

# A HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS

VOLUME TWO

TOGETHER WITH SOME ACCOUNT  
OF THEIR PRINCIPLES  
AND PRACTICES

JOHN T. CHRISTIAN, A.M. D.D. LL.D.

*Professor of Christian History in The Baptist  
Bible Institute, New Orleans, Louisiana.*

Copyright (Public Domain)

[www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html](http://www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html)

(Reformed on the Web)

# THE CONTENTS

## I. THE COLONIAL PERIOD

### CHAPTER I

#### The First Baptists in America.

First Settlers—Separatists and Puritans—The Difference in the Parties—The Puritan a Church of England Man—Reformed—Character of the Puritans—Religious Intolerance—Frothingham—Neal—Ruffini—The Theocracy—The First Baptists—Their Character—Statistics.

### CHAPTER II

#### The Baptists in Rhode Island.

Baptists Organize—Roger Williams—Relations to Sir Edward Coke—Arrival in New England—How Recognized—Estimates of Him—Pastor in Salem—Interference of the Magistrates—Plymouth—Returns to Salem—Before the Court in Boston—The Attitude of the People of Salem—His Banishment—His Popularity in Salem—Revocation of the Order of Banishment—Roman Catholics—Organization of the Church in Providence—The Baptism of Williams—The Form of Baptism—Abandons the Church Apostolic Succession and the Administration of Baptism—Irregularity—John Spilsbury—Further History of the Church—Pardon Tillinghast—Williams on Liberty—His Character—The Church at Newport—John Clarke—His Character—Recognition of Charles II—A New Charter—Rhode Island Persecuted by Other Colonies—Better Opinion of the State—Prosperity of the Baptists.

### CHAPTER III

#### The Persecution of the Baptists in Massachusetts.

Charter Rights—A Christian State—Violations of the Charter—Peter Oliver—Episcopal Worship not Allowed—The Browns—The Rise of the Baptists—The Baptists Denounced—Petitions Against Them—Lady Moody—William Witter—Thomas Painter—The Governor Acts—A Severe Law—Baptists Punished—The Law Explained—Goodman Johnson—Letters on Severity—Letter to

Plymouth Colony—The Persecution of the Quakers—Dissenters Forced to Pay Taxes—The Opinion of Ruffini.

## CHAPTER IV

### The First Baptist Churches in Massachusetts.

The First Church in the State—Swansea—Prosecutions of the Church—A Grant of Land—The Conditions of the Grant—The Church in Boston—Richard Mather—John Clarke—Obadiah Holmes and Crandall—They Are Arrested—The Whipping of Holmes—Letter to Kiffin—The Conversion of Henry Dunster—History of the Case—Removed as President of Harvard—Thomas Gould—The Church Formed—The Action of the Congregational Church—Persecutions—The Action of the Court—The Place of Meeting—The General Spirit of the Puritans—House of Worship—Some Changes in Sentiment—Their Punishment—The Witches Burned—The Opinion of the Baptists—William Melbourne—Robert Calef—The Power of the Theocracy Broken—The Later Laws.

## CHAPTER V

### The Baptists of Pennsylvania and the Jerseys.

William Penn—The "Frame of Government"—"The Great Law"—Liberal Provisions in Religion—Baptists from Rhode Island—Thomas Dungan—Cold Springs—Pennepek—Baptists from Wales, Ireland and England—Elias Keach—The Keithian Quakers—Mennonites—Baptists in Philadelphia—Jersey Baptists—Emigrants from Many Countries—The Congregationalists in Newark—A Curious Incident.

## CHAPTER VI

### The Baptists of Maine and South Carolina.

Baptists in Kittery—The Letter of Humphrey Churchwood—William Screven—Before the Grand Jury—The Account of Joshua Millet—Screven Convicted of Contempt—Fined—His Character—Screven in South Carolina—The Opinion of His Enemies—Joseph Lord Writes to the Governor—The Settlement of Charleston—The Established Church—The Different Religious Sects—The First

Baptists There—Lady Blake—Religious Conformity Demanded—No Other Baptist Church in the State—The Euhaw and Other Churches.

## CHAPTER VII

### The Baptists in New York, Delaware, Connecticut and Vermont.

The Baptists in New York—Dutch Settlers—The Reformed Church—The Baptists Conventicles Suppressed—Lady Moody—Baptists in Flushing—Francis Doughty—Laws—Fines—Valentine—Wightman—The Various Sects—Governor Andros—Governor Hunter—First Baptist Church, New York—Nicholas Eyres—Fines—The Baptists in Central New York—Delaware—The Settlement of the State—The Welsh Tract Church—Elijah Baker and Philip Hughes—The Sounds Baptist Church—Connecticut—The Severity of the Laws—Early Baptist—The Slow Progress—Vermont—The Rise of the Baptists.

## CHAPTER VIII

### The Baptists in Maryland and New Hampshire.

Maryland—Claims of the Roman Catholics—Bishop Gilmour—Cardinal Gibbons—Lord Baltimore—His Views of Liberty—A Forced Baptism of Infants—The Protestant Charter—Rufuni—De Courcey—Religious Provisions of the Charter—The Testimony of Dr. Brownson—An Attempt to Establish the Roman Catholic Religion in 1638—The Famous Act of 1649—The Political Fortunes of Baltimore at the Time—Population Mostly Protestant—The Opinion of the Historians—The Law a Compromise Measure Between Roman Catholics and the Puritans—Governor Stone a Protestant—No Liberty of Conscience Allowed—Roman Catholic View—The Terrible Penalties—The Virgin Mary—The Sabbath—Imprisonment and Public Whippings—The Baptists in Maryland—New Hampshire—The Baptist Church at Newton—Other Baptist Churches.

## CHAPTER IX

### The Philadelphia Association, Brown University, and Baptist Customs.

Organization of the Philadelphia Association—Quarterly Meetings—The Early Churches of the Body—Other Associations—Powers of an Association—The Declaration of the Association—The Separate Association in Virginia—John L. Waller—Discipline—Trouble in the Pennepek Church—The First Church, Charleston, S. C.—Requirements to Unite With a Church—Ministerial Education—Thomas Hollis and Harvard College—Scholarships for Baptists—Abel Morgan—The Academy at Hopewell—Missions—Oliver Hart—John Gano—Circular Letter on Education—Isaac Eaton—Brown University—James Manning—Dr. Ezra Stiles—The Charter—The First Commencement of Brown—The College Suspended—Resolutions on Temperance—Early Customs of the Baptists.

## CHAPTER X

### The Great Awakening.

Baptists in Massachusetts—Position of the Puritans—Reaction Against the Standing Order—Thirteen Evils—The Account of Jonathan Edwards of Conditions—A Minister in New Hampshire—The Historian Trumbull—The Drink Habit—The Half Way Covenant—The Burning of Witches—The Awakening in Northampton—The Sermons of Edwards—The Revival Begins—The Effects of the Revival—George Whitefield—The Estimate of Benjamin Franklin—Manner of Preaching of Whitefield—Calvinism—The Baptists Calvinistic—Disorders—Persecutions of the Standing Order—Edwards Ejected from His Church—The *Boston Gazette*—Opposition of the Episcopalians—Action of the Connecticut Legislature—The New Lights—The New Lights Become Baptists—Bacon's Account—Great Growth of the Baptists.

## CHAPTER XI

### The Baptists of Virginia.

The First Settlers of Virginia—The Episcopalians—Contrasts with New England—First Efforts of the Baptists—The Church of

England Established by Law—The Virginia Charter—No Toleration Allowed—The Bloody Laws—"Neck and Heels" in Jail for Not Attending Church—The First Act of Parliament—The Salary of the Clergy Paid in Tobacco—Dissenters Must Depart the Colony—Whippings and Brandings—Ordination from the Church of England Demanded—Quakers and Baptists in Virginia—Infant Baptism—Presbyterians Tolerated for a Strange Reason—Baptists Slow in Entering the State—Marvelous Growth—Dr. Hawks—Bishop Perry—The Statement of Semple—The First Baptists from England—Robert Norden—Collection of Money in England for the Baptist Church at Burley—Churches in Berkeley and Loudon Counties—The Statement of John Gano—David Thomas.

## CHAPTER XII

### *The Baptists in Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia.*

The Third Company of Baptists in Virginia—The Separatist—Shubeal Stearns—Daniel Marshall—Stearns Unites with the Baptist—North Carolina Settled—Individual Baptist—Paul Palmer—William Sojourner—Kehukee Association—Vanhorn and Miller—The Preaching of the Separatists—The Character of Stearns—History of the Movement—Many Notices of the Growth of the Baptist—Baptists in Georgia—Nicholas Bedgewood—Benjamin Stark—Botsford—Gano—Marshall Arrested—Kiokee Church—Samuel Harris—Elijah Craig—The Election of Bishops by the Baptists.

## II. THE PERIOD OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

### CHAPTER I

#### *The Baptists in the American Revolution.*

The Thirteen Colonies—The Policy of England—The Discovery of the Valley of the Ohio—The Population of the Country—The Social, Political and Religious Conditions—Political and Religious Freedom—The Forces Against America—George III—The Attitude of Pope Pius VI—John Adams on the situation—The Position of Canada—The Quebec Act—The Roman Catholics of Great Britain—The Attitude of America Toward the Roman Catholics—The

Mercenaries from Germany—The Roman Catholics of Ireland—Of America—The Clergy of the Established Church of England—Rev. Charles Inglis—Foreign Born Citizens—A Conspiracy Against Washington—William Pitt—The Baptists of England—Dr. Rippon—The Baptists of America—The Warren Association—The Philadelphia Association—An Appeal to the Continental Congress—Rhode Island Favors Independence—The Baptists of Virginia—A Memorial to Congress—Soldiers—Chaplains in the Army—Oliver Hart—John Hart.

## CHAPTER II

### The Baptists and the American Constitution.

The Constitution—The Ratification—Two Objections to the Constitution—Liberty not Sufficiently Guarded—Massachusetts—James Manning—Virginia—James Madison and John Leland—J. S. Barbour—Governor Briggs on Leland—Patrick Henry Against the Constitution—John Adam—And Religious Liberty—Thomas Jefferson—First Amendment to the Constitution—The Baptists of Virginia Propose the Amendment—The Forces Working for Liberty—Leonard Bacon—Ruffini.

## CHAPTER III

### The Period of Imprisonment and Strife in Virginia.

The Persecutions in Virginia—Imprisonments—Spotsylvania—Lewis Craig—Letter of John Blair—Waller forty—three Days in Jail—The Members of the Establishment Enraged—Others Imprisoned—William Fristoe on Persecutions—The Baptists Greatly Increase in Number—James Madison Writes Letters—The Action of the House of Burgesses—The Baptists Present Petitions—The Baptists Attack the Establishment.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Baptists and the Destruction of the Establishment.

The Evils of the Establishment in Virginia—The Baptists Render Service to the Country—Dr. Hawks on the Situation—The Convention at Williamsburg—Petition of the Clergy—Terrible Charges Against the Baptists—The Statement of Fristoe—The Tax

Law Suspended—Counter Memorials—The Law Repealed—The Statement of Rayner—The Historians Speak—The Glebe Lands—The General Assessment Proposed—The Presbyterians—The Reasons the Baptists Opposed the Measure—The Bill Examined and Rejected—The Bill of Thomas Jefferson—Bishop Perry on the Baptists—Jefferson and the Baptists—The Union of the Regular and Separate Baptists—The Terms of The Union—The Revival.

### **III. THE PERIOD OF GROWTH AND ORGANIZATION**

#### **CHAPTER I**

##### **The Baptists in Kentucky.**

The Ohio Valley—Kentucky—John Finlay—Hunters from North Carolina—Daniel Boone—Lexington—The Customs of the People—The County of Fincastle—Baptists the Pioneers—John Lythe holds "Divine Service" at Harrodsburg—Bishop Smith on the Baptists—Thomas Tinsley and William Hickman—John Taylor—William Marshall—Severn's Valley Church—Cedar Creek Church—The Traveling Church—Lewis Craig—Other Famous Preachers—The Negro Servant Peyer—The Land and Water Routes to Kentucky—Calvinistic and Separate Churches—Religious Conditions—The Revivals—John Gano—The Elkhorn Association—Foot Washing—United Baptists—Augustine Eastin and James Garrard—Cooper Run Church—A Horrible Murder—The Unitarian Movement—The Universalists.

#### **CHAPTER II**

##### **The Baptists of the Ohio Valley.**

The Ohio Valley—The Conditions—George Rogers Clark—The American Settlers—The French Settlers—The First Churches in Ohio—John Smith and James Lee—The Indians—The Miami Association—Illinois—J. M. Peek—Indiana—Isaac McCoy and George Waller—Judge Holman—Missouri—Hardships—Bethel Church—Fee Fee Church—Tennessee—Middle Tennessee—Alabama—Revivals in Alabama.

## CHAPTER III

### The Baptists in Mississippi and Louisiana.

Spanish America—The Inquisition—Florida—New Mexico—The French Occupy Louisiana—The Conditions—The Mississippi Country—The Claim of Great Britain—The Uprising Against Spain—Emigrants in the Natchez Country—Richard Curtis—Journey by Flatboats—Religious Liberty—Salem Church—Meetings Held at Night—The Spanish Officers—The Flight of Curtis—In South Carolina—The Return of Curtis—The Dissensions of the Salem Church—The Baptists Enter Louisiana—Mills and Smith—The Conditions in Louisiana—Persecutions—Bailey E. Chaney—Half Moon Bluff Church—Baptists in New Orleans.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Great Revival of 1800.

The Deplorable Conditions of the Country—Low State of Morals—Terrible Practices—Deistical Opinions of the French and Indian Wars—Alliance of America and France—The Effects of French Infidelity—Thomas Paine—Infidel Clubs—Illuminism—Want of Religious Instruction—Baptist and Presbyterian Ministers—Dull Preaching—Conditions in the Colleges—Kentucky and Tennessee—Logan County—The Great Revival—James McGready—His Sermons—The Camp Meeting at Casper River—The Account of McGready—The Meeting Described—Barton W. Stone—Other Meetings—Extravagance—Lorenzo Dow—The Jerks and Other Violent Exercises—Disorders—Such Meetings Continued for Years—The Revival Did Great Good—Testimonies—Results Among the Baptists—Effects Felt Throughout the United States.

## CHAPTER V

### The Rise of Foreign Missions Among American Baptists.

The Opinion of Southey—The Baptists of the United States Missionary—Had not Undertaken Foreign Mission Work—The Appeals of Carey and Others—The Contributions to India—Early Missionary Enterprises—No General Organization—The Spirit of the Times—The Congregationalists—The American Board of

Commissioners—Young Men in the Andover Theological Seminary—Hall, Mills, Judson, Nott and Luther Rice—Americans Seek to Be Sent from England—The Missionaries Ordained—They Sail for Foreign Lands—Adoniram Judson—Studies the Subject of Baptism—Becomes a Baptist—Informs the American Board—Appeals to the Baptists—Accepted by the Baptists—Judson in Burmah—The Return of Luther Rice.

## CHAPTER VI

### The General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States.

Luther Rice—His Character—Kingsford's Account—Note in His Journal—Before the American Board—Appeal to the Baptists—The Savannah Baptist Society—Organization of the Triennial Convention—The Numbers of the Baptists Small—The Messengers—The Constitution—Dr. Furman Preaches the Sermon—Judson Accepted as Missionary—Hough and Wife Sent to India—Domestic Missions—The Program—Indian Missions—Isaac McCoy—Rice Visits the Churches—A Great Crisis—A Resume of the Work.

## CHAPTER VII

### The Anti-Effort Secession from the Baptists.

The Rise of the Division—The Rancor of the Discussions—The Misunderstandings—Opposition to Missions—To Education—Masonry—Drinking—"Old School Baptists"—The Opposition Widespread—Beebe in *The Signs of the Times*—Tennessee—Arkansas—Kentucky—Hill Grove Church—Otter Creek Association—Georgia—Hepziban Association—Yellow River—Flint River—Alabama—Virginia—Reasons for the Divisions—State of Religion—John Taylor—Samuel Trott—Daniel Parker—Illinois—Peck and Parker—Indiana—Texas—Sad Results.

## CHAPTER VIII

### The Schism of Alexander Campbell.

Rise of the "Current Reformation"—Calvinism—Arminianism—Alexander Campbell—In Pennsylvania—A Presbyterian—Unites with the Baptists—Described by Archbishop Purcell—Debate with

John Walker—Barton W. Stone and the Reformation—Campbell and Stone Unite Their Forces—The Ten Articles—The Debate with McCalla—Immense Crowds—Peculiar Views—A Great Sensation—Prominent Ministers—His Great Talent in Debate—His Views Slowly Introduced—Baptism for the Remission of Sins—Call to the Ministry—Paid Ministry—Poorly Prepared Ministers—The Separation—Action of the Associations—The Account of Dr. W. C. Buck—The Increase of the Baptists.

## CHAPTER IX

### A Number of Baptist Activities.

Alien Immersions—J. L. Reynolds—Crosby—Philadelphia Association—The Case of James Hutchinson—Jesse Mercer—*The Christian Review*—Benedict—Education—Colombian College—The Triennial Convention on Education—An Address—The Effect of the Revolutionary War—The Charleston Association—Baptist Education Society in the Middle States—The Massachusetts Education Society—A School of Theological Instruction in Philadelphia—Washington, D. C.—The Progress of the Colombian College—President Monroe—The Resignation of Rice—Newton Theological Institution—Hamilton College—The Education Society in South Carolina and Georgia—Mercer College—Other Colleges—State Conventions—The General Convention of Western Baptists—Home Missions in the West—Sunday Schools—Baptist Publication Society—Newspapers and Periodicals—Conclusion.

## **EDITOR'S NOTE**

It is due Dr. Christian that our readers be informed that the correcting of the manuscript and the editing and proof-reading of the text of this volume have been done without the assistance of the author. The manuscript had been accepted for publication and was being held at his request for the author's perusal when death ended his earthly labors. In spite of every effort to guarantee accuracy, we are conscious that Dr. Christian's familiarity with his sources, unavailable to us, would have detected inaccuracies which may have escaped our notice. We ask, therefore, that Dr. Christian be absolved from any responsibility for any errors that may appear and that the reading public place, with charitable indulgence, all blame for such errors upon this office.

JOHN L. HILL

# A HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS

## PREFACE

In the three periods of American history under survey in this treatise, there were no worldly inducements for a person to unite with the Baptists. Slanders of the most horrible character were circulated against them. It was alleged that they held the tenets of the Mad Men of Munster; and that their doctrines of liberty of conscience were abominable and would work the ruin of Christianity. They were driven by persecution from province to province; they were imprisoned, whipped and ostracized. All through the Colonial Period they were regarded as anarchists, and indignities were heaped upon them. They were denied the common rights of citizenship. For years after the American Revolution, on account of unjust state laws, they were compelled to pay taxes and suffer imprisonments on account of their opposition to the union of Church and State. The wonder is not that in numbers the Baptists increased slowly, but that they survived the shock of this terrible opposition. Men of wealth and position sought diligently to make them a stench in the nostrils of decent people.

They increased, in spite of persecutions, and in time became influential. The story of their accomplishments, under the conditions, is really marvelous. Roger Williams and John Clarke preached human liberty, which was regarded as fanaticism; but it became the great American principle of inalienable rights of man. Cotton Mather and his contemporaries burned witches; but William Milburne, a Baptist minister, opposed the measure by circulating petitions against the delusion, and Robert Calif, a member of the First Baptist Church in Boston, wrote the book which destroyed it. Obadiah Holmes was unmercifully whipped because he was a Baptist, but this led Henry Dunster, President of Harvard, to embrace Baptist principles. This was one of the most notable events in all Colonial history.

By the time of the American Revolution the Baptists had grown sufficiently in numbers and influence to command recognition. There were no Tories among the Baptists. Their men entered the American army and none were more patriotic. They gave of their money to the cause of the Colonists. Their ministers preached the gospel to the soldiers. They supported the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; and proposed the First Amendment to that Constitution in support of the liberty and rights of man.

The War of the Revolution practically broke up all of the existing Baptist centers. The Baptist church in New York City was reduced from a membership of some two hundred and fifty to less than fifty members. The same conditions prevailed in other churches. It had, however, the wholesome influence of scattering Baptist principles throughout all the States and Territories. Great numbers of Baptist ministers emigrated from Virginia to Kentucky, planted *the cause* in that section, and in turn became the pioneers in frontier Indiana, Illinois, Ohio and Missouri. The Baptists of North and South Carolina traveled west and planted churches in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama and Tennessee.

Many of the Baptist preachers of those days were unlearned men; but they were schooled in the hardy life of pioneers. They were unpaid for their services, often crude, but they preached a mighty gospel that met with a hearty response. Often missionaries were sent forth, who remained from home for months at a time. John Gano preached all the way from Pennsylvania to North Carolina.

Nearly seventy years passed from the founding of the first Baptist church in this country to the organization of the Philadelphia Association, the first in the United States. It was one hundred and seventy-five years before they organized the first General Convention. This Triennial Convention, as it was generally called, was brought into existence by the conversion of Adoniram Judson to Baptist principles. This event was followed by the founding of missionary societies, colleges, newspapers, and indeed practically all of the general Baptist enterprises.

Unfortunately, no sooner was this movement inaugurated than opposition arose from two extremes. There had been much preaching on election and predestination. There had developed in some quarters a system of hyper-Calvinism which paralyzed all effort. This led to the anti-mission, or anti-effort secession. On the other hand there were many loose views of doctrine and practice prevalent. This led to the secession of Alexander Campbell and his followers. Not only was the denomination rent asunder by these factions; but there remained behind a spirit of controversy which did not always add to the spiritual life of the churches.

There were other factors at work which were equally serious. About the year 1835 began those political debates and animosities which were to occasion

the Civil War. These factional differences were manifested in religious affairs. They ultimately led to the division of the Baptists of the North from those of the South.

It may, therefore, conservatively be said that up to the Civil War, and for some years following, the Baptists of the United States had no favorable opportunity of expansion. The periods under observation, in this volume, are rather a history of persecutions, hardships and trials. It is to the honor of the fathers that they heroically met these conditions and laid the foundation of future success.

The references contained in the body of this book will sufficiently attest the sources and authorities used. Every effort has been used for accuracy. It would be too much, however, in a survey covering as much as does this volume, to claim that no inaccuracies have crept in.

The origin of the Baptists in some States is not traced because they were lost, or their affairs were not sufficiently advanced to admit of definite treatment. The development of the history in such States necessarily falls under a later period.

## THE AUTHOR

# I. THE COLONIAL PERIOD

## CHAPTER I

### THE FIRST BAPTISTS IN AMERICA

First Settlers—Separatists and Puritans—The Differences in the Parties—The Puritan a Church of England Man—Reformed—Character of the Puritans—Religious Intolerance—Frothingham—Neale-Ruffini—The Theocracy—The First Baptists—Their Character—Statistics.

The first Baptists on this continent were found in New England. That portion of the country was settled by the Separatists and the Puritans. The first named of these parties established Plymouth Colony and were known as the Pilgrim Fathers; the Puritans at a later date occupied Massachusetts Bay.

One point must be kept clearly in mind. In what is now called Massachusetts, there were in the early days two colonies, two centers of life and influence, very distinct one from the other. There was the little colony of Plymouth, beginning in 1620, and the larger colony of the Massachusetts Bay, beginning in 1628, which centered around Salem, Boston and Charleston. These colonies were about forty miles apart, a wilderness separated them by the land route, so that the principal intercourse was by water. But they were not so far separated by distance and physical difficulties as their general ideas and ways of looking at the great questions which were then up for consideration. So these two little confederacies, for a time, lived much to themselves.

The people at Plymouth were called Pilgrims; the people in the Bay were called Puritans. The people at Plymouth were called Separatists, and those at the Bay were Non-Conformists, and these words conveyed entirely separate ideas (Increase N. Tarbox, Plymouth and the Bay, *The Congregational Quarterly Magazine*, April, 1875, XVII. pp. 239, 241).

Most of the Separatists were North of England men. They denounced the Church of England as corrupt and they wholly separated from its communion. When the heavy hand of persecution fell on them they migrated to Holland. The surroundings in the Netherlands were not favorable to them. The language was harsh, the climate undesirable, and their environments were not satisfactory in many directions. So they crossed the seas and established themselves at Plymouth as “the forerunners of an innumerable host.”

The Puritans on the other hand did not break with the Church of England. They dissented from many of its tenets but did not separate from it. They thought that the church ought to be reformed and remodeled. When the Puritans met with no success in this direction they likewise sought a home in the New World. Rev. Francis Higginson, on leaving England, in 1629, is reported to have said: "We will not say, as the Separatists were wont to say at their leaving of England: Farewell, Babylon I Farewell, Rome! But we will say, Farewell, dear England, and all the Christian friends there. We do not go to New England as separatists from the Church of England; though we cannot but separate from the corruptions of it. But we go to practice the positive part of church reformation; and propagate the gospel in America" (Cotton Mather, *Magnalia*, Lib. III. Sec. 1).

Governor Winthrop likewise said:

We esteem it an honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother, and cannot part from our native land, where she especially resides, without much sadness of heart and many tears in our eyes. For acknowledging that such hope and faith as we have obtained in the common salvation we have received in her bosom and sucked it from her breasts, we leave it not, therefore, as loathing that milk wherewith we were. Nourished there; but, blessing God for parentage and education as members of the same God, shall always rejoice in her good, and unfeignedly grieve for any sorrow that shall ever betide her, and, while we draw breath, sincerely desire and endeavor the continuance and abundance of her welfare, with the enlargement of her bounds in the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

The Puritan was an Anglo-Saxon with an infusion of Norman blood—his northern imagination inflamed by the oriental imagery of the Old Testament, and his intellect submissive to a creed drawn from the New. And shaped by the logic of Geneva. The Cavaliers were Normans with some Saxon blood, full of haughty passions and the love of pomp, attached by sentiment and memory to the monarchy and the hallowed forms of old religion, but drunk with the new-born liberty, because they loved its license. The Huguenots were crusaders, divested of the steel-clad armor of the thirteenth century, and clothed in the full panoply of the ideas of the sixteenth. The Hollanders were

men of quiet, sent among us apparently for the purpose of showing how much may be accomplished by sitting still—a perpetual reproach upon the fussy activities of some of their more volatile neighbors.

Much of the ridicule heaped upon the Puritans was caused by their external peculiarities. “The Puritans were the most remarkable body of men,” says the *Edinburgh Review*, “perhaps which the world ever produced. The odious and ridiculous parts of their character lie on the surface. He that runs may read them; nor have there been wanting attentive and malicious observers to point them out. For many years after the Restoration, they were the theme of unmeasured invective and derision. They were exposed to the utmost licentiousness of the press and the stage, at a time when the press and the stage were the most licentious. They were not men of letters; they were as a body unpopular; they could not defend themselves; and the public would not take them under its protection. They were therefore abandoned, without reserve, to the tender mercies of the satirists and dramatists. The unostentatious simplicity of their dress, their sour aspect, their nasal twang, their stiff posture, their long graces, their Hebrew names, the scriptural phrases which they introduced on every occasion, their contempt of human learning, their detestation of polite amusements, were indeed fair game for the laughers. But it is not from the laughers alone that the philosophy of history is to be learnt. And he who approaches the subject should carefully guard against the influence of their potent ridicule which has already misled so many excellent writers” (*Edinburgh Review*, Milton’s *Treatise on Christian Doctrine*).

The first settlers came to this country with an earnest purpose. “The early settlements of the English colonies,” says McMahon, “within what are now the limits of the United States, were, in general, similar in the causes and circumstances of their establishment. It was not the mere spirit of enterprise, the thirst for gain, nor the love of novelty, which impelled the early emigrants to forsake their native land, and to sever all the ties which bound them to the homes of their fathers. It was not from these alone, that they were content to go forth as wanderers from the scenes of their infancy, and the allotments of their youth. It was not for these alone, that they took up their abode in the wilderness; made their dwelling with the savages; and encountered with cheerfulness and alacrity, all the privations and dangers of a country not yet rescued from the rudeness of nature. These causes may have contributed, and

no doubt did operate in peopling these colonies, but we must look elsewhere for the primary causes of their establishment, and the true source of their rapid increase in wealth and population. This, their new home, had other charms for them; and the history of the times and the language of the emigrants tell us what these were. They sought freedom from the religious and civil shackles, and oppressive institutions, of their parent country; and here they found, and were content to take it, with all of its alloy of hardship and danger. Too inconsiderable to attract attention, or to provoke the indignation of the parent government; too remote to be narrowly observed in their transactions, or to be reached by the speedy arm of power; here, unharassed by the old and corrupt establishments of their native land, yet cherishing all of the genuine principles of English liberty, might they spring up to consequence and happiness. Here, unchecked in their infant operations by the jealousies of the parent, they might be permitted to lay, broad and deep, the foundations of their civil and religious liberties; and here they might ‘hope to transmit to their posterity, in all their freshness and purity’ (McMahon, *A Historical View of the Government of Maryland*, I. 190. Baltimore, 1831) .

Yet it was no easy life they had chosen. “Men who had to covet, miserly, the kernels of corn for their daily bread, and till the ground, staggering through weakness from the effect of famine, can do but little in setting the metaphysics of faith, or in gauging the exercises of their feelings. Grim necessity of hunger looks morbid sensibility out of countenance” (Cheever, *Edition of the Journal of the Pilgrims*, 112. 1848).

The Separatists have been described as men with their “hearts full of charity, kindness, and toleration; their minds broadened by experience in a land where religion was free to all men.” The Puritans had no such ideas. They desired liberty for themselves and perfect toleration; but they were not willing to grant this liberty to others. “Their chief crime was their uncharitableness,” says Neale, “in unchurching the whole Christian world, and breaking off all manner of communion in hearing the Word, in public prayer, and in the administration of the sacraments, not only with the Church of England, but with the foreign Reformed churches, which though less pure. Ought certainly to be owned as churches of Christ” (Neale, *History of the Puritans*, I.). Neale elsewhere says:

It is not pretended, that the Puritans were without their failings; no, they were men of like passions and infirmities with their adversaries; and while they endeavored to avoid one extreme, they might fall into another; their zeal for their platform of discipline would, I fear, have betrayed them into the imposition of it upon others, if it had been established by law. Their notions of the civil and religious rights of mankind were narrow and confused, and derived too much from the theocracy of the Jews, which was now at an end. Their behaviour was severe and rigid, far removed from the fashionable freedoms and vices of the age; and possibly they might have been too censorious, in not making those distinctions between youth and age, grandeur and mere decency; and the nature and circumstances of things would admit; but with all their faults, they were the most pious and devout people in the land; men of prayer, both in secret and in public, as well as in their families; their manner of devotion was fervent and solemn, depending on the assistance of the divine Spirit, not only to teach them how to pray, but what to pray for as they ought (Neale, I.).

Howe tries to excuse the persecutions of the Puritans, but his explanation brings a terrible indictment against practically all of the colonies. He says:

In justice to the Puritans we should bear in mind that most of the other American colonies, no matter by whom settled or controlled, were equally intolerant. The Quakers were persecuted almost everywhere except in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. So late as 1860, a law of Maryland styled Quaker preachers "vagabonds," and authorized them to be apprehended and whipped. Baptists fared little better anywhere than did the Quakers. They were persecuted in all of the colonies and enjoyed no freedom except in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Delaware. New York and most of the colonies had laws against the Catholics. In 1664 we find the Maryland Assembly, in a law against blasphemy, including in a general sweep, "Schismatic, Idolater, Puritan, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist," etc. (Dillon, *Oddities of Colonial Legislation*; Hildreth, *History of the United States*, I; Howe, *The Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay*.)

Religious intolerance was universal in all of these parties. In a sermon preached by N. L. Frothingham, Boston, August 29, 1830, he said:

Two hundred years ago there was no such thing as toleration. In practice it was unknown, save of a few mild spirits; and even in open theory it was derided and condemned. "He that is willing," says a writer (Ward) whom I have already quoted, "to tolerate any religion or discrepant way of religion, besides his own, or is not sincere in it. There is no truth but one, and of the persecution of true religion and toleration of false, the last is far the worst. It is said that men ought to have liberty of conscience, and that it is persecution to debar them from it. I can rather stand amazed than reply to this. It is an astonishment that the brains of men should be parboiled in such impious ignorance." Another thus expresses himself (President Oakes, Century sermon, 1673. Also Higginson, Election Sermon, 1663; Shephard, Election Sermon, 1672) "The outcry of some for liberty of conscience. This is the great Diana of the Libertines of this age. I look upon toleration as the first born of all iniquities. If it should be brought forth amongst us, you may call it Gad, a troop cometh, a troop of all manner of abominations." Most of the Puritans of this period thought it impossible that different sects should exist peaceably together in the same community, and even when oppressed themselves they exclaimed against universal toleration (*The Commemoration of the First Church in Boston*, on November 18, 1880, p. 82. Boston, 1881).

"The cause of this disagreement was as follows," says Ruffini. "So resolutely and blindly did the Presbyterians profess the principles of the rigid Calvinism, that they became absolutely irreconcilable with any other religious denomination and as belligerent as the most implacable Catholic. Their supreme ideal was the realization of the kingdom of Christ on earth. Consequently the system of relations between the civil and ecclesiastical power at which they aimed was naturally a great deal more exclusive than the episcopalian system, since it was a pure theocracy. They had, therefore, taken arms against the episcopal constitution, which they accused of having fallen headlong into popery, solely in order that their form of constitution might be imposed upon the country—a constitution which, according to them, was more in conformity with the pure principles of Protestantism. But

nothing was more foreign to their ideas, nothing more remote from their intentions, than the principle of toleration and the proposal to substitute it for the old regime of episcopal coercion. They would have greatly preferred the latter to the former, if nothing else was to be had. Indeed, one of them said, 'If the devil were given the choice of reestablishing in the kingdom the episcopal or granting toleration, he would certainly declare in favor of the latter.' And another added, 'I would rather find myself buried in the grave than live to see this intolerable toleration'" (Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*).

A resume of the laws and punishments for religion in New England is interesting. "It might have been expected, that those emigrants who made New England their asylum from what they deemed civil tyranny and ecclesiastical persecution, would have guarded against every degree of oppression and persecution in that form of government they were about to establish among themselves. This, however, was far from being the case. Some of the first laws savor of a degree of persecution and intolerance unknown in the most despotic governments of Europe; and those who fled from persecution became the most bitter persecutors. Those who were fond of dancing or drank were ordered to be publicly whipped, in order to deter others from such practices. The custom of wearing long hair was deemed immodest, impious and abominable. All who were guilty of swearing rashly might purchase an exemption from punishment for a shilling; but those who should transgress the fourth commandment were to be condemned by banishment, and such as should worship images, to death. Children were to be punished with death for cursing or striking their father or mother. Marriages were to be solemnized by magistrates; and all who denied the coercive authority of the magistrate in religious matters, or the validity of infant baptism, were to be banished. Blasphemy, perjury, adultery, and witchcraft, were all made capital offences. In short, we may challenge the annals of any nation to produce a code of laws more intolerant than that of the first settlers of New England. Unlimited obedience was enjoined to the authority of the magistrate, by the same men who had refused such submission in England, and fled from their native country because it was demanded" (B. R. Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, I. 36, 37, New York, 1836; Hewatt, *A Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina*, I. 34. London, 1779).

The tragedy is, that those who came to America, on account of being

persecuted in their own land, should here persecute others. This was true of all parties except the Baptists and the Quakers. “That mutual intolerance,” says Dr. Bacon, “of differences in religious belief which, in the seventeenth century, was, throughout Christendom, coextensive with religious earnestness had its important part to play in the colonization of America. Of the persecutions and oppressions which gave direct impulse to the earliest colonization of America, the most notable are the following:

1. the persecution of the English Puritans in the reigns of James I and Charles I, ending with the outbreak of the civil war in 1642;
2. the persecution of the English Roman Catholics during the same period;
3. the persecution of the English Quakers during the twenty-five years of Charles II. (1660-85)
4. the persecution of the French Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685);
5. the disabilities suffered by the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland after the English Revolution (1688);
6. the ferocious ravaging of the region of the Rhenish Palatinate by the armies of Louis XIV in the early years of the seventeenth century;
7. the cruel expulsion of the Protestants of the arch episcopal duchy of Salzburg (1731)” (Bacon, *History of American Christianity*).

The Congregationalists of New England formed their government on the theory of a theocracy. “What they wished was a State, which they could enjoy in common as an ordinance of God. But the State was to unfold within the church. As they regarded the government as God’s servant, so likewise all citizens, as such, were to serve God.” John Davenport, as quoted by Cotton, says:

The Theocracy, that is, God’s government, is to be established as the best form of government. Here the people, who choose its civil rulers, are God’s people, in covenant with him, they are members of the churches; God’s laws and God’s servants are enquired of for counsel (*Collection of Original Papers*).

“From these declarations,” says Uhden, “it is, manifest, that the government was theocratic. The settlers whose aim it was to derive all of their institutions from the Word of God, here also universally appealed to the Jewish code. It is from this point of view that we must contemplate those peremptory measures for the expulsion of every opposite tendency, which threatened to disturb the unity of the Church and State governments, or but to cripple the expediency of the latter. But here we must especially call attention to that peculiarity of the theocratic constitution, by which no one was permitted to exercise a civil office, or even to enjoy full civil rights, unless he were a member of some regular Church, established and ordered in accordance with the principles of the Independents. In the case of State Churches elsewhere, whether of past or present time, membership is conferred by birth, and no one, while conforming to existing usages, and to the preponderating influence of the older members, is excluded for some explicit avowal contrariety of opinion. But in New England, one could not thus silently pass into the membership of the Church. He was only admitted on the development in the individual of a definite conscious need for fellowship for the Church, and when, after being examined (by the minister and elders, he had publicly made confession of his faith before the Church, and had given evidence of his religious state as that of a regenerate man. Thus was the State also, as well as the Church, to be a community of Believers.” (Uhden, *The New England Theocracy*, 75, 76. Boston, 1859. Also Sherman, *Sketches of New England Divines*, John Cotton, 17. New York, 1860).

Out of this civilization, with all of its defects, there came a type of life and character, self-dependent, God-fearing, industrious, capable and highly conscientious. Bishop Creighton’s judgment, the judgment of a trained historian but not an ecclesiastical sympathizer, was hardly an exaggeration of the facts, when he said that this movement “stamped upon the early colonies of America the severe morality and patient industry which have trained a nation.” And the late Lord Acton, also a trained historian, and even less than Creighton an ecclesiastical sympathizer, paid this ungrudging tribute to the Puritans in general and the Independents in particular, when he said: “The idea that religious liberty is the general principle of civil, and that civil liberty is the necessary condition of religious, was a discovery reserved for the seventeenth century . . . . That great political idea . . . has been the soul of what is great and good in the progress of the last two hundred years” (*The*

*Religious History of New England*). The idea of religious liberty is distinctly a Baptist contribution.

It was among these first settlers in New England that the Baptists were found. There is no certainty that any of the Pilgrim Fathers were Baptists (Millet, *A History of the Baptists in Maine*, 21. Portland, 1845); but there was from the first a Baptist taint about Plymouth. Cotton Mather states that “many of the first settlers of Massachusetts were Baptists, and that they were as holy and faithful and heavenly people as any, perhaps in the world” (Mather, *Magnalia*, II.). “As our brethren in the mother country,” says Benedict, “had been much intermixed with the dissenting pedobaptists, it is highly probable that the early emigrants of this class in the infant colony, continued to do so for the first years of their settlement here. And while they continued in this state of quiescence or concealment, they met with no trouble or opposition, Upon all of the principles which the colonists had advanced in the commencement of their undertaking at home, and after their arrival in their new and wilderness location, they should have remained unmolested—freedom of conscience to all who united in the hazardous enterprise, should have been invariably maintained. Dissent or toleration were terms which ought to have had no place in their chronicles or vocabularies. Whatever were their dogmas or their rites, they were all on a level” (Benedict). But no such an attitude was taken.

The Baptists were not associated in churches of their own; and when children were christened they would turn their heads and look in another direction (Middlesex Court, Original Papers).

This was a favorite method, at this period, of expressing dissent at the practice of infant baptism. To stand in the assembly with one’s back turned toward the minister when he administered the ordinance, was an emphatic statement, without words, of the dissenter’s opinion of the ordinance. Sometimes the dissenter would arise and walk out in no unmistakable manner so that all knew what he meant to signify. This was especially irritating to the members of the standing order. The Puritans were by nature and practice an emphatic folk, and the dissenters, who were of the same English stock and training, did not lose any of their emphatic peculiarities because of the dissent:

## STATISTICS

It is interesting to give the statistics of the denomination in the period under consideration. The following is a list of the first fifty-eight Baptist churches in this country, together with the dates of their organization according to Benedict:

Providence, R. I — 1639	Rehoboth, Mass. — 1732
1st Newport, R. I — 1644	Shiloh, N.J. — 1734
2d Newport, R. I — 1656	South Brimfield, Mass. — 1736
1st Swansea, Mass — 1663	Welsh Neck, S.C, — 1738
1st Boston, Mass — 1665	Leicester, Mass. — 1738
North Kingston, R.I. — 1665	Middletown, N.J. — 1688
7th Day, Newport, R.I. — 1671	Lower Dublin, Pa. — 1689
South Kingston, R.I. — 1680	Piscataway, N.J. — 1689
Tiverton, R.I. — 1685	Charleston, S.C, — 1690
Smithfield, R.I. — 1706	Cohansey, N.J. — 1691
Hopkinton, R.I. — 1708	2d Swansea, Mass. — 1693
Great Valley, Pa. — 1711	1st Philadelphia, Pa. — 1698
Cape May, N.J. — 1712	Welsh Tract, Del. — 1701
Hopewell, N.J. — 1715	Groton, Conn. — 1705
Brandywine, Pa. — 1715	7th Day, Piscataway, N.J. — 1707
Montgomery, Pa. — 1719	Southinton, Conn. — 1738
New York City, N. Y. — 1724	West Springfield, Conn. — 1740
Scituate, R.I. — 1725	King Wood, N.J. — 1742
Warwick, R.I. — 1725	2d Boston, Mass. — 1743
Richmond, R.I. — 1725	North Stonington, Conn. — 1743
French Creek, Pa. — 1726	Colchester, Conn. — 1743
New London, Conn. — 1726	East Greenwich, R.I. — 1743
Indian Town, Mass. — 1730	
Cumberland, R.I. — 1732	

Euhaw, S.C, — 1745  
 Heights Town, N.J. — 1745  
 South Hampton, Pa. — 1746  
 Scotch Plains, N.J. — 1747  
 King Street, Conn. — 1747  
 Oyster Bay, N. Y. — 1748

Sturbridge, Mass. — 1749  
 Bellingham, Mass. — 1750  
 Killingby, Conn. — 1750  
 Westerly, R.I. — 1750  
 Exeter, R.I. — 1750  
 Thompson, Conn. — 1750

(Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America*, pp. 384, 365. New York, 1848.)

“These are all the churches,” continues Benedict, “which acquired any durability that arose in these United States in a little more than a century after the Baptists began their operations.”

According to Morgan Edwards, in 1786, there were in the United States and Nova Scotia 137 churches. These were distributed throughout the country as follows:

Nova Scotia	2	New Jersey	15
New Hampshire	1	Pennsylvania	10
Massachusetts	30	Maryland	1
Connecticut	12	Virginia	10
Rhode Island	36	North Carolina	8
New York	4	South Carolina	8
		<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>

John Asplund, in his first Register, in 1790, makes the following exhibit:

### MINISTERS

	<i>States</i>	<i>Churches</i>	<i>Ord.</i>	<i>Lic.</i>	<i>Members</i>
1	New Hampshire	32	23	17	1732
2	Massachusetts	107	95	31	7116
3	Rhode Island	38	37	36	3502
4	Connecticut	55	44	21	3214
5	Vermont	34	28	15	1610
6	New York	57	53	30	3987
7	New Jersey	26	20	9	2279
8	Pennsylvania	28	26	26	1231
9	Delaware	7	9	1	409
10	Maryland	12	8	3	776
11	Virginia	207	157	109	20157
12	Kentucky	42	40	21	3105
13	Western Territory	1	....	....	30
14	North Carolina	94	86	76	7742
15	Deceded Territory	18	15	6	889

16	South Carolina	68	48	28	4012
17	Georgia	42	33	39	3184
18	Nova Scotia	4	....	....	....
	<b>Total</b>	<b>872</b>	<b>722</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>64975</b>

Benedict in 1812 reckoned the following statistics: Churches, 2,633; ordained ministers, 2,142; members, 204,185; and 111 associations.

Allen, in his Triennial Register for 1836, makes for the United States and the British possessions in America the following statistics: associations, 372; churches, 7,299; ministers ordained, 4,075; licensed, 966; and membership, 517, 524.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Thomas Armitage, *A History of the Baptists; traced in their Vital Principles and Practices, from the Time of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ to the Year 1886*. New York, 1887.

David Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and other parts of the World*. Boston, 1813. 2 volumes.

David Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America and other parts of the World*. New York, 1848.

John T. Christian, *A History of the Baptists together with some account of their Principles and Practices*. Nashville, 1922.

Richard B. Cook, *A Story of the Baptists in all Ages and Countries*. Baltimore, 1888.

J. M. Cramp, *Baptist History: from the Foundation of the Christian Church to the close of the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia.

J. Chaplin, The Pilgrims and the Puritans, *The Baptist Quarterly*, VII. pp. 129-148, 274-292. Philadelphia, 1873.

T. J. Conant, The Puritan Exodus, *The Baptist Quarterly*, IX. pp. 225-234. Philadelphia, 1875.

Joseph M. Atkinson, The Puritans, *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, XV. pp. 230- 255. Columbia, S. C., 1863.

Newell Dwight Hillis, The Pilgrim Fathers and the Message of the Puritans, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LV. pp. 342-356. Oberlin, 1898.

Louis Martin Sears, The Puritan and his Anglican Allegiance, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXIV. pp. 533-580. Oberlin, 1917.

John T. Christian, The Pilgrim Fathers, *The Review and Expositor*, XVIII. pp. 20-31. Louisville, 1921.

## CHAPTER II

### THE BAPTISTS IN RHODE ISLAND

Baptists Organize—Roger Williams—Relations to Sir Edward Coke—Arrival in New England—Howe Recognized—Estimates of Him—Pastor in Salem—Interference of the Magistrates—Plymouth—Returns to Salem—Before the Court in Boston—The Attitude of the People of Salem—His Banishment—His Popularity in Salem—Revocation of the Order of Banishment—Roman Catholics—Organization of the Church in Providence—The Baptism of Williams—The Form of Baptism—Abandons the Church—Apostolic Succession and the Administrator of Baptism—Irregularity—John Spilsbury—Further History of the Church—Pardon Tillinghast—Williams on Liberty—His Character—The Church at Newport—John Clarke—His Character—Recognition of Charles II—A New Charter—Rhode Island Persecuted by Other Colonies—Better Opinion of the State—Prosperity of the Baptists.

