, Gertrude. *Antinomianism in English History with Special Reference to the Period 1640-1660*. London:Cresset Press, 1951.

Ivimey, Joseph. *A History of the English Baptists*. 4 Vols. London:Printed for B.J. Holdsworth, 1811-1830.

Kliever, Lonnie D. "General Baptist Origins: The Question of Anabaptist Influence." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 36(1962):291-321.

Land, Richard D. "Doctrinal Controversies of English Particular Baptists (1644-1691) as Illustrated by the career and Writings of Thomas Collier." Unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1979.

Letham, Robert. "Baptism in the Writings of the Reformers," *The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 7(1989):21-44.

Lindberg, Richard. *The Westminster and Second London Baptist Confessions of Faith: A Historical-Theological Comparison*. Unpublished Thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1980.

Lumpkin, William L. *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. Philadelphia:The Judson Press, 1959.

Mayor, S.H. "James II and the Dissenters." *The Baptist Quarterly* 34(1991):180-190.

McGlothlin, W.J. "Dr. Daniel Featley and the First Calvinistic Baptist Confession." *The Review and Expositor* 6(1909):579-589.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Baptist Confessions of Faith*. London:Baptist Historical Society, 1911.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sources of the First Calvinistic Baptist Confession of Faith." *The Review and Expositor*

13(1916):500-507.

McBeth, H. Leon. *The Baptist Heritage*. Nashville:Broadman Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Sourcebook for Baptist Heritage*. Nashville:Broadman Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *English Baptist Literature on Religious Liberty to 1689*. Th.D. Dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1961; reprinted., New York:Arno Press, 1980.

McLachlan, H. John. *Socialism in Seventeenth-Century England*. London:Oxford University Press, 1951.

Nelson, Stanley A. "Reflecting on Baptist Origins: The London Confession of Faith of 1644." *Baptist History and Heritage* 29(1994):33-46.

Novak, Michael J. "'Thy Will Be Done' The Theology of the English Particular Baptists, 1638-1660." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1979.

Oliver, Robert. "Baptist Confession Making 1644 and 1689." Paper from the Strict Baptist Historical Society, March, 1989.

Pater, Calvin. *Karlstadt as the Father of the Baptist Movements: The Emergence of Lay Protestantism*. Toronto:University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Payne, Ernest A. "Who Were the Baptists?" *The Baptist Quarterly* 26(1956):339-342.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Contacts Between Mennonites and Baptists," *Foundations* 4(1961):39-55.

Reay, B. and J.F. McGregor, eds. *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. New York:Oxford University Press, 1984.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom Vol.1*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Creeds of Christendom Vol.2*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.

Selement, George. "The Covenant Theology of English Separatism and the Separation of Church and State." *Journal of American Academy of Religion* 46(1973):66-74.

Stassen, Glen H. "Anabaptist Influence in the Origin of The Particular Baptists." *Mennonite Quarterly Review*

36(1962):322-348.

Tolmie, Murray. "General and Particular Baptists in the Puritan Revolution." Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Harvard University, 1960.

Tolmie, Murray. *The Triumph of the Saints*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Torbet, Robert G. *A History of the Baptists*. Philadelphia:The Judson Press, 1955.

Vaughn, J. Barry. "Public Worship and Practical Theology in the Work of Benjamin Keach 1640-1704." Unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1979?

Walker, Williston. *The Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*. New York:1893.

Wamble, Hugh. "Inter-relations of Seventeenth Century English Baptists." *Review and Expositor* 54(1957):407-425.

Watts. Michael R. *The Dissenters*. Oxford:Clarendon Press, 1978.

*Westminster Confession of Faith*. Inverness:The Publications Committee of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland,1976.

White, B.R. *Hanserd Knollys and Radical Dissent in the Seventeenth Century*. London:Dr.Williams's Trust, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Frontiers of Fellowship between English Baptists,1609-1660." *Foundations* 11(1968):244-256.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Organization of the Particular Baptists, 1644-1660." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 17(1966):209-226.

\_\_\_\_\_. "How did William Kiffin join the Baptists." *The Baptist Quarterly* 23(1970):201-207.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Henry Jessey in the Great Rebellion." In *Reformation Conformity and Dissent*. Ed. R. Buick Knox. London:Epworth Press, 1977, pp.132-153.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century*. London:Baptist Historical Society,1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. "John Pendavres, the Calvinistic Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy." *The Baptist Quarterly* 25(1974):251-71.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of the Church in the Particular Baptist Confession of 1644." *Journal of Theological Studies*, New

Series 19(1968):570-90.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Baptist Beginnings and the Kiffin Manuscripts."  
*Baptist History and Heritage* 2(1967):27-39.

Whitley, W.T. "The Seven Churches of London." *The Review and  
Expositor* 7(1910):384-413.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Baptists of London: 1612-1928*. London:The  
Kingsgate Press, 1928.

Wilson, John F. "Another look at John Canne." *Church History* 33:  
34-48.