THE first sign of organization of Baptists in the United States was in Rhode Island under Roger Williams and John Clarke. Williams was one of the most notable men among the colonists. He was born in London (*New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, July 1889, p. 291f), of Welsh extraction, and died in Providence, Rhode Island, March, 1684. He was the son of James Williams, a merchant tailor, of whom Henry Fitz Waters wrote:

His house was in Cow lane, opposite a public house or tavern called the Harrow, which he owned. This lane starts at Snow hill, near its intersection with Cock lane, famous for its ghost, and sweeps around in a curve to the north, ending, I think, in Smithfield market, near the place where John Rogers and other famous religious martyrs were burned at the stake. It was in the parish of St. Sepulchre's and between the church of that name, and Charter house where young Roger got his schooling and was fitted for the ministry of Cambridge. He was born about the year 1600. He became a student at Charter House June 25, 1621, and obtained a scholarship in that school July 9, 1624 (Parley, *The History of Salem, Massachusetts*, I., pp. 227, 228. Salem, 1824).

When he was a mere boy he attracted the attention of Sir Edward Coke, while taking shorthand notes in the Star Chamber. Coke became his patron, and he graduated from Pembroke College, in 1626. Before he left England he refused to join in the Liturgy of the Church "because he durst not join with

them in their use of common prayer” (*Publications of the Narragansett Club*, IV).

He and his young wife arrived on the ship *Lyon*, at Nantucket, February 5, 1631. “The truth is,” said he late in life, “from my childhood, now about three score years, the Father of lights and mercies touched my heart with a love to himself.” When he arrived in Boston, early in February, 1631, six months after the death of Francis Higginson, he was already a resolute non-Conformist.

He was recognized by Winthrop as a “Godly minister”; and Edward Winslow characterized him as “a man lovely in his carriage.” The later historians have been the most pronounced in their tributes of appreciation. As there has been much misunderstanding of the character of Roger Williams, a few of the more recent tributes are here given.

The language of Professor Moses Coit Tyler would probably be generally accepted by most students of Colonial history. He says:

From his early manhood, even down to his old age, Roger Williams stands in New England a mighty and benignant form, always pleading for some magnanimous idea, some tender charity, the rectification of some wrong, the exercise of some sort of forbearance toward men’s bodies or souls (Tyler, *History of American Literature*, p. 31. New York, 1878).

Richman gives him the following character:

Although by nature—in all that touched not what he deemed the vitals of morals and religion—of all men most charitable, and forgiving, he was equally by nature—in all that touched those vitals—of all men the most uncompromising and stern.

Richman gives a contrast between Williams and John Winthrop, the greatest of the New England leaders:

Against the somber background of early New England, two figures above the rest—John Winthrop and Roger Williams. The first—astute, reactionary, stern—represented Moses and the law. The second—spontaneous, adaptable, forgiving—representing Christ and the individual. It is needless to say with which lay the promise of the dawn.

James Bryce, the distinguished ex-Ambassador to the United States from Great Britain, says:

Roger Williams was the founder of Rhode Island in a clearer and ampler sense than any other single man—scarcely excepting William Penn—was the founder of any other American colony; for he gave it a set of principles which, so far as the New World was concerned, were peculiarly his own . . . he and his community deserved to be honored by those who hold that one of the chief services which the United States has rendered to the world consists in the example set there of a complete disjunction of religious worship and belief from the machinery of civil government.

Edward Eggleston asserts:

Here at the very outset of his American life we find that Williams had already embraced the broad principles that involved the separation of church and state, and the most complete religious freedom, and had characteristically pushed this principle to its logical result some centuries in advance of the practice of his age.

And he further remarks:

In the seventeenth century there was no place but the wilderness for such a John the Baptist of the distant future as Roger Williams. He did not belong among the diplomatic builders of churches like Cotton, or the political founders of states like Winthrop. He was but a babbling to his own times, but the prophetic voice rings clear and far, and even clearer as the ages go on.

Secretary Oscar Straus, once a Cabinet officer of the United States, says:

The time, let us hope, is not far distant when the civilized people, in the remotest corners of the world, will recognize the truth and power of the principles which throw around the name of Roger Williams a halo of imperishable glory and fame.

Chief Justice Durfee, at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Providence, used these glowing words:

The great idea here first politically incorporated and showed forth in lively experiment, has made the circuit of the globe, driving bigotry like a mist and superstition like a shadow before it, and sowing

broadcast, among men and nations, the fruitful seeds of peace and progress, of freedom and fraternity. The little wisp of glimmering light, which hung, like a halo, over the cradle of infant Providence, has brightened and expanded until it irradiates the world. This is and will be forever the unique glory of our beloved city.

Williams was invited to settle as pastor with the church in Boston, but he declined because they were not “an unseparated people” (Letter to John Cotton, March 25, 1671). On the April following he became co-pastor with Mr. Skelton of the Salem church, since that church acted “on principles of perfect and entire independence of every other ecclesiastical body.” But the governor and magistrates interfered and made such spirited opposition that he was induced to leave Salem before the close of the summer. They protested on the ground: “That whereas, Mr. Williams refused to join with the congregation at Boston, because they would not make a public declaration of their repentance for having communion with the churches of England, while they lived there; and besides, had declared his opinion that the magistrate might not punish the breach of the Sabbath, nor any other offense that was a breach of the first table; therefore, they marveled they would choose him without advising the Council; and withal desiring that they would forbear to proceed till they had conferred about it.” He further urged that the royal patent could give them no title to their lands without a purchase from the natives. Open, bold and ardently conscientious, as well as eloquent and highly gifted, it cannot be surprising that he should have disturbed the magistrates by divulging such opinions, while he charmed the people by his powerful preaching, and his amiable, generous, and disinterested spirit. It is noticeable that one of the charges alleged against him was liberty of conscience.

After a short time, for the sake of peace, he withdrew to Plymouth, beyond the jurisdiction of Massachusetts Bay, and became assistant to Ralph Smith in the ministry. “He was friendly entertained according to their poor ability, and exercised his gifts among them, and after some time was admitted a member of the church, and his teaching well approved, for the benefit whereof I still bless God, and am thankful to him even for his sharpest admonitions and reproofs, so far as they agree with truth” (Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*, Collection Massachusetts Historical Society, III. p. 310). But the people of Plymouth, to use the words of Elder Brewster, were afraid he

would “run the same course of Separation and Anabaptistry which Mr. John Smith, the Se-Baptist at Amsterdam, had done.”

After laboring among the people at Plymouth about two years, with great acceptance and usefulness, he asked a dismissal, in 1633, upon being invited by the church at Salem to return to them as assistant to Mr. Skelton. He returned accordingly, and during Mr. Skelton’s lifetime labored with him in great harmony and affection, and after his death, was sole minister of the church till November, 1635. At this time the opposition of the magistrates was renewed, and this opposition was strengthened by a treatise which he had written against the patent.

He was summoned to appear before the Court in Boston for teaching that a magistrate ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate man. Governor Winthrop remarks that “he was heard before all the ministers and clearly refuted. He was called upon to answer the following tenets which he was alleged to hold:

1. That the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table, otherwise than in such case as did disturb the civil peace.
2. That he ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate man.
3. That a man ought not to pray with such, though they might be wife, children, etc.
4. That a man ought not to give thanks after sacrament, nor after meals; and that the other churches were about to write to Salem to admonish him of these errors, understanding that the church had called him to the office of teacher.”

“These sad opinions,” said Governor Winthrop, “were adjudged by all the magistracy and ministers—who were desired to be present—to be erroneous and very dangerous, and the calling of him to office. At that time was judged a great contempt of authority” (Winthrop, *History of New England*, I.).

“The conduct of Williams on the occasion to the magistrates,” says Elton, one of his biographers, “and clergy was mild and conciliatory; and although he did not retract his opinions, he offered to burn the offensive book, and furnish satisfactory evidence of his loyalty” (Elton, *Life of Roger Williams*, p. 25. London, 1842). Consequently, Dr. Elton regarded the sentence passed against him as “cruel and unjustifiable.”

The people of Salem were, however, steadfast in their allegiance to him. “They adhered to him long and faithfully,” says Upham, “and sheltered him from all assaults. And when at last he was sentenced by the General Court to banishment from the colony, on account of his principles, we cannot but admire the fidelity of that friendship which prompted many members of his congregation to accompany him in his exile, and partake of his fortunes when an outcast upon the earth.”

There have been repeated efforts, without much success, to prove that Williams was banished solely on account of his political opinions. John Quincy Adams says:

Can we blame the founders of Massachusetts colony for banishing him from within their jurisdiction? In the annals of religious persecution is there to be found a martyr more gently dealt with by those against whom he began the war of intolerance? (Adams, Address before the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1843, *The Congregational Quarterly*, XV., p. 401. July, 1873).

Few, however, accept this verdict. In fact he was banished on account of his religious opinions. “The offender had propagated,” says Field, “certain opinions which said the clergy were ‘subversive of the framework of government.’ And so they were, but subversive of the *religious*, and not the *political* framework” (Edward Field, *State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations at the end of the Century*, I., p. 27. Boston, 1902).

Charles Francis Adams states the case thus:

“The trouble with the historical writers who have taken upon themselves the defense of the founders of Massachusetts is that they have tried to sophisticate away the facts. . . . In Spain it was the dungeon, the rack and the fagot; in Massachusetts it was banishment, the whip and the gibbet. In neither case can the records be obliterated. Between them it is only a question of degree—one may be in color a dark drab, while the other is unmistakably a jetty black. The difficulty is with those who, expatiating with great force of language on the sooty aspect of the one, turn and twist the other in the light, and then solemnly asseverate its resemblance to driven snow. Unfortunately for those who advocate this view of the Old and the New World records, the facts do not justify it” (Adams,

*Massachusetts: Its Historians and Its History*, p. 34. 1893).

That Williams was popular in Salem there can be no doubt. Mr. Bently, in his *History of Salem*, writes as follows:

In Salem every person loved Mr. Williams. He had no personal enemies under any pretense. All valued his friendship: Kind treatment could win him, but opposition could not conquer him. He was not afraid to stand alone for truth against the world; and he always had address enough, with his firmness, never to be forsaken by the friends he had ever gained. He had always a tenderness of conscience, and feared every offense against moral truth. He breathed the purest devotion. He was ready in thoughts and words, and defied all his vaunting adversaries to public disputation. He had a familiar imagery of style, which suited his times, and he indulged, even in the titles of his controversial papers, to-wit upon names, especially upon the Quakers. He knew men better than he did civil government. He was a friend of human nature, forgiving, upright and pious. He understood the Indians better than any man of his age. He made not so many converts, but he made more sincere friends. He knew their passions and the restraints they could endure. He was betrayed into no wild expensive projects respecting them. He studied their manners, and their customs, and passions together. His vocabulary also proves that he was familiar with the words of their language, if not with its principles. It is a happy relief, in contemplating so eccentric a character, that no sufferings induced any purpose of revenge, for which he afterwards had great opportunities; that great social virtues corrected the first errors of his opinions; and that he lived to exhibit to the natives a noble example of generous goodness, and to be the parent of the independent State of Rhode Island.

The General Court pronounced sentence of banishment upon him, October, 1635. Hooker, who had been appointed to dispute with him, “could not reduce him from any of his errors.” The sentence of banishment was as follows:

WHEREAS, Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the church of Salem, hath broached and divulged new and dangerous opinions

against the authority of magistrates; and also writ letters of defamation, both of the magistrates and church here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without any retraction; it is therefore ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which, if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the Governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction, not to return any more without license from the court.

It is interesting to note that on March 31, 1676, thirty-one years afterwards, this order of banishment was revoked. The revocation is in these words:

WHEREAS, Mr. Roger Williams stands at present under a sentence of restraint from coming into this Colony, yet considering how redyly and freely at all tymes he hath served the English interest in this time of warre with the Indians and manifested his particular respects to the Authority of this Colony in several services desired of him, and further understanding how by the last assault of the Indians upon Providence his House is burned and himself, in his old age, reduced to uncomfutable and disabled state. Out of compassion to him in this condition The Council doe Order and Declare that if the sayd Mr. Williams shall see cause and desire it, he shall have liberty to repayre into any of our Towns for his security and Comfortable abode during these Public Troubles. He behaving himself peaceably and inoffensively and not disseminating and vesting any of his different opinions in matters of Religion to the dissatisfaction of any (Plymouth Colony Records, X., p. 6. Massachusetts Archives, X., p. 233).

This belated recognition was a grudging tribute to the worth of the man. Driven from among white men he became a missionary to the Indians. No missionary ever possessed a more self-denying spirit, or was actuated by a more Christian-like motive; and no heathen were ever more repulsive in appearance and habits. One writer describes them as “naked slaves of the Devil.” Williams says: “God was pleased to give me a painful, patient spirit to lodge with them in their filthy, smoky holes, even while I lived in Plymouth and Salem, to gain their tongue.” And again he says: “And to these Barbarians, the Holy God knows some pains I took uprightly, in the mainland

and the islands of New England, to dig into their barbarous rockie speech, and to speak something of God into their souls.”

“And yet it is to Williams,” says Sherman, “more than to any other man of that age, that American republicanism is indebted for its free, full, broad expression; for its wide and beneficent relation over the extended continent. He was an original, exemplar man, unfolding from his own soul the truths that should shape a whole age; that should rule whole generations of men, leaving their lengthened traces along the strata of all history” (Sherman, *Sketches of New England Divines*).

The statement has been made that Williams excluded Roman Catholics from office. This has been denied by many authors. Hon. Samuel Eddy, for many years Secretary of State for Rhode Island, says: “I have formerly examined the records of the State, from its first settlement, with a view to historical information, and lately from 1663 to 1719, with a particular view to this law excluding Roman Catholics from the privileges of freedmen, and can find nothing that has reference to it, or anything that gives preference or privileges to men of one sect of religious opinions over those of another, until the session of 1745” (*The Evening Transcript*, August 31, 1853).

Knowles, the biographer of Williams commenting on the above statement of Eddy, says:

This testimony might alone be sufficient to disprove the allegation, though it is possible that such an act might be passed, and not be recorded. But it is not probable, and when the uniform policy of the colony from the beginning, and other circumstances, are considered, it becomes morally certain, that no such act received the sanction of the Legislature of Rhode Island (Knowles, *The Memoir of Roger Williams*, p. 321. Boston, 1833).

The first sign of organization among the Baptists of America was some time prior to March, 1639. There had, however, been preaching and church services two years before this date. There had long been promulgated in Providence Baptist views. Winthrop, in his Journal, March, 1638-9, had said, “for a sister of Mrs. Hutchinson, the wife of one Scott, being infected with Anabaptistery, and going last year to live in Providence, Mr. Williams was taken (or rather emboldened) by her to make open profession thereof, and accordingly was rebaptized by one Holyman, a poor man late of Salem. Then

Mr. Williams rebaptized him and ten more. They also denied the baptizing of infants, and would have no magistrates.”

Even before the eloquence of Mrs. Scott was exerted to elucidate the “Anabaptist” point of view as to “certain perplexing theological questions,” “the Devil was not idle,” if we may quote the incisive words of Winthrop. He proceeded to relate that “at Providence . . . men’s wives and children daring to go to all religious meetings tho’ never so often, or . . . upon week days; and because one Verin refused to let his wife go to Mr. Williams, so often as she was called for, they required to have him censured.” And censured he was by his fellow townsmen, at the conclusion of a spirited debate on liberty of conscience versus the scriptural injunction, to obey their husbands. The general sense of the community seemed to be that it was, to say the least, inexpedient to “restrain their wives.” There is reason to think Joshua Verin in question did not enjoy an unqualified reputation for discretion, or piety. He is described by Williams as “a young man boisterous and desperate, who refused to hear the word with us,” and his treatment of his wife was such that “she went into danger of her life.” This turbulent pioneer shortly withdrew from the Providence Plantation and returned to Salem, “clamoring for justice” (Gertrude Selwyn Kimbell, *Providence in Colonial Times*, pp. 26, 27. Boston, 1912).

Williams was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman and in turn he baptized Holliman and some “ten others” (Felt, *The Ecclesiastical History of New England*, I., p. 402. 1855-62). As to the form of baptism used on the occasion there can be no doubt.

Richard Scott, who was a Baptist at the time, and an eye witness of the ceremony, says:

I walked with him in the Baptists’ way about three or four months, in which time he brake from the society, and declared at large the ground and reason for it; that their baptism could not be right because it was not administered by an apostle. After that he set about a way of seeking (with two or three of them that had dissented with him) by way of preaching and praying; and there he continued a year or two, till two of the three left him (Scott, Letter in George Fox’s answer to Williams. Backus, *History of the Baptists of New England*, I., p. 88. Newton, Mass., 1871).

This was written thirty-eight years after the baptism when Scott had turned Quaker. There is no doubt that “the Baptist way” was immersion.

Coddington was also a contemporary witness, and he likewise turned Quaker. He could not say enough against Williams. In 1677 he wrote to his friend George Fox, as follows:

I have known him about fifty years; a mere weathercock; constant only in inconsistency; poor man, that doth not know what should become of his soul, if this night it should be taken from him . . . One time for water baptism, men and women must be plunged into the water (Backus, I.).

Williams is himself a witness to his own practice. In a book which was a long time lost, he says:

Thirdly, for our *New-England* parts, I can speak uprightly and confidently, I know it to have been easie for myselfe, long ere this, to have brought many thousands of these Natives (Indians), yea the whole country, to a far greater Antichristian conversion then was ever yet heard of *in America*, I have reported something in the Chapter of their *Religion*, how readily I could have brought the whole Country to have observed one day in seven; I adde to have received a *Baptisme* (or washing though it were) in *Rivers* (as the first *Christians* and the Lord *Jesus* himselfe did) to have come to a *stated church meeting*, maintained priests and forms of prayer, and the whole forme of antichristian worship in life and death (Williams, *Christianing Makes not Christians*).

In a letter found among the Winthrop papers, dated Narragansett, November 10, 1649, Williams says:

At Seekonk a great many have lately concurred with Dr. John Clarke and our Providence men about the point of new baptism, and the manner by dipping, and Mr. John Clarke hath been there lately, (and Mr. Lucar), and hath dipped them. I believe their practice comes nearer the first practice of the great Founder Christ Jesus, than any other practices of religion do (Publications of the Narragansett Club).

It is certain that in 1639 the Baptists of Providence would not conform to the

liturgy of the Church of England (Felt, I.). Williams remained in communion with his church only a few months. He had doubts in regard to the validity of his baptism, and that of his associates, on account of the absence of an “authorized administrator.” “I walked with him,” said Richard Scott, after he became a Quaker, “in the Baptists’ way about three or four months, in which time he brake away from the society, and declared at large the grounds and reasons for it, that their baptism could not be right, because it was not administered by an apostle. After that he set up a way of seeking (with two or three of them that had deserted with him) by way of preaching and praying, and then he continued a year or two, till two of these left him” (Felt, I.).

“For him,” says Dr. S. L. Caldwell, “there was no church and no ministry left. The apostolic succession had ceased. It was the baptizer, and not the baptism, about which he doubted. He was a high church Anabaptist. He went out of the church, left the little congregation behind, preached when and where he could, and became a ‘seeker’ the rest of his days. And during the rest of his days he never came to a ‘satisfying discovery’ of a true church or ministry.” He never surrendered his Baptist views.

Much has been written and said in regard to the irregularity of the baptism of Roger Williams. As Baptist church polity is now interpreted it was certainly irregular; but it is necessary to understand the viewpoint of those times. Williams was an intelligent university man, had come up under the tutelage of Sam Howe, a Baptist minister of London, and he appears in his baptism to have strictly followed the most approved standards of English Baptists. Both the General and Particular Baptists of England were sticklers for regularity; but they held that, in case no administrator could be had, it was lawful for two believers to begin baptism, and they quoted the Scriptural authority of John the Baptist.

John Spilsbury is sufficient authority to establish that this was the Baptist position, and Williams, when no administrator was available, carried out their injunctions. Spilsbury says:

And because some make it such an error, and so far from any rule or example for a man to baptize others, who is himself unbaptized, and so think thereby to shut up the ordinance of God in such a strait, that none can come by it but thro’ the authority of the Popedom of Rome; let the reader consider who baptiz’d John the Baptist before

he baptized others, he himself being unbaptized. We were taught by this what to do upon like occasions (Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists*, I., pp. 103, 104. London, 1738).

Williams strictly followed the Baptist program laid down by the foremost Baptists of his day. “Neither Pedobaptists nor Baptists,” says Dr. Babcock, “can, with any propriety, object to this procedure. Not the former, for on their principles Mr. Williams was already an authorized administrator of the ordinances of Christ’s house, and his acts strictly valid. Not the latter, for they have ever rejected as of no avail a claim to apostolic succession through the corruption and suicidal perversions of the papacy. Nor, indeed, has any prelatical hierarchy of any kind ever found favor in their eyes; since each body of believers meeting in any place for the worship of Christ, and the discipline which his institution requires, they believe to be the highest source of Christian authority on earth and when acting and deciding according to the Scriptures, they doubt not, has the approval of the only Head of the Church” (*The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle*, January, 1842. I., p. 1).

The trouble in the mind of Williams was not that he had failed to follow Baptist polity, but whether there was any true succession in the world, and so he turned seeker. What would be the advice or policy of Baptists in this day, if a similar condition were to arise, is another question. This baptism of Williams has been the occasion of much heat and strife; but it is difficult for one to understand what significance it has in Baptist history. So far as known not one Baptist church, or minister, came out of the Providence church, of this period, or was in anywise affected by the baptism of Williams.

Dr. Caldwell continues his story:

After Mr. Williams “the ministry of the word fell to men of less genius, of less education, of more sobriety of mind than Mr. Williams had. They were his friends, and to a certain extent his followers. They had come after him into the wilderness, but could not follow him into the thicket of speculation where he had wandered. They were satisfied with the new baptism they had found, and such ministry as their own choice and the Holy Spirit. Had supplied. By necessity and probably by conviction, it was an unpaid ministry, and was exercised by those who in character and gifts of ‘prophesying,’ were marked for it.” But the church survived, chose

other leaders, and slowly increased with the community.

This little group of worshipers “in the Baptist way” were joined by others of “the company.” One of these was Chad Brown, the company’s surveyor. His “home lot” became the site of Brown University. Another was Thomas Olney, who, after Williams withdrew from the church, administered to that “part of the church who were called Five-Principle Baptists.” Gregory Dexter, who was formerly a stationer and printer in London, had been given a proprietor’s lot on the Town Street, at the extreme north end. He did not arrive at the settlement till 1640. Roger Williams’ characterization of him as “a man of education, and of noble calling, and versed in militaries,” who “might well be moderator or general deputy or general assistant,” but “who made a fool of conscience,” is well known. The same eminent authority speaks of him elsewhere as an “intelligent man . . . and conscionable . . . he has a lusty team, and lusty sons, and a very willing heart (being a sanguine cheerful man).” He was a preacher before he came to America.

Pardon Tillingham was born in Sussex, England, lived in Newport for a period of time, and finally appeared in Providence. Although his career as a man of business was marked both by enterprise and success, he is most conspicuously remembered for his connection with the Baptist Church in Providence, where the recollection of his services and benefits has been gratefully cherished. He was a firm believer in the rite known as “Laying on of Hands,” which formed the distinguishing tenet of the so-called “Six-Principle Baptists, and missed no opportunity to testify to the truth.”

Like all elders in the Baptist communion, Tillingham received no pay for his services. The ministers of those days were not judged unworthy of hire, but superior to it. In the present instance the modern procedure was reversed; and instead of Pardon Tillingham receiving a salary from the members of his church, he presented his little flock with their first meeting house. In 1711 he deeded “his house called the Baptist meeting house, situated between the Town Street and salt water, together with the lot whereon the said meeting house standeth, to the church for the Christian love, good will and affection which I bear to the church of Christ in said Providence.” This building is described by tradition as being “in the shape of a hay cap, with a fire place in the middle, the smoke escaping from a hole in the middle.” Crude as this sounds, it may well be believed that the comfort of this primitive structure far

surpassed some elaborate meeting houses of a later day (Kimbell). The church endured later schisms, exercised no voice in the civil conduct of the community, and entirely repudiated the Puritan prophecy that no Christian could exist under religious liberty.

The position of Williams on liberty was much discussed and often maligned. It was a new thought in the world, little understood in principle or practice. He gives a vivid description of his views symbolized by a ship on a voyage. He says:

That I should ever speak or write a title that tends to such an infinite liberty, is a mistake, and which I have ever disclaimed and abhorred. To prevent such mistakes, I shall at present only propose this case: There goes a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or society. It has fallen out sometimes, that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship. Upon which supposal, I do affirm that all the liberty of conscience, that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews or Turks, be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship; nor, secondly, compelled from their own particular prayers, or worship, if they practice any. I further add, that I never denied, that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course; yea, and also to command that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practiced, both among the seamen and all the passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their services, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help in person or purse, toward the common charges of defense; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace and preservation; if any shall mutiny, and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any shall preach or write that there ought to be no commanders nor officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters nor officers; no laws nor orders; no corrections nor punishments—I say, I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors, according to their deserts and merits. This if seriously and honestly minded, may,

if so please the Father of Lights, let in some light to such as willingly shut not their eyes. I remain studious of our common peace and liberty.

John Fiske has admirably characterized the character of Williams, and his great contribution to religious and political thought, which led Bancroft to class him with Newton and Kepler as a benefactor of mankind. The judicial and comprehensive paragraph of Fiske is as follows:

Among all the Puritans who came to New England there is no more interesting figure than the learned, quickwitted, pugnacious Welshman, Roger Williams. He was over fond of logical subtleties and delighted in controversy. There was scarcely any subject about which he did not wrangle, from the sinfulness of persecution to the propriety of women wearing veils in churches. Yet with all this love of controversy there never lived a more gentle and kindly soul. Within five years from the settlement of Massachusetts this young preacher had announced the true principles of religious liberty with a clearness of insight quite remarkable in that age . . . . The views of Williams, if logically carried out, involved the entire separation of church from State, the equal protection of all forms of religious faith, the repeal of all laws compelling attendance on public worship, the abolition of tithes and all forced contributions to the support of religion. Such views are today quite generally adopted by the more civilized portions of the Protestant world, but it is needless to say that they were not the views of the seventeenth century in Massachusetts or elsewhere (Fiske, *The Beginnings of New England*, pp. 114, 115. 1889).

About this time a church was organized in Newport, Rhode Island, by John Clarke. "Massachusetts and Connecticut," says Richard Knight, "both passed laws, that no persons, except members of the established churches, should be admitted freemen, within their jurisdiction. The Baptist churches being settled in Providence and Newport, in 1644, the Massachusetts government was so fearful that their principles would spread into their colony, that they passed a law in November following, that if any person or persons should within their colony openly condemn or oppose infant baptism, or seduce others from the approbation thereof, or should leave the Meeting House

purposely at the performance of the ordinance, every such person or persons, shall be sentenced to banishment” (Knight, *History of the General or Six-Principle Baptists*).

This intolerance led Clarke and his associates to select Newport as a proper place for a church of their own. Felt places the organization of this church in the year 1644 (Felt, I. 556).

Dr. John Clarke, the founder of this church, was a Baptist minister before he came to America (Bicknell, *The Story of Dr. John Clarke*). He was educated in the University of Leyden, Holland. “It is also reasonable to assume,” says Dr. Bicknell, “that he was a member of or in fellowship with the Baptists of Holland, who had, as early as 1611, affirmed the right of all men to religious liberty and the duty of obedience to lawful government. One of Dr. Clarke’s biographers states that ‘he attained high repute for ability and scholarship in languages, including Latin, Greek, Hebrew, law, medicine and theology.’ In theology Dr. Clarke accepted and taught the doctrines of the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists, in opposition to Arminian Baptists” (Bicknell). He had been conducting services in Newport since 1638.

He was a man of lofty character. “He was a faithful and useful minister,” says Callender, “courteous in all the relations of life, and an ornament to his profession, and to the several offices which he sustained. His memory is deserving of lasting honor, for his efforts toward establishing the first government in the world, which gave to all equal civil and religious liberty. To no man is Rhode Island more indebted than to him. He was an original projector of the settlement of the island, and one of its ablest legislators. No character in New England is of purer fame than John Clarke” (Edward Peterson, *History of Rhode Island*, p. 77. New York, 1853).

The colony of Rhode Island was the first to recognize Charles II, and by means of Clarke, who had been left behind in England by Williams as the representative of the colony, he immediately endeavored to obtain from the sovereign a new charter in which its liberties, and, before everything else, liberty of religion, should be safeguarded. The petition thus laid before the king is a very touching document. “We have it much at heart,” the colonists said, “to demonstrate by means of an efficacious experiment that there can be a very flourishing civil state, and, indeed, that it can be better maintained, with complete liberty in matters of religion.”

The king replied benignantly, saying that he would permit the colonists to continue in the enjoyment of their liberty, and that he would not allow them to be compelled to submit themselves to the Church of England. And, in fact, in 1663 a charter was granted in which the most complete toleration was sanctioned: “No one in this colony shall henceforth be molested, punished, disturbed, or brought to trial on account of any differences of opinion in the matter of religion . . . but each one, at the same time shall be able freely and lawfully to hold to his own judgment and his own conscience in what concerns religious questions . . . so long as he does not violate peace and quietness, and does not abuse this liberty in a licentious and profane manner.”

The noble stand taken by the Baptists of Rhode Island on liberty of conscience was long the occasion of hostility from other colonies. One of the first laws enacted by that State was: “Every man who submits peaceably to civil government in this colony, shall worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, unmolested.” In 1656, the Massachusetts, Plymouth, Hartford, and New Haven colonies pressed them to relinquish this point, and unite with them in crushing and driving the Quakers from New England, and preventing any more coming hither. They nobly answered: “We shall strictly adhere to the foundation principles on which this colony was first settled.” Wherefore, the persecuted Quakers found protection in this asylum of safety, while persecution and destruction followed them elsewhere. On either side, the colonies were enforcing their religious tenets by coercive laws, and could not endure the liberal system of this colony, which discarded the bigoted intolerance of their neighbors; who, finding they could not prevail on the little State of Rhode Island to act in concert with them, endeavored to swallow her up, and Massachusetts took possession of a large portion of it on the east, and Connecticut on the west; but not being able to hold possession of these forcible entries, the Indians were influenced to commit depredations upon them, in the loss of some lives and much property. They sowed discord among the subjects, and endeavored to excite a contempt of their rulers, and labored hard to raise a party in this colony, sufficient to turn the scale of government, and to establish by law their system of parish worship and taxes.

They were represented by writers of other colonies, as a set of vagabonds that had deserted them, and almost destitute of religion, civility and sense of learning. Dr. Cotton Mather, of Massachusetts, in 1695, said that Rhode Island “was occupied by Antinomians, Anabaptists, Quakers, ranters, and

every thing but Roman Catholics and Christians—and if any man had lost his religion, he might find it again in this general muster of opinionists—in this gwazzin of New England—the receptacle of the convicts of Jerusalem, and the outcasts of the land. But for fertility of soil, etc.,” he says, “the island is the best garden of all the colonies and were it not for the serpents, I would call it the *Paradise* of New England.” He adds the old proverb, *Bona terra, malla gens*—a good land, but a bad people—and says that “our ministers offered to preach the gospel to this wretched people, gratis, but they refused” (Knight, *History of the General Baptists*; Mather, *Magnalia*, bk. VII.).

Later, in 1718, Mather was led to say: “Calvinists with Lutherans, Presbyterians with Episcopalians, Pedobaptists with Anabaptists, beholding one another to fear *God* and work righteousness, do with delight sit down together at the same table of the Lord” (Massachusetts Historical Society Collection, I. 105).

Ed Randolph, an officer of the State of North Carolina, petitioned the Chief Justice, November 10, 1696, in regard to Providence: “’Tis necessary that place be taken care of and put under a regular Government, the present pretenders to govern being either Quakers or Anabaptists” (Colonial Records of North Carolina, I. 469).

This persecution was kept up for many years. A letter addressed to the inhabitants of Providence, October 21, 1721, by an association of Presbyterians of Massachusetts, desiring to send missionaries among them to correct their errors, was received. This letter, in return, received a sharp answer. The following is one paragraph in the reply:

We admire at your request, or that you should imagine or surmise that we should consent to either, inasmuch as we know that (to witness for God) your ministers, for the most part, were never set up by God, but have consecrated themselves and have changed his ordinances; and for their greediness after filthy lucre, some you have put to death; others you have banished, upon pain of death; others you have barbarously scourged; others, you have imprisoned, and seized upon their estates: and at this very time, you are rending in pieces, and ruining the people, with innumerable charges, which make them decline your ministry, and fly for refuge to the Church of England, and others to dissenters of all denominations; and you, like

wolves, pursue, and whenever you find them within your reach, you seize upon their estates. And all of this is done, to make room for your ministers to live in idleness, pride, and fulness of bread. Shall we countenance such ministers? Nay, verily: these are not the marks of Christ's ministry, but are a papal spot, that is abhorred by all pious Protestants. And since you wrote this letter, the constable at Attleborough has been taking away the estates of our dear friends and pious dissenters, to maintain the minister. The like has been done in the town of Mendon. Is this the way of peace? (Knight).

In the course of time a better opinion was held of Rhode Island. George Beverly, afterwards bishop of Cloye, an intellectual man, visited Providence in 1729-30, and made the following observation: "The inhabitants are of a mixed kind consisting of many sorts and subdivisions of sects. There are four sorts of Anabaptists, besides Presbyterians, Quakers, Independents, and many of no profession at all. Notwithstanding so many differences, here are fewer quarrels about religion than elsewhere, the people living peaceably with their neighbors of whatever profession" (Fisher, *Works of Beverly*, IV.).

The first seventy years of the eighteenth century witnessed a marked growth in the number of Baptist churches in Rhode Island. From 1706 to 1752 at least ten churches were founded, respectively, in Smithfield, Hopkinton, North Kingstown, Scituate, Warwick, Cumberland, East Greenwich, Exeter, Westerly and Coventry. In 1764 a new church, formed chiefly of members from the First Baptist of Providence, was established in Cranston, and another, still so vigorous in the middle of the next century, at Warren, with the distinguished Dr. Manning as one of its constituents and its earliest pastor. The following year, 1765, gave birth to churches in North Providence and Foster, and in 1771 to one in Johnston—a branch of the First Baptist Church in Providence, with some differences in order. In 1774-75 there occurred a potent revival of religious interest and large numbers were led to confession and sought membership in the churches. During the Revolutionary period and immediately following, on account of the excitement occasioned by the war, there was a great spiritual decline; but it was followed by a renewal of interest and in 1790 there were in the State thirty-eight Baptist churches, thirty-seven ordained ministers, and 3,502 members (Field, II.).

## BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:

- Henry C. Vedder, *A Short History of the Baptists*. Philadelphia, 1897.
- A. H. Newman, *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*. Philadelphia, 1898.
- Samuel Green Arnold, *History of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. From the Settlement of the State, 1638, to the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, 1790*. New York, 1860. 2 volumes.
- C. E. Barrows, Dr. John Clarke, *The Baptist Quarterly*, VI., pp. 482-502. Philadelphia, 1872.
- S. L. Caldwell, Roger Williams as an author, *The Baptist Quarterly*, VI., pp. 385-407.
- John C. C. Clarke, The Pioneer Baptist Statesman (Roger Williams), *The Baptist Quarterly*, X., pp. 180-204, 257-281. Philadelphia, 1876.
- C. E. Barrows, As to Roger Williams, *The Baptist Quarterly*, X., pp. 353-361. Philadelphia, 1876.
- The Influence of the Baptist Denomination on Religious Liberty, *The Christian Review*, III., pp. 333-342. Boston, 1838.
- John Dowling, Soul Liberty, *The Christian Review*, XVIII., pp. 22-50. New York, 1858.
- Franklin C. Clark, Rise of the Toleration Movement, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXVI., pp. 249-305. Oberlin, 1908.
- A. H. Newman, Baptist Pioneers in Liberty of Conscience, *The Review and Expositor*, VI., pp. 239-255. Louisville, 1909.
- Henry M. King, John Eliot and Roger Williams. *The Review and Expositor*, XIV., pp. 340-347. Louisville, 1917.
- W. J. McGlothlin, The Struggle for Religious Liberty, *The Review and Expositor*, VIII., pp. 378-394. Louisville, 1911.
- George B. Eager, Calvin and Roger Williams in Relation to Religious Liberty, *The Review and Expositor*, XVII., pp. 341-348. Louisville, 1920.

## CHAPTER III

### THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE BAPTISTS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Charter Rights—A Christian State—Violations of the Charter—Peter Oliver—Episcopal Worship not Allowed—The Browns—The Rise of the Baptists—The Baptists Denounced—Petitions Against Them—Lady Moody—William Witter—Thomas Painter—The Governor Acts—A Severe Law—Baptists Punished—The Law Explained—Goodman Johnson—Letters on Severity—Letter to Plymouth Colony—The Persecution of the Quakers—Dissenters Forced to Pay Taxes—The Opinion of Ruffini.

The chartered rights of the Massachusetts Bay colony have been variously interpreted. The position has been taken that it was a mere commercial transaction; while others have placed much emphasis upon the spiritual bearings of the charter. Some hold that its intention was the foundation of a Christian State. Perhaps both parties have too far pressed their conclusions.

President Styles, in 1783, said:

It is certain that civil dominion was but the second motive, religion the primary one, with our ancestors in coming hither and settling this land. It was not so much their design to establish religion for the benefit of the State, as civil government for the benefit of religion, and as subservient, and even necessary, for the peaceable enjoyment and unmolested exercise of religion—of that religion for which they fled to these ends of the earth.

They understood that the charter under Charles left them on the basis pointed out by Governor Matthew Craddock, July 28, 1629, namely, “with the transfer of the government of the plantation to those who shall inhabit there,” as well as with liberty of conscience, so they could be as liberal as they pleased in religious matters. They neither were nor could be chartered as a purely civil nor as a purely spiritual body, but all that related to the rights of man; body and soul, was claimed and enjoyed by them under their charter.

John Cotton understood that the colony possessed all the rights of a “body politic,” with its attendant responsibilities. He says:

By the patent certain select men, as magistrates and freemen, have power to make laws, and the magistrates to execute judgment and justice amongst the people according to such laws. By the patent we have power to erect such a government of the Church as is most

agreeable to the word, to the estate of the people, and to the gaining of natives, in God's time, first to civility, and then to Christianity. To this authority established by this patent, Englishmen do readily submit themselves; and foreign plantations, the French, the Dutch, the Swedish, do willingly transact their negotiations with us, as with a colony established by the royal authority of the State of England (Armitage, *A History of the Baptists*).

However the charter may be explained, there is no question that the government as organized had embedded in it religious persecution. There are those who hold that this was contrary to the charter rights. On this line Peter Oliver says:

I have thus sketched, in outline, a glowing picture, wherein the whip, the pillory, and the gallows are exhibited as weapons of defence in the hands of the elders of Massachusetts. I have explored the long silent recesses of the Puritan Inquisition, and re-peopled its dungeons with the victims of a narrow and austere faith. I have exhibited those great principles of intolerance, which our ancestors recorded in their histories and enrolled among their laws. And, regarded simply in a legal view, it is a startling fact, that every execution was a murder; every mutilation, a maiming; every whipping, a battery; every fine, an extortion; every disfranchisement, an outrage; and all were breaches of the charter. There were no laws in England for hanging, or mutilating, or flogging the king's subjects because they did not profess the Puritan faith; while to disfranchise a member of the corporation for any case unconnected with the objects for which the charter was given, was a clear violation of justice and authority (Bagg's Case, 11 Co., 99, a. Tedderly's Case, 1 Sid. Rep., 14. 1 Burn. Rep., 517. Kent, Commentaries, 297. Willcox, Mun. Cer., 271, 272). Unless then, we lay aside abstract right and wrong, and disregard the nature of the charter, the liberty of the subject, the supremacy of parliament, the jurisdiction of the royal courts, the authority of the law, and the prerogative of the king, we cannot consider the persecutions of the elders of Massachusetts merely as an act of intolerance. They were, in any proper legal sense, violations of, and crimes against, the laws of England. For the king did not bestow upon the grantees of the

charter the power of removing from the kingdom his 'loving subjects,' in order that they might deprive them of their ears, or their liberties, for refusing to conform to a sectarian religion. Nor was the Familist, or the Quaker, or the Anabaptist, so much to blame as those who persecuted a royal and sacred franchise to purposes which were hostile to the best interests of the empire. And, above all, it should be remembered that the Puritan Church is chiefly responsible for the guilt of those proceedings. The state was merely *particeps criminis*. For all the doubts, and she maintained many as to her authority to act under the charter, she even applied to the elders for counsel, and the elders uniformly supported her claims and removed her indecision (Oliver, *The Puritan Commonwealth, an Historical Review of the Puritan Government of Massachusetts*, pp. 227, 228. Boston, 1856).

One of the first acts of the colony and of the church was a violation of the rights of conscience. John Endicott, who had previously been in the Bay, was chosen the first governor and, with a company, soon set out for Salem, where he organized the colony in 1628. Five councilors were chosen in England, and the remaining eight were to be subsequently chosen.

In June, 1629, several vessels reached Salem bearing a company of emigrants, among whom were the ministers Higginson and Skelton. On July 20 they were chosen ministers of the congregation. On the heads of these ministers "the hands of three or four grave members were laid, with solemn prayer." August 6 the church was formed of thirty persons, and the ministers were again "ordained." This church instituted great reforms in the ritual and practices of the Church of England.

Among the five councilors chosen in England to associate with Endicott were two brothers, John Brown and Samuel Brown, the one a merchant and the other a lawyer. These men were of the highest character. At the close of a long and important document sent by Governor Craddock, President of the Company in England, these brothers were particularly commended to the regard of Governor Endicott.

The brothers were not impressed with the changes made in the church, and with some others they met and read the Book of Common Prayer. They were immediately summoned by the governor and the ministers. The Browns

expressed the opinion that the church and ministers were “separatists,” and would become “Anabaptists.” The ministers declared they had not separated from the church, but only left off its corruptions. “The governor and council, and the generality of the people,” says Morton, “did not approve the answer of the ministers.” It was, however, decided that what the Browns had done “tended to mutiny and faction,” and they were sent home on the returning ships. Such was the early act of oppression.

This act of the governor and the ministers brought letters of caution from England. “It is possible some undigested counsellors have too sodainely bin put in execucon . . . in introducing any lawes or comandes which may render yourself or us distasteful to the state here.” They also expressed their fears that the ministers have “overshot themselves” by “attempting some inovacons” (Massachusetts Records, I., p. 407).

At an early date in the Massachusetts colony attention began to be taken of the rise of the Baptists, or, as they were invariably caked by their enemies, Anabaptists. A few of these early notices are here transcribed.

Hubbard, speaking of the year 1638, remarks:

Amongst those, who at this time that removed from about Boston, divers inclined to rigid separatism, and favored Anabaptism, and they removed to Providence to join Mr. Williams and those of his company (*A General History of New England*, I., p. 336. Boston, 1815).

E. Z. Rogers wrote to Governor Winthrop, Rowly, December 8, 1639, as follows:

We have certainly many Anabaptisticall spiritts among us, and other base persons, who would diligently & yet secretly be searched out (The Winthrop Papers. The Collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fourth Series, VII., p. 210).

Richard Bellingham, of Boston, wrote to the governor of the Bay, 1, 28, 1642, as follows:

We have had some experience here of some of their undertakings, who have lately come amongst us, and have made public defiance against magistracie, ministrie, churches, & church covenants, &c. as antichristian; secretly also sowing the seeds of Familisme, and

Anabaptistrie, to the infection of some, and danger of others, so we are not willing to joyne with them in any league or confederacie at all, but rather that you would consider & advise with us how we may avoyd them, and keep ours from being infected by them (Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation*. Collections of Massachusetts Historical Society, Fourth Series, III., pp. 386, 387).

In 1643 a petition was presented to the General Court to repeal the cruel laws against the Baptists, which was flatly rejected (Publication of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, III., p. 161). The records of the Suffolk county Court, 1643, make mention of the prosecutions of the Anabaptists (Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, III., p. 323).

The frequent references to the Baptists in sundry communities would indicate something of their activities. Their views were “secretly” promulgated, and there was much danger of “infection” to many persons.

One of these instances was Lady Moody, an eminent woman of the colony, and widely known. She was cited to appear before the Quarterly Court of Salem, December 14, 1642, along with others. The record is: “The Lady Deborah Moody, Mrs. King, and the wife of John Tilton were presented for holding that the baptizing of infants is noe ordinance of God” (Lewis and Newhall, *History of Lynn*). Winthrop mentions the case of Lady Moody as follows: “The Lady Moodye, a wise and anciently religious woman, being taken with the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the church at Salem (whereof she was a member); but persisting still, and to avoid further trouble, etc., she removed to the Dutch, against the advice of all of her friends. Many others infected with anabaptism removed thither also. She was afterward excommunicated” (Ellis, *The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*, p. 381. 1888). She played a considerable part in the introduction of Baptist views in New York.

The mother of David Yale, the father of the founder of Yale College, and the wife of Governor Theophilus Eaton, was tried by the New Haven Church for “divers scandalous offences.” “By toying with the Anabaptist doctrines she had come to entertain scruples which interfered with conformity in church practices” (Publication of the Colonial Records of Massachusetts, XXI., p. 27).

One William Witter was arraigned, February 28, 1644, before the Salem Court. The record of the case is as follows: "For entertaining that the baptism of infants was sinful, now coming to Salem Court, answered humbly and confessed his ignorance, and his willingness to see light, and (upon Mr. Morris, our Elder, his speech) seemed to be staggered." It was said he called "our ordinance of God a badge of the whore." The sentence was that "on some lecture day, the next fifth day being a public fast, to acknowledge his fault . . . and enjoined to be here next Court at Salem."

William Witter did not change his opinions so the record of a later Court reads: "At the Court at Salem, held the 18<sup>th</sup> of the 12<sup>th</sup> month, 1645, William Witter of Lynn, was presented by the grand jury for saying that they who stayed while a child is baptized do worship the devil. Henry Collins and Nat. West dealing with him thereabouts, he further said that they who stayed at the baptizing of a child did take the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in vain, broke the Sabbath, and confessed and justified the former speech" (Records of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, III., p. 67) . He was sentenced to answer at another session of the Court. Also on June 24, 1651, he was again before the Court "for absenting himself from the public ordinances nine months or more, and for being re-baptized" (Felt, II.). Several years later he will appear in this history.

Thomas Painter, of Hingham, who had lived in several other places, had become a Baptist. He would not suffer his wife, a member of the church, to have his child baptized. He was presented, and required to cease from such opposition. But "still refusing and disturbing the church," and asserting that the baptism of the colony was anti-christian, and affirming the same before the court, they sentenced him to be whipped, because not able to pay a fine. Winthrop adds: That this punishment was "not for his opinion, but for reproaching the Lord's ordinance, and for his bold and evil behaviour both at home and in the court" (Felt, I.). Hubbard adds: "It may be, that some others at that time came down from Providence and Rhode Island, and entered into the assemblies in some places in Massachusetts, would in time of singing keep on their hats, as it were to brave it out with them, and so occasion disturbance, and breach of the peace. If any such have by that means been brought to suffer corporal punishment, they will certainly in the account of all indifferent and prudent people have cause to find no fault with any thing but their own obstinacy and folly" (Hubbard, I.).

These instances and other activities of the Baptists stirred up the governor of the province. “Mr. Endicott began to be a sovereign against all the sects,” says William Bentley, “and as a magistrate did not bear his sword in vain . . . Persons addicted to the tenets of the Anabaptists were deprived of personal liberty, by being confined to town, or by being under severe prohibitions. The whole number did not exceed nine. Mr. Norris never appeared active in such proceedings; and the comparative tranquility of the town, during his ministry, is an evidence of his moderation. The alarm against the Anabaptists had been so great, that, in 1644, a law had been made against them” (Bentley, *A Description and History of Salem*, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, VI., p. 255).

The following is the law passed against the Baptists in Massachusetts, November 13, 1644:

Forasmuch as experience hath plentifully and often proved that since the first arising of the Anabaptists, about a hundred years since, they have been the incendiaries of commonwealths, and the infectors of persons in maine matters of religion, and the troublers of churches in all places where they have bene, and that they have held the baptizing of infants unlawfull, have usually held other errors in heresies together therewith, though they have (as other hereticks use to do) concealed the same, till they spied out a fair advantage and opportunity to vent them, by way of question or scruple, and whereas divers of this kind have, since our coming into New England, appeared amongst ourselves, some whereof have (as others before them) denied the ordinance of magistracy, and the lawfulness of making warr, and others the lawfulness of magistrates, and their inspection into any breach of the first table, which opinions, if they should be connived at by us, are like to be increased amongst us, and so must necessarily bring guilt upon us, infection and trouble to the churches, and hazard to the whole commonwealth.

It is ordered and agreed, that if any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall either openly condemne or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from their approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of

magistracy, or their lawful right or authority to make warr, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, and shall appear to the Court wilfully and obstinately to continue therein after due time and meanes of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment (Records of the Colony of Massachusetts, II. 85).

As might be expected, the enactment of such a law produced conflicts of opinion. There were various petitions presented to the Court for and against its enforcement. To give a view of the situation some of these petitions and opinions are here recorded.

A petition to the General Court, October 18, 1645, is as follows:

In answer to the petition of Em. Donning, Nehe. Bourne, Robt. Seducke, Thos. Foule, with others, for the abrogation or alteration of the lawes against the Anabaptists, and the law that requires speciall allowance for new comers residing here, itt is ordered, that the lawes in the petition mentioned shall not be altered or explained at all (Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, III., p. 51. Boston, 1854).

The Robert Foule mentioned above is described by the General Court as a church member who “will be no freeman” since “he likes better to be eased of that trouble and charge” (Hutchinson Papers, I., p. 239) . He was truly an advocate of liberty of conscience, or at least of a large toleration (Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXI., p. 23) .

John Josselyn, Gentleman, writing under date of 1646, says:

Anabaptists they imprison, fine and weary out (Josselyn, *An Account of Two Voyages to New England*, second edition, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Third Series, III., p. 331).

The following law was enacted in 1646:

That if any Christian within this jurisdiction, shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith or Religion, by broaching and maintaining any *Damnable Heresies*; as denying the immortality of the soule, or resurrection of the body, or any sin to be repented of in the regenerate, or any evil done by the outward man to be accounted

sin, or denying that Christ gave himselfe a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by his death and righteousness, but by the perfection of our own works, or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment, or shall openly condemn or oppose the Baptizing of Infants, or shall purposely depart the Congregation at the administration of that Ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or the Lawful Authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first commandment, or shall endeavor to seduce others to any of these errors or heresies above mentioned, every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due meanes of conviction, shall be sentenced to Banishment (Colonial Laws, 1660-1672, p. 154).

May 6, 1646, the following is taken from the Records of Massachusetts:

In answer to a petition, subscribed by seventy-seven inhabitants of this colony, humbly requesting all dew strengthening and keeping in force such laws as has binn made by this Court, for the preventing the increse of many dangerous errors, Anabaptists, Antinomians, &c., as also for the dew punishment thereof, the Court gratefully accepts of their acknowledgement, granting their request in the continuance of those wholesome lawee (Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay, III., p. 64).

There came also a petition from Roxbury, Dorchester and other points, dated May 13, 1646, praying that the laws against the Baptists might be strengthened. The petition says:

As the prevaylinge of errors and heresies is noted by our Saviour in the gospel, and elsewhere in the Scriptures, as a forerunner of God's judgments, and in as much as the errors of the Anabaptists, where they do prevayle, are not a little dangerous to church and commonwealth, as the lamatable tumults in Germany, when the said errors were grown into a height, did too manifestlie witnesse, and such good laws or orders are enacted amongst us, against such persons havinge already bene, as we are informed, a special meanes of discouraging multitudes of erroneous persons from comminge over into this countrie, which wee account noe small mercie of God unto us, and one sweet and wholesome fruite of the sayd lawes, it is

therefore our humble petition to this honorable court, that such lawes or orders as are in force amongst us against Anabaptists or other erroneous persons, whereby to restraints the spreadinge and divulginge of their errors amongst people here, may not be abrogated and taken away, nor any waise weakened, but may still be continued.

As might have been expected the law of 1644 brought about many reactions. “This enactment bore severely,” says Felt, “upon a denomination whose subsequent precept and example manifested that they were, in general, far from indulging in the reckless and ruinous notions of German adherents of Stuber and Jack of Leyden, though honestly suspected of such indulgence by most of the leading men of New England. The authors and abettors of it were desirous to tolerate religious freedom, as far as they deemed best for the highest good of the commonwealth, They, however, found this, as Christian legislators ever have, a very difficult point to be settled. They felt, as many do now, that they must bound their toleration short of atheism and infidelity; but where to fix the line exactly, they were not fully satisfied” (Felt, 1.).

Whatever may have been the pressure brought to bear the General Court, November 4, 1646, made the following explanation:

The truth is, the great trouble we have been putt unto and hazard also by Familisticall and Anabaptisticall spirits, whose conscience and religion bath been only to sett forth themselves and raise contentions in the country, did provoke us to provide for our safety by a lawe that all such should take notice how unwelcome they should be to us either coming or staying. But for such as differ from us only in judgment in point of baptism or some other points lease consequence, and live peaceably among us without occasioning disturbance . . . such have no cause to complaine, for it hath never beene as yet putt in execution against any of them, although such are knowne to live among us (Hutchinson Papers).

Goodman Johnson, writing about this time, gives the reasons for the enactment of this law. He says:

To the end that the laws might be the most agreeable with the rules of Scripture, in every county there were appointed members of the committee two magistrates, two ministers and two able persons from

among the people. In the year 1648 these laws were printed, so that they might “be seen of all men,” and that none might plead ignorance; and that all persons intending to transport themselves to the colonies might know exactly what to expect: “For it is no wrong to any man, that a people, who have spent their estates, many of them, and ventured their lives for to keep the faith and a pure conscience (should) use all means, that the word of God allows, for maintenance and continuance of the same.” Still further, these colonists “have taken up a desolate wilderness to be their habitation, and not deluded any by keeping their profession in huggermug, but print and proclaim to all the way and course they intend (God willing) to walk in;—If any will, yet notwithstanding, seek to jostle them out of their own right, let them not wonder if they meet with all the opposition a people put to their greatest straights can make (Goodman Johnson, *Wonder-working Providence in Zion’s Saviour in New England*).

Probably these explanations were brought about by much opposition to the law. There is evidence that friends of New England felt that the harshness against the Baptists, and others, was bad for the colony. On March 1, 1644-45, Stephen Winthrop wrote to his brother, John: “Here is great complaint against us for our severity against Anabaptists. It doth discourage many people from coming to us for fear they should be banished if they dissent from us in opinion” (Winthrop Papers, IV., p. 200). On September 4, 1646, Hugh Peter wrote to the younger Winthrop: “None will come to us because you persecute” (Ibid, p. 109); and Coddington refers to this remark in a letter November 11, 1646: “Mr. Peters writes in that you sent to your son that you persecute” (Deane, *Some Notices of Samuel Gorton*, p. 41, Boston, 1850). Giles Firmin wrote to the elder Winthrop, July 1, 1646, with regard to Hugh Peter: “I could wish he did not too much countenance the Opinionists, which we did so cast out of N. England. I know he abhors them in his heart, but he hath many hang upon him; being a man of such use” (Winthrop Papers, II., p. 277). Cotton says: “Surely the way that is practiced in New England cannot justly be taxed for too much connivance at all kinds of sects; wee here rather hear ill for too much rigour” (Cottons, *The Way of Congregational Church Cleared*, p. 22. London, 1648. Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, XXI., p. 30 note).

The law was not relaxed on account of these criticisms; but rather enforced with more rigor. One of the deputies of the Court at Dover was fined for three weeks' absence. The Court in October, 1648, "being informed of great misdemeanor committed by Edward Starbuck, of Dover, with profession of Anabaptistry for which he is to be proceeded against, set the next court of assistance if evidence can be prepared by that time" (Records of the Colony of Massachusetts, II. 253).

The far-famed Cambridge Platform, 1648, declared:

It is the duty of the magistrate to take care of matters of religion, and to improve his civil authority for the observing of the duties commanded in the first as well as the second table. The end of the magistrate's office is not only the quiet and peaceable life of the subject in matters of righteousness and honesty, but also in matters of Godliness. Idolatry, blasphemy, heresy . . . are to be restrained and punished by the civil authority.

Massachusetts was not satisfied with persecution on its own account; but wrote the Plymouth Colony to join them in this practice. The following letter was written by the Court of Massachusetts Bay, October 18, 1649, to the Colony of Plymouth:

Honored and beloved Brethren:

We have heretofore heard diverse Anabaptists, arisen up in your jurisdiction, and connived at; but being but few, wee well hoped that it might have pleased God, by the endeavors of yourselves and the faithful elders with you, to have reduced such erring men againe into the right way. But now, to our great grieffe, wee are credibly informed that your patient bearing with such men has produced another effect, namely, the multiplying and encreasing of the same errors, and wee feare of other errors also, if timely care be not taken to supresse the same. Particularly wee understand that within a few weeks there have binne in Sea Cuncke thirteen or fourteen persons rebaptized (a swift progress in one towne; yett wee heare not of any effectuall restriction is entended thereabouts). Lett it not, wee pray you, seem presumption in us to mind you heereof, nor that wee earnestly intreate you to take care as well of the suppressing of errors, as the maintenance of the truth, God equally requiring the

performance of both at the hands of Christian magistrates, but rather that you will consider our interest is concerned therein. The infection of such diseases, being so near us, one likely to spread into our jurisdiction; *tunc tua res agitur paries cum proximeus ardet.* Wee are united by confoedaracy, by faith, by neighborhood, by fellowship in our sufferings as exiles, and by other Christian bonds, and wee hope that neither Sathan nor any of his instruments shall, by thes or any other errors, disunite us of our so neere conjunction with you, but that wee shall both aequally and zealously uphold all the truths of God revealed, that wee may render a comfortable account *to Him that* hath sett us in our places, and betrustrusted us with the keeping of both tables, of which will hoping, wee cease you further trouble, and rest,

Your-very loving Friends and Brethren,

(Records of the Colony of Massachusetts, III. 173, 174).

Comment upon this frightful letter is not necessary. Not satisfied with excluding persons from its own territory, persecution was urged upon a neighboring colony.

E. Downinge, Salem, March 7, 1651, wrote to John Winthrop, Jr., as follows:

There is an act to punishe all heresyes with death that raise foundations, and all Anabaptists to be banished, and if they retorne to England to be hanged unless they recant (The Winthrop Papers, Collection of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fourth Series, VI., p. 78).

The Quakers first appeared in New England in 1656. The government, both in Massachusetts and Plymouth, set itself instantly in the attitude of intolerance. Massachusetts took the lead. In the year 1656, the General Court urged the General Commissioners to recommend to the several colonies the adoption of severe measures against the Quakers, and itself began a course of barbarous legislation, which extended through several years, for imposing a heavy fine for bringing in Quakers, “the cursed sect of hereticks,” and ordering that every Quaker who arrived should be sent to the House of Correction, severely whipped and kept in hard labor, no person being allowed to have any intercourse with him; also imposing a fine of five pounds for bringing in, spreading, or concealing Quaker books or “writings concerning

their devilish opinions”; a fine of forty shillings for receiving such books or embracing their sentiments, the penalty for the second offense being four pounds; and for further persistence, confinement in the House of Correction, and banishment.

The next year a fine of forty shillings was imposed for every hour of entertainment of a Quaker, and imprisonment until the fine was paid; and any Quaker who came into the jurisdiction was to have one ear cut off and put to work in the House of Correction, the penalty to be repeated for the second offense. Any Quaker who had before “suffered the law” and returned, was to be severely whipt and sent to the House of Correction, and for the third offense his tongue was to be bored with a hot iron, besides his being imprisoned. The next year a fine of ten shillings was imposed upon any one professing Quakerism, or meeting with the Quakers; for speaking in their meetings a fine of five pounds. A little later it was enacted that every Quaker found within the jurisdiction, and any person who defended Quaker doctrines, was to be committed to prison, and if found guilty, after trial by special jury, to be banished on pain of death; and every “inhabitant” who should favor Quakers was to be imprisoned one month and banished on pain of death. In carrying out the sentence of banishment, even women, stripped to the waist, and tied to a cart’s tail, were whipped from town, to town, and carried on a two days’ journey into the wilderness, among wolves and bears. To cap the climax of intolerance, Quakers were hanged in 1659, 1660, and 1661. Governor Endicott was among the most vindictive enemies of these “hereticks,” and when in 1661 the Court hesitated to pass sentence of death, he said: “You will not consent, record it; I thank God I am not afraid to give judgment.” He had previously said to certain Quakers: “Take heed ye break not our ecclesiastical laws, for then you are sure to stretch by halter” (J. Chaplin, *The Pilgrim and the Puritans*, *The Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1873. VII. pp. 286, 287). The laws of Plymouth were equally severe, only no Quaker was executed.

One of the chief grievances of the Baptists, and other dissenters, was that the people were taxed to support the ministry of the standing order. At first there did not appear to be much difficulty in regard to the support of the ministry, but as time wore on there were serious objections in many quarters. The remark of Johnson, in his “Wonder-working Providence,” that “it is as unnatural for a right New England man to live without an able ministry, as a

smith to work ‘his iron without fire,’ is still true; but there are those coming in who differ very considerably from the “right New England man.” Antinomians, Anabaptists, Quakers—a few individuals bearing these names—have lately appeared, and are zealously entering upon their vocation of crying down the standing order, and their hireling priesthood. Faint whispers, swelling into audible words, and growing by degrees into ranting tirades, against learned and pious divines, began at length to operate on a certain class of otherwise well disposed persons, who could see no objection to a “freer-gospel,” if that would quiet the newcomers and cause the disturbance to cease. As these views spread, contributions naturally fell off, and the deacons’ labor to make up the deficit increased. About 1654 ministers began to leave the country, so the General Court of Massachusetts appointed a commission to investigate the matter, which resulted in passing the order

That the civil court in every shire, shall, upon information given them of any defect or any congregation or township within the shire, order and appoint what maintenance shall be allowed to the ministers of that place, and shall issue out warrants to the selectmen to assess, and the constable of the said town to collect the same, and to distraine the said assessment upon such as shall refuse to pay (Massachusetts Colonial Records. IV., pt. ii., p. 199).

The first law bearing on ministerial support in the Plymouth colony was passed the same year, and the same reason for it is given in its preamble, namely, “railing and renting.” The law was not seriously enforced until 1657 (*The Congregational Quarterly*, April, 1859, I., pp. 160, 161). Thus was added an additional grievance against the Baptists.

Some of the things recorded in this chapter are almost incredible. That men should be whipped, imprisoned, banished, ears cut off, tongue bored with a hot iron and put to death in a barbarous manner; that women should be tied to the tail end of a cart, dragged from town and whipped along the way, stripped to the waist, and finally carried into the wilderness and left among wolves and bears to die, all for some religious belief, now held by most of men to be harmless, all happening in this country in the last three hundred years, requires the fullest confirmation. Yet the facts are not disputed.

The situation has well been summed up by the Italian writer, Ruffini. “If the intolerance of these earliest Puritan colonists,” says Ruffini, “becomes

indubitably apparent from the extremely severe dispositions which they adopted against the Baptists, the Quakers, the Catholics, and even against the members of the Anglican Church, who were put into a boat by the colonists of Massachusetts and sent back to England, the close union between the civil and ecclesiastical powers is shown by these not less evident signs. In 1631 the Court of Massachusetts explicitly ordained that the quality of a free man, that is to say, the enjoyment of full rights, should not be granted except to the members of one of the churches of the colony. The same exclusivism prevailed, if not everywhere as a written law, still less as a custom in the other colonies. The civil affairs of the community were settled in the congregations of the faithful (Masson, *Life of Milton*, II., p. 552). In the fundamental ordinances of the colony of New Haven, Connecticut (1639), it is laid down as a supreme principle that the Government must conform in everything to the Word of God. The colony, as Bancroft observes, thus adopted the Bible as its fundamental statute. Moreover, the compulsion of conscience and the confusion of the two powers blemished those colonial laws which imposed serious punishments upon citizens who did not scrupulously fulfill their religious duties and punctually pay the contributions belonging to the church and its ministers” (Ruffini, pp. 256, 257).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:**

Isaac Backus, *A History of New England, with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians called Baptists*. Newton, Mass., 1871. 2 volumes.

Daniel Neale, *The History of New England containing an Impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country to the Year of our Lord, 1700*. London, 1720. 2 volumes.

Benjamin Franklin Bronson, Palfrey on Religious Intolerance in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, *The Baptist Quarterly*, VI., pp. 147-180, 280-300.

Lucius E. Smith, The New England Ecclesiastical Legislation, *The Baptist Quarterly*, I., pp. 81-101. Philadelphia, 1871.

Norman Fox, George Fox and the Early Friends, *The Baptist Quarterly*, XI., pp. 433-453. Philadelphia, 1877.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCHES IN MASSACHUSETTS

The First Church in the State—Swansea—The Origin of the Church—John Myles—Persecutions of the Church—A Grant of Land—The Conditions of the Grant—The Church in Boston—Richard Mather—John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes and Crandall—They are Arrested—The Whipping of Holmes—Letter to Kiffin—The Conversion of Henry Dunster—Character of Dunster—History of the Case—Removed as President of Harvard—Thomas Gould—The Church Formed—The Action of the Congregational Church—Persecutions—The Action of the Court—The Place of Meeting—The General Spirit of the Puritans—House of Worship—Some Changes in Sentiment—Their Punishment—The Witches Burned—The Opinion of the Baptists—William Melbourne—Robert Calef—The Power of the Theocracy Broken—The Later Laws.

For more than forty years after the landing of the Pilgrims there was no Baptist church in Massachusetts. The first Baptist church constituted in that State was at Swansea, on the south side, near the Rhode Island line.

The beginning of this movement, and of many other Baptist churches in this country was in Wales. “But as God had preserved his scattered and hidden people in Piedmont and Holland,” says Tustin, “and as thousands were found in every age, who formed an uninterrupted succession of witnesses to the Truth, so now in Wales, multitudes of these sequestered people, unbroken in spirit, formed a regular chain of true and faithful witnesses to that gospel which they had received from their Christian ancestors of former centuries, and which they have preserved amid their quiet and fertile valleys, shut up by lofty mountains from the rest of the world, as if God had designed these mountain fastnesses as the barriers of protection for his chosen and faithful people, against the corruptions and assaults of the papal hierarchy. And it seems to have been a part of the wise arrangement of Providence for their preservation, that they should be kept in obscurity, and that obscurity makes it now very difficult to trace their history. What is chiefly found concerning these Welsh Christians in the Ecclesiastical and Secular Histories of their later contemporaries, are but scattered fragments, which their enemies in the Church and State of England, would have gladly thrown into obscurity and contempt” (Tuskin, A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the New Church Edifice of the Baptist Church and Society in Warren, R. I., May 8, 1845, pp. 57, 58. Providence, 1845).

Tuskin further says: "It is a fact generally known, that many of the Baptist churches in this country derived their origin from the Baptist churches in Wales, a country which has always been a nursery for their peculiar principles. In the earlier settlements of this country, multitudes of Welsh emigrants, who left their fatherland, brought with them the seeds of Baptist principles, and their ministers and members laid the foundation of many Baptist churches in New England, and especially in the Middle States" (Tuskin, pp. 31, 32).

This was certainly true of the first Baptist church in Massachusetts. The beginning of this movement was in Wales at Ilston, Glamorganshire, where a Baptist church was organized, October 1, 1649. The beginning is described in their records as follows:

We cannot but admire at the unsearchable wisdom, power and love of God, in bringing about his own designs, far above, and beyond the capacity and understanding of the wisest of men. Thus, to the glory of his great name, hath he dealt with us; for when there had been no company or society of people, holding forth and professing the doctrine, worship, order and discipline of the gospel, according to the primitive institution, that ever we heard of in Wales, since the apostacy, it pleased the Lord to choose this dark corner to place his name in, and honor us, undeserving creatures, with the happiness of being the first in all these parts, among whom was practiced the glorious ordinance of baptism, and here to gather the first church of baptized believers (Backus, I.).

The pastor of this church was John Myles. He was born at Newton, in Herefordshire, about 1621, and was a student in Oxford in 1636. The next spring John Myles and Thomas Proud visited the Baptist church at the Glass-house, Broad street, under the care of William Cossett and Edward Draper. They were joyously received by the brethren in London, and probably received material assistance. By the year 1660 the church in Wales had prospered greatly and had two hundred and sixty-three members.

Myles became one of the testers under Cromwell, but upon the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II, Myles was ejected along with two thousand ministers (Calamy, *Abridgment*, I., II.). Upon which he and some of his friends came to this country, and brought their church records with them. At

Rehoboth, in 1663, John Myles, elder, James Brown, Nicholas Tanner, Joseph Carpenter, John Butterworth, Eldad Kingsley and Benjamin Allby, joined in a solemn covenant together.

The church was then located in Plymouth colony. Newman, the minister who persecuted Holmes, died that year and for four years the church had peace. At that time the following record of the Court explains itself:

At the Court holden at Plymouth the 2<sup>nd</sup> of July, 1667, before Thomas Prince, Governor, John Alden, Josiah Winslow, Thomas Southworth, William Bradford, Thomas Hinckley, Nathaniel Bacon, and John Freeman, assistants . . . Mr. Miles, and Mr. Brown, for their breach in order, in setting up a public meeting without the knowledge and approbation of the Court to the disturbance of the peace of the place, are fined each of them five pounds, and Mr. Tanner the sum of one pound, and we judge that their continuance at Rehoboth, being very prejudicial to the peace of that church and that town, may not be allowed; and do therefore order all persons concerned therein, wholly to desist from the said meeting in that place or township, within this month. Yet in case they shall remove their meeting unto some other place, where they may not prejudice any other church, and shall give us any reasonable satisfaction respecting their principles, we know not but they may be permitted by this government to do so.

Accordingly on October 30 following, a grant of land was given them at Swansea where they made their settlement. The following proposals were made in the grant:

1. That no erroneous persons be admitted into the township either as an inhabitant or sojourner.
2. That no man of an evil behaviour or contentious person be admitted.
3. That none be admitted that may become a charge to the place.

This grant was accepted and became the location of the church with the following explanations:

That the first proposal relating to the non-admission of erroneous persons be only understood under the following explanations, viz.:

of such as hold damnable heresies, inconsistent with the faith of the gospel; as, to deny the Trinity, or any person therein; the deity or sinless humanity of Christ, or the union of both natures in him, or his full satisfaction to the divine justice of all his elect, by his active and passive obedience, or his resurrection, ascension into heaven, intercession, or his second coming personally to judgment; or else to deny the truth or divine authority of the Scriptures, or the resurrection of the dead, or to maintain any merit of works, consubstantiation, transubstantiation, giving divine adoration to any creature, or any other anti-christian doctrine directly opposing the priestly prophetic or kingly offices of Christ, or any part thereof; (2) or such as hold such opinions as are inconsistent with the well being of the place, as to deny the magistrate's power to punish evildoers as well as to encourage those that do well, or to deny the first day of the week to be observed by divine institution as the Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, or to deny the giving of honor to whom honor is due, or to oppose those civil respects that are usually performed according to the laudable customs of our nation each to other, as bowing the knee or body, &c., or else to deny the office, use or authority of the ministry or a comfortable maintenance to be due them from such as partake of their teachings, or to speak reproachfully of any of the churches of Christ in the country, or of any such other churches as are of the common faith with us or them.

We desire that it be also understood and declared that this is not understood of any holding any opinion different from others in any disputable point, yet in controversy among the godly learned, the belief thereof not being essentially necessary to salvation; such as paedobaptism, anti-paedobaptism, church discipline or the like; but that the minister or ministers of the said town may take their liberty to baptize infants or grown persons as the Lord may persuade their consciences, and so also the inhabitants take their liberty to bring their children to baptism or to forbear (Backus, I., pp. 285, 286).

Often in the days of persecution lie preached to the church in Boston. At length lie grew "very aged and feeble" but he continued the pastoral oversight of the Swansea church till his death, which occurred February 3, 1683.

The First Church, Boston, Massachusetts, was organized under peculiar conditions (*A Short History of the First Baptist Church in Charleston*, Boston, 1852; *History of the Covenant and Catalogue First Baptist Church Charleston*, Boston, 1823). The activity of the Baptists in disseminating their belief that none but adults should hold membership in the church, rendered the supporters of the opposite opinion more aggressive in maintaining their own practice. Richard Mather addressed a friend as follows:

My thoughts have been this long time, that our churches in general do fall short in their practice of that, which the Rule requires in this particular, which I think ought to be thus, via.: that the children of church members, submitting themselves to the discipline of Christ in the church, by an act of their own, when they are grown to men's and women's estate, ought to be watched over as other members, and have their infants baptized, but themselves not to be received to the Lord's Table, nor to voting in the church, till by the manifestation of faith and repentance, they shall approve themselves to be fit for the same. But we have not yet thus practiced, but are now considering of the matter, and of sending to other churches for advice. Help us, I pray you, with your prayers, that we may have grace to discern, and to do the Lord's mind and will herein (Mather, *First Principles of New England*).

Under these existing conditions John Clarke and two of his disciples had gone to Lynn to hold a service with an aged Christian, William Witter, who has already been mentioned in these pages. While he was expounding the Scriptures in the house to a little company that had gathered, two constables came in and arrested the three. They were watched "over that night as Theeves and Robbers" by the officers, and shortly afterwards were lodged in jail. When they were brought to trial Governor Endicott charged them with being Anabaptists, to which Clarke made reply that he was "neither an Anabaptist, nor a Pedobaptist, nor a Catabaptist." "In the forenoon we were examined," says he, "in the afternoon, without producing either accuser, witness, or jury, law of God or man, we were sentenced." Clarke was fined twenty pounds, or to be well whipped. Crandall was fined "five pounds or to be well whipped." Holmes was "fined thirty pounds or to be well whipped." This trial excited much attention (Felt, II.).

Clarke gives the following account of his arrest and detention:

While I was yet speaking, there come into the house where we were two constables, who, with their clamorous tongues, made an interruption in my discourse, and more uncivily disturbed us than the persuivants of the old English bishops were wont to do, telling us that they were come with authority from the magistrates to apprehend us. I then desired to see the authority by which they thus proceeded, whereupon they plucked forth their warrant, and one of them with a trembling hand (as conscious he might have been better employed) read it to us; the substance whereof was as follows:

By virtue hereof, you are required to go to the house of William Witter, and so to search from house to house, for certain erroneous persons, being strangers, and then to apprehend, and in safe custody to keep, and tomorrow morning by eight o'clock to bring before me  
—Robert Bridges.

When he read the warrant, I told them, Friends, there shall not be, I trust, the least appearance of resisting of that authority by which you come unto us; yet I tell you, that by virtue hereof you are not so strictly tied, but if you please you may suffer us to make an end of what we have begun, so may you be witnesses either to or against the faith and order which we hold. To which they answered they could not; then said we, Notwithstanding the warrant, or anything therein contained, you may . . . They apprehended us, and carried us away to the alehouse or ordinary, where (after) dinner, etc.

Clarke and Crandall were not long afterwards released “upon the payment of their fines by some tender hearted friends without their consent and contrary to their judgment.” But Obadiah Holmes could not be persuaded to accept such deliverance. He would neither pay the fine nor allow it to be paid, and was kept in prison till September. Then he was whipped unmercifully with a corded whip. When he was released he said to the magistrate: “You have struck me as with roses.” In a long letter to William Kiffin, in London, he gives an account of his imprisonment and sufferings.

Of his imprisonment he said:

Not long after these troubles I came upon occasion of business into the colony of Massachusetts, with two other brethren, as brother

Clarke being one of the two can inform you, where we three were apprehended, carried to (the prison at) Boston, and so to the Court, and were all sentenced. What they laid to my charge, you may here read in my sentence, upon the pronouncing of which I went from the bar, I expressed myself in these words: I bless God, I am accounted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus. Whereupon John Wilson (their pastor, as they call him) struck me before the judgment seat, and cursed me, saying, The curse of God or of Jesus go with you. So we were carried to the prison, where not long after I was deprived of my two loving friends, at whose departure the adversary stepped in, took hold of my spirit, and troubled me for the space of an hour, and then the Lord came in, and sweetly relieved me, causing to look to himself; so was I stayed, and refreshed in the thought of my God.

The story of his whipping is pathetic:

And as the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people, Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet my God would not fail. So it pleased the Lord to come in, and so to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I broke forth praying unto the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge; and telling the people, that now I found that he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him forever who faileth me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me, I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence as the like thereof I never had nor felt, nor can with fleshy tongue express; and the outward pain was so removed from me, that indeed I am not able to declare it to you, it was so easy to me, that I could well bear it, yea and in a manner felt it not although it was grievous as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength (yea spitting in his hand three times as many affirmed) with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart, and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, You have struck me with roses; and said moreover, Although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge.

On account of this terrific whipping Holmes was not able to lie in bed on his

back. This experience immediately bore fruit in the conversion of President Dunster of Harvard College to Baptist views. He had witnessed the heroic conduct of Holmes in his punishment and his testimony convinced Dunster that infant baptism was wrong. “The most significant event in early Baptist history,” says Platner, “next to the work of Roger Williams, was the conversion of President Dunster, of Harvard College, about the year 1650. Dunster’s withdrawal from Congregational fellowship, and his acceptance of Baptist principles, startled the adherents of the standing order, and greatly encouraged the few struggling representatives of the Baptist cause. To allay public alarm, and refute the threatening ‘errors,’ Jonathan Mitchell, pastor of the church in Cambridge, ‘preached more than half a score of ungainsayable sermons’ in defense of the ‘comfortable truth’ of infant baptism. But not even these ten discourses, or the open opposition of the authorities, sufficed to prevent the gathering of the first Baptist church in Boston a few years later” (Platner, *Religious History of New England*).

Dunster brought to the college a high character and great ability. He was a profound scholar, especially in the Oriental languages, and an attractive preacher and seemed to happily combine decision of character with suavity of disposition. Johnson gave the opinion generally held of him when he said: “Mr. Henry Dunster is now President of the Colledge, fitted from the Lord for the work, and by those who have skill that way reported to be an able Proficient in both Hebrew, Greek and Latine languages, an Orthodox Preacher of the truths of Christ, very powerful through his blessing to move the affections” (Johnson, *Wonder Working Providence*).

Thomas Shepard, pastor at Cambridge during the first nine years of Dunster’s administration, speaks of him as a “man pious, painful, and fit to teach, and very fit to lay the foundations of the domesticall affairs of the Colledge; whom God hath much honored and blessed” (Young, *Chronicles of Massachusetts*, p. 552. 1841). In a letter to John Winthrop the high esteem in which Shepard held Dunster is manifested: “Your apprehensions agaynst reading and learning heathen authors, I perswade myselfe were suddenly suggested, and will easily be answered by H. Dunster, if you should impart them to him” (Massachusetts Historical Collection, Fourth Series, VII.).

The conversion of Dunster to Baptist views was sensational. Alexander McKenzie, the historian of the church at Cambridge, gives the following

account of the defection of Dunster: “Henry Dunster, President of the College, and a member of this church, was, to use the language of Cotton Mather, ‘unaccountably fallen into the briars of antipaedobaptism; and being briar’d in the scruples of that persuasion, he not only forebore to present an infant of his own unto the Baptism of our Lord, but also thought himself under some obligation to bear his testimony in some sermons against the administration of baptism to any infant whatsoever.’ This seems to have been in the year 1653; of course this made a great excitement in the church and community. The brethren of the church were somewhat vehement and violent in the expression of their dissatisfaction with the position by one so eminent. They thought that for the good of the congregation, and to preserve abroad the good name of the church, he should cease preaching until ‘he had better satisfied himself in the point doubted by him.’ The divine ordinance which he opposed was held in the highest veneration by our fathers. It had come to them from the earliest days of the church, and was sanctified before them by all the early associations of life. It connected them with God by his ancient covenant. It was a heavenly boon to the child upon whom parental faith and fidelity bestowed it. Its meaning, value and authority, had been carefully taught by their first ministers, of blessed memory. With the boldness and decision with which they set themselves against all wrong, all encroachment on religious ordinances, they lifted up their voice against one who presumed to contradict what the church had always held, and to deny where Shepard affirmed; and not even his sacred calling, nor his lofty official position could shield him from censure” (McKenzie, *Lectures on the History of the First Church in Cambridge*, pp. 102, 103. Boston, 1873) .

Neale, one of the early historians of New England, gives the following account of his removal as President:

The overseers were uneasy because he had declared himself an Anabaptist, fearing lest he should instill those Principles into the Youth that were under his Care; but the President no sooner understood their Minds, but he feely resigned his Charge, and retired to Scituate, where he spent the Rest of his Days in Peace (Neale, *The History of New England*, I.).

And Cotton Mather makes the following comment:

Among those of our fathers, who differed somewhat from his

brethren, was that learned and worthy man, Mr. Henry Dunster . . . Wonderfully falling into the errors of Antipaedobaptism, the overseers of the College became solicitous that the students there might not be unawares ensnared in the errors of the President. Wherefore they labored with an extreme agony either to rescue the good man from his own mistake, or to restrain him from imposing them upon the hope of the flock, of both which, fording themselves to despair, they did as quietly as they could, procure his removal, and provide him a successor in Mr. Charles Chauncy (Mather, *Magnalia*, Bk. III).

After a conference of the ministers in which nothing was accomplished the General Court, May 3, 1654, passed the following order:

Forasmuch as it greatly concerns the welfare of this country that the youth thereof be educated, not only in good literature. But sound doctrine, this Court doth therefore commend it to the serious consideration and special care of the Overseers of the College and the selectmen in the several towns, not to admit or suffer any such to be continued in the office or place of teaching, educating, or instructing the youth or child, in the college or school, that have manifested themselves unsound in the faith, or scandalous in their lives, and not giving due satisfaction according to the rules of Christ (The Records of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, III., p. 397).

Dunster accepted this statement and sent in his resignation as President of the College, June 10, 1654. He graciously says:

I here resign up the place wherein hitherto I have labored with all my heart (Blessed be the Lord who gave it) serving you and yours. And henceforth (that you in the interim may be provided) I will be willing to do the best I can for some weeks or months to continue the work, acting according to the orders prescribed to us; if the Society in the interim fall not to pieces in our hands; and what advice for the present or for the future I can give for the public good, in this behalf, with all readiness of mind I shall do it, and daily by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, pray the Lord to help and counsel us all.

From the Court, on the 25<sup>th</sup> of the same month, he received only this curt

answer:

In answer to the writing presented to this Court by Mr. Henry Dunster, wherein amongst other things he is pleased to make a resignation of his place as President, this Court doth order that it shall be left to the care and discession of the Overseers of the College to make provision, in case he persist in his resolution more than one month (and inform the Overseers) for some meet person to carry on and end that work for the present (The Records of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, III., p. 353).

It was in this manner that Henry Dunster, the President of Harvard College, became a Baptist.

The hero of the Baptist Church in Boston was Thomas Gould. He refused in 1665 to bring his child to baptism. The Elder then remarked: "Brother Gould, you are to take notice, that you are admonished of these things, withholding the child from baptism, irreverent carriage in time of administering baptism, and not complying with your word" (Willard's Answer to Russell, Backus, I.). He was frequently admonished. "Hence, after much time spent, the brethren consenting, he was admonished for making way from the church in the way of schism." Such discipline was continued several years, until he was finally excommunicated (Felt, II.).

The result was that a church was organized in Charleston, May 28, 1665, Thomas Gould, Thomas Osborne, Edward Drinker and John George were baptized, and these joined with Richard Goodall, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodall, and Mary Newel "in a solemn covenant, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to walk in fellowship and communion together, in the practice of all the holy appointments of Christ, which he had, or should further make known to them." Goodall came from Kiffin's church in London; Turner and Lambert from Dartmouth; Gould and Osborne separated from the church in Charleston; and Drinker and George had long lived in the country, but had been unaffiliated.

The church in Cambridge demanded of Gould and the others why they had "embodied themselves in a pretended church way"; and in July 9, 1665, Gould stated to the church that he "has nothing more to do with them" (Felt, II.). So it followed upon the 30<sup>th</sup> day of the same month he was excluded "for their impenitency in their schismatical withdrawing from this church and

neglecting to hear the church.”

This was by no means the first action of the church against him. The following record is under date of June 6, 1858:

Upon the 6<sup>th</sup> of 4<sup>th</sup>, 1658.

Brother Thomas Gould, according to the agreement of the church the Lord's day before, was called forth to give an account of his long withdrawing from the public ordinances amongst us, on the Lord's day. It was asked brother Gould, whether he had any rule from God's word so to do? Or whether, it were not a manifest breach of rule and order of the gospel? His answer several times was to the effect that he had not turned from any ordinance of God, but did attend the word in other places.

It was then asked him, whether he did not own church covenant, as an ordinance of God, and himself in covenant with the church?

He answered he did, but we had cut him off, or put him away by denying to him the Lord's Supper, when only he had been admonished, so now had no more privilege than an Indian, and therefore he looked now not at himself as a member of our church, but was free to go any whither?

He was likewise blamed, that having so often expressed his desire to attend any light that might help him in his judgment and practice, about children's baptism; that yet he should forbear, and stay away, when he could not but know, that his pastor was speaking largely on the subject. He confessed that his wife told him of it, and being asked how he could in faith partake of the Lord's Supper, whilst he judges his own baptism void and null? He owned that it was so, as administered to him as a child; but since God had given him grace, he now came to make use of it, and get good by it. It being replied that a person owned by all, as gracious, and (fit) for the Supper, is not yet to be admitted to it, till baptized; he said little or nothing to it, but spoke divers things generally offensive to the brethren, and would own no failing. Hence after much time spent, the brethren consenting, he was admonished for breaking away from the church, in way of schism, never having used any means to convince the church of any irregular proceeding, but continuing peremptorily and

contumaciously to justify his schism.

This transaction was speedily after the acting thereof truly recorded by the then only elder of this church; Zech. Symmes, Mr. Green, the ruling elder, dying a little before (Buddington, *The History of the First Church*, Charleston, pp. 56, 57. Boston, 1845).

Of the formation of the Baptist church and the reasons for it Gould himself gives an account. A small section of his narrative is here transcribed as follows:

“Now after this, considering with myself what the Lord would have me to do; not likely to join with any of the churches of New England, and so to be without the ordinance of Christ; in the meantime God sent out of Old England some who were Baptists; we, consulting together what to do, sought the Lord to direct us, and taking counsel of other friends who dwelt among us, who were able and godly, they gave us counsel to congregate ourselves together; and so we did, being nine of us, to walk in the order of the gospel according to the rule of Christ, yet knowing that it was a breach of the law of this country; that we had not the approbation of magistrates and ministers, for that we suffered the penalty of that law, when we were called before them. After we had been called into two courts, the church understanding that we were gathered into church order, they sent three messengers of the church to me, telling me that the church required me to come before them the next Lord’s day” (Callender Papers, Backus, I.).

The organization of this Baptist church caused a great noise throughout New England. Mather says:

Our Anabaptists formed a church . . . not only with a manifest violation of the laws of the Commonwealth, relating to the orderly manner of gathering a church, but also with a manifold provocation unto the rest of our churches, by admitting into their own society such as our churches had excommunicated for moral sandals, yea, and employing such persons to be administrators of the two sacraments among them (Mather, *Magnalia*, Bk. VII. Vol. II.).

The organization of this church was the occasion of much persecution. The rise of the Baptists and the demands of the English government “made this a

strenuous time for the officers” (Publications of the Colonial Society of, Massachusetts, VII., p. 285). The English commissioners were in New England at the time and on this account the authorities for a time were compelled to go slow in persecutions. But as soon as this danger was past “the church tried persecution,” says Nathan N. Wood, “the court tried coercion; but both alike vain. The church proposed argument and excommunication; the Court proposed fines and imprisonment; but no proposal proved persuasive with the indomitable spirit of Thomas Gould, the Baptist pastor.”

The following September they were called before the Court of Assistants; and they were commanded to desist from their schismatical practice. Not obeying the orders of this court October 11, 1665, they appeared in the General Court, when the following action was taken:

WHEREAS, at the late Court of Assistants, Thomas Gould and his company, sundry of them were openly convicted of a schismatical rending from the communion of the churches here and setting up a public meeting in opposition to the ordinances of Christ, here publicly exercised, and were solemnly charged not to persist in such pernicious practices. Yet, this notwithstanding (as this Court is informed), they do still persist in condemning the authority here established. It is therefore ordered, that the aforesaid Gould and company be summoned before this Court, to give an account of such, their irregular practices with their celebrating the Lord’s Supper by an excommunicated person.

A warrant being sent for the accused, they appeared. As they professed “their resolution yet further to proceed in such their irregular practices, thereby as well contemning the authority and laws here established for the maintenance of godliness and honesty, as continuing in the profanation of God’s holy ordinances. This Court do judge meet to declare, that the said Gould and company are no orderly church assembly, and that they stand jointly convicted of high presumption against the Lord and his holy appointments, as also the peace of this Government, against which this Court do account themselves bound to God, his Truth, and his Churches here planted, to bear their testimony; and do therefore sentence the said

Gould, Osborne , Drinker, Turner and George, such as are Freeman, to be disfranchised, and all of them upon conviction before any one magistrate or Court, of their further proceeding herein, to be committed to prison until the General Court shall take further order with them (Felt, II.).

The next year, for not complying with these requirements, they were again fined and committed to prison and finally sentenced to banishment. They refused to depart and held their meetings on Noodle's Island. It is related. That the town and country were much troubled by these meetings of the Baptists. Many desired that they should be dismissed but the Governor thought otherwise. By the summer of 1674 they met in Boston, in a hired house; because "some of the magistrates will not permit any punishment to be inflicted on heretics, as such" (Felt, II.).

"In circumstances like these," says Neale, in an address on the two hundredth anniversary, "for over a half a century they stood alone, and bore the responsibilities and the whole weight of theological odium which rested upon the Baptist name and cause in the Colony of Massachusetts. They must have had, and did have, during the first seventy years of their experience, a painful sense of isolation. They were separated from their brethren in England. No sister churches were in the neighborhood. No Baptist associations, as now, with letters and delegates, pleasant countenances, and kindly words to cheer and sustain them. Rev. John Myles, who had recently emigrated with a remnant of his flock, from Wales, was at Swansea, and occasionally made a visit to Boston; and sometimes a good brother or two would come up from Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations; but in general, our brethren were shut out from public sympathy, and lived in constant dread of the emissaries of the government. They met in houses of the different members of the church at Charleston, Noodle's Island, and Back street, now Salem street, until the erection of their first sanctuary in 1679" (Robert Heber Neale, An Address delivered at the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the First Baptist Church, Boston, June 7, 1865, pp. 17, 18. Boston, 1865).

The occasional ministry of Myles in Boston was accompanied with much persecution. Rev. Solomon Stoddard, of Northampton, wrote to Dr. Increase Mather, November 29, 1677:

I hear Mr. Miles still preaches in Boston, I fear it will be a means to

fill that town, which is already full of unstable persons, with error; I look upon it as a great judgment . . . let all due means be used to prevention (Massachusetts Historical Collection, VIII. Mather Papers).

The general spirit of the severer class of the Puritans, of this period, may be better understood in the light of some of their utterances: “Anabaptism is an engine framed to cut the throat of the Infantry of the Church.” . . . “’Tis Satan’s policy to plead for an indefinite and boundless toleration.” “Anabaptism we shall find hath ever been looked at by the Godly Leaders of this people as a Scab” (Thomas Shepard, Election Sermon (1672), pp. 24, 25). “Protestants ought not to *persecute* any, yet the Protestants may punish Protestants; and as the case may be circumscribed, a Congregation of such as may call themselves Protestants cannot be rationally denied” (Increase Mather, Introduction, *Ne Sutor Ultra Crepidam*). “Experience tells us that such a rough thing as a *New England Anabaptist* is not to be handled over tenderly. It was toleration that made a world Antichristian” (Samuel Willard, *Ne Sutor Ultra Crepidam*). The Lord keep us from being bewitched with the whore’s cup, lest while we seem to detest & reject her with open face of profession, we do not bring her in by any back door of Toleration” (John Cotton, *Bloody Tenet Washed*). “*Separation and Anabaptism* are wonted intruders,. and seeming friends, but secret fatall Enemies to Reformation” (Jonathan Mitchell, Election Sermon, A.D. 1667). The Baptist schism was the most dreaded of all with which the colony was threatened, and no epithets were too opprobrious to be hurled at its adherents. The ministers were insistently urging the civil magistrates to use coercive measures and to punish heretics. “To purge New England of heresie,” was the favorite appeal, and was the open door through which the civil courts let loose the fierce hordes of fines, imprisonments, and banishments (Wood, *History of the First Baptist Church of Boston*).

The most terrible fake accounts were published against the Baptists. A pamphlet was published in London entitled:

Mr. Baxter *Baptiz’d in Bloud*, or a *Sad History of the unparalleled Cruelty of the Anabaptists in New England*. Faithfully relating the Cruel, Barbarous and Bloudy Murther of Mr. *Baxter* an Orthodox minister who was killed by the Anabaptists and his skin most cruelly

fleed off from his body, with an Exact Account of all the Circumstances and Particularities of this barbarous Murther. Published by his Mournful Brother, Benjamin Baxter, living in Fen church street, London (Felt, II.).

The pamphlet was sold on the streets and created much excitement. The author asks: “Dares any man affirm that Anabaptists to be Christians! For how can they be Christians who deny Christianity, deride Christ’s Institution of Baptism, and scoffingly call it, *Baby sprinkling*, and in place thereof *Booby dipping*” (p. 1)? “These wicked Sectarians deny this Sacrament and compel their adherents to renounce their Baptism, and to be dipt again in their prophane waters” (p. 3). The author represents his brother as having removed to New England and circumstantially describes how the Baptist flayed the man before his wife and children. It was proved that there had been no such minister in Boston, and no such a man as Baxter lived in Fen Church Street. It is alleged that Dr. Parker, the Chaplain to the Bishop of London, was the author, and published it because of his hatred to the Baptists.

But their troubles were not over. The Baptists of Boston erected a house of worship, and on February 15, 1679, it was opened for services. In the meantime Governor Severet died and persecutions were renewed. There was no law to prevent their using the house, and so the Court, the following May enacted a law to the effect:

That no person should erect or make use of a house for public worship, without license from the authorities, under the penalty, that the house and land on which it stood should be forfeited to the use of the county, to be disposed of by the county treasurer, by sale, or demolished, as the court that gave judgment in the case should order.

The matter passed through various proceedings until the king interfered and decreed:

Requiring that liberty of conscience should be allowed to all protestants, so that they might not be discountenanced from sharing in the government, much less, that no good subject of his, for not agreeing in the Congregational way, should by law be subjected to fines and forfeitures, or other incapacities for the same, which, said

his majesty, is a severity more to be wondered at, whereas liberty of conscience was made- a principal motive for your transportation into these parts.

They were permitted to assemble three or four times when they were again called before the Court to answer for their offense. They found that the doors of their house had been nailed up, and a paper attached to the effect:

All persons are to take notice, that by order of the court, the doors of this house are shut up, and they are inhibited to hold any meetings, or to open the doors thereof without license from the authority, till the General Court take further order, as they will answer the contrary at their peril.

Dated at Boston, 8<sup>th</sup> March, 1680.  
EDWARD RAWSON, *Secretary*.

Five days later Increase Mather recorded in his diary:

The Council ordered the Doors of the meeting house which the Anabaptists have built in Boston, to be shut up. They took away their doors (blank) boards were nailed. So perverse were they that they would not meet in a private house, but met this Sabbath out of doors (blank) their meeting house (Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1899-1900, p. 408).

The congregation erected a cover and met in the church yard. The Court, June 11, 1680, upon a petition from the church, admonished them “for their offense, and so granted them their petition so farr as to forgive their offense past, but still prohibited them as a society of themselves, to meet in that publick place they have built, or any other publick house, except such as are allowed by publick authoritie” (The Records of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, V., p. 272).

It is comforting to know that at a later date these acts were recognized as vicious, and some apology extended. Certain it is that the majority of the people of Massachusetts were opposed to the rigorous measures against the Baptists and the Quakers (Daniel Waite Howe, *The Puritan Republic of the Massachusetts Bay*, p. 252. Indianapolis, 1899). It is said that Winthrop upon his death bed, when pressed by some to sign an order for the banishment of some heterodox person, refused, saying that he “had done too much of that

work already” (Hutchinson, I., p. 142. Boston, 1764).

Cotton Mather, in 1717, preached the ordination sermon of a Baptist minister in Boston upon “Good Men United.” It contained a frank confession of repentance for the persecutions of which the Boston churches had been guilty. He said:

Good men, alas I have done such ill things as these. New England also has in former times done some of this aspect which would not now be so well approved; in which, if the brethren in whose house we are now convened met with anything too unbrotherly, they now with satisfaction hear us expressing our dislike of everything which looked like persecution in the days that have passed over us (Vose, *Congregationalism in Rhode Island*).

There was a constant correspondence kept up for years between the ministers of New and Old England, much of which bore upon the subject of the Baptists. Often it was suggested that the Baptists should receive more lenient treatment. In a letter which Thomas Cobbet wrote to Increase Mather, 1681, he said:

“And as you will say concerning toleration of Antipedobaptists in general, here in New England, as they are in Old, they might soon flock over hither thereupon so many as would sink our small vessel; whereas in that greater ship of England, there is no such danger of those multitudes to founder the same” (The Mather Papers. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fourth Series, VIII. 291, 292).

The bitterness against the Baptists had no appreciable diminution.. The General Court assembled in Boston, May 27, 1674. Samuel Torrey of Weymouth preached the sermon from Rev. 2:5. The Introduction was by Increase Mather, who says:

We may conclude that the Lord meant some great thing, when he planted these heavens and laid the foundations of this earth, and said unto New England (as sometimes to Zion), Thou art my people. And what should that be, if not that so a Scripture pattern of the Reformation as to civil, but especially in ecclesiastical respects, might be here erected, in a first fruits of that which shall in due time be accomplished the whole world throughout, in that day there shall

be one Lord, and his name one over all of the earth. The first design of New England was purely religious, but now we begin to espouse and are eagerly pursuing another, even a worldly interest.

Torrey, in his sermon, gives his views of the Baptists as follows:

Such I take to be the transgression of those who do grossly and scandalously profane any of the holy ordinances of Christ, in the administration; but much more of those who do both professedly and practically deny most, if not all fundamentals, both of faith and order, and are known and acknowledged so to do by all the reformed churches in the world (Felt, II.).

With such impressions he supposed the Baptists ought not to be tolerated by law in their deviations from the Congregational order. He urges as a means of reformation, “the full and faithful discharge of duty to the children of the Covenant.”

Cotton Mather, in the year 1689, published a book “*Memorable Providences Relating to Witchcraft, with an Introduction by Richard Baxter.*” He afterwards expressed his opinion on the subject as follows:

The houses of good people are filled with shrieks of children and servants who have been torn by invisible hands with tortures altogether preternatural. The recent extreme measures for witchcraft are justified. The devil exhibits himself ordinarily as a small black man. He has his sacraments; he scratches, bites and sticks pins in the flesh; he drops money before sufficient spectators out of the air; he carries witches over trees and hills. Twenty persons have confessed that they signed a book which the devil showed them.

The influence of this book was very great. Sibley says:

The tendency of his books was to extend and increase the excitement. He was credulous, superstitious, and fond of the marvelous. Previous to the witchcraft trials he possessed more power and wielded greater influence than any other individual ever did in Massachusetts. After this his influence declined until at length he became the object of public ridicule and open insult (J. L. Sibley, *Sketches of Harvard Graduates*, III.).

At that time the jails of Salem and the adjoining towns were filled with

prisoners who accused lying children of bewitching them. The question was, what should be done with these prisoners, many of them already condemned or awaiting trial, and this is the answer written by Cotton Mather and signed by twelve pastors: "We cannot but recommend unto the government the speedy and vigorous punishment of such as have rendered themselves obnoxious according to the directions given under the laws of God and the wholesome statutes of the English nation for the destruction of witchcraft. We hope that some of the accused are yet clear from the great transgression laid to their charge." "The people stood poised upon the panic's brink," says Adams, "and their pastors lashed them in. The Salem trials left a stain upon the judiciary of Massachusetts that can never be effaced" (Brooks Adams, *Emancipation of Massachusetts*).

Drake says: "Some say it was worse in other countries and long after. Yes, ignorance and superstition prevailed to a great, if not a greater, degree in Europe than in New England. Mental darkness was as dense in Old England as in New" (Drake, *History of Witchcraft*, Preface XXX.). A later writer has shown that Drake was wrong so far as Old England was concerned, for the last execution of a witch in that land occurred ten years before the tragedy took place in Salem (Moore, *Notes on Witchcraft*). It was Montague, the skeptic, whose voice was raised almost alone among the writers of Europe against the nefarious inquisition. "It is rating our opinions high to roast other people alive for them," he said. But Mather rode horseback to the execution, exhorting the people to their duty.

It is everlastingly to the credit of the Baptists that they opposed this procedure. On June 25, 1692, William Milburne, a Baptist preacher, was summoned before the Court for reflecting upon the administration of public justice. His crime was the circulation of a petition for signatures of persons who opposed the further prosecution of suspected witches or specter testimony." "The innocent will be condemned," he said, "a woeful chain of consequences will follow, inextricable damage will be done this province. Give no more credence to specter testimony than the Word of God alloweth."

George H. Moore says:

William Milburne, upon examination having owned that he wrote the papers and subscribed his name to them, was ordered to be committed to prison or give bond of \$200 with two securities to

answer at the next session of the Superior Court for framing, contriving, writing and publishing the said seditious and scandalous papers or writings. William Milburne was a brother of Jacob Milburne and the prosecuting attorney was Thomas Newton, who had secured the execution of Jacob the year before in New York. The magistrates and ministers of 1692 who engineered the witchcraft business were trusted leaders of the people (George H. Moore, *Notes on Witches; Final Notes on Witchcraft*).

The effective book was that of Robert Calef, a member of the Baptist church in Boston. It was entitled: “*More Wonders from the Invisible World*”; was finished in 1697, but there was no publisher in Boston who dared to issue it. It finally appeared in England in 1700. It created a sensation in Boston. Among many other things he says:

I hope I understand my duty better than to imitate Mr. Mather in retorting his hard language. If his report stands in competition with the glory of God, His truth, and His people’s welfare, I suppose these to be too valuable to be trampled on for Mr. Mather’s mistake. This country will be likely to be afflicted again if the same notions are still entertained. “God has implanted in our consciousness to judge a miracle,” Cotton Mather says: It seems the light within is here our guide and not the Scripture. Such ridiculous and brutish stuff as “turning men to cats and dogs,” “riding on a pole through the air,” Mather calls Baxter’s book, “*The World of Spirits*,” “an ungainsayable book but the Bible.” What mean these specters that none can see but those that have not the use of their reason and senses? Plastic spirit? What’s that? Some ink-horn term. So hardy and daring are some men, though without one word of Scripture proof of it. Sound reason is what I have long been seeking for in this country in vain.

You forbade my making a copy of the four pages that you let me read. I am not surprised at your caution in keeping from the light the crude matters and imperfect absurdities that are found there. My task is offensive, but necessary. I would rather expose myself to censure than that it should be omitted. I took it to be a call from God to vindicate his truth. The principal actors in these tragedies are far

from defending their action now, but they do not take due shame to themselves. It was bigoted zeal stirring up blind and bloody rage against virtuous and religious persons. No one of them has testified as the case required against the doctrine and practice though they have brought a stain and lasting infamy upon the whole country, if not entailing upon themselves all the blood of the righteous.

I cannot believe that there are several Almightyies. My letter to Mr. Mather remains unanswered, so that I suppose he regards it as either orthodox or unanswerable. What he says about a thunder storm breaking into his house savors too much of enthusiasm. He magnifies the devil's power beyond and against the Scripture. Not bringing Scripture to prove his positions shows that there are none. If I err I hope you will let me see it by Scripture. What do you find in Scripture for your structure? If you are deficient in that warrant, the more eminent the architect the more dangerous he is. I pray that you may be an useful instrument in the removal of this popish and heathen superstition. It may be asked what need is there of raking up coals that lie buried in oblivion, but Satan would like to drag us through the pond again by the same cat. This is an affliction far exceeding all that this country has ever labored under. Those who oppose such a torrent know that they will meet with opposition from magistrates, ministers and people, and the name of Sadducee, atheist, witch, will be cast against them. God is able to protect those who do their duty herein against all opposers.

Mr. Mather's language sounds more like that of a Manichee or a heathen than like that of an orthodox believer.

The witchcraft delusion and this book probably broke the power of the Theocracy. When the book reached Boston, November 5, 1700, Cotton Mather spent the day in fasting. For the fifth month, the second day, 1701, he writes: "The enemies of the churches are set with implacable enmity against myself, and one vile fool, Robert Calef, is employed by them to go on with more of his filthy scribbling."

Increase Mather, then President of Harvard College, took what he called "the wicked book" and had it burned in front of Stoughton Hall. Calef was driven out of Boston, and settled at Roxbury, where he was more highly esteemed

than in the vicinity of the Mathers. Samuel, the son of Cotton Mather, wrote in 1728: "There was a certain disbeliever in witchcraft that wrote against my father's book, but the man is dead, and his book died long before him." This was not a fact for four editions of the book were printed.

Whether the book of Calef produced a reaction, or simply brought to a head the opposition to Increase Mather, the fact remains that in a few weeks he was dismissed as President of Harvard. An author makes the assertion that the "descendants of Calef rank as high as those of the Mathers, since Warren, the hero of Bunker Hill, was a descendant of Calef (W. W. Everts, Robert Calef and Cotton Mather, *The Review and Expositor*, April, 1916. XIII., p. 232).

The government of Massachusetts was slow in recognizing the claims of the Baptists. Between the years 1727 and 1733 there were 28 Baptists, two Quakers and two Episcopalians imprisoned in Bristol, Massachusetts (now Rhode Island) for the ministerial tax (Benedict, 443). The first act 1728-1729 was passed recognizing the religious scruples of the Baptists. This was limited to five years, exempted the poll only of Baptists and Quakers, from being taxed for the support of the ministers and their bodies from being taken in execution for collecting such taxes. The next year (1729) an act, in addition to the act of previous year, was passed extending the exemption to the real and personal estates of the Anabaptists, as they were called.

In 1751, Mr. Moulton was arrested for preaching Baptist sentiments at Sturbridge, Massachusetts, and, by public authority, shut up in prison, and finally banished as a vagrant and vagabond, and his deacon, risk, and his brethren, John Corey, Jeremiah Barstow, John Perry, and John Draper, were imprisoned in the Worcester jail. The following property belonging to that Baptist church was taken and sold by authority to pay the salary of Caleb Rice, a Congregational preacher: Cash, \$.36; 7 cows, 1 heifer, 2 steers, 2 oxen, a flock of geese, 20 pewter plates, 1 tankard, 1 saddle, a trammel and hooks, shovels, tongs and andirons, 1 pot, 1 kettle, 1 warming pan and 1 broad axe (Benedict).

The laws were reenacted for limited periods until 1752, when an act was passed "to relieve the Anabaptists by establishing rules for identifying their members and ministers. In 1770 the objectionable name of Anabaptist was replaced by Antipaedobaptist (Publications of the Colonial Society of

Massachusetts, I., pp. 142- 144. Boston, 1895). But in this same year about 400 acres of land, belonging to members of the Baptist Church in Ashfield, were sold at auction to pay the ministerial tax (Benedict).

At the beginning of the Revolution the status of the Baptists was regulated by the provincial law of 1770. This act exempted them from the payment of religious taxes upon giving certificates to the town assessors, signed by their minister and three other Baptists, that they regularly and conscientiously attended Baptist worship (Hovey, *A Memoir of the Life and Times of Isaac Backus*, p. 180. Boston, 1858). Though more tolerant than earlier legislation, this act did nothing to relieve isolated Baptists who could attend no meeting of their denomination, nor did it fully protect against local tyranny and intolerance those who fully complied with the law. Three such were arrested in Clemford, although one was infirm, another the sole support of his family and the third over eighty years of age, and lodged in jail at Concord, January, 1773 (Hovey). Some of the more conscientious refused to fill out the exemption certificates required by law, deeming such an act “an implicit acknowledgment of a power assumed by man, which in reality belongs to God” (Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1916-1917, I., pp. 373, 374).

The constitution of 1780 did not improve the position of the Baptists. In reality the article on religion was reactionary. It not only continued the religious system of the province but exalted it to a fundamental law, out of reach of ordinary legislative enactment. The provincial system, which was still in force in 1780, may be described as compulsory support of at least one Congregational church in every town, by public taxation on all polls and estates, with official exemptions for Baptists, Quakers and members of the Church of England, under certain conditions. This new article on religion was even less liberal than the old system, for instead of exempting members of dissenting sects from religious taxation, it merely gave them the privilege of paying their taxes to their pastors. Unbelievers, non-churchgoers and dissenting minorities too small to obtain ministers, had to contribute to the Congregational worship. The whole article was so loosely worded that it resulted in innumerable lawsuits. One may say that the ecclesiastical history of the Commonwealth during the next fifty years was one of vexations and lawsuits (Ibid, L., p. 371).

## BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:

Henry S. Burrage, *A History of the Baptists in New England*. Philadelphia, 1894.

Daniel Neale, *The History of the Puritans; or Protestant Nonconformists; from the Reformation in 1517 to the Revolution in 1688: Comprising an Account of their Principles, their attempt for a further Reformation of the Church; their sufferings; and the Lives and Characters of their most considerable Divines*. London, 1822. 5 volumes.

John Jones, John Myles and his Times, *The Baptist Quarterly Review*, X., pp. 30-46. New York, 1888.

R. D. C. Robbins, Cotton Mather and the Witchcraft Delusion, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXIV., pp. 473-512. Andover, 1877.

Joshua Thomas, *A History of the Baptist Association in Wales, from the Year 1650, to the Year 1790. Shewing the Times and Places of their Annual Meetings, whether in Wales, London, or Bristol, &c., including several other interesting Articles*.

J. Davis, *History of the Welsh Baptists. From the year sixty-three to the Year one thousand seven hundred and seventy*. Pittsburgh, 1835.

## CHAPTER V

### THE BAPTISTS OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE JERSEYS

William Penn—Pennsylvania—The “Frame of Government”—”The Great Law”—Liberal Provisions in Religion—Baptists from Rhode Island—Thomas Dungan—Cold Springs—Pennepek—Baptists from Wales, Ireland and England—Elias Keach—The Keithian Quakers—Mennonites—Baptists in Philadelphia—Jersey Baptists—Emigrants from Many Countries—The Congregationalists in Newark—A Curious Incident.

THE accession by Great Britain of Pennsylvania and the Jerseys from the Swedes and the Dutch brought many Quakers, and at a later date Baptists, into this section. William Penn, whose father was a Baptist, acquired the territory of Pennsylvania. “This day (March 5, 1681) my country,” says Penn, “was confirmed to me under the great seal of England, by the name of ‘Pennsylvania.’” He had proposed to name it New Wales, “being as this is a pretty, hilly country”; and when this was objected to, he suggested Sylvania. “They added Penn to it,” he continues, “and though I much opposed it and went to the king to have it struck out, he said it was past, and would take it upon him; nor could twenty guineas move the under Secretary to vary the name; for I feared it would be looked on as a vanity in me and not in respect to the king, as it truly was, to my father.”

The first “Frame of Government” was a compound of feudal, monarchical, aristocratic and democratic elements. The proprietor was the lord paramount of the soil and all the colonists were his tenants; he claimed the right not only to appoint the judges; but to organize the courts; the assembly had the power to assent to or to reject proposed laws, but the initiative in legislation as well as supreme judicial and administrative authority were vested in the council, which was thus a copy, in miniature of the House of Lords and Privy Council rolled into one. The assembly chafed under the restrictions placed upon its action; and it was finally modified into a liberal government.

Penn, at the beginning of his legislation in Pennsylvania, had passed by the Assembly the “Great Law,” the first section of which had regard to religious matters; and, among other things, provided:

That no person, now, or at any time hereafter, Living in this Province, who shall confess and acknowledge one Almighty God, to be the Creator, Upholder and Ruler of the World, and who confesses

him, or herself, Obligated in Conscience to Live peaceably and quietly under the civil government, shall in any case be molested or prejudiced for his or her Conscientious persuasion or practice. Nor shall hee or shee at any time be compelled to frequent or Maintain anie religious worship, place, or Ministry whatever, Contrary to his, or her mind, but shall fully and freely enjoy his or her Christian Liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflection. And if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his, or her, different persuasion and practice in matters of religion, such a person shall be looked upon as a Disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly (Charter and Laws of the Province of Pennsylvania, 1682-1700, pp. 81-99. Harrisburg, 1879).

The provisions in Chapter VI. Are as follows:

That all officers and persons Commissionated and employed in the service of the government of this Province, and all Members and Deputies elected to serve in the Assembly thereof, and all that have a Right to elect such Deputies, shall be such as profess and declare they believe in Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, the Saviour of the world, And that are not Convicted of ill-fame, or unsober and dishonest Conversation, and that are of twenty-one years of age at Least (Ibid, 108).

The law was liberal but departed widely from religious liberty. No unbeliever in Jesus, infidel or Jew, had any rights under its provisions. In 1696, William Markham being governor, a new Frame of Government was enacted, in which a property qualification for electors and deputies was substituted for the religious, and the guarantee of freedom of conscience was omitted. By the first code of March 1, 1664, it was enacted that all ministers must present certificates of episcopal ordination, and were to be paid out of the common treasury. It does not appear that this law was ever effective. The charter contained liberal provisions. "It is one of the marvels of history;" says Dr. Newman, "that such a king as Charles II. Should have sold to such a man as William Penn so large and valuable territory as Pennsylvania on terms so highly favorable to civil and religious freedom, and with the certainty that it would be used for the freest development of what was then regarded as one of the most radical forms of Christianity" (Newman, *History of the Baptists*

*in the United States).*

The first company of Baptists to settle in the State came from Rhode Island, in 1684. This was three years after Penn had received his patent, and one year after the death of Roger Williams. Morgan Edwards, in his history of Pennsylvania Baptists, makes the following statement: "In 1684, Thomas Dungan removed from Rhode Island and settled in a place called Cold Springs, in Bucks county, between Bristol and Trenton." Probably there were other Baptists who came with him. "Of this venerable father," says Edwards, "I can learn no more than that he came from Rhode Island, about the year 1684; that he and his family settled at Cold Spring, where he gathered a church, of which nothing remains but a grave yard and the names of the family which -belonged to it; . . . that he died in 1688, and was buried in said graveyard; that his children were five sons and four daughters . . . To mention the name, alliance and offspring of these would tend toward an endless genealogy. Sufficeth that Rev. Thomas Dungan, the first Baptist minister in the province, now (1770) existeth in a progeny of five or six hundred" (Edwards, *Material for a Baptist History of Pennsylvania*, note).

The second company of Baptists were Welsh emigrants who settled in Pennepek, or Lower Dublin, in 1686. There were already a number of persons in this Community from Wales, England and Ireland. The place they selected for their residence must have exhibited a most inviting aspect to these early emigrants. Though the hand of cultivation has marred the native beauties of the scenery, even yet there is much to invite the eye of him who loves to gaze upon nature's loveliness. Along the banks of the Pennepek there is a sweetness and a silence which invites contemplation. Many native trees of the forest, which the indulgence of an importunate cultivation has yet spared, there interweave their hospitable branches and cover with pleasant shade the green margin by which the laboring current softly meanders. A flat rock, which projects into the stream at a certain point, and leaves an easy slope into the water, has been for a series of years the platform on which the administrator of baptism has stood to propound the way of truth to the surrounding multitude, and from which he has conducted into the yielding elements below him, the placid forms of the new converts.

The records of the church state that "by the good Providence of God, there came certain persons out of Radnorshire in Wales, over into this Province of

Pennsylvania, and settled in the Township of Dublin, in the County of Philadelphia, viz.: John Eatton, George Eatton and Jane, his wife, Samuel Jones, and Sarah Eatton, who had all been Baptized upon Confession of Faith and Received into Communion of the Church of Christ meeting in the Parishes of Llandewi and Nantmel, in Radnorshire, Henry Gregory being Chief Pastor. Also John Baker who had been Baptized and was a member of a congregation of Baptized believers in Kilkenny, in Ireland, Christopher Blackwell, pastor, was in the providence of God settled in the township aforesaid. In the year 1687 there came one Samuel Vaus out of England, and settled near the aforesaid Township and went under the denomination of a Baptist and was so taken to be.”

The next year Elias Keach came from London and baptized some persons. Twelve entered into church relations and chose Mr. Keach as pastor. Soon after, a few Baptists from this province and West Jersey joined them, also some persons baptized at the Falls, Cold Spring, Burlington, Cohansey, Salem, Penn’s Neck, Chester, Philadelphia and elsewhere united with the church. These were all in one church, and Pennepek was the center of the union, where as many as could met to celebrate the Lord’s Supper. Quarterly meetings were held in other places to accommodate the members there. From this church went out many others. They were orthodox according to the Baptist faith; but at times they were disturbed by such subjects as absolute predestination, laying on of hands, distributing the elements, singing psalms, seventh-day Sabbath and other ecclesiastical fevers (Horatio Gates Jones, *The Baptists in Pennsylvania*. Being a sketch of the Pennepek or Lower Dublin Baptist Church. *The Historical Magazine*, August, 1868. New Series, IV., p. 76).

Elias Keach, the first minister of the church, was a son of the celebrated Benjamin Keach of London. He came to this country about the year 1686, and was then a very wild youth. On his landing he dressed in black and wore a band in order to pass as a minister. The project succeeded to his wishes, and many persons resorted to hear the young London divine. He performed well enough till he advanced pretty far in the sermon, then, stopping short, he looked like a man astonished. The audience concluded that he was seized by some disorder; but, on asking what the matter was, received from him a confession of imposture, with tears in his eyes and much trembling. Great was his distress, though it ended happily; for from this time he’ dated his

conversion. He visited Dungan, was instructed, baptized and ordained. He traveled through the wilderness of Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, preaching the gospel with great success. He became the chief apostle of the Baptists in this country. With his family he finally returned to London and became a most successful minister (Morgan Edwards, *Materials Toward a History of the Baptists of Pennsylvania*, p. 9-11. Philadelphia, 1770).

The third company of the Baptists originated from the Keithian Quakers, called after their leader, George Keith. On account of some differences they separated from the main body of the Quakers and published reasons for their separation. They were prosecuted in the courts by the Quakers. Morgan Edwards remarks:

Whether these complaints be just or not, is neither my business nor inclination to determine. If just, the Quakers have also shown: "That every sect would persecute if they had the power." I know but one exception to this satirical remark, and that is the Baptists; they have had the civil power in their hands in Rhode Island government for an hundred and thirty-six years, and yet have never abused it in this manner, their enemies themselves being judges. And it is remarkable that John Holmes, Esq., the only Baptist magistrate in Philadelphia at the time referred to, refused to act with the Quaker magistrates, against the Keithians, alleging, "That it was a religious dispute, and therefore not fit for a civil court." Nay, he openly blamed the court, held at Philadelphia, December 6-12, 1692, for refusing to admit the exceptions, which the prisoners made to the jury. However the Keithian Quakers soon declined; their head deserted them, and went over to the Episcopalians. Some followed him thither; some returned to the Penn Quakers; and some went to other societies. Nevertheless others persisted in the separation, particularly the Upper Providence; at Philadelphia; at Southampton; and Lower Dublin. These, by resigning themselves to the guidance of Scripture, began to find water in the commission; bread and wine in the command; community of goods, love feast, kiss of charity, right hand of fellowship, anointing the sick for recovery, and washing the disciples' feet; and were therefore determined to practice accordingly (Edwards, pp. 56, 57).

There were other companies of Keithian Quakers who arrived at the same conclusion. Edwards continues:

Thus have we seen that the Keithian Quakers ended in a kind of transformation into Keithian Baptists; they were also called Quaker Baptists, because they still retained the language, dress and manners of Quakers. We have seen also, that the Keithian or Quaker Baptists ended in another kind of transformation into seventh-day Baptists, though some went among the first-day Baptists and other societies. However, these were the beginning of the Sabbatarians in Pennsylvania. A confession of faith was published by the Keithian Baptists in 1697; it consisted chiefly of the articles in the Apostles' Creed. The additions are articles which relate to baptism by immersion, the Lord's Supper; distinguishing days and months by numerical names, plainness of language and dress, not swearing, not fighting, etc. (Edwards, pp. 59, 60).

There came, in 1692, companies of Mennonites from the Dutch settlements in New York. They were found mostly in the neighborhood of Germantown and Frankfort. There also came into the country a company of persons from Germany who became Tunkers or Dunkers. They were from Schwartzenu, Friesland. With but one exception these people had been bred Presbyterians. They consorted together to read the Bible and edify one another in the way they had been brought up, for as yet they did not know that there were any Baptists in the world. "However, believers' baptism," says Edwards, "and a congregational church soon gained upon them, insomuch they had determined to obey the gospel in these matters. They desired Alexander Mack to baptize them; but he, deeming himself in reality unbaptized, refused. Upon which they cast lots to find who should be administrator. On whom the lot fell hath been carefully concealed. However, baptized they were in the river Eder, by Schwartzenu, and they formed themselves into a church, choosing Alexander Mack to be their minister. Persecution drove them from Holland. "Thus we see that all the Tunker churches in America sprang from the churches at Schwartzenu in Germany; that the church began in 1708, with only seven souls, and that in a place where no Baptist had been in the memory of man, nor any now are. In 62 years that little one has become a thousand, and the small one a great nation" (Edwards, pp. 65, 66).

There were Baptists in Philadelphia in 1686, but for forty-six years the church had no settled pastor. It was regarded as a branch of the church at Pennepek. The church was formally constituted May 15, 1746.

New Jersey was at first settled by the Dutch and the Swedes. It soon passed under the control of England; and finally came into the possession of Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret. The proprietors February 10, 1664-5, issued certain "Concessions and agreements of the Lord Proprietors of New Jersey to and with all and every one of the adventurers and all such as shall settle and plant there." It distinctly provides:

That no person qualified as aforesaid within the said Province at any time shall be anyways molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any difference in opinion or practice in matters of religious concernment, who does not actually disturb the civil peace of the said Province; but that all and every such person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their judgments and consciences in matters of religion throughout the said Province (Whitehead, *New Jersey Under the Proprietors*, p. 27. 1846).

However, the Assembly of the Province was authorized to appoint as many ministers as should be thought proper, and to provide for their maintenance (Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of the United States*, III.). Benedict calls it a "mild shade of religious toleration" (Benedict).

Some towns enacted statutes which were oppressive. The following is from Newark:

None shall be admitted freemen or free burgesses, within our town upon Passaic River in the Province of New Jersey, but such planters as are members of some or other of the Congregational churches; nor shall any but such be chosen to magistracy . . . or to any chief military trust or office. Nor shall any but such church members have any vote in any such elections (Henry F. Smith; *Celebration of the twenty-fifth Anniversary of the First Baptist Church of Bloomfield, N. J.*).

One of the celebrated Baptist churches of this section was the Welsh Tract church from Pembrokeshire, Wales. It emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1701, and their pastor, Thomas Griffith, came with them. They received in 1703 a

large grant of land on the Delaware, known as Welsh Tract. They greatly prospered, furnished many able ministers to the denomination and sent forth a strong colony to South Carolina. Morgan Edwards declares that this church “was the principal, if not the sole, means of introducing singing, imposition of hands, and by 1712” all the ministers in Jersey “had submitted to the ordinance.”

The State of New Jersey from ancient times had strong and respectable Baptist churches in its borders. Edwards gives the following general account of the origin of the Jersey Baptist churches: “In the year 1675, and afterwards, emigrants arrived in the Delaware from England and settled in the parts adjoining the river, since distinguished by the name West Jersey; some of these were also Baptists. About 1683, a company of Baptists from the county of Tipperary, in Ireland, arrived at Amboy; they proceeded toward the interior parts. In the fall of 1729, about thirty families of the Tunker Baptists from Holland (but originally from Schwartzenu in Germany) arrived in Philadelphia; some of whom, in 1733, crossed the river Delaware and settled in Amwell in Hunterden county. In 1734 the Rogerene Baptists arrived from Connecticut and settled near Schoolmountain, in the county of Morris. Thus it appears that among the first Jersey settlers some were of the Baptist denomination; the present Baptists are, partly, the offspring of those adventitious Baptists; and, partly, such as have been proselyted to their way” (Edwards, *Materials Toward a History of the Baptists in New Jersey*, p. 10. Philadelphia, 1792). Most of these churches were from Wales, but Cohansy originated in Ireland. Obadiah Holmes, who suffered as a Baptist in Massachusetts, came in 1664-5 into New Jersey with other Baptists and some Quakers and settled in Monmouth county. John Bray was pastor in 1707. The following, taken from the records of the court of that date, shows something of the trials and perplexities of the Baptists:

Court of Sessions begun and held at Shrewsbury for the county of Monmouth on the third Tuesday in September, Anno Dom. 1707. WHEREAS, Mr. John Bray, minister of the Baptists of the county of Monmouth, made application to the Court of Sessions, held last month, that he might be permitted to qualify himself as the law directs in the behalf, and the Court there ordered the further consideration thereof should be referred and now said John Bray appearing in open sessions, being presented by several of the said

congregation, viz.: Lawrence, John Garret Wall, Jacob Troax, Jr., James Bolen, in behalf of themselves and the rest of their brethren, and accordingly the said John Bray had qualified himself as the law in the case directs, viz.: he did take the oath made in a statute, made in the first year of her majesty's reign, entitled an act for removing and preventing all disputes concerning the assembly of that Parliament and did make and subscribe the declaration mentioned in the statute made in the thirtieth year of the reign of King Charles II, entitled an act to prevent Papists from sitting in either house of Parliament and also did declare his approbation of and did subscribe the articles of religion mentioned in the statute made in the thirtieth year of the reign of the late Queen Elizabeth, except the 34, 35, 36 and those words of the 20<sup>th</sup> article, viz.: the church hath full power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in matters of faith and that part of the 27<sup>th</sup> article concerning infant baptism, all of which are entered on record. According to the direction of another act of Parliament entitled, an 'act for exempting her majesty's Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England from the penalty of certain laws.

Such were some of the restrictions thrown around Baptist preachers. For long periods many of these churches were destitute of settled pastors. Most of these early churches were endowed. Some of these endowments were lost, by what Morgan Edwards denominated "that sacrilegious thing called continental money."

An interesting occurrence happened in one of the churches. A zealous Pedobaptist was desirous of having his first child initiated into the church according to established forms. His wife was averse to the measure, and would not consent until some plain passage of scripture could be adduced in its favor. He repaired to his minister, who frankly admitted that there was no such scripture, but showed him how the proofs were made out. On hearing of this Robert Calver inserted an advertisement in the newspaper offering twenty dollars reward to any one who would produce a text proving infant baptism. Rev. Samuel Harker took him up and carried a text to the advertiser; Calver would not allow that infant baptism was in it; Harker sued him; the Court was of Calver's mind and Harker had the costs to pay. Calver then offered forty dollars for such a passage, but no one accepted his challenge.

The historian of the times made this quaint remark: “It does not appear that the Court had any bias in favor of Baptist sentiments; their decision was, no doubt, made according to the law and evidence, and as what is wanting cannot be *numbered*, no other verdict could be rendered.”

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:**

Thomas S. Griffiths, *A History of the Baptists of New Jersey*. Hightstown, 1904.

Henry C. Vedder, *A History of the Baptists to the Middle States*. Philadelphia, 1898.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE BAPTISTS OF MAINE AND SOUTH CAROLINA

Baptists in Kittery—The Letter of Humphrey Churchwood—William Screven—Before the Grand Jury—The Account of Joshua Millet—Screven Convicted of Contempt—Fined—His Character—Screven in South Carolina—The Opinion of his Enemies—Joseph Lord Writes to the Governor—The Settlement of Charleston—The Established Church—The Different Religious Sects—The First Baptists There—Lady Blake—Religious Conformity Demanded—No Other Baptist Church in the State—The Euhaw and Other Churches.

THE history of the Baptists in Maine is widely connected with other sections of the country, especially with South Carolina. The first information at hand concerning the presence of Baptists in Kittery is contained in a letter which Humphrey Churchwood, a member of the Baptist church in Boston, but a resident of Kittery, addressed to his brethren in Massachusetts Bay, January 3, 1662. The letter is as follows:

Humphrey, a servant of Jesus Christ, to the church which is at Boston; grace be with you, and peace, from God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comforts, who comforteth us in all our tribulations that we may, be able to comfort them that are in trouble, as we are comforted of God. Most dearly beloved brethren and friends, as I am, through free grace, a member of the same body, and joined to the same head, Christ Jesus, I thought it my special duty to inform you that the tender mercies of God in and through Jesus Christ, hath shined upon us by giving light to them that sit in darkness, and to guide our feet in the way of peace; for a great door, and effectual, is opened in these parts, and there are many adversaries, according to the 1<sup>st</sup> of Corinthians 16:9. “Therefore, dearly beloved, having desire to the service of Christ, which is perfect freedom, and the of his glorious gospel of peace and salvation, and eyeing that promise in Daniel 12:3: “They that turn many to shall shine as the stars forever”; therefore I signify to here (are) a competent number of well established people whose Lord hath opened insomuch that they have gladly received the do seriously profess their hearty desire to the following of to partake of all of his holy ordinances, according to his

institutions and divine appointments; therefore I present my ardent desire to your serious consideration, which is, if the Lord see it fit, to have a gospel church planted here in this place; and in order hereunto, we think it meet that our beloved brother, William Screven, who is, through free grace, gifted and endued with the spirit of utterance to preach the gospel, being called by us, who are visibly joined to the church. When our beloved brother is ordained according to the sacred rule of the Lord Jesus, our humble petition is to God that he will be pleased to carry on his good work to the glory of his holy name, and to the enlarging of the kingdom of his beloved Son, our Redeemer, who will add daily to his church such as shall be saved; and we desire you in the name of the Lord Jesus not to be slack in this great work, believing verily that you will not, and that you are always abounding in the work of the Lord, and we humbly crave your petitions for us to the throne of grace, and we commend you to God and to the good work of his grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified.

This William Screven had already “presentments” by the Grand Jury before the County Court, at York, July 6, 1675, for not attending the church of the standing order. The following are the citations:

We'll present William Screven for not frequenting the publique meeting according to the Law on the Lord's days (Early Records, III. 396).

This person presented is remitted because in evidence it appears that he usually attends Mr. Mowdy's meeting on Lord's days (Early Records, III. 315).

At a Court held in Wells, July 4, 1676, Screven was appointed a constable for “ye lower part of the River.” In 1678 and in 1680 he was appointed to serve on the grand jury, and at the General Assembly, held at York, June 30, 1681, he took his seat as a deputy from Kittery.

It is evident from these records, as well as from the letter of Churchwood, that in his religious views Screven was not in harmony with the standing order. He was nevertheless esteemed as a citizen, and was rapidly advanced to positions of official trust.

Joshua Millet gives a full account of the rise of these Baptists in Kittery. That account is here transcribed, with some authorities added which sustain every word of this careful historian. He says: "Baptist sentiments first appeared in Maine in 1681. At this time, there was peace and prosperity in the province. The war whoop was not heard; disputation and wrangling about claims and titles were at an end; and Massachusetts and Maine moved under the same form of government. Massachusetts had spread over the Province, not only her laws, but her spirit of religious intolerance. This spirit had already erected her battlements against the 'wild fanaticism' of all sects who did not bow to its authority (William D. Williamson, *The History of the State of Maine*, I.).

"Kittery, the oldest town in the Province, incorporated 1647, was selected as the place first to raise a Baptist standard. The first avowal of Baptist sentiments tested the spirit of charity in other sects. As in Massachusetts, so in Maine, the Congregationalists were recognized by law as 'the Standing Order.' They viewed the Baptists in the light of religious fanatics and regarded their doctrines and influences as deleterious to the welfare of both religion and society (Benedict, I.).

"It was soon known, that in Kittery, there were several persons professing to be Baptists. From where they came, is now unknown. In the course of events, an opportunity offered to them the privilege of church communion, agreeable to their own theological views. The nearest Baptist church was at Boston, Mass., over which Rev. Isaac Hull (*ibid*, I.) then presided. At the advice of Mr. Hull, these Baptists in Kittery united with his church.

"William Screven, an emigrant from England (Williamson, I.) was one of their number. Being a man of more than common talents, and devoutly pious, he officiated as leader of their worship (Boston Church Records). The brethren in Kittery and in Boston were satisfied that the Great Head of the Church had designed and called him to preach the gospel of Christ. He was accordingly licensed by the church in Boston, to 'exercise his gifts in Kittery, or elsewhere, as the providence of God may cast him' (Boston Church Records).

"The Baptists in Kittery being now blessed with a minister, and situated at so great a distance from Boston, deemed it expedient for their own spiritual advantage, and for the cause of Christ in the new settlements, to unite in a separate church. But their desire was at once disappointed by the violence of

opposition.

“Moved by the same spiritual despotism which had disturbed the Baptists in Massachusetts, Mr. Woolbridge, the minister, and Mr. Huck, the magistrate, awakened prejudice and hatred against these conscientious disciples in Kittery. Slandorous abuses and legalized tyranny were now to be endured by them. Church members suffered not alone; but those who assembled with them for worship were repeatedly summoned before the magistrate, and by him threatened with a fine of five shillings for every such offence in the future (Backus, I.).

“Humphrey Churchwood, a man worthy of respect and esteem, for exercising his liberty of conscience, and encouraging the baptism of some of his friends, was conveyed before Mr. Huck and Woolbridge, to answer for abuses against the established order. But it does not appear that much was done but to revile and ridicule the Baptists.

“Alarmed at the success which attended these incipient and feeble efforts of the Baptists, the General Assembly of the Province took the business of oppression in their own hands. At the August session of the council, 1682 (Maj. B. Pendleton was then Deputy-President of the Province), Mr. Screven was tried and placed under bonds for good behaviour. The following is a copy of the records made by Edward Bishworth:

Mr. Screven appearing before this court, and being convicted of contempt of his majesty's authority, and refusing to submit himself to the sentence of the court, prohibiting his public preaching; and upon examination before the court, declaring his resolution still to persist therein; the court tendered him the liberty to return home to his family in case he would forbear such turbulent practices, and amend for the future; but he refused, the court sentenced him to give *bonds* for his good behaviour, and to forbear such contentious behaviour for the future; and the delinquent stand committed until the judgment of this court be filed.

Varis Copia transcribed, and with the records compared this 17<sup>th</sup> of August, 1682

E. B., *Recorder*

(Early Records, IV. 237. August 17, 1688).

“Mr. Screven, regarding the precepts and examples of Christianity the only just rule of conduct, did not comply with the requisitions of the court. A fine of ten pounds was therefore imposed upon him. He was, moreover, threatened with the infliction of the penalties of the law for each and every future offence against the *established order*. This treatment constituted an other part of the important business of the same session:

The court having considered the offensive speeches of Mr. Screven, viz.: his rash and inconsiderate words tending to blasphemy, do adjudge the delinquent for his offence, to pay ten pounds into the treasury of the court or Province. And, further, the court doth forbid and discharge the said Screven under and pretence, to keep any private exercise at his own house or elsewhere, upon the lord's day, either in Kittery, or any other place within the limits of this Province; and he is enjoined for the future to observe the public worship of God in our public assemblies upon the Lord's days, according to the laws established in this Province, upon such penalties as the law requires upon such neglect in the premises (Early Records, IV. 261).

“Neither these terrific proceedings of a provincial court, nor the slander and abuse of the clergy could crush the spirit and zeal of Screven, or prevent the embodiment of a Baptist church in Kittery. By the assistance of Rev. Isaac Hull, of Boston, the following persons were recognized, September, 1682, as a church of Christ in gospel order, they having been previously baptized. Wm. Screven, minister; Humphrey Churchwood, deacon; Robert Williams, John Morgandy, Richard Cutts, Timothy Davis, Leonard Brown, Wm. Adams, Humphrey Azell, George Litter, and several females (Benedict, I.). Storm and violence, fines, and imprisonments were now experienced by this little band of disciples. As a result of a long cherished and well organized religious intolerance venting itself in vehement and impassioned persecution, these humble Christians became disheartened and overcome. In less than one year from its organization, the church was dissolved and the members 'scattered like sheep upon the mountains' (Benedict, I.).

“To avoid the embarrassments of clerical opposition and further litigations, to shun the evils of slander and calumny, Mr. Screven, accompanied with his family, and some of his suffering brethren, left the Province, removed to

South Carolina, where he gathered a Baptist church, which subsequently, became a Nourishing society (Backus, II.).

“Mr. Screven was a native of England—born in 1629. Soon after his residence in Kittery, he married Bridget Cutts, and was, with her, blessed with eleven children (Williamson, I.). His talents were above mediocrity. Though favored with but a partial literary competency, yet, a brilliant and energetic imagination, a fervent heart, enlivened by the genial influences of Christianity, wonderfully supplied that literary deficiency (Backus, I.). He was beloved by his brethren, his ministrations were listened to with delight, and received with edification and profit (Backus, III.). He was eminent for devoted piety and religious usefulness. Mr. Screven died near Charleston, S. C., at the age of eighty-four years, leaving a respectable posterity to bear witness to his worth. . . .

“From the dissolution of the church in Kittery, no Baptists appeared publicly in Maine for an interval of eighty-five years” (Millet, *History of the Baptists in Maine*; Greenleaf, *Sketches of the Ecclesiastical History of the State of Maine*, 243. Pourtsmouth, 1821).

It is not at all strange that under these conditions William Screven, now fifty-eight years of age, and his Baptist company removed to Cooper Creek, South Carolina, not far from the present site of Charleston. He called his home Somerton, after his residence in England. Charleston was then not even a village (McCrary, Edward, *The History of South Carolina*, 325, 326. New York, 1897).

The hatred of the New England clergy followed him in South Carolina. Rev. Joseph Lord wrote to Governor Thomas Hinkley from Dorchester, February 21, 1698-99, as follows:

When I came to Dorchester, I found that a certain Anabaptist teacher (named Scriven), who came from New England, had taken advantage of my absence to insinuate into some of the people about us, and to endeavor to make proselytes, not by public preaching up his own tenets, nor by disputations, but by employing some of big most efficient and trusty adherents to gain upon such as they had interest in, and thereby to set an example to others that are too apt to be led by anything that is new. And he had like to have prevailed, but Mr. Cotton and my coming has a little obstructed them; one

woman being recovered and convinced of the error of that way,—for whose rebaptization a day was appointed, and another (a neighbor of ours, the wife of Major Broughton; by which you may perceive that they enter into the houses, and lead captive silly women) is in a way (I hope) to be convinced of it, though she was almost prevailed on to be rebaptized by plunging (The Hinckley Papers, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fourth Series, V. 305).

The surroundings of the new church were favorable. They had left a region which but recently, in 1675, had been devastated in King Philip's War, the most fearful of the early struggles of the natives. It had spent its fury in the region of Piscataqua. Though these emigrants from Maine were still in the region of the wild Indians, they were not molested by them.

Most of the members of the Baptist colony had, before 1693, removed to Charles Town. At first their meetings were held in the house of William Chapman in King Street. In 1699 William Elliott, one of the members, gave the church the lot of land on which the First Baptist Church, in Charleston, now stands, and a house of worship was erected on this lot in that or the following year (Tupper, *History of the First Baptist Church*). Since then this church has erected two buildings (Shecut, *Essays*).

Early in 1670, the first colony which made permanent settlement in South Carolina arrived. They were under the charge of William Sayle, of Bermuda, as Governor. He is described by the old narrator somewhat unkindly, as a "Puritan and Nonconformist, whose religious bigotry, advanced age and failing health promised badly for the discharge of the task before him." After many adventures, losing some of their ships, they finally made settlement on the banks of the Ashley. There they laid the foundations of the old Charleston, which was named in honor of King Charles.

On the 19<sup>th</sup> of April Sir John Yeamens entered upon his duties as Governor of the province. He brought with him from the Barbadoes the first negro slaves seen in South Carolina. Mayor Courtenay has given a graphic description of these early settlers—"pioneers in the settlement of an immense hunting ground, filled with wild animals, overgrown with forests, partly covered by swamps, and roamed over rather than inhabited by a great number of savage tribes, subsisting by the chase, and accustomed to war among themselves. In the midst of such conditions, these colonists laid the foundation, and their

descendants reared this noted city, enduring hardships, facing the Indian and the wild beast and at times pestilence and famine. They were plain, earnest, hard-working people, who had left native land and crossed the ocean, their compelling motive the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, their hope to secure a large opportunity of life and work for themselves and their children.”

There came settlers, in 1674, from New Amsterdam, or New York, as the English called it, because they were dissatisfied with their own masters. In course of time they blended with the other colonists.

While a majority of the Proprietors were of the Established Church of England, the larger part of the immigrants were from the beginning dissenters. “The first settlers of South Carolina were of different religious persuasions. None had any particular connection with government; nor had any sect legal preeminence over another.

“This state of things continued for twenty-eight years. In that early period of the province divine service was seldom publicly performed beyond the limits of Charleston, with the exception of an independent church formed near Dorchester in 1696. The inhabitants of the province were nevertheless kept in a state of social order; for they generally believed in God, a future state of rewards and punishments, the moral obligations of the decalogue, and the divine authority of the Old and New Testaments. The first two acts of the legislature which have been found in the records of the secretary's office enjoined the observance of the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday; and prohibited certain gross immoralities, particularly idleness, drunkenness, and swearing.' Thus far the government aided religion in the infant colony. In the year 1698, one step further was taken by an act 'to settle a maintenance on a minister of the Church of England in Charleston.' This excited neither suspicion nor alarm among dissenters, for the minister in whose favor the law operated was a worthy good man; and the small sum allowed him was inadequate for his services. The precedent thus set by the legislature being acquiesced in by the people, paved the way for an ecclesiastical establishment. In the year 1704, when the white population of South Carolina was between 5,000 and 6,000, when the Episcopalians had only one church in the province and the dissenters three in Charleston and one in the country, the former was so favored as to obtain a legal establishment (Ramsay, *A History of South Carolina*, II. I., 2, Charleston, 1809).

Ramsay further says:

Liberty of conscience, which was secured to every one by the charter, proved a great encouragement to emigration. The settlement commenced at a period when conformity to the Church of England was urged with so high a hand as to bear hard on many good men. Dissenters labored under many grievances. They felt much and feared more.

“The toleration,” says Oldmixon, “appears so firm in this charter, that we wonder that any Palatine could presume to break in upon it” (Oldmixon, *The History of Carolina*, I. London, 1708). “But it was inevitable that Old World's animosities must needs sometime break out among the various people. They had indeed been alive from the very planting of the colony” (McCrary).

“With respect to religion,” says Carroll, “three terms of communion were fixed: *first*, to believe that there is a God; *secondly*, that he is to be worshiped; and *thirdly*, that it is lawful, and the duty of every man when called upon by those in authority, to bear witness to the truth. Without acknowledging which, no man was to be permitted to be a freeman, or to have any estate or habitation in Carolina. But persecution for observing different modes and ways of worship was expressly forbidden, and every man was to be left full liberty of conscience, and might worship God in that manner which he in his private judgment thought most conformable to the divine will and revealed Word” (Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, I.).

It was not without violence that the Church of England was established by law. Lord Granville “the palatine was a bigoted zealot for his mode of ecclesiastical worship and government; the governor was strongly attached to it. It was not, however, without some difficulty and considerable struggle that the keen opposition raised by the dissenters, 'Who now plainly perceived their design, and who had an irreconcilable aversion to Episcopacy, could be overcome. By an undue influence and violence the governor and his adherents gained their point, and secured a majority in the house; so that a species of corruption had now infected the great fountain of liberty, the election of representatives.

“It would appear that some of the colonists at this period had distinguished themselves by loose principles and licentious language, and had treated some

of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion with the ridicule and contempt of professed infidelity. To bring an odium upon this class of dissenters, and to discourage such licentious practices, a bill was brought into the new assembly for the suppression of blasphemy and profaneness; by which bill, whoever should be convicted of having spoken or written anything against the Trinity, or the divine authority of the Old and New Testaments, by the oath of two or more credible witnesses, was to be made incapable of being a member of assembly, or of holding any office of profit, civil or military, within the province; and whoever should be convicted of such crimes a second time, was also to be disabled from suing or bringing any action of information in any court of law or equity, from being guardian to any child, executor or administrator to any person; and without hail suffer imprisonment for three years. Which law, notwithstanding its fine gloss, savored not a little of an inquisition, and introduced a species of persecution ill calculated to answer the end for which it was intended” (Carroll, I.; also Hewatt, I.).

Manifestly these acts did not bring peace to the province. “If Christian magistrates and ministers would forsake their Quarrels,” says Governor Archdale in 1707, “for Poor Triffies and barren Opinions, and encourage each other to plant substantial practical Truths, they may now sail East or West, and meet with people to make a plentiful harvest on, both in a Temporal and Spiritual respect, which would redound more to their glory and Advantage than all the unchristian Quarrels and Practices to promote unfruitful Doctrines that are computed to have shed more Christian Blood than all the Heathenish Ten Persecutions. I hope the Reader will not think this mixture of Spirituals with Temporals improper and impertinent, since the original Design of the Patent was the promotion of both” (John Archdale, *A Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina*. London, 1707).

Thus it happened that South Carolina received a considerable number of its early settlers from men who sought the prospect of securing religious liberty. Though not allowed to live in peace in Britain, they were from motives of policy encouraged to emigrate to the colonies, and were promised freedom and protection there—a promise which was not faithfully kept. They sometimes met with annoyance. Their friends protested earnestly against the intolerance. “Cannot dissenters,” said they, “kill wolves and bears as well as

churchmen, and also fell trees, and clear ground for plantations, and be as capable of defending them as churchmen?" The argument availed, so far at least as to allow their coming freely, though not to secure them the grants of land bestowed on the favorites of the royal family, or to obtain for them entire equality of privileges.

Grahame, an English writer of high character, says:

Strong symptoms of mutual jealousy and dislike began to manifest themselves between the Dissenters and the Puritans on the one hand, who were the most numerous party in the colony, and the Cavaliers and Episcopalians on the other, who were favored by the proprietaries in the distribution of land and official power and emoluments; and although the firmness and prudence of Governor West prevented the discord of these parties from ripening into strife and confusion, it was beyond his power to eradicate the evil, or to restrain his own Council, which was composed of the leading Cavaliers, from treating the Puritans with insolence and contempt. The Cavalier party was reinforced by all those persons whom debauched habits and broken character and fortune had conducted to the province, not for a cure, but a shelter of their vices, and who regarded the austere manners of the Puritans with as much dislike as the Cavaliers entertained for their political principles. The adversaries of the Puritans, finding that it was in their power to shock and offend them by a social behavior opposed to their own, affected an extreme of gay and jovial license. Each party considered its manners as the test of its principles and emulously exaggerated the distinctive features of its appropriate demeanor; and an ostentatious competition ensued in which the ruling party gave countenance and encouragement to practices and habits very unfavorable to the prevalence of industry and the acquisition of wealth (Grahame, *Colonial History of the United States*, I. 369, London, 1827).

"If the complaint of the dissenters that Episcopacy," says a North Carolina historian, "had waited till the colony had increased in wealth and numbers, and there had come much of the spirit of proselytism and dictation, as the natural and favored church (Howe, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, 172),

was not altogether without foundation, it must, on the other hand, be remembered that the founder of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina was but providentially cast upon the shores of the province, his coming having been neither of his own will nor in the instance of the members of his church. So, too, the Baptist minister had come as an exile driven from New England, seeking the religious indulgence promised in the Royal charter to those who could not conform to the church and thereby established. It remains, however, to the honor of the dissenters in the province, that, though themselves taxed to support the established church, they maintained their own churches by voluntary offerings in addition to the tax for religious purposes imposed by the government” (McCrary).

The years 1682 and 1683 were marked by considerable immigration. One body came from Ireland under Ferguson, another from Scotland, which was groaning under the barbarous administration of Lord Lauderdale. “But,” says Mr: Grahame, “the most valuable addition to its population, which the colony now received, was supplied by the immigration of a considerable number of pious and respectable Dissenters from Somersetshire in England. This band of emigrants was led by Humphrey Blake, the brother and kin of the renowned Admiral Blake. . . . Humphrey Blake was a worthy, conscientious and liberal man; and willingly devoted his fortune to facilitate the retirement of a number of Dissenters, with whom he was connected, from the persecutions they endured in England, and the greater calamities they apprehended from the probable accession of the Duke of York to the throne” (Grahame, I.).

Among this number of “substantial persons,” as they were called by Hewatt (*History of South Carolina and Georgia*, I. 140. London, 1779), was also Joseph Blake, the nephew of the Admiral, and the friend and trustee of Lord Berkeley, one of the Lord's Proprietors. His wife, Lady Blake, and her mother, Lady Axtell, were valuable accessions to the infant Baptist church, and it is likely that Screven was a neighbor of theirs in England. Joseph Blake himself, if not a communicant, at least entertained the sentiments of the Baptists and favored their cause. He was twice subsequently Governor of the province; and his sister was the wife of Governor Morton, and the mother of Joseph Morton, who was a friend of liberty and voted against the establishment of the Church of England as the religion of the State (Hewatt, I.).

Joseph Blake, together with Paul Grimball, a Baptist, and five other persons, was a committee for revising the “Fundamental Constitutions” prepared by John Locke. It was during his second administration as Governor that the French Huguenot refugees, who had come in large numbers, in consequence of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 1685, and the renewal of Roman Catholic persecution, received equal rights with those born of English parents.

The conflict upon the establishment of the Episcopal Church culminated in 1704, in the enactment of two laws. By one of these the dissenters were deprived of all civil rights; and the other was the Court of High Commission to try all ecclesiastical causes, and to enforce religious conformity in South Carolina. An appeal was made to Queen Anne and the House of Lords praying for a repeal of the obnoxious laws, and the punishment of the authors of them, affirming that “the law for forcing conformity to the Church of England in Carolina is an encouragement to atheism and irreligion, destructive to trade, and tends to ruin and depopulate the province.” Whereupon the Queen issued an order declaring the laws null and void. From that period (1706) the dissenters had not the equality they had been led to expect, but simple toleration. In 1707 an act was passed for the establishment of religious worship according to the forms of the Church of England, the province was divided into ten parishes, and provision was made for building a church in each parish and for the endowment of its minister (Basil Manly, *History of the First Baptist Church of Charleston*).

In the year 1700 the Baptists of Charleston entered their new house of worship. At the same time they adopted their creed from that of the London creed of 1689. The introduction is 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 till the eleventh of the same 1689, to consider some things that might be for the glory of God, and the good of the Congregations, have thought meet (for the satisfaction of all other Christians that differ from us on the point of baptism) to recommend to their perusal the Confession of our Faith; printed for and sold by John Marshall, at the Bible in Grace Church Street. 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.

For half a century after the founding of the church in Charleston, that body stood alone, so far as any historic facts have been revealed in the South Colony. Their influence was felt. A letter has come to light which casts information on the situation. It is as follows, from William Orr, St. Paul's Parish, September 30, 1742:

If the Society thought proper to send me some few of Mr. Wall's abridgement of the History of Infant Baptism and the best answer to Barclay's Apology (if cheap and to be had on easy terms) to be distributed among the people, I believe they might be of great use. For as this country was at first settled in a great measure by Baptists and Quakers, so their defendants (tho' they come to church now and then) yet they still retain, and are more or less under the influence of their Father's Principles (Colonial Records of North Carolina, IV. 609).

There were in 1770, in all the province in addition to Charleston, but six other Baptist churches: Ashley River, Welsh Neck, Euhaw, Pipe Creek, Coosawatchie and Fairforest. By 1790 there were 66 churches with 46 ordained and 27 licensed preachers. This was principally owing to the labors of the New Light and Separate preachers from New England.

For sixty years Euhaw was a branch of the Charleston church. It was loath to give up this connection but in May, 1746, it was organized into an independent body. The first pastor was Francis Pelot, a man of ample fortune. He was a native of Switzerland, at first a Pedobaptist, but after he came to South Carolina he embraced Baptist principles. He became a distinguished man among South Carolina Baptists.

“So far back as the year 1685,” says Thomas Curtis in a fine resumé of the Baptists in Charleston, “William Screven, an ancestor of the respectable family of that name connected with the Baptist church in Liberty county., Georgia, driven from England by persecution, became the first pastor of the Charleston Church. Before the year 1700, he laid the foundation of the Old Church, on the site which the place of worship of the First Baptist Church now occupies. At this period, there was but one clergyman of the Church of

England, and one of the established Church of Scotland, officiating in the city. To secure purity of doctrine, the Church subscribed what was called the Century Confession of the English Baptists—an outline of faith and practice which has expressed the principles of our body to the present day. Good William Screvin's injunction to the people was, that they should remain 'orthodox in the faith, and of blameless life' (Be this perpetually the motto of both churches). Through six generations this body has freely chosen its own pastors; generally, and with increased liberality, maintained them, and voluntarily assumed all its pecuniary burdens. It has yielded a Botsford and a Stillman of Boston to other Churches, and many more than its own number of pastors to the State. It has once asserted a right to remove a minister for heresy, and a full and independent power always to discipline its own members. Blessings on the parent stock (we must pray in parting)—that has produced such, and so much fruit! It has survived, you see, the government and monarchy of England here; the war of the Revolution, by which it severely, for a time, suffered; all the wars of party spirit in Church and State, and the establishment of several more modern churches. Surely, its helper has been God. But without illiberality to other Church organizations, I would observe, here has been a long trial of the Voluntary System in religion!" (*The Baptist Memorial and Christian Chronicle*, 61, 62. February, 1844.)

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Joshua Millet, *History of the Baptists in Maine*.

H. A. Tupper, *Two Centuries of the First Baptist Church of South Carolina, 1683-1888*. Baltimore, 1889.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE BAPTISTS IN NEW YORK, DELAWARE, CONNECTICUT AND VERMONT

The Baptists in New York—Dutch Settlers—The Reformed Church—The Baptists—Conventicles Suppressed—Lady Moody—Baptists in Flushing—Francis Doughty—Laws—Fines—Valentine Wightman—The Various Sects—Governor Andros—Governor Hunter—First Baptist Church, New York—Nicholas Eyers—Fines—The Baptists in Central New York—Delaware—The Settlement of the State—The Welsh Tract Church—Elijah Baker and Philip Hughes—The Sounds Baptist Church—Connecticut—The Severity of the Laws—Early Baptists—The Slow Progress—Vermont—The Rise of the Baptists.

THE Dutch, who first settled New York, set up the Reformed Religion, according to the Acts of the Synod of Dort, and the colonial clergy were commissioned by the Classis of Amsterdam. No formal constitutional restriction was enacted until 1640, when the East India Company, which then controlled the colony, decreed that “no other religion shall be publicly admitted,” “except the Reformed Church” (Documents of Colonial History of New York, I. 123).

In a description of the New Netherlands, in 1644, by Father Isaac Jogues, a Jesuit missionary, is found the following statement:

No religion is publicly exercised but the Calvinist, and orders are to admit none but Calvinists, but this is not observed, besides Calvinists in the Colony are Catholics, English Puritans, Lutherans, Anabaptists, here called Menetes, &c. (*Documentary History of New York*, IV. 22. Albany, 1851).

There were, therefore, Baptists in New York preceding 1644; but their location is not indicated. A grant of worship had been given the town of Flushing for sectaries. It was soon discovered that the Lutherans and other dissenters were using these privileges, and the authorities became alarmed. “In the meantime we already have the snake in our bosom.” These persons were required to abstain from all “church services or holding any meetings.” On February 1, 1656, the authorities decreed that all 14 conventicles and meetings” held in the province, “whether public or private,” should be “absolutely and expressly forbidden”; and that “only the Reformed Divine service, as this is observed and enforced according to the Synod of

Dortrecht,” should be held,

Under the penalty of one hundred pounds Flemish, to be forfeited by all those who, being unqualified, take upon themselves, either on Sundays or other days, any office, whether of preacher', reader or singer, in such meetings differing from the customary and legal assemblies, and twenty-five like pounds to be forfeited by every one, whether man or woman, married or unmarried, who is found at such meetings.

A noted woman called Lady Moody bought a plantation near Lynn, Massachusetts. “She soon embraced Baptist principles, and suffered therefor. And divers of those at Aquidneck turned professed Anabaptists” (Backus, I.). She was on this account compelled to leave Lynn. For a period she was in New Haven where she is reported to have brought over to her views Mrs. Eaton, the wife of the governor of the province and the daughter of an English bishop. This brought much distress to the Congregational pastor. She finally settled at Gravesend, near New Amsterdam. She took out, December 19, 1645, a patent of land, which, among other things, guaranteed “the free libertie of conscience according to the custom of Holland, without molestation or disturbance from any magistrate or magistrates, or any other ecclesiastical minister that may pretend jurisdiction over them.” Without regard to her patent the authorities were not always amicable. Many others of like sentiments gathered around her, “with liberty to constitute themselves a body politic as freedmen of the Province and town of Gravesend.” James W. Gerard says: “The settlers at Gravesend seem to have been generally affected with Anabaptist views, and to have had no settled church” (Gerard, *Discourse Before the New York Historical Society*, May, 1880, 28).

There were likewise Baptists in Flushing where some toleration had been granted. George Gardyner, in his description of America, remarks that the Northeast part of Long Island is inhabited by “some English, who have been thrust from New England for their judgment. The most of them holding the Christian Tenet of confession before baptism” (Felt, II.). The following is the old record:

The four villages on Long Island viz.: Gravesend, Middleburg, Vlissingen & Meemstede were established by the English. Those of Gravesend are reported Menonists; yea, they, for the most part,

reject Infant Baptism, the Sabbath, the office of Preacher, and the Teachers of God's word, saying that through these have come all sorte of contention into the world. Whenever they meet together the one or the other reads something for them. At Flushing they heretofore had a Presbyterian Preacher who con- formed to our church, but many of them became endowed with divers opinions and it was with them *quot homines tot sententia*. They absented themselves from preaching, nor would they pay the Preacher his promised stipend. The said preacher was obliged to leave the place to repair to the English Virginias” (*Documentary History of New York*, III.).

Clearly the preacher referred to above was Francis Doughty, who “had fled from troubles in England, and found that he got out of the frying pan into the fire.” In Massachusetts he denied “baptism to infants.” He was the first pastor in Flushing, but in 1656 he went to Virginia. “He was unquestionably the first religious teacher in Flushing, and had adopted Baptist views on baptism” (Prime, *History of Long Island*; Mandeville, *Flushing Past and Present*).

The documentary narrative continues:

Last year a fomenter of error came here. He was a cobbler from Rhode Island in New England & stated that he was commissioned by Christ. He began to preach at Flushing and then went with the people into the river and dipped them. This becoming known here, the Fiscaal proceeded thither and brought him along. He was banished from the province.

This cobbler was none other than William Wickenden, the pastor of the church in Providence. He was one of the foremost men in Rhode Island, and had served the State in various important positions. In 1656 he visited Flushing, dipped his converts in the river and administered the Lord's Supper. O'Callagan, under date of November 9, 1656, gives an account of these occurrences. “The Baptists at Flushing,” says he, “were the next to feel the wrath of the law. William Hallett, sheriff of the place, 'had dared to collect conventicles in his house, and to permit one William Wickendam (Wickenden) to explain and comment on God's Holy Word, and to administer sacraments, though not calling thereto by any civil or clerical authority.' He had, moreover, assisted at such meetings and afterward, 'accepted from said

Wickendam's hands the bread in the form and manner of the Lord's Supper as usually celebrated.' For this violation of the statute Hallett was removed from office and fined fifty pounds, and failing to pay he was to be banished" (O'Callagan, *Laws and Ordinances of the New Netherlands*, 1634-1678; Broadhead, *History of the State of New York*).

When the Council was informed that he was a very poor man, "with a wife and many children, by profession a cobbler, which trade he neglects, so that it will be impossible to collect anything from him," the costs of the fines were remitted. He was condemned November 11, "to immediate banishment, under condition if ever he be seen again in the province of New Netherland he shall be arrested and kept in confinement till the fine and costs are paid in full" (Albany Records, VIII.).

These Baptists, in 1653, elected officers. The record is: "The English do not only enjoy the right of nominating their own magistrates, but some of them usurp the election and appointments of such magistrates, as they please, without regard to their religion. Some, especially the people of Gravesend, elect libertines and Anabaptists, which is decidedly against the laws of the Netherlands" (Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York, I. 318. Albany, 1901).

The laws were more severe as time went on. The authorities September 21, 1662, say that because they

Find by experience that their hitherto issued proclamations and edicts against conventicles and prohibited assemblies are not observed and obeyed as they ought, therefore, by these presents, they are not only renewed but enlarged in manner following. Like as they have done heretofore, so they prohibit and interdict as yet, that besides the Reformed worship and service no conventicles and meetings shall be kept in this province, whether it be in homes, barns, ships, barks, nor in the woods nor fields, upon forfeiture of fifty guldens for the first time, for every person, whether man or woman or child that shall have been present at such prohibited meetings, and twice as much for every person, whether it be man or woman or child, that has exhorted or talked in such prohibited meetings, or shall have lent his house, barn, or any place to that purpose; for ye second time twice as much, for the third time four

times as much, and arbitrary punishment besides (O'Callagan, *Laws and Ordinances of the New Netherlands*, 1638-1674).

From time to time in the records there were various notices of the Baptists and others. Governor Dongan reported, in 1684, as follows:

Here be not many of the Church of England; few Roman Catholicks; abundance of Quakers preachers men and women especially; singing Quakers; Ranting Quakers; Sabbatarians; Some Anabaptists; some Independents; some Jews; in short all sorts of opinions there are some, and the most part, of none at all (Ecclesiastical Records, II. 880).

Governor Andros had made inquiries, in 1678, in regard to New York. The following answer was given in regard to the Baptists:

There are religions of all sorts, one Church of England, several Presbyterians and Independents, Quakers and Anabaptists, of severall sects, some Jews, but Presbyterians and Independents most numerous and substantial (Ecclesiastical Records of New York, I. 709).

The friends of Governor Hunter, in 1717, addressed the Bishop of London, as follows:

My Lord, we believe it is not unknown to your Lordship, in what manner this Province is on all sides surrounded by New England, Connecticut, Road Island, and other places, all which are chiefly inhabited by professed Dissenters from the Church of England; a set of men whose forefathers had a high hand in that wicked rebellion which at the same time destroyed the Church and Monarchy of England; and that they still retain the very same principles, and profess the many various religions, of their Ancestors; the Presbyterian, the Anabaptist, the Independent and the Quaker have each a large lot in this Continent, and such seems to be the combination among them, (however they may differ in other matters), that they doe not willingly suffer any other plants to take root here. My Lord, these Sectarys have spread themselves so widely, and grown so numerous in North America, and are so firmly seated, that wee of the Communion of the established church seem strangers in the land, and as if our worship were of such a foreign

growth that it alone wanted the support of the royal hand. Neither my Lord is this Province begirt only with Colonies and Commonwealths of those men, but they grow up and thrive in the very midst of Her (Colonial Records of New York, III. 2015).

The Dutch ministers of New York, August 15, 1728, wrote to the Classis of Amsterdam, as follows:

Your Rev. Body must not conceive of us in any other light, as living among all sorts of errorists, as Independents, Puritans, Anabaptists, the New-born, Saturday folks, yea, as living among some of the most dreadful heretics, etc. (Ecclesiastical Records, IV. 2429).

Valentine Wightman, of Groton, Connecticut, began to hold meetings in Broad Street, New York, in 1711. He preached in the house of Nicholas Evers. Under his ministry many became serious and, in 1714, twelve persons were baptized. Wightman baptized, for fear of the mob, five women at night, and seven men stood ready to be baptized. The following text dropped into Mr. Evers' mind: "No man doeth anything in secret, when he himself seeketh to be known openly." Accordingly he and his brethren put off their design till morning, when Evers waited on the governor (Burnet)—told the case, and solicited protection, which the governor promised, and was as good as his word, for he and many of the gentry came to the water side, and the rite was performed in peace. The governor, as he stood by, was heard to say, "This was the ancient way of baptizing, and in my opinion much preferable to the practice of modern times" (Benedict, 541; John Dowling, *Sketches of New York Baptists, The Baptist Memorial*, 112, 113. 1849).

This church was said to have been Arminian in sentiment. Some of its members embraced Calvinistic doctrines, but the church continued only about eight years. The remnant became a part or arm of the Scotch Plains, New Jersey, church. In 1762 it became independent and settled John Gano as pastor.

The severity of the laws against the Baptists; the difficulties in which their houses of worship were licensed; the annoyances incident to their meetings; and the general difficulties attending their surroundings are all well illustrated by the documents here presented. These documents show the red tape and almost impossible legal barriers thrown around them. The following papers are taken from the *Documentary History of New York*:

## BAPTISTS

To His Excellency William Burnet Esquire, Capt General & Governor in chief of the province of New York & New Jersey and the Territories depending on them in America and Vice-Admiral of the same.

The humble petition of Nicholas Eyers brewer a baptist teacher in the City of New York.

Sheweth unto Yor Excellency that on the teusday of ffebry 1715 At a General quarter sessions at the peace held at the city of New York the hired house of Yor petitioner scituate in the broad street of this City between the house of John Michel Eyers and Mr. John Spratt was registerd for an anabaptist meeting house with this City. That the petitioner has it certified under the hands of sixteen inhabitants of good faith and credit that he has been a public preacher to a baptist congregacon within this City for four years and some of them for less. That (he) has it certified by the Honble Rip Van Dam, Esqr., one of his Majestyes Council for the province of New York to have hired a house in this City from him January first 1720 only to be a public meeting house for the Baptists, which he still keeps and as he has obtained from the Mayor and Recorder of this City an ample Certificate of his good behaviour and innocent conversacon. He therefore pubilcly prays

May it please yor Excellency

To grant and permitt this peticoner to Execute ministeriall function of a minister within this City to a baptist congregacon and to give him proteccion therein according to His Majesty's gracious indulgence extended towards the protestants dissenting from the established church he being willing to comply with all what is required by the Act of toleracon from dissenters of that perswasion in great Britain & being owned for a reverend brother by other baptist teachers And as in duty bound the peticoner shall ever pray, &c.

*Nicholas Eyers.*

Those may Certify all whom it may Concern that Nicholas Eyers of

this City of New York Brewer hired a House of me January ye 1st 1720 only to be a publick Meeting Place of the Baptists therein to Worship Almighty God and the said Nicholas Eyres was their Preacher. In testimony whereof I have hereunto my Hand January 19, 1721 In the Eighth Year of his Majesties Reign King George, &c.

Rip Van Dam.

*City of New York.*

These are to certify unto all whom it shall come or may concern that Nicholas Eyres brewer an inhabitant of the City of New York during all of the time of his residence in said City hath behaved himself well as becometh a good subject And that to the best of our Knowledge and understanding he is blameless and free from any notorious and publick slander and vice has gained himself the good name and reputation of his neighbors of being a sober just and honest man And is said to be an anabaptist as to his profession in religion In testimony whereof We the Mayor, Recorder & Aldermen of the City of New York whose names are hereunto subscribed have signed to these presents this thirteenth day of January in the eighth year of the reign of Our Sovereign Lord George by the grace of God of Great Britain France and Ireland Defender of the faith &c annoq Domini 1721-2.

R. Walter.

Davis Jamison.

*Wm Burnet &c.*

To all whom these presents shall come or may concern

WHEREAS Mr. Nich. Eyres Brewer and Inhabitant of ye City of New York pretending to be at present a Teacher or preacher of a Congregation of Anabaptists wch has had its beginning about five Years ago within this City and has so continued hitherto, and yt at quarter sessions of the Peace their House or Place of Meeting within this City has been Registered having a Certificate of his past good behaviour I have thought fit to grant unto said Nicholas Eyres that he may enjoy the Privilege, benefits and advantages which

dissenting Ministers may enjoy in great Britain by virtue of a Statute made and Enacted at Westminster Ent an Act for Exempting their maties Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penaltys of Certain Laws in the first Year of King Wm and Queen Mary Provided always that he shall comply with all the Rules and orders or directions mentioned & Expressed in the same statute with Regard to Anabaptists or such Dissenting Protestants who scruples the Baptizing Infants as far as can be and so long as he shall continue of the good behaviour towards (our) Lord the King and his Lege People in Witness &c dat ye 23d of January 1721-2.

W. Burnet.

By his Excellencys Command

Is: Bodin D: Sec'ry.

(Ecclesiastical Records of New York, III. 2187-2189).

The First Baptist Church of New York was organized June 10, 1762. The year previous sixteen Baptists emigrated from England and, not securing religious liberty in Massachusetts, purchased Block Island and settled there. Through John Clarke and Roger Williams, Block Island enjoyed liberty through the charter of Rhode Island. The king granted "that no person within the said colony at any time hereafter shall be in any way molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any difference in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of the said colony."

A Baptist church was formed in Warwick, in 1776, on the west side of the Hudson, fifty-four miles north of New York City, by the labors of James Benedict, of Ridgefield, Connecticut, who continued pastor till his death. From this church soon after several others were formed. Still further north on the east side of the river, in Dutchess county, there were Baptist churches at an earlier date than this. In Fishkill there was a church previous to 1745, which had a pastor by the name of Holstead. William Marsh, of New Jersey, in 1755, gathered a church in the township of Dover. He was succeeded by Samuel Waldo, who served the churches as pastor for thirty-five years. Simon Dakin, who had been a Newlight preacher, gathered a church in the northeast. On the eastern borders of the State still further north many churches were organized (*The Christian Review*, June, 1839. IV. 217).

The Baptists in Central New York did not begin until 1773. The first church

organized was Butternuts, out of which finally grew the Ostego Association. The old historian gives the following interesting story of the beginning of this church:

In the month of June, A. D. 1773, Ebenezer Knop and Increase Thurstin, removed with their families and settled on the Butternut Creek about fourteen miles from its mouth where it empties into the Undella river, about thirty miles southeast from the head of Susquehannah river. At the time there was no English settlement to the westward of them nearer than Niagara in the province of Upper Canada, which is upwards of two hundred miles distance, the immediate space was filled with several tribes of the aborigines nor any inhabitant within sixteen miles. A few more persons came on the same summer, and made some improvements, but in the winter they returned (except Benjamin Lull, jun., who had married Elizabeth the daughter of Ebenezer Knop and lived in the family with him) and these two families lived alone through the winter. Ebenezer Knop and his wife were members of the Baptist church in Warwick under the care of Rev. James Benedict. These persons notwithstanding their local situation, and their distance from civilized people, were not unmindful of the duties of religion; but upon their arrival in this inhospitable wild they set up a religious meeting, which was held in the house of Ebenezer Knop, in which they attended to singing and praying (A. Hosmer and J. Lawton, *A View of the Rise and Increase of the Churches Composing the Ostego Association*, Whitestown, 1800, *The Historical Magazine*. June, 1871. Second Series, IX, 391).

In 1773 there were in New York twelve Baptist ministers who had congregations, some of them pretty large, and some but small. There were four vacant congregations, but no one of them very large (*A Brief View of the State of Religious Liberty in the Colony of New York*. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Second Series, V. 141. Boston, 1814). In 1790 there were thirty-four Baptist churches in the State.

It was early in the eighteenth century that William Penn granted to David Evans and William Davis thirty thousand acres of land, to be divided and deeded to settlers from South Wales, some of whom had, at that time settled

in Radnor township, Chester county, Pennsylvania. This grant ever afterwards was known as "The Welsh Tract." It is located partly in Pecadur Hundred, New Castle county, Delaware, and partly in Cecil county, Maryland. Prominent among the original settlers upon the Welsh Tract were the founders of the Baptist meeting, who, with Thomas Griffith as their first minister, came from Pembroke and Carmarthenshire, South Wales, in 1701, and soon after erected a log meeting house in which they worshiped until the present structure was built in 1746. This was the third Baptist meeting house founded in America. The first house occupied the same location as the present one. The house constructed in 1746 is built of brick, and is said to contain some of the material used in the first building. The bricks were brought from England, and transported from New Castle, where they were landed in panniers upon mules. It is reported as still in a good state of preservation, regular services are held there, with a stated minister.

The following, "Our Beginnings as a Church," is taken from the old church records:

In the year 1701 some of us (who were members of the church of Jesus Christ in the countys of Pembroke and Carmathen, South Wales, in Great Britain, professing believers baptism; laying-on-of-hands; elections; and final perseverance in grace) were moved and encouraged in our own minds to come to these parts, viz.: Pennsylvania and after obtaining leave of the churches it seemed good to the Lord and to us, That we should be formed into a church order, as we were a sufficient number; and as one of us was a minister: that was accomplished and, withal letters commendatory were given us, that if we should meet with any congregations of Christian people, who held the same faith with us, we might be received by them as brethren in Christ.

Our number was sixteen; and, after bidding farewell to our brethren in Wales, we sailed from Milford-haven in the month of June, the year above mentioned, in a ship named James and Mary; and landed in Philadelphia the eighth of September following.

After landing, we were received in a loving manner (on account of the gospel) by the congregations meeting in Philadelphia and Pennopek who held the same faith with us (excepting the ordinance

of laying on of hands on every particular member) with whom we wished much to hold communion at the Lord's Table; but we could not be in fellowship with them in the Lord's Supper; because they bore not testimony to God touching the fore mentioned ordinance.

There were some among them who believed in the ordinance; but it was neither preached up, nor practiced in that church, for which cause we kept separate from them for some years.

We had several meetings on this account, but could not come to any agreement; yet were in union with them (except only in the Lord's Supper, and some particulars relative to a church).

After our arrival we lived much scattered for about a year and a half, yet kept up weekly and monthly meetings among our selves; during which time it pleased God to add to our number about twenty members, in which time we and many other Welsh people purchased a tract of land in New Castle county, on Delaware, which was called Welshtract; in the year 1703 we began to get our living out of it, and to set our meeting in order, and build a place of worship which was commonly known by the name of the Baptist meeting house by the Ironhill.

In the year 1706 we, and the congregation (meeting in Philadelphia and Pennepek) appointed a meeting to come together once more, in order to try at union in the good ways of the Lord setting up our prayers and supplications on this great occasion and purposing to do as the Lord would give us light.

The following considerations induced us to come to the above appointment:

- (1) Because they and we were so desirous of union in the privileges of the gospel.
- (2) Because we were not like to gain them by keeping asunder from them.
- (3) Because they without were taking occasion to mock because of so much variance among Baptists.
- (4) Because some of our members were far from us, and near them; and some of theirs near us and far from them; and that these

members might sit down in the meetings next to them.

**(5)** Because, as we all came to the yearly meetings, we might have a general union at the Lord's table.

In the said meeting (after seeking God by prayers and supplication) we came to the following conclusion, viz.: That they with us and we with them might hold transient or occasional communion; but that we might not be obliged to receive into membership any that were not under laying on of hands.

This agreement was set down in writing as follows:

At the house of Richard Niles in Radnor, Chester County, and province of Pennsylvania July 22, 1706.

The agreement of many persons met together from the congregation under the care of brother Thomas Griffith, and others, from the congregation (late under the care of our brother John Watts meeting at Pennepek, both congregations holding believer's baptism) to converse together on the subject of union and brotherly love, and occasional communion.

After making our supplication to God for a blessing, we came to the following resolutions, viz.: For as much as we are of the same faith and judgment in all things (as far as we understand one another, except in relation to the ordinance of laying on of hands), we have agreed in the following particulars:

**(1)** With regard to them who believe in the ordinance of laying on of hands on every believer. That they are to enjoy all liberty, within the bounds of brotherly love, to preach on the subject, and to practice according to their belief.

**(2)** And in regard to them who do not think it duty to practice the ordinance, that they be left to their liberty.

**(3)** And further it was agreed, That neither of the parties were to make opposition in any mixed assembly, but that the members, of either church might enjoy occasional communion one with the other (Records of the Welsh Tract Meeting Pencadur Hundred, New Castle County, Delaware, 1701-1828, 3-10. *Historical and Biographical Papers*, IV. Wilmington, 1904).

The gospel was preached in this meeting in Welsh until 1800; and for several years the records were kept in the Welsh language.

There came from Virginia into Delaware, at the close of 1778, Elijah Baker, and in the spring of 1779 he was followed by Philip Hughes of the same State. They labored together as evangelists for about twelve months, preaching at Broad Creek, Gravelly Branch, and other places. Many converts “were baptized on profession of faith and repentance.” They prepared material and resolved to build churches. At first they were known as Separate Baptists, but shortly afterwards the distinction was dropped. They were not only well received but were assisted in their efforts, by ministers and laymen, in organizing churches and ordaining ministers.

These men were instrumental in founding twenty-two churches in Virginia, Maryland and Delaware, and spent much time in “visiting them, as fathers do their children.” The Salisbury Association was organized by them. It takes its name from a town in Maryland near the Delaware line, where this association was formed.

Baker died at the home of Dr. Robert Lemon, who was for years the moderator of this association. He testified to his exalted character, the faithfulness and power of his preaching, and his triumph in the hour of his death, which seemed to be a translation rather than a painful dissolution. Morgan Edwards gave an interesting account of how Baker came to leave Virginia, where he was born in 1742, and was baptized by Samuel Harris, in 1769. He suffered much for the cause of the truth. He came into Delaware upon “an invitation from Thomas Batston, Esq., who had heard him preach through the grates in Accomack jail about the year 1777. The rude Virginians, in order to get rid of him, put him on board a privateer, where he suffered much abuse, but he continued to sing, and pray, and exhort notwithstanding, till the crew was tired, and then let him alone, saying, 'He is not worth a curse'; but the privateer being detained in the harbor by contrary wind, the crew suspected the cause was that preaching fellow, and therefore put him on board another vessel; but the wind continued contrary, that vessel began to be of the same mind with the privateer, and therefore shifted him to a third, and the third put him ashore. When Jonah found himself on dry land he complied with Squire Batston's invitation.” And be it said to the credit of Delaware that she had no prison, like Virginia, or whipping post, like Massachusetts, for

Baptists, who were left undisturbed in their views and practices.

The account which Edwards gives of his co-laborer is not without interest:

Rev. Philip Hughes shares in the praise of Mr. Baker, as they were fellow laborers in most of the good that was done in this and other States. He was born in Colver county, November 28, 1750, bred a Churchman, avowed his present sentiments, August 10, 1773, when he was baptized by Rev. David Thompson, called to the ministry in Rowanty church, was ordained at an Association held in Virginia, August 13, 1776. He published a volume of hymns in 1782, many of which are of his own composing; also an answer to a Virginia clergyman on the subject of baptism in 1784. He was also obliged twice to appear on the stage to dispute on the subject—once in Fouling Creek in Maryland in 1782. His antagonist was a Methodist preacher of the name of Willis. Victory was announced by both parties, but facts varied much, for after the dispute three class leaders and many others were baptized by Mr. Hughes. The other dispute was held near the mouth of the Potomac, in Virginia, in the year 1785. Mr. Hughes' challenger was one Coles, another Methodist preacher. Here the victory was decisive, for twenty-two of the audience were baptized the next day, and soon after as many more by Rev. Lewis Lunsford (Morgan Edwards, *Materials for a Baptist History of Delaware*, 247, 248. Cook, *The Early and Later Delaware Baptists*, 22-24. Philadelphia, 1880).

The Sounds Baptist Church was the second church organized in Delaware and was one of the constituent churches of the Salisbury Association. It was formed August 12, 1779, with twenty-one members. During the first thirteen years six preachers came from this body (Scharf, *History of Delaware*, II. 1342. Philadelphia, 1888).

The laws of Connecticut were rigid against all sectaries. The following law was enacted by the General Court, in October, 1656:

That no town within this jurisdiction shall entertain any Quakers, Ranters, Adamites, or such like notorious heretics, nor suffer them to continue in them above the space of 14 days, upon the penalty of five pounds.

In 1658, the Court of New Haven made a similar law increasing the penalties

and prohibiting all conversation of the common people with any heretics (Quakers, Baptists, etc.) and of all persons giving them any entertainment upon penalty of five pounds (Trumbull, *History of Connecticut*, I. 299, 300).

The following is the enactment of May, 1723:

And it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that whatsoever person not being a lawfully allowed (Congregational) minister of the gospel shall presume to profane the holy sacraments by administering them to any person or persons whatsoever, and being thereof convicted before the County Court, in such County where such an offence shall be committed, shall incur the penalty of ten pounds for every such an offence and suffer corporeal punishment by whipping, not exceeding thirty stripes for each offence (Records of the State of Connecticut, V. May, 1723. Trumbull, II. 38).

In December, 1740, John Merriman, pastor of the Baptist church at Wallingford, invited Rev. Philemon Robbins, pastor of the Congregational Church in Bradford, to preach for him. Mr. Robbins accepted the invitation and preached to the Baptist Church in Wallingford, January 6, 1741; for this offense, the New Haven Congregational Association laid Mr. Robbins under censure, and finally deposed him from the ministry. A majority of the church in Bradford decided with the pastor rather than with the New Haven Association, renounced the Saybrook and adopted the Cambridge platform; for this act the New Haven Association held the Bradford church under censure till 1748 (Trumbull, II.). In 1741, Rev. Mr. Humphreys, of Derby, a Congregational minister, preached to a Baptist church, and on that account was soon after deprived of a seat in the New Haven Association (Trumbull, II.).

In February, 1744, fourteen persons were arrested in Sayville for holding a Baptist meeting; the charge brought against them was, "for holding meeting contrary to law, on God's holy Sabbath day." They were arraigned, tried, fined, and driven on foot, through a deep mud, to New London jail, a distance of twenty-five miles, where they were thrust into prison, without food, fire, or beds, and kept in dreadful sufferings for several weeks, and probably would have perished had not some Baptist brethren, residing in New London, Great Neck, carried them provisions. One of the imprisoned was an infant, who afterwards became the wife of Mr. Stephen Webb, of Chester. Another was an

unconverted man by the name of Job Buckley; the prayers and Christian patience with which these Christians bore their sufferings in jail were blessed to his conversion; when they were released they formed a church in Sayville, placed his name first on the list of constituent members (Trumbull, II.).

The earliest operations of the Baptists in Connecticut were commenced by a small colony from Rhode Island, in the year 1705. It was in New London county, in the southeast part of the State. This part of the State was a distinguished resort for the advocates of the standing order. A great excitement was raised on account of the baptisms, and the Legislature was asked to suppress the innovations. At this time no Baptist church was formed, and the believers under this strong opposition united with a church in Rhode Island. Here, however, at a later date, Baptist churches multiplied and sent out branches in various directions; and here were revivals great and powerful.

The first church organized in the colony was planted at Groton in 1705, by Valentine Wightman. The second was organized at Waterford, then a part of New London, about the year 1710. The third was gathered at Wallingford, in 1735, with Timothy Waters as pastor, who was succeeded by John Merriman. Three were established in 1743: one in Stonington, one in Lyne, and one in Clochester. A seventh was gathered at Saybrook in 1744.

Their progress at first was extremely slow, and much embarrassed; they had to work their way against the deep-rooted prejudices of a people who had always been taught that the Baptists were the descendants of the mad men of Münster; that they propagated errors of a pestilential and dangerous kind; that they were aiming to subvert all the established forms of religion in the land, and by their disorganizing and heretical principles to ruin all the Pedobaptist churches in the land; and for the people to hear them preach, or for the magistrates to permit them to meet, was an enormous crime.

These were only shadowy obstacles compared with the severity of the laws with which the Connecticut rulers had fenced their ecclesiastical establishment. In the New Light stir, the foundations of this establishment were sensibly shaken; many ministers opposed this extraordinary revival as the fruit of fanaticism and the devil; divisions ensued; Baptist principles almost everywhere prevailed; separate meetings were set up in towns and parishes; and many of the New Lights became Baptists.

By 1789, there were in the State about thirty Baptist churches, and twenty

ministers. From that date the denomination increased much more rapidly than it had formerly; so that in 1795 the number of churches amounted to sixty, the ministers about forty, and the communicants a little over three thousand five hundred. Baptist churches were found in almost every township in the State. In 1842 there were over one hundred churches and sixteen thousand members.

“The first Baptist church in Vermont was organized at Shaftsbury in the latter part of August, 1768, at a time when the inhabitants were greatly excited over the contentions between New Hampshire. And New York, both claiming jurisdiction over the New Hampshire Grants. These grants had suddenly risen in importance, and a very strong current of immigration had set toward them for eight years previous.

“The earliest records of this pioneer church have been carefully preserved, and, in quaint language, tell the story of its origin, and incidentally of the other Shaftsbury churches. They reveal, too, somewhat clearly the character of the founders of this early church, and the course of their church life. The first entry in the old church records is as follows:

#### **Shaftsbury in the year, 1768**

**1st.** A number of Christians, that had before Covenanted to watch over one another for Good, had much labour about the Doctrins of Christ and the form of his house. Some of them hold that the Doctrin of laying on of hands is to be Imposed on common believer, others hold not. Finally a held That laying on of hands Should not hinder Our building together in Church State, Not holding it as a Term of Communion.

**2ndly.** We had a dispute about Telling Experiences. Finally we agreed that Telling of Experiences of a work of Grace upon the heart of those who offer themselves to the Church, is in the general, Essential Steps toward admitting members Into the Church.

August ye latter End a number of Christians being met Together after labor upon points forementioned we proceeded into the Following order:

Cyprian Downer, John Millington, Samuel Waters, Icabod West, Reuben Ellis, Thomas Matteson, Lydia Barr, Join together in a most

Solemn Covenant as a Church of Christ to watch over one another in the fear of and to walk in all the Laws and ordinances of the Lord as members of Christ's church, depending upon God for Grace.

“That the church prospered in its earlier years is evident from the fact that, in August, 1774, they wrote that they had thirty-nine members, twenty of whom were men. Thomas Mattison, one of the original members, was one of the first settlers in the town, and its first town clerk, a position which he held for more than forty years.

“For twelve years the first church in Vermont was without a pastor. There were two members, with recognized ministerial gifts, whose record was interwoven with that of the church, and illustrative of its life (Crocker, *History of the Baptists of Vermont*, 15, 16. Bellows Falls, Vt., 1913).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:**

Barnas Sears, The New York Baptist Missionary Convention, *The Christian Review*, IV. 217-243. Boston, 1839.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE BAPTISTS IN MARYLAND AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

Maryland—Claims of the Roman Catholics—Bishop Gilmour—Cardinal Gibbons—Lord Baltimore—His Views of Liberty—A Forced Baptism of Infants—The Protestant Charter—Ruffini—De Courcey—Religious Provisions of the Charter—The Testimony of Dr. Brownson—An Attempt to Establish the Roman Catholic Religion in 1638—The Famous Act of 1649—The Political Fortunes of Baltimore at the Time—Population Mostly Protestant—The Opinion of the Historians—The Law a Compromise Measure Between Roman Catholics and the Puritans—Governor Stone a Protestant—No Liberty of Conscience Allowed—Roman Catholic View—The Terrible Penalties—The Virgin Mary—The Sabbath—Imprisonments and Public Whippings—The Baptists in Maryland—New Hampshire—The Baptist Church at Newton—Other Baptist Churches.

The most extravagant claims have been made by Roman Catholics in regard to the introduction of religious liberty into Maryland. Bishop Gilmour says:

Seeing how the world writes and speaks of Catholics, you will hardly be prepared to believe that the Catholics in Maryland were not only the first, but the only people who, uninfluenced of their own free will, ever did proclaim religious freedom in these United States (Gilmour, *Catholic National Series, Sixth Reader*, 467).

Cardinal Gibbons says:

Turning to our own country, it is with no small degree of satisfaction that I point to the State of Maryland as the cradle of civil and religious liberty, and “the land of the sanctuary.” Of the thirteen original American colonies, Maryland was the only one settled by Catholics. She was also the only one that spread aloft over her fair lands the banner of liberty of conscience and invited the oppressed of other colonies to seek an asylum beneath its shadow (Gibbons, *Faith of our Fathers*).

For other Roman Catholic claims see *Contemporary Review*, September, 1876. Cardinal Gibbons does not appear to understand liberty of conscience. For further on he remarks:

“The church is, indeed, intolerant in this sense, that she can never confound truth with error; nor can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject the truth when its claims are

convincingly brought home to his mind” (Gibbons).

The facts are that religious liberty did not exist in Maryland in colonial days, and that Maryland did not carry a single one of its institutions into the national life. These statements are upheld by all of the great Maryland authorities, and even the toleration extended to alien faiths came through Protestant legislative enactment.

Maryland was settled by Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic. James I, who gave him the charter, was a bigoted member of the Church of England. “James is precisely the historical prodigy, to whom a reflecting mind would suppose the horrors of his parentage naturally gave birth. In royal chronology he stands between two axes,—the one that cleft the ivory neck of his beautiful mother—the other that severed the irresolute but refined head of his son and heir. His father, doubtless, had been deeply concerned in the shocking murder of his mother’s second husband. Cradled on the throne of Scotland; educated for kingship by strangers; the ward of a regency; the shuttlecock of ambitious politicians; the hope and tool of two kingdoms, James lived during an age in which the struggle of opinion and interest, of prerogative and privilege, of human right and royal power, of glimmering science and superstitious quackery, might well have bewildered an intellect, brighter and calmer than his” (Brantz Mayer, *Calvert and Penn; or the Growth of Civil and Religious Liberty in America*, 25, 26. Philadelphia, 1852).

James would not tolerate a convert to the Roman Catholic religion; but he promoted the old Catholic families to high political honors (Von Raumer, *History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, II.). He was, in 1611, mad against heretics and at this date Calvert was his trusted lieutenant. How much Calvert had to do with the burning of Edward Wightman and Bartholomew Legate is not known; but he was at Royston when Wightman was arrested by the king (Neill, *Terra Mariae*). The king was greatly agitated against Vorstius, a heretic of Holland. He wrote a book against the heresies of Vorstius and desired “to remand to hell such doctrines” (Wilhelm, *Sir George Calvert*; Maryland Historical Society Publications, No. 20) . The author of a part of this book was Calvert (Domestic State Papers, James I. 1611-18, III.). As a result the books of Vorstius were publicly burned.

Calvert wrote a tract entitled: “*The Answer to Tom Tell Troth, the Practice of*

*Princes and the Lamentations of the Kirk.*” Concerning the Independents he says: “I write not to confute these learned scribblers (more worthy to be contemned than answered), but to advertise your highness of them, that by an *obsta principiis*, you may upon such smoke prepare all things needful to quench such a fire, when it shall flame and first break out, which it may do when you least look for it; for by nature these spirits are fiery hotspurs, and fitter for anything than that they most profess, Piety and Patience” (Streeter, *Maryland Two Hundred Years Ago*).

Baltimore has been summed up in the following manner:

“With reference to Lord Baltimore, the fact is patent that he was not a religious zealot, but a shrewd man of affairs; that, while he was more than willing to furnish an asylum for the people of his own persuasion in religion, he was much too wise to risk his own interest and theirs by adopting a policy that would raise against him the opposition of Protestant princes and people, whereby his charter would be sure to slip out of his grasp. His life, spent wholly in England, was one long struggle so to conform his administration to the revolutions in the superior government there, that he should not loose cast in the court, and so loose his plantation in the New World. Both James I, from whom the charter originated, and Charles I, by whom it was maintained, were violent defenders of the Protestant faith. They could readily confer privileges upon a favorite, even though he went beyond High Church all the way to Rome, but only in case he did not allow his ecclesiastical connection to influence his course as a public man and lord proprietor. Fortunate for his fame, fortunate for his church, which has scarcely another such an instance of leniency and liberality to show, fortunate alike for the Romanists and Protestants of Maryland at that day, that so singular an anomaly occurred” (Edwin John, *Maryland Congregationalists Two Hundred Years Ago*, *The Congregational Quarterly*, April, 1868. X. 202, 203).

Lord Baltimore in the colony, in 1628, forced the baptism of a Protestant child against the wish and protest of the father. The record is as follows:

Lord Baltimore, arrived in the colony about the 23d July, 1627, and with the two seminary priests Longvyll and Anth. Smith, but left for

England with Longvyll, and returned with another priest named Hackett and about forty Papists. Every Sunday, mass and all the ceremonies of the Church of Rome are performed. The child of one William Pool, a Protestant, was baptized into the Church of Rome contrary to the will of his father (Colonial State Papers).

The bulwark of the liberties of Maryland rested in its Protestant charter. It was the grant of a Protestant king, of an intensely Protestant government. The laws of England were at this time very stringent toward Roman Catholics. The zeal against Roman Catholicism was so intense that the residence of the Spanish minister was watched to see who went there for mass. "The glory of Maryland toleration," says Kennedy, "which has been so fruitful a theme of panegyric to American historians, is truly the charter, not to the celebrated act of 1649. There is more freedom of conscience, more real toleration, a hundred fold, in the charter of a Protestant prince to a Catholic nobleman, than in that act so often called to our remembrance" (Kennedy, *George Calvert*).

Ethan Allen says:

This charter made all the English emigrants English subjects, with all the rights and privileges of such. It gave them also, together with Lord Baltimore, authority to make all needful local or provincial laws, without reference to the king or parliament, not conflicting with the English law, and providing that no interpretation of the charter should be made by which God's holy rites of worship and the true Christian religion should in anywise suffer change, prejudice, or diminution. All churches to be built were to be consecrated according to the laws of England (Allen, *The History of Maryland*, II. Philadelphia, 1866).

The position of James may be easily understood. "Toward the Catholics, however, from the time of his first speech to the Parliament," says Ruffini, Professor in the University of Turin, "he promised mildness, and that promise he kept in the application of the laws passed against them by his predecessors. But he did not abolish those laws; indeed, the jealous control of the Puritans compelled him to maintain the so-called laws of conformity even in regard to the Catholics. The latter, who expected something different from the son of Mary Stuart, turned against him, and some of the more fanatical of

them entered into the conspiracy known as the Gunpowder Plot, the purpose of which was to blow up the king and Parliament (1605). For this incredible outrage the whole body of Catholics had to suffer. The laws against them were sharpened, and they all had to take the oath of allegiance. They had to swear to recognize James as their legitimate sovereign, to acknowledge that the Pope had no power to depose the king or to absolve his subjects from their oath of fealty, and to repudiate the Jesuitical doctrine—then in full flower—which justified regicide. The Popes—Paul V (1606), Urban VIII (1626), and Innocent X (1648) (whose decree, however, was not published)—prohibited the taking of this oath under pain of excommunication, but the majority of English Catholics had to obey. Thereby they secured for themselves a certain amount of toleration which, under Charles I, principally owing to the queen, who was French and a Catholic, increased to such an extent as to become not the least of the charges which the Protestant dissenters brought against the crown” (Ruffini, *Religious Liberty*, 150, 151. New York, 1912). It was under these conditions that the charter of Maryland was granted, under the protection of a Protestant king.

De Courcey, an eminent Roman Catholic author, frankly avows that this liberty came through the Protestant charter. He says:

When a State has the happiness of possessing unity of religion, and that religion the truth, we cannot conceive how the government can facilitate the division of creeds. Lord Baltimore had seen too well how the English Catholics were crushed by the Protestants, as soon as they were the strongest and most numerous; he should then have foreseen that it would have been so in Maryland, so that the English Catholics, instead of Ending liberty in America, only changed their bondage. Instead, then, of admiring the liberality of Lord Baltimore, we prefer to believe that he obtained this charter from Charles I only on the formal condition of admitting Protestants on an equal footing with Catholics (De Courcey, *The Catholic Church in the United States*, 30. Edited by Shea. New York, 1879).

There are two provisions in the charter looking toward religious matters. The first is a general one, which is found in most of the English charters, that he “being animated with a laudable and pious zeal for extending the Christian religion” (Bozman, *History of Maryland*, II., 9. Baltimore, 1837). The other

provision is a distinct check on the Roman Catholics. The charter provided that the colony should be governed on Protestant lines. The words of the charter are:

And furthermore the patronages and avowsons of all the churches which (with the increasing worship and religion of Christ), within the said religion, islands, islets, and limits aforesaid, hereafter shall happen to be built; together with license, and faculty of erecting and founding churches, chapels and places of worship, in convenient and suitable places, within the premises, and of causing. The same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England (Bowman, II).

Baltimore was no democrat and had no sympathy with the common people. "For instead of being a leader of men by gentleness," says Mereness, "sympathy, and persuasive appeal, he was cold, stern, and was not over scrupulous as to his choice of measures for immediate triumph over the opposition" (Newton D. Mereness, *Maryland as a Proprietary Province*, 33, 24. New York, 1901). "Baltimore had not the slightest sympathy," says Neill, "with popular government, and he viewed with displeasure the firm and manly opposition of the Parliament to the arrogant demands of the King."

"An analysis of the charter proves it to be destitute of a single democratic element. By it he and his heirs were created true and absolute Lords and Proprietaries of the region; with free, full, and absolute power to ordain, make, and enact laws; with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the provinces, and with authority to appoint all judges, justices and constables.

"The freemen could only meet in Assembly with his permission, and the eighth section expressly provides that he may make wholesome ordinances from time to time, to be kept and observed, on the ground that it might be necessary, before the freeholders of the said provinces could be convened for the purpose. As he could not, by the laws of England, make the Church of Rome the established church, a check was held on all religious denominations, by securing the patronage of all churches that might be built" (Neill, *Terra Mariae*, 54, 56. Philadelphia, 1867).

Dr. Brownson, himself a Roman Catholic, says:

But the first government of Maryland was not founded on the

distinctive principles of American freedom. It was a feudal government; and the charter instituting it provided for a colonial aristocracy by subinfeudation. It recognized religious toleration; but toleration is not a principle of American freedom. The American principle is religious liberty, not religious toleration (Brownson, *Quarterly Review*, 253. A. D., 1856).

Streeter, in his address before the Maryland Historical Society, in 1852, says:

The policy of Lord Baltimore, in regard to religious matters in his colony, has, in some particulars at least, been misapprehended, and therefore misstated. The assertion has long passed uncontradicted, that toleration was promised to the colonists in the first conditions of plantations; that the rights of conscience were recognized in a law passed by the first Assembly held in the colony; and that the principal officers, from the year 1636 or 7, bound themselves by oath not to molest, on account of his religion, any one professing to believe in Jesus Christ. I can find no such authority for any one of these statements. Lord Baltimore's first and earliest conditions breathe not a word on the subject of religion; no act recognizing the principles of toleration was passed in the first or following Assembly, until fifteen years after the first settlement, at which time a Protestant had been appointed governor, and a majority of the Burgesses were of the same faith; and when, for the first time, a clause involving a promise not to molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ; and "particularly a Roman Catholic" (Streeter. Also Mereness. Joseph Bangard, *Tragic Scenes in the History of Maryland*, 54. Boston, 1866).

Upon the charter Edwin D. Neill says:

When we examine the Maryland charter it is found to contain neither the elements of civil or religious liberty, but to be just such an instrument as the friend of James and his son Charles would wish (Neill, Lord Baltimore and Maryland Toleration, *The Contemporary Review*, September, 1876, p. 620).

The General Assembly, at St. Mary's, on March 19, 1638, attempted to establish the Roman Catholic religion as that of the State. "Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights and liberties safe, whole and

inviolable in all things” (Proceedings of the Acts of the Assembly of Maryland, I. 40). The reason Holy Church was not made the establishment is obvious. “It is probable,” says Bozman, “however, that they felt themselves checked in carrying these intentions into execution by the reflection of their being still under the superintending domination of the Protestant hierarchy of the mother country, and therefore they permitted heretics to become colonists among them; though it does not appear that these heretics or Protestants enjoyed any immunity than a mere toleration of residence and a security in the protection of their persons and property” (Bozman, II.). It is certain Protestants were annoyed and had few or no privileges.

Many instances of this kind could be cited. The action of the Roman Catholic priesthood may be thus illustrated:

“A certain one altogether to us unknown, but zealous in the religion of the Protestants, and staying with a host more fervent than himself, being bitten by a snake, expected death every instant. One of our people understanding this, having taken a surgeon with him to the sick man, who was now said to be deprived of his senses, was anxious for his soul, that he might in a measure heal it also. But his host perceiving the thing, interrupted his pious endeavors. And when the priest could think of no other opportunity, he resolved to spend the night with the sick man. But the host threw an impediment in the way of this also, and lest by night access might be granted to the priest, he set a watch who could sleep in a bed opposite to the door of the chamber. Nevertheless, the priest taking advantage of every means, at an unseasonable hour of the night, when he supposed the guard most oppressed with sleep, without his being aroused, found a way of entrance to the sick man, and admitted him into the Church as he desired it” (Allen).

Not a Protestant minister, at this time, had been in Maryland.

Much has been said of the famous act of 1649. Lord Baltimore was in dire straits on account of affairs in England. The king had been beheaded, and Baltimore was compelled to accede to the demands of the Parliament. The following facts are related by Streeter that upon “March 26, 1642, Lord Baltimore was brought before the House of Lords on charges, the precise nature of which is not now known, but in consequence of which he was

placed under heavy bonds not to leave the kingdom.

“It is possible that these charges had something to do with his Lordship’s management of his colony. Certain it is, that, from this time, he manifested great anxiety to avoid every act which would expose him to the charge of contravening, by his colonial policy, the established laws of the realm. His firmness in this particular, and his watchfulness in regard to compromising his proprietary rights, even placed him in opposition to the Jesuit missionaries in the colony, to whose aid he for a time refused to allow others to be sent, unless they would pledge themselves to make their practices conformable to the policy of the English government, and leave him to the full exercise of his prerogatives” (Streeter, *Maryland, Two Hundred Years Ago*, 29, 30. Baltimore, 1852).

Under this pressure, August 17, 1648, Stone was appointed governor of the province. He was an intense Protestant, of the Parliamentary party, from Northampton county, Virginia (Allen, *History of Maryland*); so were his secretary and a majority of the Council. The population, on account of a rebellion, was mostly Protestant. The Assembly, April 21, 1649, wrote a letter to Baltimore in which mention is made of the rebellion “in which time most of your lordship’s loyal friends here were spoiled of their whole estate and sent away as banished persons out of the province. Those few that remained were plundered and deprived in a manner of all livelihood and subsistence” (Bozman, II. 665). Ingle had banished the Roman Catholics from Maryland and as Hammond truly says, only “a few Papists” were left (Hammond, *Leah and Rachael*, 22. London, 1656). That state of affairs continued throughout the century. Dr. Hawks says: “It is indeed true that at this time, 1692, from the testimony of an eye witness, there were thirty Protestants to one Papist in the province” (Hawks, *Maryland Ecclesiastical Contributions*), Dr. Bray, in a Memorial to the House of Bishops, in 1700, says: “The Papists in this province appear to me not to be above the twelfth part of the inhabitants.”

This fact was recognized by Lord Baltimore. “Witness the fact of so large a portion of the first Colonists being Protestants; his invitation to Captain Fleet; his invitation to Puritan Colonists of Massachusetts to come and reside in the Colony in 1643 (Hawks, *Maryland*); his constituting Colonel Stone his Governor in 1648, who was a Protestant, and was to bring in five hundred Colonists; his admitting the Puritans of Virginia in the same year; and in the

year following creating a new County for Robert Brooke, a Puritan, and his Colonists” (Allen, *Maryland Toleration; or, Sketches of the Early History of Maryland to the year 1650*, 36. Baltimore, 1855).

James McSherry, who was a Roman Catholic, admits that “hitherto, the most of those appointed to office by the lord Proprietary were Catholics, as were a majority of the early settlers; but now, the Puritans being triumphant at home, he hoped by this measure to propitiate them, at the same time, that, by the oath of office, he secured to all Christians the full toleration which had hitherto been observed” (McSherry, *History of Maryland*, 65. Baltimore, 1849).

The act seems to have been a compromise measure between the Puritans and Lord Baltimore as a protection for the latter, in this critical period. However, for many months after its passage the act was not approved by Lord Baltimore (The Record Book. Annapolis Manuscripts). This is the general view. For example, Browne says:

In the wording of this act we see evident marks of a compromise between the different sentiments of the Assembly. It was not such an act as a body of zealous Catholics or of zealous Protestants would have passed, nor, in all probability, did not come up, to Baltimore’s ideas of toleration (Browns, *Maryland the History of a Palatinate*).

“My investigation into the origin of these laws,” says Streeter, “has convinced me that they originated primarily neither with Lord Baltimore nor the Assembly; that their provisions sprang from no congenial principles at that day active in either the Catholic or Protestant divisions of the church; that they were drawn up in deference to the progressive doctrines and increasing political strength of the Independents in England, as well as to meet the wants of the mixed population of the province; and their adoption was an act prompted far less by feelings of religious benevolence than by civil necessity” (Streeter).

Charles F. Mayer says:

The Protestant population appears to have been largely predominant, and it is therefore to be inferred that such was the prevailing religious cast of the Delegates, the Burgesses, when the Legislature paved the Act (Mayer, First annual Discourse before the Maryland Historical Society, 31. Baltimore, 1844).

Hawks, who lauds Lord Baltimore on all occasions, concedes that the famous law was created by Protestants. He says:

It has commonly been supposed, that the merit of having thus early made an escape from the spirit of bigotry and intolerance, belongs almost exclusively to the Roman Catholics; but from this testimony a contemporary, such would appear not to have been the fact. There doubtless were Roman Catholics in the legislature to share the honor with their companions in that body; but our authority informs us, that divers others had moved into the colony, every possible encouragement had been given for such removals, by the Lord Proprietor (Francis L. Hawks, *A Narrative of Events Connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland*, 34, 35. New York, 1839).

The Act (Bozman, II. 661) allows liberty of conscience to none, and toleration to some. "Toleration is not liberty," asserts Brownson, "and the act of the Maryland Assembly does not assert religious liberty. It tolerates all Christian denominations holding the divinity of our Lord, and belief in the ever adorable Trinity; but it does not recognize this liberty as a right prior to and independent of the civil power. The civil power grants or confers the right; and it does not recognize it as an existing right which the State cannot take away, and which it is bound to respect and protect for each one and all its citizens. In this respect, the Puritans of Massachusetts really went further in the assertion of religious liberty than the Catholics of Maryland (Brownson, *Quarterly Review*, 1856, p. 255) .

"The competency of the State in spirituals," he continues, "was a fundamental principle with the old Puritans; and this is the fundamental principle of that religious freedom, not granted, but recognized by the American people in their institutions. It is the Puritan doctrine of the spiritual incompetency of the State and the freedom and independence of the church, rather than the doctrine of toleration of the Maryland Assembly, that has prevailed and become incorporated in the fundamental institutions of the country."

"The pretense that religious liberty was first understood and applied by Lord Baltimore and his colonists, we look upon as ridiculous, notwithstanding it was supported by names we cannot but respect" (Ibid, 257).

The following is the first section enacted:

That whatever person or persons within this province and the islands thereto belonging shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is curse him, or deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead or any of the said three persons of the Trinity or the unity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful speeches, words or language concerning the said Holy Trinity, or any of the said three persons, shall be punished with death, and confiscation or forfeiture of all of his or her lands and goods to the Lord Proprietary and his heirs.

A person who denied, or made speeches in regard to, the “Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Saviour” or the holy Apostles or Evangelists shall be fined twenty-five pounds; in case he has no money, to be publicly whipped; for the second offense he shall be whipped and imprisoned; and for the third his good shall be forfeited and he shall forever be banished from the province. This law discriminates against the high and against the poor.

Other portions of the charter provide for fines, imprisonment and public whippings for religious beliefs. A Roman Catholic sums up the acts in the following words:

The assumption that the Maryland Colony was “The Day Star of American Freedom” (New York, 1855), enables the author (Mr. Davis) to give a poetical title to his volume, but it has very little historical foundation. We should not make that assumption exclusively for any one of the colonies, and, least of all for a colony which, however respectable in itself, exerted no leading influence on its sister colonies. Never in our colonial days was Maryland the heart and soul of the Anglo-American colonies. We have a high esteem for the first settlers of Maryland, and in the elevation of character, nobility of sentiment, and private and domestic virtues, they were unsurpassed, if not unrivaled, by the first settlers of any colony; but we cannot learn from history that they were propagandists, that they sent out missionaries and teachers to the other colonies, or that they were induced by their efforts or example to adopt the free institutions they had founded. Even if Maryland

had the advantage of priority of time, we cannot award her the claim Mr. Davis sets up in her behalf. The leading colonies—those which exerted the greatest influence in moulding others, and determining the character of the American institutions—were unquestionably Virginia and Massachusetts. Maryland in her general colonial action, followed Virginia, and even now belongs to the Virginia family of States. We say not this in disparagement of Maryland, to which we are attached by the strongest of ties, but in vindication of simple historical truth (Brownson, *Quarterly Review*, 1856, 252, 253).

Gambrall further sums up the law as follows:

“The whole animus of the law, legitimate but not exalted, is expressed in the words ‘for the more quiet and peaceable government of the province and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants here.’ The whole is a matter of policy, good policy, it is true, but policy; the more quiet and peaceable government. No recognition of a man’s inherent and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. He must profess to believe in Jesus Christ; so far must he be orthodox. A Jew might be placed under the ban; a Unitarian was liable to be punished with death and confiscation of goods, and family left in poverty, the goods to go to the proprietary. There was no protection for such. By the first clause of the Act they were liable to punishment and by this clause they might be molested, disturbed at pleasure.

“And this is all there is of this much vaunted law. Surely it must be of a general poverty of claims that so much is made of this one instance. There was no religion in it whatever, no recognition of inherent human rights, only a wise adaptation to an emergency by a shrewd and observant man, who felt that the whole drift of the times and the powers of numbers were against him and the general policy of his administration. He on the one side and the colonists on the other, each of free will considered the other, and united to establish by statute what had been from the beginning the common practice of the province, a practice always rendered necessary by imperative circumstances” (Theodore C. Gambrall, *History of Early Maryland*,

117, 188. New York, 1893).

The Quakers were, in 1659, persecuted in Maryland. In carrying out their practices they were accused of disturbing the government. "They were all, therefore, ordered to leave the province, before the 5<sup>th</sup> of the following month, under the penalty of being treated as rebels and traitors." When they paid no attention to this decree they were ordered to be "banished and it was directed that if found in the province again they should be whipped thirty lashes at every constable's till they were out of it; no person was allowed to harbor or conceal them, upon a pain of a fine of five hundred pounds of tobacco" (Allen).

Charles Calvert visited England in 1675 and there he met a serious criticism against his government. A letter had been written by the Rev. Mr. Yeo, of Patuxent, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, presenting a picture which it must be confessed was hideous enough. "The province of Maryland," thus he wrote, "is in a most deplorable condition for want of an established ministry. Here are ten or twelve counties, and in them at least twenty thousand souls; and but three Protestant ministers of the Church of England. The priests are provided for, and the Quakers take care of those who are speakers; but no care is taken to build up Churches in the Protestant religion. The Lord's day is profaned; religion is despised, and all of the notorious vices are committed; so that it has become a Sodom of uncleanness and a pest house of iniquity" (Hawks).

In this territory and under these conditions the Baptists were slow to enter. There were doubtless some Baptists in Maryland in 1649. "The language of this enactment," says Hawks, "furnishes us some evidence, of the mixed character of the population, in the enumeration of those terms of personal reproach which were made punishable; we find mention among them, 'Heretic, Schismatic, Idolater, Puritan, Independent, Presbyterian, Popish priest, Jesuit, Jesuited papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, and Separatist'; and it is not improbable, that the individual application which had been made to these several terms, led to their specific enumeration; it is to be supposed therefore, that there were some belonging to most of the classes above named" (Hawks).

The church at Chestnut Grove was founded in 1742. A layman by the name of Henry Sator, a General Baptist from England, settled here in 1709. He

frequently requested pastors to preach and at length he had sufficient following to gather a church. Their covenant, which was presented to the Governor of the Court, in order to have the right of worship granted to them, is practically a confession of faith and an expression of their intentions in regard to the obedience of the laws of the government.

The covenant is as follows:

We, the humble professors of the Gospel of Christ, baptized upon a declaration of faith and repentance, believing the doctrine of general redemption (or the free grace of God to all mankind), we do hereby seriously, and solemnly, in the presence of the Searcher of all hearts, and before the world, covenant, agree, bind, and settle ourselves into a church, to hold, abide by, and contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, owned by the best reformed churches in England, Scotland, and elsewhere, especially as published and maintained in the forms and confessions of the Baptists in England and Scotland, except in infant baptism, church government, the doctrine of absolute reprobation, and some ceremonies We do also bind ourselves hereby to defend and live up to the Protestant religion, and abhor and oppose the whore of Rome, pope and popery, with all her Antichristian ways. We do also engage, with our lives and fortunes, to defend the down and dignity of our gracious sovereign, King George, to him and his sue forever; and to obey all the laws, humbly submitting ourselves to all in authority under him and giving custom to whom custom, honor to whom honor, tribute to whom tribute is due. We do further declare that we are not against taking oaths, nor using arms in defense of our king and country, when legally called thereto; and that we do approve and will obey the laws of the Province. And further, we bind ourselves to follow the patterns of our brethren in England, to maintain order, government, and discipline in our church, especially that excellent director Rev. Francis Stanley, entitled, "The Gospel Honor and Church Ornament," dedicated to the churches in the counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, and Cambridge. We also engage that all persons, upon joining our society, shall yield consent to and subscribe this our solemn league and covenant. Subscribed by us whose names are underwritten, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of July, 1742 (Benedict).

Very slowly did the Baptists grow in this province. Outside of the Tunkers and the Mennonites, in 1772, there were reported only two Baptist churches; but in 1792 there were seventeen churches with 1,300 members.

The Baptist Church at Newton is the oldest in the State of New Hampshire. It was organized in 1755 (Lawrence, *The New Hampshire Churches*, 105. Claremont, 1856). This was in a period that foretold a dreadful struggle. Bancroft thus characterizes the times in the opening passage of the chapter describing the history of 1755. "Anarchy lay at the heart of the institutions of Europe; the form of political life was struggling for its development in the people of America. While doubt was preparing the way of destruction in the old world, faith in truth and in the formative power of order were controlling and organizing the free and expanding energies of the new. The world could not watch with indifference the spectacle—but yet the world could not see its deep significance. Those thirteen colonies were feeble settlements along the coast of a vast continent, and separated from among the civilized nations of the earth by a broad ocean, and yet in them was involved the future of our race." It was exactly at this date the Baptists entered New Hampshire.

The church dates back to 1755 but the first record on its books is twelve years later, October 1, 1767. It presents in a striking light some of the features of the times, and the vexations with which the fathers had to contend. It is supposed to be the earliest record extant of a Baptist church in New Hampshire. The record is as follows:

October 1, 1767. A Society meeting was called at the Baptist meeting house in Newton.

1. John Wadleigh was chosen moderator.
2. Joseph Welch was chosen Clerk.
3. Voted, To carry on Mr. Stewart's and Mr. Carter's law suits which are now in the law on account of rates imposed on them by the standing order.
4. Voted, To give Mr. Hovey for the year ensuing for his labors with us fifty pounds of lawful money in such things as he wants to live on.
5. Voted, That Andrew Whittier, John Wadleigh, and Joseph Welch be chosen to say what each man's part shall be of what was

promised to give Mr. Hovey.

6. Voted, That these men shall take the province rates for their rate and do it as light as they can.

7. Voted, That these men are to abate such men as they think are not able to pay their parts with the rest.

8. Voted, That those who will not pay their equal proportion according as these men shall tag them, their punishment is this, that they shall have no help from us to clear them from paying rates other where.

Joseph Welch, *Clerk*.

William Lamson, of Portsmouth, in his centennial address, says of the history of this church and the early Baptist movement in New Hampshire: “There is something deeply interesting in this old record of a meeting once held in this ancient town (of Newton), and not far from the very spot on which we are now assembled. It is significant of much. It is an opening in the veil which conceals the past through which we can look back and trace some of its marked features. It is a veritable record, of a meeting actually held by the Baptist society of Newton, and the first of the kind, of which we have any record, ever held in the State. It was a meeting for business, and business was done. We see the old standing order, with its stern inflexible countenance and its commanding mien, peering out upon us from the background of this rough sketch. Mr. Steward and Mr. Carter are there, and they are in trouble, already in the law, and they must not be left alone. The standing order has them in its iron grasp, and they must have help such as the Baptist society of Newton can give, they shall have. Sympathy and substantial aid are voted—the cause is a common one—and all must help to sustain it. One hopes, as he reads the record, that Mr. Steward and Mr. Carter and the Baptist society of Newton were the successful party in the litigation. His sympathies, whoever he may be, now all flow in that direction.

“This business disposed of, the question of the support of the ministry, that question which is even now an annually recurring one, and sometimes a very troublesome one, comes up. Mr. Hovey is to preach the gospel for one year which is to come, and must have things to live on. It is decided that he will need these things to the amount of fifty pounds lawful money. That sum is voted. Then Andrew Whittier and John Wadleigh, and Joseph Welch must see

that this money is raised, and that every man bears his proportion. But there may be those—when or where have not such been—who would be glad to shift this responsibility of paying the minister. Some punishment must be devised by us—the Baptist society at Newton before we separate, by which these men may be deterred from pursuing so mean a course. Their punishment shall be this—we will not help them get out of the grasp of the standing order. This done and duly recorded by Joseph Welch, the clerk, the Baptist society at Newton adjourns. One imagines that there were some earnest words, as the members repair to their homes, spoken around the hearthstones of these homes after the meeting broke up that night—and he hopes that some believing petitions ascended to God. Plans are now settled, and things are in a fair way till next October, before which it is hoped that the lawsuit against Mr. Steward and Mr. Carter will have been carried to a successful issue. But this lawsuit proved to have been as lawsuits generally are, a protracted as well as a vexatious affair. Nearly three years after the date of this meeting, in which the whole business of this lawsuit pertained, we have the record of the same lawsuit:

June 25, 1770. A meeting was legally holden at the Antipedobaptist meeting house.

1. Chose John Wadleigh, moderator.

2. Voted, To choose a Committee to proportion the whole costs of the lawsuits of Mr. Stuart and Mr. Carter from the first to the last as has before been voted. Ebenezer Noys, John Wadleigh, and Abraham Kimball, were chosen a Committee to examine the accounts and settle what is honest and right.

“How this lawsuit, which after three years was brought to a close, terminated, we are not informed. But it is gratifying to know that the Baptist society redeemed its pledge and paid the whole cost from first to last.

“Such records as these let us into the heart of those distant times, and are worth more than whole chapters of rhetorical descriptions. These were brave men, fighting seriously for right, for what they believed God had given them—the right to worship and practice his ordinances as they understood them.

“Of this church what remains to be said may be compressed into a small compass. The records of its early history are very few. They are mostly the records of their litigations to avoid the payment of the obnoxious taxes of the

standing order. These were continued, but with diminishing frequency, until by a change of the laws permanent relief was obtained. In 1782, March 1, we have the record of a meeting at the house of Noah Johnson, which was opened by solemn prayer to Almighty God, on matters of experience, in which Asaph Harriman and six others relate their Christian experience. Walter Powers was the first pastor of the church, and since its formation it has had, for a longer or shorter time, the labors of seventeen pastors. In the year 1767, an obligation to observe the ordinances and to sustain the ministry of the gospel according to the faith and order of the Baptist church, was drawn up and signed by seventy-five men—all of whom have long since passed away.

“This covenant which was drawn up and signed eighty-eight years ago, does not seem to have been a church covenant, but was, as I suppose, simply an agreement to sustain Baptist preaching in this place. It was as follows:

We whose names are hereunto subscribed by studying the Holy Scriptures believe the faith and order of the Antipedobaptists to be agreeable thereto, do honestly covenant and agree, and engage to uphold and maintain and support each man his equal proportion towards the support of the gospel ministry all the necessary charges arising relative thereunto in witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands.

“From the year 1755, the date of the organization of the church, there is little to be found in the history of the denomination, for sixteen years. I find it stated on one authority that during these years there was only one other church organized, and that at Marbury in 1768. From another source, in which there is no mention of the church in Marbury, we learn that a church was organized at Weare, in 1768. It is probable therefore that in 1770, fifteen years after the origin of the first church in the State, there were three feeble Baptist churches in New Hampshire; one at Newton, another at Marbury, and the third at Weare. Unquestionably the constant persecutions and repeated litigations to which the Baptists were subjected in those years had much to do in retarding their growth. The standing order believed that they were the church of God, and that they were truly serving God in compelling the Baptists and other Separatists into conformity, as they were in the prayers of the closet or in the Worship of the sanctuary. Scattered over the State there

may have been many of our faith who were longing and praying for the time when they should be permitted to worship God and obey his ordinances, with none to molest or make them afraid. But the difficulty, under the circumstances, of sustaining churches, deterred them from becoming organized. They were as sheep not having a shepherd” (Lamson, a Centennial Discourse delivered at the one hundredth Anniversary of the formation of the Baptist Church, Newton, N. H., October 18, 1855, 24-30. Portsmouth, 1856).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Ethan Allen, Maryland, Toleration, or Sketches of the Early History of Maryland to the Year 1650, *The Church Review*, VII. 617; VIII. 264-293. New Haven, 1856.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION, BROWN UNIVERSITY AND BAPTIST CUSTOMS

Organization of the Philadelphia Association—Quarterly Meetings—The Early Churches of the Body—Other Associations—Powers of an Association—The Declaration of the Association—The Separate Association in Virginia—John L. Waller—Discipline—Trouble in the Pennepek Church—The First Church, Charleston, S. C—Requirements to Unite With a Church—Ministerial Education—Thomas Hollis and Harvard College—Scholarships for Baptists—Abel Morgan—The Academy at Hopewell—Missions—Oliver Hart—John Gano—Circular Letter on Education—Isaac Eaton—Brown University—James Manning—Dr. Ezra Stiles—The Charter—The First Commencement of Brown—The College Suspended—Resolutions on Temperance—Early Customs of the Baptists.

The organization of the Philadelphia Association, in 1707, is one of the most far-reaching events connected with the Baptist denomination. The church at Pennepek has the following record: “Before our general meeting, held in Philadelphia, in the seventh month, 1707, it was concluded by the several congregations of our judgment, to make choice of some particular brethren, such as they thought most capable in every congregation, and those to meet at the yearly meeting, which began the 27<sup>th</sup> of the seventh month, on the seventh day of the week, agreed to continue the meeting till the third day following in the work of the public ministry. It was then agreed that a person that is a stranger, that has neither letter of recommendation, nor is known to be a person gifted, and of good conversation, shall not be permitted to preach, nor to be entertained as a member in any of the Baptist congregations in communion with each other.

“It was also concluded, that if any difference shall happen between any member and the church he belongs to, and they cannot agree, then the person so grieved may, at the general meeting, appeal to the brethren of the several congregations, and with such as they shall nominate, decide the difference; that the church and the person so grieved do fully acquiesce in their determination” (Minutes of the Philadelphia Association).

Before the formation of the Association the churches had a general meeting for preaching and administering the ordinances, which was held in different places. The first was at Salem, New Jersey, in 1688; this was about three

months after the Lower Dublin Church was constituted. The next was held at the latter church, the next in Philadelphia, and the fourth at Burlington. Other meetings were held at various places. The people with whom the brethren met called the gatherings a yearly meeting because it met with them but once a year, but those who attended all of the sessions spoke of it as a quarterly meeting. The association was designed to differ from the yearly meeting chiefly in this, that it was to be a body of delegates representing churches, and the yearly meeting had no representative character.

The brethren who constituted the association came from Lower Dublin (Pennepek), Middletown, Piscataqua, Cohansey, and Welsh Tract. The Philadelphia congregation, though giving its name to the association, is not represented as a constituent member, because it was regarded as a branch of the Lower Dublin church. Morgan Edwards mentions with evident satisfaction that, though the Association was formed of but five churches, “it has so increased since as to contain thirty-four churches (in 1770), exclusive of those that have been detached to form another association.” The influence of the Philadelphia Association in shaping Baptist modes of thinking and working has been greater than any other body in existence.

The Philadelphia Association was followed by the Charleston, South Carolina. Wood Furman, the historian, gives the following account of this important transaction:

The settlement of Mr. Hart in Charleston is an important event in the annals of these churches. His unexpected arrival while the church was destitute of a supply, and immediately after the death of the excellent man who had occasionally officiated for them, was believed to have been directed by a special providence in their favour. He undertook the pastoral office with much seriousness, and soon entered on an extensive field of usefulness. His ardent piety and active philanthropy, his discriminating mind and persuasive address, soon raised him high in the esteem of the public, and gave him a distinguished claim to the affections of his brethren. Between him and the Rev. Mr. Pelot, actuated by the same principles and possessing very respectable talents, a cordial intimacy commenced. Mr. Hart had seen, in the Philadelphia Association, the happy consequences of union and stated intercourse among Churches

maintaining the same faith and order. To accomplish similar purposes, an union of the four Churches before mentioned was contemplated and agreed upon. Accordingly on the 21<sup>st</sup> of October 1751 Delegates from Ashley River and Welch Neck met those of Charleston in the said City. The Messengers from Euhaw were prevented from attending. It was agreed that an annual meeting should thenceforward be holden on Saturday preceding the 2d Sabbath of Nov. to consist of the Ministers and messengers of the several Churches; that the two first days should be employed in public worship, and a Sermon introductory to business preached on the Monday following at 11 o'clock.

The object of the union was declared to be the promotion of the Redeemer's kingdom, by the maintenance of love and fellowship, and by mutual consultations for the peace and welfare of the churches. The independency of the churches was asserted, and the powers of the Association restricted to those of a Council of Advice. It was agreed to meet again in Charleston, Nov. 1752. At that time the delegates from Euhaw attended, and the proceedings of the first meeting ratified. The instrument of Union bears the following signatures: John Stephens, Oliver Hart, Francis Pelot, John Brown, Joshua Edwards, Ministers; James Fowler, William Screven, Richard Bedon, Charles Barker, Benjamin Parmenter, Thomas Harrison, Philip Douglass, and John Mikell, Messengers (Furman, *A History of the Charleston Association of Baptist Churches in the State of South Carolina*, with an Appendix, 8, 9. Charleston, 1811).

By the year 1800, forty-eight associations had been organized as follows:

Philadelphia (1707); Charleston (1751); Sandy Creek, N. C. (1758); Kehukee, N. C. (1765); Kettocton, Va. (1766); Warren, R. I. (1767); Rapidan, Va. (1770); Congaree, S. C. (1771, recognized as Bethel in 1789); Stonington, Conn. (1772); Redstone, Pa. And Strawberry, Va. (1776); Shaftesbury, Vt. (1780); Holston, Tenn. (1781); Salisbury, Md. (1782); Woodstock, Vt., Dover, Va., and Middle District, Va. (1783); Georgia, (1784); New Hampshire (1785, though 1776 is also given as a date. It was later called the York, Me.); Vermont, Elkhorn, Ky., South Kentucky, and Salem, Ky. (1785); Bowdoinham, Me.

(1787); Roanoke, Va. (1788); Portsmouth, Va., and Yadkin, S. C. (1790); New York and Warwick, N. Y. (1791); Baltimore, Goshen, Va., and Shiloh, Va. (1792); New River, Va., and Tates Creek, Ky. (1793); Hepzibah, Ga., and Neuse, N. C. (1794); Ostego, N. Y. (1795); Rensselaerville, N. Y., New District, Tenn., Chemung, Pa., and Fairfield, Vt. (1796); Miami, Ohio (1797); Delaware (before 1798); Mayo, N. C., Mountain, N. C., Sarepta, Ga., Green River, Ky., and Cumberland River, Ky. (1790).

The powers of an association and its relation to the churches, to ministers and members, were much debated. The attitude of the Cayuga Association fairly represents the situation. "A diversity of opinions prevailed in the churches," says their historian, "in relation to forming an association, and were expressed, both by their delegates, and in the letters to the body. Many, ever watchful against any infringement of individual rights, and ever vigilant in their defense of Baptist views of unrestricted liberty of conscience, and church independence, expressed their fears that an associated body might become corrupt, and assume an unwarranted control of the actions and discipline of the churches. In their letters to the body, they express, in most definite terms, their belief 'that Christ and not an associated body of any kind, is Law-giver and Head of the church'" (Belden, *History of the Cayuga Baptist Association*, 8. Auburn, N. Y., 1851).

At first more authority was claimed by associational bodies than was finally granted to them. The following is from the Minutes of the Philadelphia Association, in 1749, in an elaborate statement in reference to churches, which has usually been accepted:

At our annual Association, met September the 19<sup>th</sup>, 1749, an essay, on the power and duty of an association of churches, was proposed to the consideration of the Association; and the same, upon mature deliberation, was approved and subscribed by the whole house, and the contents of the same was ordered to be transcribed as the judgment of the Association, in order to be inserted in the Association book, to the end and purpose that it may appear what power an Association of churches hath, and what duty is incumbent on an Association; and prevent the contempt with which some are ready to treat such an assembly, and also to prevent any future

generation from claiming more power than they ought-lodging over the churches.

After broadly stating the independency of the churches the Association in this essay says:

Such churches there must be, agreeing in doctrine and practice, and independent in their authority and church power, before they can enter into a confederation, as aforesaid, and choose delegates or representatives to associate together; and thus the several independent churches being the constituents, the association, council, or assembly of their delegates, when assembled, is not to be deemed a superior judicature, or having a superintendency over the churches, but subservient to the churches, in what may concern all the churches in general; or any one church in particular, and, though no power can regularly arise above its fountain from where it rises, yet we are of an opinion that an Association of the delegates of associated churches have a very considerable power in their hands respecting those churches in their consideration; :or if the agreement of several distinct churches, in sound doctrine and regular practice, be the first, motive, ground and foundation or basis of their confederation, then it must naturally follow, that a defection in doctrine or practice in any church, in such confederation, or any party in any such church, is ground sufficient for an Association to withdraw from any such church or party deviating or making defection, and to exclude such from them in some formal manner, and to advertise all the churches in confederation thereof, in order that every church in confederation may withdraw from such in all acts of church communion, to the end that they may be ashamed, and that all the churches may discountenance such, and bear testimony against such defection.

The first Separate Baptist Association, held at Craig's Meeting House, Orange County, Virginia, in 1771, adopted the following article in their constitution:

We believe we have a right to withdraw ourselves from any church unsound in doctrine or irregular in practice.

On this article Semple makes the following comment:

It is worthy of note, that one of the constitutional articles disclaims all power over the churches. Yet the next declares a right in the Association to withdraw from delinquent churches in certain cases. Nothing less can be meant by this article than that the Association, in behalf of all orderly churches in her correspondence, would discountenance all disorderly ones. It is then a question, whether a church, discountenanced by the Association, can any longer be considered a part of the Baptist Society? Would it not be deemed disorderly for any other church to continue their fellowship towards one that could not meet in the same Association? Churches may not only become disorderly in practice, but heterodox in doctrine. To give an association power to deal with, and finally to put such out of their connection, must be proper, and, indeed, must be what is designed by the above article. By no other means could a general union be preserved.

The following comments on the power of associations by John L. Waller, of Kentucky, have met with favor:

**First**, Does a church sustain the same relation to an association that an individual member does to the church?

**Second**, If so, is it Baptist custom for an association to receive a church contrary to the wish and votes of another church or churches in the same association?

We answer the first question emphatically, that a church does not sustain the same relation to an association that an individual member doer to a church. The relation between the member and the church is a divine ordinance—was instituted by Jesus Christ—and is regulated by the precepts and principles of the New Testament. But the relation between the church and the association has its origin solely in Christian polity and expediency, claiming no more warrant in the word of God than missionary societies, and other benevolent institutions. The association is formed by a compact between churches, for the purpose of correspondence and acquaintance, and the promotion, by devotional exercises and mutual consultation, of their own and common welfare of Zion. As the churches are sovereign and independent, they sustain no relation to each other,

except by agreement, and are bound in nothing, except by express stipulation. Whatever they have not covenanted to do by the terms of association, is of no force or obligation. Of course, it would be something new under the sun, if a church should be dealt with according to the 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Matthew for private or individual offenses; or in any way arraigned and excluded for moral delinquency like a member of a church. Our doctrine is, that a church is the highest ecclesiastical tribunal on earth; and when assembled in the name of Christ, he, the Great Head, is in her midst. But if our association can exclude a church, as a church can exclude a member, then associations might do what the gates of hell cannot do, prevail against the church.

In short, an affirmative to the question, would be to regard a Baptist association, which we are wont to call a mere advisory council, as something beyond a Presbyterian Synod and a Methodist Conference an ecclesiastical body supreme over supremacy, and controlling in cringing subserviency, independent sovereignties! But the supposition is too absurd to be entertained.

The plain, common sense of the case is simply this: When a church violates the compact upon which she agreed to meet in association with her sister churches, she forfeits her rights under that compact, and may, and ought to be denied the privileges of the association. But so long as she adheres to the terms of compact, she has a right to be regarded as a member. She can commit no offense over which the association can exercise jurisdiction, except a plain and obvious violation of the terms of compact; and when dropped from correspondence and association, she is still as much a church as she ever was. Connection with an association is not essential to the existence of a church; but piety, purity of doctrine, and walking in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless. So the New Testament teaches, so the Baptists believe.

The second question may be more summarily disposed of. But we beg leave to premise that we have given very little study to that code of discipline, held in high esteem by some brethren, called “Baptist custom,” or “Baptist usage,”—a kind of ecclesiastical common law,

found in tradition touching the practices of the churches in Virginia, the Carolinas, or New England; or else of the churches fifty years ago. We hope the brethren will avoid the yoke of “custom” and “usage” as much as possible. For ourselves, we have no more respect for Baptist than for Papistical “usage,” unless it is sustained by the Bible, or supported by sound Christian expediency. But to the question.

The reception of a church by unanimity or by majority is a matter solely to be settled by the constitution or compact of the association. In the associations of our acquaintance, both modes obtain—by unanimity generally. It seems to us better not to receive a new church at the expense of the feelings of one already in connection. Fellowship ought to be preserved if possible. But when an objection is made, the reasons for it may be demanded; and then it is entirely competent for the association to determine whether these reasons are good and sufficient. If good, let the church applying be rejected. If not good, then the objectors ought to be required to yield, or else to be dismissed from the association. This seems to us to be a wise and prudent course; and some of our oldest and most intelligent associations pursue it.

These are the principles which generally govern Baptist associations in the United States.

The associations and churches were especially strict on the subject of discipline. An instance of this kind came up in the Philadelphia Association in the year 1712. One Thomas Selby made a disturbance and rupture in the churches at Philadelphia and Pennepek. The Association nominated persons to hear and determine concerning the differences; and they brought in their judgment and determination, confirmed under their hands, as follows:

With respect to the difference between the members and others, sometime belonging to the Baptist Church in Philadelphia, as it hath been laid before us, persons chosen by both sides, they having referred the whole of their differences to our determination; we, doing what within us lies for the glory of God, and the peace of the whole church, in regard to the transactions past, and what may be best for the future, for the interest of the gospel, upon due

consideration of what hath been laid before us, as followeth, viz.: We do find the way and manner of dealing and proceeding with each other hath been from the rule of the gospel, and unbecoming Christians in many respects, and in some too shameful here to enumerate the particulars.

And first, we judge it expedient in point of justice, that Mr. Thomas Selby be paid the money subscribed by him by the members of this church, and he discharged from any further service in the work of the ministry; he being a person, in our judgment, not likely for the promotion of the gospel in these parts of the country; and considering his miscarriages we judge he may not be allowed to communion.

And secondly, as to the members of this congregation, we do apprehend the best way is, that each party offended do freely forgive each other all personal and other offences that may have arisen on this occasion, and that they be buried in oblivion; and that those who shall for future mention or stir up any of the former differences, so as to tend to contention, shall be deemed disorderly persons, and be dealt with as such.

And thirdly, that those who exempted themselves from their communion on this account, except as above, be allowed to take their places orderly without contention, and such as refuse to be deemed disorderly persons.

“Let it be noted, that the said Thomas Selby, though he and his party referred to above said, yet he appeared afterwards very outrageous while he stayed in the province, and some of his adherents joined other denominations, and never returned to seek their places in the church, and the church did accordingly exclude them. But the greatest, part took their places personally” (Minutes of the Philadelphia Association).

A notable illustration of the care with which members were received and discipline administered is found in the rules adopted by the First Baptist Church, Charleston, South Carolina: The rules were as follows:

**1st.** When a person desires to join the church, the desire shall be made known to the Pastor a sufficient length of time before the communion season, to allow of conversation and acquaintance; and

for further satisfaction, the Pastor may appoint the deacons, or any other of the brethren he may think proper, to visit the Candidate, for the purpose of obtaining all needful information concerning his or her experience and faith, character and life.

**2nd.** The Pastor, and those he may have sent to visit and converse with the Candidate, shall meet together, at such a place as he may appoint, to consider the qualification of the Candidate, and after which conference, the Pastor shall give such advice to each as may appear suitable. In the meantime, any of the members may visit the Candidate or Candidates, for the purpose of forming acquaintance, and obtaining fellowship, before the period of their reception into the church.

**3d.** If the Candidate or Candidates be thought to possess those qualifications which may entitle them to a participation of the privileges of God's house, they shall appear before the church; which (as it is a garden enclosed) shall be privately convened for said purpose, and none but the members to be present, and each Candidate will then relate the reason for his or her hope, and give such answers to questions respecting their Christian knowledge, repentance and faith, as may afford consistent evidence of a gracious state; after which, satisfaction being obtained, they shall be baptized, and admitted to all the privileges of the church.

**4th.** After each Candidate has been examined before the church, he or she shall be requested to retire to the vestry, while the church considers the case; which done, the Candidate shall be called in and the Pastor shall make known the decision of the church, which if favorable, they shall be kindly received; but if there should appear to be any deficiency in the knowledge and experience of the Candidate, and it may be thought advisable to wait sometime longer, or in order to get better information, the Pastor will, in a kind, affectionate and encouraging manner, present this advice.

**5th.** In case of Candidates coming from the country, or under any peculiar providential circumstances, where the above course cannot be, pursued, the Pastor, and those he may consult, must act as may seem most for the glory of God, and the welfare of the church

(Rules for the Admission of Members into the Baptist Church in Charleston, 1828).

A series of elaborate and searching questions was asked of the candidate preceding baptism. He was then requested to sign the church covenant. One of the many provisions of the covenant was to the effect. That “we promise to contribute in a reasonable manner, according to our ability, for the support of public worship, and the relief of the poor in the church; and to use our influence to forward and promote the interests of the Redeemer’s kingdom in the world.” There are no traces of any systematic efforts in regard to ministerial education, until about the year 1752. The denomination had, however, been decidedly friendly to an educated minister, from the beginning, and they had as great a degree of learning as perhaps any since that time. The churches, it must be remembered, were exceedingly few; as late as 1700, the number was not more than fourteen. The connection with the mother country was most intimate; indeed, many of the pastors had been educated in England.

Thomas Hollis, a business man of England and a Baptist., was a liberal supporter of education in America. In 1720 he founded a professorship of Divinity in Harvard College, and in 1726 a professorship of Mathematics and Experimental Philosophy, and sent over apparatus that cost one hundred and fifty pounds. These professorships were endowed with a salary of eighty pounds a year. Likewise ten pounds each were allowed to ten scholarships, four of which were to be for Baptists.

“The aggregate of his donations,” says Pierce in his History of the University, “was not much, if at all, short of two thousand pounds sterling. So large an amount was never given to the college before by any individual; and when it is considered that all of this came from a stranger in a distant land, from one of the then poor, despised Baptists, during the lifetime of the donor, and at a time when the value of money was vastly greater than it is now, what breast does not glow with grateful admiration! Some idea may be formed of the difference in the value of money then and now by considering that, the salary of a professor was at first only twenty-six pounds sterling, and that, this was then called an honorable stipend. The total amount of the benefactions of this family ‘exceeded,’ says Quincy, “six thousand pounds currency of Massachusetts, which, considering the value of money at that period, and the

disinterested spirit by which their charities were prompted; constitutes one of the most remarkable instances of continued benevolence upon record.”

In a letter which Hollis wrote to Rev. Ephraim Wheaton, Swanzey, Massachusetts, he refers to these scholarships and says that he had made provisions for “Baptist youth to be educated for the ministry, and equally regarded with Pedobaptists,” and requests Mr. Wheaton to inform him of any duly qualified young men for the first vacancy (*Massachusetts Missionary Magazine*, I.).

He likewise corresponded with the Philadelphia Association on the subject. That body, in 1722, proposed to the churches “to make inquiry among themselves, if they have any young persons hopeful for the ministry, and inclined to learning; and if they have, to give notice of it to Mr. Abel Morgan before the first of November, that he might recommend such to the academy of Mr. Hollis, his account” (Minutes of the Philadelphia Association, 27).

This provision of Mr. Hollis, however, proved of little avail to the Baptists, in consequence of the growing unfriendliness exhibited toward them throughout. Most of the New England States.

The Philadelphia Association, in 1731, sent a letter of salutation to the various churches represented in that body. The Association, among other things, said:

The harvest is great and the laborers are few; pray mightily for more, and treat honorably the few you have left. Your neglect of hearing them may provoke the Master of the vineyard to call home from you those laborers you have, as he hath of late many of our reverend brethren. See what gifts you have among you; if there be any hopeful youths, let them exercise themselves, and be kind to them and tender to them; take heed that you do not discourage them you have, lest you should be made to lament your imprudent and inconsiderate management (Minutes, 32).

Isaac Eaton, who was the pastor of the church at Hopewell, New Jersey, from 1748 to 1772, set up a school for the education of youth for the ministry as well as other callings, in 1756, and kept it for eleven years. To him belongs the honor of being the first American Baptist to establish a seminary for the literary and theological training of young men. For this work his natural endowments of mind, his varied attainments of knowledge, and his genuine

piety happily qualified him. In the welfare and progress of this academy, the Philadelphia and Charleston Associations ever manifested a lively interest. They appointed trustees, had some oversight and liberally supplied funds. Some of the most distinguished men in the country were there educated.

The following extract from a letter, addressed to the Particular Baptist ministers of London, by the Philadelphia Association, in 1762, has an allusion to the academy at Hopewell:

Our numbers in these parts multiply; for when we had the pleasure of writing you in 1754, there were but nine churches in our association; yet now, there are twenty-nine all owning the Confession of Faith put forth in 1689. Some of the churches are now destitute; but we have a prospect of supplies, partly by means of a Baptist academy, lately set up.

There follow some very interesting statements from the Charleston Association. "In 1755, the Association taking into consideration the destitute conditions of many places in the interior settlements of this and neighboring States (then provinces), recommended to the churches to make contributions for the support of a missionary to itinerate in those parts. Mr. Hart was authorized and requested, provided a sufficient sum should be raised, to procure if possible a suitable person for the purpose. With this view he visited Pennsylvania and New Jersey in the following year, and prevailed with Rev. John Gano to undertake the service; he attended the annual meeting and was cordially received. The Association requested Mr. Gano to visit the Yadkin first and afterwards to bestow his labors wherever Providence should appear to direct. He devoted himself to the work; it afforded ample scope for his distinguished piety, eloquence and fortitude; and his ministrations were crowned with remarkable success. Many embraced and professed the gospel. The following year he received from the Association a letter of thanks for his faithfulness and industry in the mission. At the same time, the expediency of raising a fund to furnish suitable candidates for the ministry with a competent share of learning, was taken into consideration, and it was recommended to the churches generally to collect money for the purpose. The members present engaged to furnish one hundred and thirty-three pounds to begin the fund; and Messrs. Stephens, Hart, and Pelot were chosen trustees. In 1759, Mr. Evan Pugh was proposed by Mr. Gano as a candidate for the ministry. He

was examined, approved, and put on a course of studies. Having gone through them, he preached before the Association in 1762 with acceptance, and was soon afterward ordained.

“The general contribution from the churches was not so great as wished. But a society instituted in Charleston in 1755, which was called ‘the Religious Society’ and flourished many years, was highly useful in aiding the Association in its benevolent design. Several young men were furnished by it with the means of pursuing studies preparatory to the ministry. Of this number were Messrs. Samuel Stillman and Edmund Botsford, both from the church in Charleston. The former was ordained there February 26, 1759; and in 1807 finished in Boston a long life distinguished by fervent piety, shining talents and eminent usefulness. The latter survives as the eminent pastor in George-Town” (Wood Furman, *A History of the Charleston Association of Baptist Churches in the State of South Carolina*, 11, 12. Charleston, 1811).

The Circular Letter of this association, for 1786, contains this beautiful statement:

It is our ardent desire that the members of our churches be well established in the evidence, as well as the necessity and importance of Christianity; and that the reasonableness and consistency of its particular doctrines be well understood. We recommend therefore that a thirst for divine knowledge, together with a laudable desire to excel in every grace and virtue, be entertained in all our breasts. Pay particular attention to the education of your children with this in view; and where it has pleased God to call any of his young servants to the work of the ministry, let the churches be careful to introduce them in the line of study and improvement; and make suitable exertions to furnish them with the necessary means for this end (Furman, 19).

Rhode Island College, now known as Brown University, originated in the Philadelphia Association and was likewise intimately connected with the Warren Association. On October 12, 1762, the Association with twenty-nine churches, met at the Lutheran church building, in Fifth street, Philadelphia. Rev. Morgan Edwards was chosen moderator, and Abel Morgan clerk. At this meeting, says Backus, “the Association obtained such an acquaintance with the affairs of Rhode Island, as to bring themselves to an apprehension that it,

was practicable and expedient to erect a college in the colony of Rhode Island, under the chief direction of the Baptists, in which education might be promoted, and superior learning obtained, free from any sectarian tests” (Backus, II. 137). The principal mover in this matter was Morgan Edwards, to whom, with the Rev. Samuel Jones, the business in general appears to have been entrusted. This gentleman, who had but recently settled in Philadelphia, was a native of Wales, having come to this- country upon the recommendation of Dr. Gill and other prominent ministers in London. He had been bred an Episcopalian, but in 1738 he embraced the sentiments of the Baptists, He received his academic education in Bristol, and in his sixteenth year entered upon the work of a Christian minister. Possessing superior abilities, united with great perseverance and zeal, he became the leader in various denominational enterprises, devoting to them his time and talents, and thereby rendering essential service to the cause. Many of his sermons, treatise, and historical works have been published. In one of them entitled ‘Materials toward a History of the Baptists in Pennsylvania,’ he speaks of himself as having ‘labored hard to settle a Baptist, college in Rhode Island Government, and to raise money to endow it’; which he deems the greatest service he has done or hopes to do for the Baptist interest.” He died on January 28, 1795, in the seventy-third year of his age.

The first president of the college was James Manning, who had been a student in Hopewell Academy. He was now twenty-five years of age, of a fine, commanding appearance, pleasing manners, and polished address. “His person,” says a writer, “was graceful, and his countenance handsome and remarkably expressive of sensibility, dignity and cheerfulness. He possessed a voice of extraordinary compass and harmony, to which, in no small degree, may be ascribed the vivid impression which he made upon our minds. In his manners, which seemed to be the natural expression of dignity and grace, he combined ease without negligence, and politeness without affectation. Blest with an amiable disposition, and possessing versatile colloquial powers, he was most engaging and instructive as a companion. And when to all these gifts and accomplishments is added sterling good sense, for which he was preeminently distinguished, and superior learning, it will be readily perceived that he was well fitted to act as a pioneer in the general educational work before him.”

The history of the enterprise from this point may be best given in the

language of Manning, which is as follows:

In the month of July, 1763, we arrived at Newport, and made a motion to several gentlemen of the Baptist denomination—whereof Col. Gardner, the Deputy Governor, was one—relative to a seminary of polite literature, subject to the government of Baptists. The motion was properly attended to, to which brought together about fifteen gentlemen of the same denomination at the deputy's house. Who requested that I would draw up a sketch of the design, against the day following. The day came; and the same gentlemen, with other Baptists, met in the same place, when a rough draught was produced and read,—the tenor of which was, that the institution was to be a Baptist one, but that as many of other denominations should be taken in as was consistent with the said design. Accordingly, the Hon. Josiah Lyndon and Col. Job Bennet were appointed to draw up a charter to be laid before the next General Assembly with a petition that they should pass it into a law. But the said gentlemen pleading unskillfulness touching an affair of this kind, requested that their trusty friend, the Rev. Ezra, now Dr. Stiles, might be solicited to assist them. This was opposed by me as unwilling to give the Doctor trouble about an affair of other people; but they urged that his love of learning and catholicism would induce him readily to give his assistance. Accordingly their proposition was assented to, and his assistance obtained; or, rather, the draughting the charter was entirely left to him, after being told that Baptists were to have the lead in the institution, and the government thereof, forever; and that no more of other denominations were to be admitted than would be consistent with that. The charter was drawn, and a time and place were appointed for the parties concerned to meet and read it. But the vessel in which I was to sail for Halifax going off that day, prevented my being present with them long enough to see whether the original design was secured; and as the corporation was made to consist of two branches, Trustees and Fellows, and these branches to sit and act distinct and separate powers, it was not easy to determine, by a transient hearing, what those powers might be. The Trustees were presumed to be the principal branch of authority; and as nineteen out of thirty-five were to be Baptists, the Baptists were

satisfied, without sufficient examination into the authority vested in the fellowship, which afterwards appeared to be the soul of the institution, while the trusteeship was only the body. Placing, therefore, an entire confidence in Dr. Stiles, they agreed to join in a petition to the Assembly to have the charter confirmed by authority. The petition was proffered, and cheerfully received, and the charter read; after which the vote was called for, and urged by some to pass into law. But this was opposed by others, particularly by Daniel Jencks, Esq., member for Providence, who contended that the Assembly required more time to examine whether it was agreeable to the design of the first movers of it, and therefore prayed the house to have the perusal of it, while they adjourned for dinner. This was granted, with some opposition. Then he asked the Governor, who was a Baptist, whom they intended to invest with the governing power in said institution. The Governor answered, "The Baptists by all means I" Then Mr. Jencks showed him that the charter was so artfully constructed as to throw the power into the Fellows' hands, whereof eight of the twelve were Presbyterians, usually called Congregationalists, and that the other four might be of the same denomination, for aught that appeared in the charter to the contrary. Convinced of this, Governor Lyndon immediately had an interview with Dr. Stiles, the Presbyterian minister of Newport, and demanded why he had perverted the design of the charter. The answer was, "I gave you timely warning to take care of yourselves, for that we had done so in regard to our society"; and finally observed, that "he was not a rogue." When the Assembly was convened again, the said Jencks moved that the affair might be put off to the next session; adding that the motion for the college originated with the Baptists, and was intended for their use, but that the charter in question was not at all calculated to answer their purpose; and since the committee entrusted with this matter by the Baptists professed that they had been misled, not to say imposed upon, it was necessary that the Baptists in other parts of the colony should be consulted previous to its passing into a law, especially as few, if any of them except himself, had seen it; and he prayed that he might have a copy for the said purpose, which he promised to return. All which was

granted. When the charter came to be narrowly inspected, it was found to be made by no means answerable to the design of agitators and the instructions given to the committee. Consequently, application was made to the Philadelphia Association, where the thing took its rise, to have their mind on the subject, who immediately sent two gentlemen hither to join with the Baptists of this colony in making such alterations and amendments as were to them specified before their departure. When they arrived, Dr. Eyres of Newport, was added to the committee, and they happily draughted the present charter, and lodged it, with a new petition, in proper hands. The most material alterations were, appointing the same number of Baptists in the fellowship that had been appointed by the Presbyterians, by Dr. Stiles; setting the presidency in the Baptist society; adding five Baptists to the Trustees, and putting more Episcopalians than Presbyterians in the corporation (Guild, *Life and Times of James Manning and the Early History of Brown University*).

The college required rigid examinations in the classics for entrance. Some of the orations at the commencement were delivered in Latin. For subjects chosen, modes of presentation, and the customs of the times, the following account of the first commencement is interesting:

On Thursday, the seventh of this instance (1769), was celebrated at Warren the first commencement in the college of this colony; when the following young gentlemen commenced Bachelor of Arts; namely, Joseph Belton, Joseph Eaton, William Rogers, Richard Stites, Charles Thompson, James Mitchell Varnum and William Williams.

About ten o'clock, A. M., the gentlemen concerned in conducting the affairs of the college, together with the candidates, went in procession to the meeting house.

After they had taken their seats respectively, and the audience composed, the President introduced the business of the day with prayer; then followed a salutatory in Latin, pronounced with much spirit, by Mr. Stites, which produced him great applause from the learned part of the assembly. He spoke upon the advantages of

liberty and learning, and their mutual dependence upon each other; concluding with proper salutations to the Chancellor of the college, Governor of the colony, etc., particularly expressing the gratitude of all the friends of the college to the Rev. Morgan Edwards, who has encountered many difficulties in going to Europe to collect donations for the institution, and has lately returned.

To which succeeded a forensic dispute, in English, on the following thesis, namely, “The Americans, in their present circumstances, cannot, consistent with good policy, affect to become an Independent State.” Mr. Varnum ingeniously defended it, by cogent arguments handsomely dressed; though he was subtly but delicately opposed by Mr. William; both of whom spoke with emphasis and propriety.

As a conclusion to the exercises of the forenoon, the audience were agreeably entertained with an oration on benevolence, by Mr. Rogers; in which, among many other pertinent observations, he particularly noticed the necessity which that infant seminary stands in of the salutary effects of that truly Christian virtue.

At three o’clock P. M., the audience being convened, a syllogistic dispute was introduced on the thesis: “*Materia cogitate non potest*” Mr. Williams the respondent; Messieurs Belton, Eaton, Rogers and Varnum the opponents,—in the course of which dispute, the principal arguments on both sides were produced toward settling the critical point.

The degree of Bachelor of Arts was then conferred on the candidates. Then the following gentlemen (graduated in other colleges) at their own request received the honorary degree of Master of Arts; namely, Rev. Edward Upham, Rev. Morgan Edwards, Rev. Samuel Stillman, Rev. Hezekiah Smith, Hon. Joseph Wanton, Jun. Esq., Mr. Jabez Bowen, and Mr. David Howell, Professor of Philosophy in said college.

The following gentlemen, being well recommended by the Faculty for literary merit, had conferred on them the honorary degree of Master in the Arts; namely, Rev. Abel Morgan, Rev. Oliver Hart, Rev. David Thomas, Rev. Samuel Jones, Mr. John Davis, Mr. Robert

Strettle Jones, Mr. John Stites, Rev. James Bryson, Rev. James Edwards, Rev. William Boulton, Rev. John Ryland, Rev. William Clark, Rev. Joshua Toulmin, and Rev. Caleb Evans.

A concise, pertinent, and solemn charge was then given to the Bachelors by the President, concluding with his paternal benediction, which naturally introduced the valedictory orator, Mr. Thompson, who, after some remarks upon the excellences of the oratorical art, and expressions of gratitude to the patrons and officers of the college, together with a valediction to them, and all present, took a most affectionate leave of his classmates. The scene was tender, the subject felt, and the audience affected.

The President concluded the exercises with prayer. The whole was conducted with a propriety and solemnity suitable to the occasion. The audience (consisting of the principal gentlemen and ladies of the colony), though large and crowded, behaved with the utmost decorum.

In the evening, the Rev. Morgan Edwards, by particular request, preached a sermon, especially addressed to the graduates, from Phil. 3:8: “Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ my Lord”; in which (after high encomiums on the liberal arts, and sciences) the superior knowledge of Christ, or the Christian science, was clearly and fully illustrated in several striking examples and similes; one of which follows: “When the sun is below the horizon, the stars excel in glory; but when his orb irradiates our hemisphere, their glory dwindles, fades away, disappears.”

Not only the candidates, but even the President, were dressed in American manufactures. Finally, be it observed, that this class are the first sons of that college which has existed for more than four years; during all which time it has labored under great disadvantages, notwithstanding the warm patronage and encouragement of many worthy men of fortune and benevolence; and it is hoped, from the disposition which many discovered on that day, and other favorable circumstances, that these disadvantages will soon, in part, be happily removed (*The Providence Gazette and*

*County Journal*).

The performances of the day excited universal attention. “We can readily imagine,” says one, “how the beautiful and benevolent face of President Manning was radiant with smiles on this occasion; with what joy he beheld the first fruits of his anxieties; and labors and prayers; with what glowing eloquence he poured forth, at the throne of grace, the pious effusions of a grateful heart, invoking the blessing of God upon the future efforts of the friends of the infant institution, and filling every heart with emotion, if not every eye with tears, as, with the affection of a friend and the solicitude of a father, he commended to the care of heaven those who were about to depart from him, and, at a period of no ordinary moment, to enter a world of temptation and trial.”

The college continued in successful operation till 1776, when, in consequence of the war, which had now deeply engrossed the attention of the whole country, the students were all dispersed. The college edifice was occupied by the French and American soldiery as a hospital and barracks from December, 1776, to June, 1782, at which time study was again resumed. These were days of trial, in which every muscle and sinew of the American people were put in requisition. The students of this then infant institution left the walls of science for the duties of the camp. The President, meanwhile, occupied an honorable seat in the American Congress.

The Philadelphia Association was among the first, if not the very first, ecclesiastical body in America, it is believed, which took a stand on the subject of temperance. The following is from the minutes of the year 1788:

This Association, taking into consideration the ruinous effects of the great abuse of distilled liquors throughout the country, take this opportunity of expressing our hearty concurrence with our brethren of several other religious societies, in discountenancing the use of them in the future; and earnestly entreat our brethren and friends to use all of their influence to that end, both in their own families and neighborhood, except when used as a medicine (Minutes, 239)

The manners and customs in worship were primitive and often rude. “Behold now the congregation as it assembles on the Sabbath. Some of them are mounted on horses, the father with his wife or daughter on a pillion behind him, and perhaps also his little boy astride before him. They ride up to the

stone horseblock and dismount. The young men and maidens, when not provided with horses, approach on foot. They have worn their everyday shoes until just before coming into sight and have exchanged them for their clean calfskins or morocco, having deposited the old ones in some unsuspected patch or breaks or some sly hole in the wall. They carry in hand a rose, a lilac, a pink, a peony or a pond lily (for this was the whole catalogue of flowers then known in the country towns), or, what was still more exquisite, a nice bunch of caraway seed. Instead of this in winter they bare a tin foot-stove containing a little dish of coals, which they have carefully brought from home or filled at some neighboring house; and this was all the warmth they were to enjoy during the two long hours of the service. In winter they come a long distance on ox-sleds, or perhaps skim over the deep untrodden snow on snow shoes. They enter the house stamping the snow from their feet and tramping over the uncarpeted aisles with their cow-hide shoes.

“Let us enter with them. The wintry blast howls around and shrieks among the loose clap-boards; the half-fastened windows clatter; and the walls re-echo to the thumping of thick boots as their wearers endeavor to keep up the circulation in their half-frozen feet, while clouds of vapor issue from their mouths; and the man of God, as he raises his hands in his long prayers, must needs protect them with shaggy mittens. So comfortless and cold—it makes one shudder to think of it. In summer, on the contrary, the sun blazes in, unscreened by window curtains; the sturdy farmer, accustomed to labor all day in his shirt sleeves, takes the liberty to lay aside his coat in like manner for the more serious employments of the sanctuary” (*History of a Hampshire Town*).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

*Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association from A. D. 1707, to A.D. 1807; being the first One Hundred Years of its Existence.* Edited by A. D. Gillette, A.M., Pastor of the Eleventh Baptist Church, Philadelphia. Philadelphia, 1851.

Reuben Aldridge Guild, *Life, Times and Correspondence of James Manning, and the Early History of Brown University.* Boston, 1884.

Reuben A. Guild, Charter of Brown University, *The Baptist Quarterly*, IX. 165-187. Philadelphia, 1875.

A. H. Newman, History of Baptist Organization, *The Review and Expositor*, VIII. 353-362. Louisville, 1911.

## CHAPTER X

### THE GREAT AWAKENING

Baptists in Massachusetts—Position of the Puritans—Reaction Against the Standing Order—Thirteen Evils—The Account of Jonathan Edwards of Conditions—A Minister in New Hampshire—The Historian Trumbull—The Drink Habit—The Half Way Covenant—The Burning of Witches—The Awakening in Northampton—The Sermons of Edwards—The Revival Begins—The Effects of the Revival—George Whitefield—The Estimate of Benjamin Franklin—Manner of Preaching of Whitefield—Calvinism—The Baptists Calvinistic—Disorders—Persecutions of the Standing Order—Edwards Ejected from His Church—The *Boston Gazette*—Opposition of the Episcopalians—Action of the Connecticut Legislature—The New Lights—The New Lights Become Baptists—Bacon's Account—Great Growth of the Baptists.

At the time of the Great Awakening in Massachusetts there were nine Baptist churches. After the Great Awakening, and as a result of it before the Revolution, there were organized in the State twenty-seven other Baptist churches. From these beginnings the Baptists spread, in the course of time, through all of the New England States. The Great Awakening began in 1734 with the third generation of the Puritans. With the origin of this revival the Baptists had nothing to do; but from it they reaped great results.

The churches of the Puritans, or the standing order, were intensely religious in their theory and organization. The connection between Church and State was close; and they confidently asserted that they were led of God in all of the affairs of life. They believed that the Scriptures prescribed not only grace for salvation, but laws for the government of the community. These laws were derived from Moses rather than from Christ. In the first twenty years about one hundred ministers came over from England. They were of a highly intellectual character and they were constantly consulted by governors and magistrates. Their advice was freely given, sometimes before it was asked; yet it was never unwelcome. In 1635 Rev. John Cotton drew up, for the use of the General Court, a law code based upon "Moses, his judicials"; and capital punishment was long continued for offenses specified in the book of Leviticus.

From necessity there came a reaction against the standing order. Men could not be made pious by law. Non-church members were not permitted to

participate in the government. Until a profession of religion was made even the children of such unbelievers were barred from all the privileges of the church. There was a general lapse in morals. The General Court called, in 1679, a Reforming Synod to consider the evils of the day.

After a careful consideration of these problems thirteen evils were specified as being the cause of the disasters and calamities which had come upon them. They were as follows: decay of godliness on the part of professed Christians; pride and extravagance in dress; neglect of baptism and church fellowship together with a failure to testify against Quakers and Baptists; profanity and irreverent behaviour in the sanctuary; absence of Sabbath observance; lack of family government and worship; backbitings, censures, revilings, and litigations between church members; intemperance, tavern haunting and putting the bottle to the lips of the Indians, besides adultery, lustful dress and behaviour, mixed dancings, gaming and idleness; covetousness and a love of the world; opposition to reformation and leniency toward sin; a want of public spirit in causing schools and other common interests to languish; and finally a general unfruitfulness under means of grace and a refusal to repent.

Jonathan Edwards, writing concerning the year 1730, when he succeeded his grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, as the pastor of the church in Northampton, says:

It seemed to be a time of extraordinary dullness in religion; licentiousness for some years greatly prevailed among the youth of the town; they were many of them very much addicted to night walking, and frequenting the tavern, and lewd practices wherein some by their example exceedingly corrupted others. It was their manner very frequently to get together in conventions of both sexes, for mirth and jollity, which they called frolicks; and they would often spend the greater part of the night in them, without any regard to order in the families they belonged to; and indeed family government did not much prevail in the town. It was become very customary with many of our young people to be indecent in their carriage at meeting, which doubtless would not have prevailed to such a degree, had it not been that my grandfather, through his great age (though he retained his powers surprisingly to the last) was not able to observe them. There had also prevailed in the town a spirit of

contention between two parties, into which they had for many years been divided, by which was maintained a jealousy one of the other, and they were prepared to oppose one another in public affairs (Edwards, *Narrative of Surprising Conversions*. Works, III.).

A minister in the capital town of New Hampshire says of the state of the churches at this time:

No serious Christian could behold it without a sad heart, and scarce without a weeping eye; to see the solid, substantial piety, for which our ancestors were justly renowned, having long languished under sore decays, brought so low, and seemingly just ready to expire and give up the ghost. How did not only Pelagianism, but Arianism, Socinianism, and even Deism, and what is falsely called Free-Thinking, here and there prevail! The instituted means of salvation, in many places, were but lightly esteemed, and a horrid contempt was put upon the ministry of the word (Shurtliff, *Defence of Whitefield*).

Trumbull, the historian of Connecticut, speaking of the year 1734, says:

The forms of religion were kept up, but there appeared but little of the power of it. Both the wise and foolish virgins seemed to slumber. Professors appeared too generally to become worldly and lukewarm. The young people became loose and vicious, family prayer and religion were greatly neglected, the Sabbath was lamentably profaned; the intermissions were spent in worldly conversation. The young people made the evenings after the Lord's day, and after lectures, the times for their mirth and company keeping. Taverns were haunted; intemperance and other vices increased; and the Spirit of God appeared to be awfully withdrawn. It seems also to appear that many of the clergy, instead of clearly and powerfully preaching the doctrines of original sin, or regeneration, justification by faith alone, and the other peculiar doctrines of the gospel, contented themselves with preaching a cold, unprincipled and lifeless morality; for when these great doctrines were perspicuously and powerfully preached, and distinctions were made between the morality of Christians, originating in evangelical principles, faith and love, and the morality of heathen, they were offended, and

became violent opposers (Trumbull, *History of Connecticut*, II.).

And of the year 1739 he says:

But few persons offered themselves to the communion of the churches. It was also observed that those who did offer themselves gave no account of any previous convictions which they had obtained of their great sin and misery by nature and practice. It does not appear that ministers in general, at that time, made any particular enquiry of those whom they admitted to communion, with respect to their internal feelings and exercises. The Stoddardian opinion generally prevailed at this period, that unregenerate men could consistently covenant with God, and when moral in their lives, had a right to sealing ordinances (Trumbull, II.).

The drink habit had frightfully increased. "It is easy to praise the fathers of New England," says Theodore Parker, "easier to praise for virtues they did not possess than to discriminate and fairly judge those remarkable men . . . . Let us mention two facts. It is recorded in the probate office that in 1678, at the funeral of Mrs. Mary Norton, widow of the celebrated John Norton, one of the ministers of the first Church in Boston, fifty-one and a half gallons of the best Malaga wine were consumed by the mourners. In 1685, at the funeral of Rev. Thomas Cobbett, minister of Ipswich, there were consumed one barrel of wine and two barrels of cider; and, as it was cold, there were 'some spice and ginger for the cider.' You may easily judge of the drunkenness and riot on occasions less solemn than the funeral of an old beloved minister. Towns provided intoxicating drinks at the funeral of their paupers. In Salem, in 1728, at the funeral of a pauper, a gallon of wine and another of cider are charged as 'incidentals'; the next year six gallons of wine on a similar occasion. In Lynn, in 1728, the town furnished 'half a barrel of cider for the widow Despau's funeral.' Affairs had come to such a pass that in 1742 the General Court forbade the use of wine and rum at funerals" (Parker, *Speeches, Addresses and Occasional Sermons*).

The year 1662 marks a transitional point in the churches of New England. The adoption of the celebrated half-way covenant that year opened the door for worldliness, formality, and dangerous errors. In 1670 a decay in spirituality was very apparent. Rev. Samuel Danforth, of Roxbury, spoke of "the temper, complexion, and countenance of the churches as being strangely

altered” and “a cold, careless, dead frame of spirit” as having “grown steadily” upon them. In 1678 Increase Mather spoke of “conversions” as “rare.” “The body of the rising generation is a poor, perishing, unconverted, and, except the Lord pour down his Spirit, an undone generation. Many are profane, drunkards, lascivious, scoffers at the power of godliness.” In 1683 Rev. Samuel Torrey, of Weymouth, spoke: “Of the many symptoms of death that are upon our religion!” “As converting work doth cease, so doth religion die away; though more insensibly, yet more irrevocably. How much is religion dying in the hearts of sincere Christians!” In 1702 Increase Mather said: “Look into our pulpits and see if there is such a glory there as there once was. Look into the civil State. Does Christ reign there as he once did? How many churches, how many towns are there in New England over which we may sigh and say, the glory is gone!” (Dorchester, *Christianity in the United States*).

The burning of the witches greatly lowered the religious tone of the country. New England suffered the consequences of a delusion which was at this period dying out in Europe. In the year previous witches had occasionally been tried and executed; but in 1692, processes of this kind commenced, especially in Salem, on such a scale that by degrees towards one hundred persons were brought to trial. The accusers represented themselves as tormented by these persons in a very singular manner, and as having seen and watched their secret conclaves with evil spirits. Not one of the number confessed his guilt. It was not until the accusers had impeached many persons of blameless character and members of distinction that the public opinion turned against the accusers. The cause of religion, however, was irretrievably injured (Uhlen, *The New England Theocracy*, 222. Boston, 1859).

There had been some manifestations of a better state of affairs. Theodore Frelenhuyson, a Dutch Reformed minister, near New Brunswick, New Jersey, was afflicted with a serious illness. After his recovery he seriously called sinners to repentance. “Which method,” he said, “was sealed by the Holy Spirit in the conviction and conversion of a considerable number of persons at various times and in different places in that part of the country as appeared by their acquaintance with experimental religion and good conversation” (Tracy, *The Great Awakening*).

The Great Awakening, however, properly began in Northampton, Massa-

chusetts, about the year 1734. The honor belongs to Jonathan Edwards. As a child he was precocious. At six he commenced the study of Latin, at ten he wrote an essay denying the materiality of the soul, and at thirteen he entered Yale College, from which he graduated in September, 1720, before he had quite reached the age of seventeen. During his second year in college he read Locke on the "*Human Understanding*," with which he said he was inexpressibly pleased and entertained; more so than the greedy miser, when gathering a handful of silver and gold from some newly-discovered treasure. After graduation he remained two years in college, studying and preparing himself for the gospel ministry to which he had already committed himself.

A genealogical study of the descendants of Edwards reveals very interesting facts. It has been computed that among them are presidents of eight colleges, about one hundred college professors, more than one hundred lawyers, sixty physicians, thirty judges, eighty holders of important public offices, twenty-five officers in the army and navy, and numberless clergymen and missionaries (Winship, *The Human Legacy of Jonathan Edwards*, *The World's Work*, October, 1903).

With Edwards began a new period of American religious history, a period characterized on the one hand by revivalism and on the other by the appearance of theological parties and the growth of denominationalism.

After his settlement at Northampton he began preaching sermons on justification by faith, the justice of God in the damnation of sinners, the excellency of Christ, and the duty of pressing into the kingdom of God. These sermons greatly deepened the religious impressions of his hearers.

In these sermons the doctrine of God's sovereignty was strongly insisted upon. Through the fall of Adam man had lost God's favor and henceforth had no claim upon his mercy. Man is a sinner by birth as well as by choice and is possessed of no moral power of his own wherewith he may turn to God or please him. God is under no obligation to save any one. "His sovereignty is involved in his freedom to take whom he pleases, and to leave whom he pleases to perish." Special grace is communicated to such as he has chosen to salvation, but all others are left to die in their sins. Satisfaction must be made for the sins of those who are foreordained to eternal life. Such satisfaction was made in the vicarious sacrifice on the cross by Jesus Christ, who suffered thereby a penalty equivalent to the eternal sufferings of the elect, and thus

their debt was literally paid. By the imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer soul salvation was effected (Beardsley, *A History of American Revivals*).

Under this preaching some persons were converted. Among these was a frivolous young woman, who it was feared would bring disrepute upon the gospel, but these fears were not realized.

"Presently upon this," wrote Edwards, "a great and earnest concern about the great things of religion, and the eternal world, became universal in all parts of the town, and among persons of all degrees, and all ages; the noise among the dry bones waxed louder and louder; all other talk but about spiritual and eternal things was soon thrown by; all the conversation in all companies, upon all occasions, was upon these things only, unless so much as was necessary for people carrying on their ordinary secular business. Other discourse than on the things of religion, would scarcely be tolerated in any company. The minds of the people were wonderfully taken off from the world; it was treated amongst us as a thing of very little consequence; they seemed to follow their worldly business, more as a part of their duty, than any disposition they had to it; the temptation now seemed to lie on that hand, to neglect worldly affairs too much, and to spend too much time in the immediate exercise of religion; which thing was exceedingly misrepresented by reports that were spread in distant parts of the land, as though the people here had wholly thrown by all worldly business, and betook themselves entirely to reading and praying, and such like religious exercises.

"But though the people did not ordinarily neglect their worldly business, yet there was the reverse of what commonly is; religion was with all sorts the common concern, and the world was a thing only by the way. The only thing in their view was to get the kingdom of heaven, and everyone appeared pressing into it; the engagedness of their hearts in this great concern could not be hid; it appeared in their very countenances. It was then a dreadful thing amongst us to lie out of Christ, in danger every day of dropping into hell; and what persons' minds were intent upon was to escape for their lives, and to fly *from the wrath to come*. All would eagerly lay hold of opportunities for their souls; and were wont very often to meet together in private houses for religious purposes; and such meetings, when appointed, were wont greatly to be thronged.

“There was scarcely a single person in the town, either old or young, that was left unconcerned about the great things of the eternal world. Those that were wont to be vainest, and loosest, and those that had been disposed to think and speak slightly of vital and experimental religion, were now generally subject to great awakenings. And the work of conversion was carried on in a most astonishing manner, and increased more and more; souls did, as it were, come by flocks to Jesus Christ. From Day to day, for many months together, might be seen evident instances of sinners brought *out of darkness into marvelous light*, and delivered *out of an horrible pit, and from the miry clay, and set upon a rock*, with a *new song of praise to God in their mouths*” (Edwards, III.).

The effects of the revival were far reaching; but the labors of George Whitefield greatly augmented the results. “The life of Whitefield reads like a romance. He was born in Bell Inn, in the city of Gloucester, England, December 16, 1714. His father, who had been a wine merchant and afterwards an inn keeper, died when the future evangelist was but two years of age. Notwithstanding her limited resources his mother determined to give him every advantage within her power. As a youth he was sent to the Grammar School of St. Mary de Crypt, and at the age of eighteen he entered Oxford University, where he secured a position as servitor in Pembroke College. With the assistance thus afforded and through the kindness of friends he was enabled to reach the end of his three years’ residence at college with but twenty-five pounds indebtedness.” At first he was reckless, but after he gave himself to the ministry he lived an austere life. He was an orator of unusual power. Of his first sermon it was reported that he had driven fifteen persons mad. Repeatedly he visited America and preached in every section of the country. In Philadelphia he spoke from the gallery of the Court House, on Market Street. It was said that “his voice was distinctly heard on the Jersey shore, and so distinct was his speech that every word was understood on board of a shallop at Market street wharf, a distance of upward of four hundred feet from the court house. All the intermediate space was crowded with his hearers” (Gillies, *Memoirs of Whitefield*).

“He seems to have no regard,” says Prince, “to please the eyes of his hearers with agreeable gesture, nor their ears with delivery, nor their fancy with language; but to aim directly at their hearts and consciences, to lay open their ruinous delusions, show them their numerous, secret, hypocritical shifts in

religion, and drive them out of every deceitful refuge wherein they made themselves easy with the form of godliness without power” (Tracy, *The Great Awakening*).

On the effects of the visit to Philadelphia Benjamin Franklin said:

The multitudes of all sects and denominations that attended his sermons were enormous, and it was a matter of speculation with me to observe the influence of his oratory on his hearers and how much they respected him, notwithstanding his common abuse of them, assuring them that they were naturally half beasts and half devils. It was wonderful to see the change soon made in the manners of the inhabitants. From being thoughtless and indifferent about religion, it seemed as if all the world was growing religious; so that one could not walk through the town in an evening without hearing psalms in different families in every street (Billingsley, *Life of Whitefield*).

The manner of his preaching is thus described by a contemporary:

“He loudly proclaims all men by nature to be under sin, and obnoxious to the wrath of God. He maintains the absolute necessity of supernatural grace to bring men out of this state. He asserts the righteousness of Christ alone to be the cause of the justification of a sinner; that this is received by faith; that faith is the gift of God; that where faith is wrought it brings the sinner under the deepest sense of unworthiness, to the footstool of sovereign grace to accept of mercy as the free gift of God only for Christ’s sake. He asserts the absolute necessity of the new birth; that this new production is solely the work of God’s blessed spirit; that wherever it is wrought it is a permanent, abiding principle, and that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it” (Dunning, *Congregationalists*).

The trend of the preaching was decidedly Calvinistic. The sovereignty of God was the central theme about which all else revolved. Jonathan Edwards wrote:

I think I have found that no discourses have been more remarkably blessed, than those in which the doctrine of God’s absolute sovereignty with regard to the salvation of sinners, and his just liberty, with regard to the answering the prayers, or succeeding the pains of mere natural men, continuing such, have been insisted on

(Edwards, Works, III.).

On the subject of a “*Sinner in the Hands of an Angry God*” President Edwards says:

God has laid himself under no obligation, by any promise, to keep any natural man out of hell one moment.... The bow of God’s wrath is bent, and the arrow made ready on the string, and justice bends the arrow at your heart, and strains the bow, and it is nothing but the mere pleasure of God, and that of an angry God, without any promise or obligation at all, that keeps the arrow for one moment from being drunk with your blood ....The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider or some loathsome insect over the fire, abhors you and is dreadfully provoked ....You hang by a slender thread, with the flames of divine wrath flashing about it, and ready every moment to singe it and burn it asunder; and you have no interest in any mediator, and nothing to lay hold of to save yourself, nothing to keep off the flames of wrath, nothing of your own, nothing that you have ever done, nothing that you can do to induce God to spare you one moment.

The preaching of some Baptists was equally Calvinistic in tone. Ezra Stiles, in a letter to Chauncy Whittlesey, March 6, 1770, describes one Dawson, a Baptist minister of Newport, as follows:

He preaches that it is sinful for an unregenerate to pray at all; to use the Lord’s Prayer in particular, for if they said the truth, they would say....”Our Father which art in Hell,” our Father, the Devil; that unregenerate are to use no means at all, there are no means appointed for them;...they are more likely, or at least as likely, to be seized by grace, not using than using means. Particularly, as to attending his preaching, he asked them what they came there for, he had nothing to say to them, only to tell them that they were heirs of damnation, and that would do them no good nor hurt...None but saints were the subjects of his preaching or ordination; and (he) forbid at length the promiscuous congregation to sing with them, or to pray with them,—and only a dozen or so now sing .... So that he does the thing thoroughly,—he makes no pauses or reservations. Now this, at this time, is a very wonderful looking glass (Stiles,

*Diary, I.*)

Naturally there were many disorders which accompanied these revival services. A writer in the *Boston Gazette*, May 31, 1743, suggested that a convention be held to “consider whether they are not called upon to give an open, conjunct testimony to an event so surprising and gracious, as well as against those errors in doctrine and disorders in practice, which, through the persistent agency of Satan, have attended it, and in some measure blemished its glory and hindered its advancement.” Such a meeting was held July following. After deliberation sixty-eight persons signed a manifesto. In part the ministers expressed themselves in these words.

With respect to a number of those who have been under the impressions of the present day, we must declare there is no good ground to conclude that they have become real Christians; the account they give of their conviction and consolation agreeing with the standard of the holy scriptures, corresponding with the experience of the saints, and evidenced by the eternal fruits of holiness in their live; so that they appear to those who have the nearest access to them, as so many epistles of Christ, written, not with ink, but by the Spirit of the living God, attesting to the genuineness of the present operation, and representing the excellency of it. Indeed, many who appeared under conviction, and were much altered in their external behaviour, when this work began, and while it was most flourishing, have lost their impressions, and are relapsed into their former manner of life; yet of those who were judged hopefully converted, and made a public profession of religion, there have been fewer instances of scandal and apostasy than might be expected. So that, so far as we are able to form a judgment, the face of religion is lately changed much for the better in many of our towns and congregations; and together with a reformation observable in divers instances, there appears to be more experimental godliness, and lively Christianity, than most of us can remember we have ever seen before.

The conduct of Whitefield sometimes savored of fanaticism. His Journal abounds in descriptions of the emotional effects of his preaching. “Shrieking, crying, weeping, and wailing were to be heard on every corner.” “In almost

every part of the congregation somebody or another began to cry out, and almost all melted into tears.” “Some were struck pale as death, others wringing their hands, others were lying on the ground, and most lifting their eyes toward heaven, and crying to God for mercy.” He was greatly influenced by impulses and impressions.

There were many protests from the State Churches which finally led to the organization of Separate or New Light churches. There are many examples of this kind. Ebenezer Frothingham, of Middletown, gives an account of conditions, in 1767, in Connecticut. He says:

I myself have been confined in Hartford prison near five months, for nothing but exhorting and warning the People, after the public Worship was done and the Assembly dismissed. And whilst I was there confined, three more persons were sent to prison; one for exhorting, and two for worshipping God in a private house in a Separate meeting. And quick after I was released by the Laws being answered by natural Relations unbeknown to me, then two brethren were committed for exhorting and preaching, and several others afterwards for attending the same duties; and I myself twice more was sent to prison for the Minister’s rates (Frothingham, *A Key to Unlock the Door that leads in to take a Fair View of the Religious Constitution established by Law in the Colony of Connecticut*, 51. Printed 1767).

He further informs us the Baptists were persecuted for the same reasons:

Young Deacon Drake, of Windsor, now in Hartford prison, for the Minister’s rates and building their meeting house, altho’ he is a baptist;...is accounted a harmless, godly man; and he has plead the privilege of a baptist, through all the courts, and been at great expense, without relief, till at last the assembly has given him a mark in his hand, and notwithstanding this, they have thrust him to prison for former rates, with several aggravations, which I shall omit. But as to what the Constitution does to relieve the poor Deacon, he may there die, and the cry of blood, blood, go up to the ears of a just God (Frothingham).

To prevent Whitefield from visiting Connecticut, and to prejudice the people against him, the General Association of Churches of Connecticut, June, 1745,

passed the following resolution:

That, WHEREAS, there has of late years been many errors in doctrine and disorders in practice, prevailing in the Churches in this land, which seem to have a threatening aspect upon the Churches; and WHEREAS, Mr. George Whitefield has been the promoter, or at least the faulty occasion of many of these errors and disorders; this Association think it needful for them to declare, that if the said Mr. Whitefield should make his progress through this government, it would by no means be advisable for any of our ministers to admit him into their pulpits, or for any of our people to attend his administrations (Frederic Denison, *Notes of the Baptists, and Their Principles in Norwich, Conn., from the Settlement of the Town to 1850*).

Even Jonathan Edwards was ejected from his church at Northampton. An ecclesiastical council, “convened not without elements of unfairness,” voted “that it is expedient that the pastoral relation between Mr. Edwards and his church be immediately dissolved, if the people shall persist in desiring it.” The action of the council was ratified by the church by a majority of two hundred and fifty votes. July 1, 1750, he preached his farewell sermon. For sometime he preached occasionally, until prohibited to do so by the town meeting.

The Episcopalians were likewise in opposition to Whitefield and the revival. This did much toward the unpopularity of that denomination in the American Revolution. Dr. Colman of the Battle Street Church invited Whitefield to Boston. Dr. Cutler, meeting him on the street, said to him frankly: “I am sorry to see you here”; to which Whitefield replied: “So is the Devil.” Dr. Cutler described Whitefield’s visit in a letter to a friend, as follows:

Whitefield has plagued us with a witness. It would be an endless attempt to describe the scene of confusion and disturbance occasioned by him; the divisions of families, neighborhoods and towns; the contrariety of husbands and wives; the undutifulness of children and servants; the quarrels among the teachers; the disorders of the night; the intermission of labor and business; the neglect of husbandry and the gathering of the harvest.... In many communities several preaching, and several exhorting and praying, at the same

time, the rest crying, or laughing, yelping, sprawling or fainting. This revel in some places has been maintained many days and nights together.

When Mr. Whitefield first arrived here, the whole town was alarmed. He made his first visit to church on Friday, and canvassed with many of our clergy together, and belied them, me especially, when he was gone. Being not invited into our pulpits, the Dissenters were highly pleased, and engrossed him; and immediately bells rang, and all hands went to lecture. This show kept up all the while he was here. The town was ever alarmed; the streets were filled with people with coaches and chairs, all for the benefit of that holy man. The conventicles were crowded; but he rather chose the Common, where multitudes might see him in all his awful postures; besides, in one crowded conventicle, six were killed in a fight before he came in; but he ever anathematized the Church of England, and that was enough.

After him came one Tennant, a monster, impudent and noisy, and told them they were all Damned! Damned! Damned! This charmed them, and, in the most dreadful winter I ever saw, people wallowed in the snow, night and day, for the benefit of this beastly brayings.

In order to correct these alleged evils the Connecticut legislature, in 1742, passed an act forbidding any minister or licentiate to preach in any church not his own, without the consent of its pastor and the major portion of the membership, under penalty of forfeiting the right to collect his legal salary, if a resident of the colony, and liability of expulsion from the colony if not.

The Great Awakening “was begun and carried on almost wholly by Pedobaptists, from which denomination their fathers had suffered much, most of the Baptists were prejudiced against the work, and against the Calvinian doctrine by which it was prompted” (Backus, II. 41). Those who were converted in the Great Awakening found most of the churches of the standing order chilly and uncongenial and as a result became Separatists, or New Lights, founding churches of their own. The Separate churches organized in this movement continued to exist many years. Much complaint was urged against them because they were accused of being Americans (Reuben Fetcher, *The Lamentable State of New England*, Boston, 1771) .

The explanation of how these New Light churches became Baptist churches in many instances is thus given by Bacon:

“An even more important result of the Awakening was the swift and wide extension of Baptist principles and churches. This was altogether logical. The revival had come, not so much in the spirit and power of Elijah, turning to each other the hearts of the fathers and of children, as in the spirit of Ezekiel, the preacher of individual responsibility and duty. The temper of the revival was wholly congenial with the strong individualism of the Baptist churches. The Separatist churches formed in New England by the withdrawal of revival enthusiasts from the parish churches in many instances became Baptists. Cases of individual conversion to Baptist views were frequent, and the earnestness with which the new opinion was held approved itself not only by debating and proselyting, but by strenuous and useful evangelizing. Especially in the South, from Virginia to Georgia, the new preachers, entering into the labors of the annoyed and persecuted pioneers of their communion, won multitudes of converts to the Christian faith, from the neglected populations, both black and white, and gave to the Baptist churches a lasting prominence in numbers among the churches of the South” (Bacon, *A History of American Christianity*).

Thus the Baptists greatly profited by the Great Awakening. “At this period,” says Baron Stow, “the Baptist denomination on this continent was exceedingly limited, numbering only thirty-seven churches, and probably less than three thousand members. The preaching of Mr. Whitefield and others who caught from heaven the same hallowed fire, and the great awakening consequent upon their sanctified labors, gave currency to the principles which wrought undesired changes, and conducted to results which were neither anticipated nor desired. Little did those men of God who were such efficient agents in the ‘New Light Stir,’ as it was opprobriously called, and who pushed their measures with almost superhuman vigor, amidst a tempest of opposition and obloquy, imagine that they were breaking up the fallow ground of their own ecclesiastical system, and sowing seed from which a sect that was everywhere spoken against, would reap a bountiful harvest.

“The converts who received the name of ‘Separatists,’ were taught to throw

aside tradition, and take the Word of God only as their guide in all matters of religious faith and practice. This was in perfect coincidence with all Baptist teaching, and, as was predicted by the most sagacious among the opposers of the revival, ultimately led thousands, among whom were many ministers, to embrace our views and enter our churches.”

The method by which these Separate churches became Baptists may be illustrated by the history of the Sturbridge church, Massachusetts. “This church was in its origin one of those which claimed vital and practical godliness to be indispensable qualification for membership in a church of Christ. This principle was the whole ground of separation, in this case, as well as in many others.

“At first, the church believed in and practiced infant sprinkling. The fact that this is not an ordinance of scripture, probably, had never entered their minds. But still, the other principles which they had adopted, especially that of making the scriptures the supreme arbiter in religion, prepared the way for their giving up this unscriptural ceremony. Accordingly, some of the members soon began to entertain strong doubts of the correctness of their practice, and in this respect, and, soon after, openly to call in question the validity of infant sprinkling. Although a number of the members of the church became fully convinced that the scriptures point out no other baptism than that of believers, and no other mode than that of immersion. In May, 1749, thirteen of the members submitted to this ordinance, administered according to apostolic direction and practice. The ordinance was administered by Rev. Mr. Moulton of Brimfield. About fifty of the members were soon afterward baptized, including with those before mentioned the Pastor, the Deacons and the Ruling Elders. From the time of the first baptism, when the thirteen mentioned above were baptized, the sprinkling of infants, like the house of Saul, waxed weaker; while the baptism which the scriptures require, waxed stronger and stronger; till at length, the baptism of believers, as held and practiced by Baptist churches, at the present day, gained the complete victory.

“It will be seen by these statements, that this church was originally a Pedobaptist church....The Presbyterian form of church government was the model by which the discipline of this church, in its early history, was conducted....And it is presumed, that by tacit consent, the form of

government in the church became congregational” (Joel Kenney, Historical Sketch of the Baptist Church in Sturbridge, *The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record*, 201, 202. June, 1844).

This is a fair illustration of how many of the Separate became Baptist churches.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

The Works of President Edwards in four volumes. New York, 1849.

Frank Grenville Beardsley, *A History of American Revivals*. New York, 1912.

Warren A. Candler, *Great Revivals and the Great Republic*. Nashville, 1904.

John T. Perry, In the Footsteps of Whitefield, *The Baptist Review*, VII. 13-27. Cincinnati, 1885.

J. D. Knowles, Life and Times of Whitefield, *The Christian Review*, III. 264-271. Boston, 1838.

A. P. Marvin, Three Eras of Revival in the United States, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XVI. 279- 301. Andover, 1859.

Joseph F. Thompson, Jonathan Edwards, his Character, Teaching and Influence, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XVIII. 809-839. Andover, 1861.

Increase N. Tarbox, Jonathan Edwards, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXVI. 243-267.

Ezra Hoyt Byington, Jonathan Edwards and the Great Awakening, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LV. 114-127. Oberlin, 1898.

Arthur W. Cleaves, The Significance of Whitefield, *The Review and Expositor*, XII. 577-594. Louisville, 1915.

## CHAPTER XI

### THE BAPTISTS OF VIRGINIA

The First Settlers of Virginia—The Episcopalians—Contrasts with New England—First Efforts of the Baptists—The Church of England Established by Law—The Virginia Charter—No Toleration Allowed—The Bloody Laws—”Neck and Heels” in Jail for not Attending Church—The First Act of Parliament—The Salary of the Clergy Paid in Tobacco—Dissenters Must Depart the Colony—Whippings and Brandings—Ordination from the Church of England Demanded—Quakers and Baptists in Virginia—Infant Baptism—Presbyterians Tolerated for a Strange Reason—Baptists Slow in Entering the State—Marvelous Growth—Dr. Hawks—Bishop Perry—The Statement of Semple—The First Baptists from England—Robert Norden—Collections of Money in England for Baptists—Church at Burley—Churches in Berkeley and Loudon Counties—The Statement of John Gano—David Thomas.

Virginia is famous for being the oldest State in the Union; in early days it contained the largest number of inhabitants, and produced many distinguished men. “The first settlers of the country were emigrants from England, of the English Church, just at a point of time, when it was flushed with complete victory over the religions of all other persuasions.” Possessed as they became of the power of making, administering, and executing the laws, they showed intolerance to all other religious beliefs.

“The Episcopalians retained full possession of the country about a century. Other opinions began to creep in; and the care of the government to support their own church, having begotten an equal degree of indolence in its clergy, two-thirds of the people had become dissenters at the commencement of the Revolution. The laws indeed were still oppressive on them; but the spirit of the one party had subsided into moderation, and on the other, had arisen to a degree of determination which commanded respect” (Morse, *Geography*, I.).

There were strange contrasts which prevailed between the conditions in New England and Virginia; but in the fierceness of persecutions of Baptists there were no differences. Baptists here, as everywhere else, met with the keenest opposition. “The endeavor to found Baptist churches in Virginia was in its earlier stages an extraordinary and unique religious movement, unparalleled elsewhere in the history of Christianity on the American continent, and the like of which, it is not supposed, will ever occur again. The cause of this may be traced in the origin and history of the colony of Virginia, the successful

undertaking of which found its most zealous and effective advocate in a prebendary of the Established Church of England, whose pen drafted the rules of government under which the first expedition sailed. Priests of the church accompanied the earliest and most important voyages, and formally signaled their landings on James river with their prayers. Among the earliest buildings reared at Jamestown was one consecrated to the services of the church. The most zealous care of the Colonial Assembly for more than a century after the settlement was to cement the union between the government and the church, and to make the claims and officers of the latter as binding as possible upon the people. Thus legalized, the church anticipated the birth of the children of the colony, and did not forsake them in their death. It offered its blessings on the natal hour in prayer ‘for all women in the perils of child birth.’ It sealed their tender infancy with its baptismal sacrament, under rubrics which provided: ‘The priest shall take the child in his hands, and naming the child, shall dip it in the water “discreetly and warily.”’ It published the bands of matrimony on its church doors, and solemnized the rite with its formula. It enforced Sabbath worship in accordance with its ritual and creed, and under heavy penalties for its neglect; and the obsequies of the dead it directed after its own impressive burial service. Even its church yards were made by law cemeteries, so that the Establishment which nursed its children so closely in life, ceased not to covet them with its shadows in death” (Semple, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia*).

The charter of the colony made the Church of England an established part of the law of the land. The first charter granted by James I, April 10, 1606, was for a time the organic law. That part of the charter which relates to religion is as follows:

We do especially ordain, and require the said Presidents, and Councils, and the Ministers of the said several colonies respectively, within their limits and precincts, that they with all diligence, care and respect do provide that the true word and service of God, and Christian faith, be preached, planted, and used, not only within every one of the said several colonies and plantations, but also as much as they may among the savage people which do or shall adjoin unto them, according to the doctrine, rites and religion now professed, and established within our realm of England; and that

they shall not suffer any person or persons, to withdraw and of the subjects or people inhabiting or shall inhabit within any of the said several colonies and plantations from the same, or from their due allegiance to us and our heirs and successors, as their immediate sovereign under God; and if they shall find within the said colonies and plantations any person or persons so seeking to withdraw any of the subjects of us, our heirs or successors, or any of the people of these lands or territories within the precincts aforesaid, they shall with all diligence, him or them so offending cause to be apprehended, arrested and imprisoned, until he shall fully and thoroughly reform himself; or otherwise, when the cause so requireth, that he shall with all convenient speed, be sent into the realm of England, here to receive condign punishment for his or their said offence or offences (Hening, *Statutes at Large*, being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the First Session of the Legislature, I. 68. New York, 1823).

This charter was granted upon the principle of intolerance and persecution. There was at no time any intention of recognizing human liberty. This was never a part of the creed of the Stuarts. "Toleration in the forms of religion," says Foote, "was unknown in Virginia in 1688. From the commencement of the colony, the necessity of the religious element was felt. The company knew not how to control the members composing the colony but by religion and law" (Foote, *Sketches of Virginia Historical and Biographical*, I. 25. New York, 1850).

The provisions of the charter were further strengthened by "The Code of Sir Thomas Dale," of 1611. This code carried the following terrible enactments relating to religion:

There is not one man nor woman in this colony, now present nor hereafter to arrive, but shall give an account of his or their faith and religion, and repair unto the minister, that by his conference with them, he may understand and gather whether they have been sufficiently instructed and catechised in the principles and grounds of religion; whose weakness and ignorance, the minister finding, and advising them in love and charity to repair often to him, to receive therein a greater measure of knowledge, if they shall refuse

to repair unto him, and he, the minister, give notice thereof to the governor, or the chief officers of that town or fort, wherein he or she, the parties so offending shall remain, the governor shall cause the offender for the first time of refusal, to be whipped; for the second time, to be whipped twice, and to acknowledge his fault upon the Sabbath day in the congregation; and for the third time, to be whipped every day, until he hath made the same acknowledgment, and asked forgiveness for the same, and shall repair unto the minister to be further instructed as aforesaid; and upon the Sabbath when the minister shall catechise, and demand any question concerning his faith and knowledge, he shall not refuse to make answer, upon the same peril (Laws, &c. Strachey. London, 1612. Howison, *History of Virginia*, II. 148).

Captain Argall, who became governor, in 1617, decreed “that every person should go to Church, Sundays and Holidays, or lye Neck and Heels that Night, and be a Slave to the Colony the following week; for the second offence he should be a Slave for a month; and for the third, a year and a day” (Stith). “These were times when religion was to be taught with the whip,” says Howison, “when the heart was to be affected with the punishment of the body, and when prayer was the only means of escaping the gibbet. This code was too cruel to be rigidly enforced, yet we have reason to believe it was not entirely a dead letter. When Argall became governor, he took special delight in reviving it, and many Colonists learned in sadness that the Church was the occasion of stripes, rather than freedom and happiness” (Howison, II.).

No wonder that Bishop Perry, of Iowa, calls this code “impolitic and inhuman,” “stern and inhuman” (Perry, *History of the American Episcopal Church*, I). The historian Stith says of these laws: “These were very bloody and severe, and no ways agreeable to a free people and the British Constitution; neither had they any Sanction or Authority from the Council and Company of England. However, Sir Thomas Dale, being sadly troubled and pester’d with mutinous Humors of the People, caused them to be published, and put into Execution with the utmost Rigor. And altho’ the Manner was harsh and unusual to Englishmen, yet had not these military laws been so strictly executed at this time, there were little Hopes or Probability of preventing the utter subversion of the Colony” (Stith, *The History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia*, 122, 123.

Williamsbourg, 1747). Dale's Code has been chiefly remembered because of the penalty for blasphemy, which was the thrusting of a bodkin through the blasphemer's tongue. Sabbath observance was enforced by whipping, and speaking against the Trinity or the Christian religion by death (H. J. Eckenrode, *Separation of Church and State in Virginia*, 6. Richmond, 1910).

By the first Act of Parliament of 1623 it is provided that in every plantation or settlement there shall be a house or room set apart for the worship of God. But it soon appears that this worship was only to be according to the Church of England, to which a strict uniformity was enjoined. A person absenting himself from divine service on Sunday without a reasonable excuse, forfeited a pound of tobacco; and he that absented himself a month, forfeited fifty pounds. Any minister who was absent from his church above two months in a year, forfeited half his salary; and he who absented himself four months, forfeited the whole. Whoever disparaged a minister whereby the minds of his parishioners might be alienated, was compelled to pay 500 pounds of tobacco and ask the minister's pardon publicly in the congregation. No man was permitted to dispose of any of his tobacco till the minister was satisfied under penalty of forfeiting double his part of the minister's salary (Hening, I.).

The first allowance made to the ministers was ten pounds of tobacco and a bushel of corn for each tithable; and every laboring person, of what quality or condition, was bound to contribute. In the year 1631 the Assembly granted to ministers, besides the former allowance ten pounds of tobacco and a bushel of corn, the twelfth calf, the twentieth kid and the twentieth pig (Semple).

To preserve the purity of doctrine and unity of the church, it was enacted in 1643 that all ministers should be conformable to the orders and constitution of the Church of England, and that no other persons be permitted to preach publicly or privately. It was further provided that the governor and council should take care that all nonconformists departed the colony with all conveniency (Semple). Accordingly this came to pass: "In 1643, Sir William Berkeley, Royal Governor of Virginia," says Hassell, "strove, by whippings and brandings, to make the inhabitants of that colony conform to the Established Church, and thus drove out the Baptists and Quakers, who found a refuge in Albermarle county of North Carolina, a colony which 'was settled,' says Bancroft, 'by the freest of the free—by men to whom the restraints of other colonies were too severe'" (Hassell, *Church History*).

After the restoration of Charles II, May, 1660, heavier burdens were laid upon Dissenters in Virginia. No minister was permitted to preach unless he had received ordination from some bishop in England; and the rites of matrimony must be celebrated by a minister of the Established Church according to the ceremony prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer.

About this time the Quakers and Baptists came into Virginia in numbers. This greatly aroused the authorities so that in 1661-2 the following act was passed:

WHEREAS many schismatical persons, out of their averseness to the orthodox established religion, or out of the new-fangled conceits of their own heretical inventions, refuse to have their children baptized; be it, therefore, enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that all persons that, in contempt of the divine sacrament of baptism, shall refuse, when they may carry their child (children) to a lawful minister in that country to have them baptized, shall be amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco, half to the informer, half to the public (Hening, II. 165, 166).

Upon the accession of William and Mary to the throne of England, the Act of Toleration was, in 1689, passed; but in Virginia the provisions of this act were not recognized for ten years later. It was not published in that State and the terms were obscured. It was never interpreted in Virginia as giving any liberty to Dissenters. "The people are generally of the Church of England," explains Beverley, "which is the religion established by law in the country, from which there are few dissenters. Yet liberty of conscience is given to all other congregations pretending to Christianity, on condition they submit to all parish duties" (Beverley, *History of the Present State of Virginia*, 226. London, 1722).

There arose at this date, a strange condition of circumstances, accompanied by a stranger reason for the toleration of certain Presbyterians in Virginia. Francis Makemie made application for a license to preach, which was granted. Beverley explains this as follows:

They (dissenters) have no more than five conventicles amongst them—namely: three small meetings of Quakers and two of Presbyterians. Tis observed that those counties where the Presbyterian meetings are produce very mean tobacco, and for that reason can't get an orthodox minister to stay among them.

Upon this action Foote, the Presbyterian historian, makes the following quaint remarks:

It appears on account of the poorness of the tobacco the established clergy left some counties, although in 1698 their salary had been fixed at sixteen thousand pound weight of that commodity. If this statement be true, we can more easily understand why Makemie had not been molested. We suppose he took his residence in Accomac soon after his marriage. There was no Episcopal minister to complain of him, and many of the inhabitants preferred to hear Makemie to passing silent Sabbaths, and many others were true Presbyterians (Foots, *Sketches of Virginia*, I.).

From 1732 to 1738 Presbyterian families had been moving into the Valley of Virginia. They asked for the privilege of preaching and Governor Gooch granted the request. Foote explains it in the following manner:

Poverty and intolerance drove them (the Presbyterians) from their mother country, and the necessity of providing a frontier line of brave people west of the Blue Mountains compelled Virginia to relax her rigor and open her borders....The reasons that actuated Governor Gooch to promise protection in the exercise of their religious forms, in a State whose laws for uniformity were precise and enforced with rigor, were two: 1st. He wished a frontier line at a greater distance from Williamsburg; if possible, west of the great mountains. 2d. He knew these people to be firm, enterprising, hardy, brave, good citizens and soldiers. To form a complete line of defense against the savage inroads, he welcomed these Presbyterian emigrants, the Quakers, and colonies from the different German States to the beautiful and luxuriant prairies of the great Valley of the Shenandoah, on the head waters of the James, and along the Roanoke. At so great a distance from the older settlements, he anticipated no danger or trouble to the established church of the colony; perhaps he never seriously considered the subject in the probable influence of the necessary collision of religious opinions (Foots; also Gillet, *The Presbyterian Church in the United States*, I.).

These were remarkable reasons for toleration. In some counties the tobacco

was too poor to pay an Episcopal rector to live among the people; and in others brave men were needed to defend the borders of Virginia from the Indians. In none of these provisions was there any toleration extended toward the Baptists. Baptists had existed in Virginia from early times, but they had left no impression on the unpropitious seventeenth century. In 1714 a colony settled in the southeast part of the State but it did not flourish (Eckenrode); and nearly thirty years afterwards another body came from Maryland, and occupied a place in one of the northern counties, then thinly inhabited. These were the Regular Baptists, and though they were not without zeal, they were speedily eclipsed by more enthusiastic brethren (Howison, II.). The first New Light Baptist church, in Virginia, was organized August, 1760; but soon the number of such churches greatly increased. It is certain from this date they greatly flourished. Fervent declamation distinguished them; the prominent motives of the gospel were presented in language made strong by earnestness; the joys of heaven and the torments of hell were opened to the eyes of the hearers, and men were urged to immediate repentance, faith and baptism. The practice of immersion forcibly addressed the senses, and gave something more substantial upon which to dwell than the simple rites of other churches. The people heard the Baptists gladly; day after day added fresh accessions, -and it was apparent that they could no longer be without weight in the counsels of the colony (Howison, II.).

Several causes account for their progress. When people are persecuted there always follows in their favor a reaction. Likewise the colonists were greatly disturbed on account of the French and Indian wars; and in religion they sought consolation. The Baptist preacher was a plain man, with a message, and he had a great appeal to these distressed people. A Mr. Wright, a Presbyterian preacher, in the frontier county of Cumberland, August 18, 1755, makes this statement:

People generally begin to believe the divine government, and our judgments are inflicted for our sins. They now hear sermons with solemnity and attention; they acknowledge their wickedness and ignorance, and believe that the new light clergy and adherents are right (Foote, I.).

This feeling became quite universal.

The Episcopal clergy developed a most distressing moral and religious

situation. Unless fully attested one could hardly credit how low the clergy of the Established Church, at this time, had fallen. The testimony, however, comes from the most reliable sources; and so far as known has not been questioned.

This situation was of long standing. Few men of ability would leave England for the colony; those who came were usually inferior in ability and perhaps in character. “The ministers and publick dispensers of the Gospel which were sent into that Plantation, are for the most part, not only far short of those qualifications required of ministers, but men of opposite qualities and tempers, such as either by their loose lives, and un-Gospel becoming conversation, or by their known weakness and insufficiency of understanding and parts, do not only not gain or win upon those that are without, the Indian heathen, but cause more to go astray, and lose, many, very many of those that pretend to be within the English Christians . . . . The ministers of Virginia, too many of them, are very careless and negligent in dispensing God’s words and sacraments, as also indecent and slovenly in their manner of dispensing them....There are not a few of the ministers, whose wicked and prophane lives cause the worship of God, not only to be slighted, but to be little less than abhorred, when they officiate therein” (*Public Good Without Private Interest* (1657), 3, 14, 15).

The Bishop of London, in 1743, said to Doddridge in a letter:

Of those who are sent from hence, a great part are the Scotch or Irish, who can get no employment at home, and enter into the service more out of necessity than choice. Some others are willing to go abroad to retrieve either lost fortune or lost character.

Dr. Hawks remarks:

They could babble in a pulpit, roar in a tavern, exact from their parishioners, and rather by their dissoluteness destroy than feed the flock (Hawks, *A Narrative of Events connected with the Rise and Progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia*, 65. New York 1836).

Even the General Assembly of Virginia, in the year 1776, passed the following law:

Be it further enacted by this Grand Assembly, and by the authority

thereof, that such ministers as shall become notoriously scandalous by drunkenness, swearing, fornication, or other heinous and crying sins, and shall thereof be lawfully convicted, shall, for every such their heinous crime and wickedness, etc. (Hening, *Statutes*, II.).

Bishop Perry sums up the situation in the following words:

It was in 1779, during the darkest days of the war, that the “establishment” in Virginia “was finally put down” (Hawks, I. 152). In the language of the annalist of the religious body to which this result was chiefly due, “the Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, Deists, and the covetous had all prayed for this” (*The Virginia Baptist Chronicle*, by John Leland in Hawks, I. 139). To prayers had been added untiring and most energetic labor. Taking advantage of existing and acknowledged evils, growing out of the utter want of ecclesiastical discipline in restraining delinquent clergymen, and the lack of men of devout life and conspicuous ability among the incumbents of the vacant parishes, these sectaries had multiplied on every side. It was but natural that men of earnest convictions and inward spirituality should turn from those possessing only the form of godliness to hang upon the lips of the wandering evangelists and lay preachers whose sincerity and devotion could not be gainsaid, and who introduced and propagated dissent in various forms throughout the length and breadth of the land. It was not to be expected that men whose shining parts and exemplary character made them sought after at home would leave their comfortable livings in England to put themselves at the mercy of sordid and ignorant vestries in a distant colony where the “livings” yielded only a precarious support, and there was little hope of preferment (Perry, *History of the American Episcopal Church*, II.).

However this may be explained it gave the Baptists of Virginia their opportunity. “The great success and rapid increase of the Baptists in Virginia,” says Semple, “must be ascribed primarily to the power of God working with them; yet it cannot be denied but there were subordinate, and cooperating causes, one of which, and the main one, was the loose and immoral deportment of the Established clergy, by which the people were left almost destitute of even the shadow of true religion. ‘Tis true, they had some

outward forms of worship, but the essential principles of Christianity were not only not understood among them, but by many never heard of. Some of the cardinal precepts of morality were disregarded, and actions plainly forbidden by the New Testament were often proclaimed by the clergy as harmless and innocent, or at worst, foibles of but little account. Having no discipline, every man followed the bent of his own inclination. It was not uncommon for the rectors of parishes to be men of the loosest morals. The Baptist preachers were, in almost every respect, the reverse of the Established clergy. The Baptist preachers were without learning, without patronage, generally very poor, very plain in their dress, unrefined in their manners, awkward in their address, all of which, by their enterprising zeal and unwearied perseverance, they either turned to advantage or prevented their ill effects. On the other hand, most of the ministers of the Establishment were men of classical and scientific education, patronized by men in power connected with great families, supported by competent salaries, and put into office by the strong arm of the civil power. Thus pampered and secure, the men of this order were rolling on the bed of luxury when the others began their extraordinary career. Their learning, riches, power, etc., seemed only to hasten their overthrow by producing an unguarded heedlessness which is often the prelude to calamity and downfall” (Semple).

The Baptists of Virginia originated from three general sources. As has been indicated, the first came from England, about 1714. Some of these Baptists wrote letters to England asking for assistance. The Assembly of the General Baptists sent, in the same year, Robert Norden, of Warbleton, who was already an ordained minister, and Thomas White, who died Upon the journey. The order of the Assembly was as follows:

To Stir them Up for Some Assistance for Robt. Norden and Thos. White who are Appointed & Approved by this Assembly to go to Virginia to propagate the Gospel of truth (The Minutes of the General Assembly of the General Baptist Churches in England, I.).

For a period collections were taken in Kent to sustain this enterprise. In 1724 Norden wrote to the Assembly and the next year the question was raised whether he should return to England to solicit funds. The action of the Assembly was as follows:

Agreed by this Assembly that Bror Norden being sent for Home

from Virginia if he be Disposed to Returne be to Bror Henry Miller & Bror Robt. Mesers who are Impowered by this Assembly to Act in that Affair as they Shall Judge Necessary & Call Such Assistance from other Churches as they may think proper (Minutes, I.).

Norden gathered a church at a place called Burley, in the county of the Isle of Wight. He was faithful in his labors and died in the year 1725. Two years after his death Casper Mintz and Richard Jones, two ministers, came over from England, and Jones became pastor of the church. The following additional information is given by Paul Palmer in a letter to John Comer, in 1729:

There is a comely little church in the Isle of Wight county, of about thirty or forty members, the elder of which is one Richard Jones, a very sensible old gentleman, whom I have great love for. We see each other at every yearly meeting, and sometimes more often. There is another church in Surry county, where my brother Jones lives, I suppose of about thirty more.

This church by 1756 embraced Calvinistic sentiments. The Church at Burley wrote the Philadelphia Association the following letter:

The church of Jesus Christ, in Isle of Wight county, holding adult Baptism, &c., to the Reverend and General Assembly or Association at Philadelphia, send greeting: We, the above mentioned church, confess ourselves to be under clouds of darkness, concerning the faith of Jesus Christ, not knowing whether we are on the right foundation, and the church much unsettled: wherefore we desire alliance with you, and that you will be pleased to send us helps to settle the church, and rectify what may be wrong, and subscribe ourselves, your loving brethren in Christ, Casper Mintz, Richard Jones, Randall Allen, Joseph Mattgum, Christopher Atkinson, David Atkinson, Thomas Cafer, Samuel Jones, William Jordan, John Allen, John Powell, Joseph Atkinson. Dec. 27, 1756 (Benedict).

These churches were not persecuted. Probably they were too obscure to attract much attention. It is also likely they secured a license to preach. It was not long till they ceased to exist.

The next appearance of the Baptists was in the counties of Berkeley and Loudon. Several churches were organized, of which Opeckon Creek seems to

have been the most prominent. A number of the members of the General Baptist Church, at Chestnut Ridge, Maryland, in 1743, removed to Virginia. Soon after their minister followed them and he baptized several persons. He was soon excluded from the church on account of immorality. On this account the church was broken up and afterwards a Particular Baptist church was organized in its stead.

Many churches in this section of the country were loosely constituted, and serious trouble existed among them. On request the Philadelphia Association sent a committee composed of James Miller and David Thomas to settle their difficulties. This course was often pursued by that association. The committee was accompanied by John Gano, who was destined to become a most distinguished preacher.

The account of Gano is as follows:

We examined them, and found they were not a regular church. We then examined those who offered themselves for the purpose, and those who gave us satisfaction we received, and constituted a church. Out of the whole who offered themselves, there were only three received. Some openly declared they knew they could not give an account of experiencing a work of grace, and therefore need not offer themselves. Others stood ready to offer if the church was formed. The three before mentioned were constituted, and six more were baptized, and joined with them. After the meeting ended, a number of old members went aside and sent for me. They expressed their deplorable state, and asked me if I would meet with them that evening, and try to instruct them. They were afraid the ministers blamed them. They had been misled, but it was not their fault, and they hoped I would pity them. I told them I would with all my heart, and endeavored to remove their suspicion of the ministers. They met, and I spoke to them from these words: *“They being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.”* I hope I was assisted to speak to them in an impressive manner, and they to hear, at least some of them, so as to live. They afterwards professed and became zealous members, and remained so, I believe, until their death (Benedict).

It was not long until David Thomas became connected with this company of Baptists. He was a tower of strength. He was born August 16, 1732, at London Tract, Pennsylvania, and had his education at Hopewell, New Jersey, under the celebrated Isaac Eaton. He received his Master's degree from Rhode Island College. He had often made missionary excursions to the State under the direction of the Philadelphia Association. He removed to this section in 1760. His experiences well illustrated the trials of the Baptist ministry of northern Virginia.

“Mr. Thomas is said to have been a minister of great distinction in the prime of his days. Besides the natural endowments of a vigorous mind, and the advantages of a classical and refined education, he had a melodious and piercing voice, a pathetic address, expressive action, and above all a heart filled with love for God and his fellow men. But for a few of his first years in Virginia, he met with much persecution. He was frequently assaulted both by individuals and mobs. Once he was pulled down while he was preaching, and dragged out of the house in a barbarous manner. At another time, a malevolent fellow attempted to shoot him, but a bystander wrenched his gun from him and thereby prevented the execution of this wicked purpose. The slanders and revilings he met with, says Mr. Edwards, were innumerable; and if we judge of a man's prevalency against the devil by the rage of the devil's children, Thomas prevailed like a prince. But the gospel had free course; and Broad Run Church, of which he was pastor, within six or eight years from its establishment, branched out and became the mother of five or six others.

“Elder Thomas traveled much, and the fame of his preaching drew the attention of the people throughout an extensive circle, so that in many instances they came fifty and sixty miles to hear him. It is remarkable about this time, there were multiplied instances in different parts of Virginia of persons, who had never heard anything like evangelical preaching, but who were brought, through divine grace, to see and feel their want of vital godliness. Many of these persons, when they heard Mr. Thomas and other Baptist preachers, would travel great distances to hear them, and to procure their services as ministers of the gospel. By this means the gospel was first carried into the county of Culpepper. Mr. Allen Wyley, a man of respectable standing in that county, had been thus turned to God, and not knowing of any preacher in whom he had confidence, he had sometimes gathered his neighbors, read the Scriptures, and exhorted them to repentance; but being

informed of Mr. Thomas, he, with some of his friends, traveled to Farquier to hear him. As soon as he heard, he knew the joyful sound, submitted to baptism, and invited him to preach in his house. He also preached in the county of Orange, and, in company with Elder Garrard, carried the Word of life through all the upper counties of the Northern Neck.

“Elder Thomas ultimately removed to Kentucky. He lived to an advanced age, and sometime before his death was nearly blind” (Taylor, *Lives of Virginia Baptist Ministers*, Series One).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Robert B. Semple, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Virginia*. Richmond, 1810. A New Edition by Beale. Philadelphia, 1894.

B. F. Riley, *A History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi*. Philadelphia, 1898.

Foote, William Henry, *Sketches of Virginia Historical and Biographical*. Philadelphia, 1850. 2 volumes.

## CHAPTER XII

### THE BAPTISTS OF VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, AND GEORGIA

The Third Company of Baptists in Virginia—The Separatists—Shubeal Stearns—Daniel Marshall—Stearns Unites with the Baptists—North Carolina Settled—Individual Baptists—Paul Palmer—William Sojourner—Kehukee Association—Vanhorn and Miller—The Preaching of the Separatists—The Character of Stearns—History of the Movement—Many Notices of the Growth of the Baptists—Baptists in Georgia—Nicholas Bedgewood—Benjamin Stark—Botsford—Gano—Marshall Arrested—Kiokee Church—Samuel Harris—Elijah Craig—The Election of Bishops by the Baptists.

The third company of Baptists which came to Virginia extended their labors into North Carolina and Georgia. “North Carolina, in the days of her colonial dependence,” says one of her historians, “was the refuge of the poor and the oppressed. In her borders the emigrant, the fugitive, and the exile found a home. Whatever may have been the cause of leaving the land of their nativity—political servitude—tyranny over conscience,—or poverty of means, with the hope of bettering their condition,—the descendants of these enterprising, suffering, afflicted, yet prosperous people, have cause to bless the kind Providence that led their fathers, in their wanderings, to such a place of rest” (Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina Historical and Biographical*, illustrative of the principles of a portion of her Early Settlers. New York, 1846).

The exact date of permanent settlement in the present limits of North Carolina has not been clearly ascertained. The first Assembly that made laws for the State convened in the fall of 1669. “Here was a colony of men,” says Bancroft, “scattered among forests, hermits with wives and children resting on the bosom of nature, in perfect harmony with the wilderness of their gentle clime. The planters of Albermarle were more led to the choice of their residence from a hatred of restraint. Are there any who doubt man’s capacity for self-government? Let them study the history of North Carolina. Its inhabitants were restless and turbulent in their imperfect submission to a Government imported from abroad; the administration of the colony was firm, and tranquil when they were left to take care of themselves. Any government but one of their own institution was oppressive. North Carolina was settled by the freest of the free. The settlers were gentle in their tempers, of serene minds, enemies of violence and bloodshed. Not all the successive

revolutions had kindled vindictive passions; freedom, entire freedom was enjoyed without anxiety as without guarantees. The charities of life were scattered at their feet like the flowers of their meadows” (Bancroft, *History of the United States*, II.). No freer country was ever organized by man. Freedom of conscience, exemption from taxation, except by their own consent, gratuities in land to every emigrant, and other wholesome regulations claimed the prompt legislative action of the infant colony. “These simple laws suited a simple people, who were as free as the air of their mountains; and when oppressed, were as rough as the billows of the ocean” (Wheeler, *Historical Sketches of North Carolina*, I. 30. Philadelphia, 1851).

This Baptist movement into North Carolina originated with the Separatists of Connecticut. It was led by Shubael Stearns and Daniel Marshall. This Shubael Stearns was a remarkable man. He was a product of the Whitefield revival, and in 1745 united with the New Lights. Immediately afterwards, his mind became impressed with the obligation to preach the gospel, and, accordingly he entered upon this responsible work. He continued with the Pedobaptists till 1751, when examining the Word of God, he became convinced that in failing to submit to the ordinance of immersion he had neglected a most important command of his Redeemer. The futility of infant baptism was also discovered, and he determined to take up his cross, be baptized, and unite himself with the Baptists. This he accordingly did and was immersed by Wait Palmer, at Toland, Connecticut, May 20, 1751.

For two or three years he continued his labors in New England; but he became impressed that he must preach the gospel to more destitute sections of the country. He pursued a southwesternly direction scarcely knowing where he was going. In the course of time he arrived at Opeckon Creek, where, as has been am, there was already a Baptist church. Here he met his brother-in-law, Daniel Marshall. This church under the influence of this new preaching became very warm and much animated in their religious exercises. They soon went such lengths in the New Light career that some of the less engaged members preferred charges against them in the association. The matter was finally adjusted favorably to the Separatists and the work continued to prosper.

It was not long till Stearns settled in Guilford county, North Carolina. Here he permanently remained. The great spiritual destitution which prevailed

seems to have induced his removal to that section. Such was the anxiety to hear the gospel preached that people frequently traveled a day's journey to hear it. He began his labors by building a house of worship and constituting a church of sixteen members.

There had been individual Baptists in the State as early as 1695. On May 2, 1718, there was one who pretended to "be a physician, fortune teller and conjurer, always chosen Burgess, for that precinct and a leading man in our assemblies" who was an Anabaptist (Colonial Records of North Carolina, I. 304). William Orr, the Episcopal rector, says he had "one convert from the sect of the Anabaptists" (Ibid, IV. 608). Clement Hall, 1745, baptized one "brought up an Anabaptist" (Ibid, IV. 753). Hall likewise rejoiced at Edenton, May 19, 1752, that he baptized four "brought up in anabaptism and Quakerism" (Ibid, VI. 1315). Mr. Reed likewise baptized the Honorable Chief Justice of the Province, July 2, 1771. "He was bred and born an Anabaptist, but had never been baptized, and as I suspected that he might still retain a particular liking for Anabaptism, I offered to baptize him by total immersion. But he refused and said his prejudices were vanished, that he regarded the moral more than the mode" (Ibid, IX. 6). Such are some of the examples.

The first church was gathered by Paul Palmer, about the year 1727, at a place called Perquimans, on Chowan river, in the northeast part of the State.

William Sojourner, an excellent man and minister, removed in 1742 from Berkeley, in Virginia, and settled at Kehukee Creek. Most of these Baptists came from the Burley church. Lemuel Burkit and Jesse Reed give the following account of some of these Baptists: "Some of the churches which at first composed the Kehukee Association were, the church at Toisnot, in Edgecomb county; the church at Kehukee, in Halifax county; the church at the Falls of Tar River, in Edgecomb county; the church on Fishing creek, in Halifax county; the church at Reedy creek, in Warren county; the church at Sandy Run, in Birtie county; and the church in Camden county, North Carolina. Most of these churches, before they ever formed an Association, were General Baptist, and held to the Arminian tenets. We believe they were descendants of the English General Baptists, because we find from some original papers that their Confession of Faith was subscribed by certain Elders, and Deacons, and Brethren, in behalf of themselves and others, to

whom they belonged, both in London, and several counties in England, and was presented to King Charles the second.

“They preached, adhered to the Arminian, or Free-Will doctrines, and their churches were first established upon this system. They gathered churches without requiring an experience of grace previous to their baptism; but baptized all who believed in the doctrine by immersion, and requested baptism of them. The churches of this order were gathered by Elders Paul Palmer and Joseph Parker, and were succeeded by a number of ministers whom they had baptized; and of whom we have no reason to believe were converted when they were baptized, or first began to preach. We cannot learn that it was customary with them to hold an Association at all; but met at yearly meetings, where matters of consequence were determined.

“This was the state of these churches until divine providence disposed the Philadelphia Baptist Association to send Mess. Vanhorn and Miller, two ministers belonging to that Association, who lived in New Jersey, to travel into the southern colonies, and visit the churches and preach the gospel. It appears that this effort was attended with a happy effect. When they came into North Carolina, some of the members belonging to these churches seemed to be afraid of them, as they were styled by most people New Lights; but by the greater part of the churches they were cordially received.

“Their preaching and conversation seemed to be with power, the hearts of the people seemed to be open, and a very great blessing seemed to attend their labors.

“Through their instrumentality many people were awakened, many of the members of these churches were convinced of their error, and were instructed in the doctrines of the gospel; and some churches were organized anew; and established upon the principles of grace. These churches newly constituted adopted the Baptist confession of faith published in London in 1639, containing 32 articles, and upon which the Philadelphia and Charleston associations are founded. And it is customary for churches thus formed, at their first constitution, to have a church covenant, in which they solemnly agree to endeavor to keep up the discipline of the church” (Burkitt and Read, *A Concise History of the Kehukee Association*).

John Gano was appointed by the Philadelphia Association to travel in the Southern States. He visited these churches about the year 1754, and his

report to the association led to the visit of Miller and Vanhorn the following year and in the reorganization of these churches. The visit of Gano has been described as follows by Morgan Edwards:

Mr. Gano, on his arrival, sent to the ministers, requesting an interview with them, which they declined, and appointed a meeting among themselves to consult what to do. Mr. Gano hearing of it, went to their meeting, and addressed them in words to this effect: "I have desired a visit from you, which, as a brother and a stranger, I had a right to expect, but as ye have refused, I give up my claim and come to pay you a visit." With that, he ascended into the pulpit and read for his text the following words: "*Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?*" The text he managed in such a manner as to make some afraid of him, and others ashamed of their shyness. Many were convinced of errors touching their faith and conversion, and submitted to examination. One minister hearing this (who stood well with himself), went to be examined, and intimated to his people, he would return triumphant. Mr. Gano heard him out, and then turning to his companion, said, "I profess, brother, this will not do; this man has the one thing needful to seek." Upon which, the person examined hastened home, and upon being asked how he came off, replied, "The Lord have mercy on me, for the northern minister has put a *mene tekel* upon me.

The coming of Shubeal Stearns brought a new day to the Baptists of North Carolina. He was in every respect an extraordinary man. He "was a man of small stature, but of good natural parts, and sound judgment. Of learning, he had but little share, yet he was pretty well acquainted with books. His voice was musical, and strong, and he managed it in such a manner, as one while to make a soft impression on the heart, and fetch tears from the eyes in a mechanical way; and anon, to shake the very nerves; and to throw the animal system into tumults and perturbations. All the Separate Baptists copied after him in tones of voice, and actions of body; and some few exceeded him. His character was indisputably good, both as a man, a Christian and a preacher. In his eyes was something very penetrating; there seemed to be a meaning in every glance. Many stories have been told of the enchantment of his eyes and voice."

Tidence Lane, who was afterwards himself a minister, tells of the curious effect Stearns had on him. "When the fame of Mr. Stearns' preaching," said he, "had reached the Yadkin, where I lived, I felt a curiosity to go and hear him. Upon my arrival, I saw a venerable old man sitting under a peach tree with a book in his hand, and the people gathered about him. He fixed his eyes on me immediately, which made me feel in such a manner as I had never felt before. I turned to quit the place, but could not proceed far. I walked about, sometimes catching his eye as I walked. My uneasiness increased, and became intolerable. I went up to him, thinking that a salutation and shaking hands would relieve me; but it happened otherwise. I began to think that he had an evil eye, and ought to be shunned; but shunning him I could no more effect, than the bird can shun the rattlesnake, when it fixes its eyes upon it. When he began to preach, my perturbations increased, so that nature could no longer support them, and I sunk to the ground."

If the appearance of Stearns was singular, his methods were even more so. "The natives around the little colony of Baptists, although brought up in the Christian religion, were grossly ignorant of its essential principles. Having the form of godliness, they knew nothing of its power.

"The doctrine of Mr. Stearns and his party was consequently quite strange. To be born again appeared to them as absurd as it did to the Jewish doctor, when he asked if he must enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born again. Having always supposed that religion consisted in nothing more than the practice of outward duties, they could not comprehend how it should be necessary to feel conviction and conversion: But to be able to ascertain the time and place of one's conversion was, in their estimation, wonderful indeed. These points were all strenuously contended for by the new preachers.

"But their manner of preaching was, if possible, much more novel than their doctrines. The Separates in New England had acquired a very warm and pathetic address, accompanied by strong gestures and a singular tone of voice. Being often deeply affected themselves while preaching, correspondent affections were felt by their pious hearers, which were frequently expressed in tears, trembling, screams, shouts and acclamations. The people were greatly astonished, having never seen things on this wise before. Many mocked, many trembled, but the power of God attended them.

In process of time some of the natives became converts, and bowed obedience to the Redeemer's scepter. These, uniting their labors with the chosen band, a powerful and extensive work broke out. From sixteen, Sandy Creek church soon swelled to six hundred and six members, so mightily grew the work of God" (Semple).

There was not always harmony between the Regular and Separate Baptists. When a church had been formed at Abbott's Creek there was a call for Daniel Marshall as pastor. When he was to be ordained Stearns was the only Separate preacher in the community; the Regulars would have nothing to do with the ordination, so a Mr. Ledbetter, from South Carolina, was called upon to sit in the council.

Something of the differences in origin and opinions existing between the Regular and Separate Baptists is expressed by Burkitt and Read. Some years after the Kehukee Association was established on its original plan, in Virginia, and some parts of North Carolina, the Separate Baptists (as they were then called) increased very fast. The Separates first arose in New England, where some pious ministers and members left the Presbyterian, or Standing Order, on account of their formality and superfluity, viz.:

1. Because they were too extravagant in their apparel.
2. Because they did not believe their form of church government to be right.

But chiefly because they would admit to the ministry only men of classical education, and many of their ministers apparently seemed unconverted. They were then called Separate Newlights. Some of them were baptized and moved into the southern provinces, particularly Elders Shubeal Stearns and Daniel Marshall, whose labors were wonderfully blessed in Virginia, North and South Carolina and Georgia. Many souls were converted, and as the work of the Lord progressed many churches were established in Virginia and some in North Carolina. Their preachers were exceedingly pious and zealous men, and their labors were wonderfully blessed; and such a work appeared among the people, that 'some were amazed and stood in doubt, saying what means this.'

"The distinction between us and them was, that they were called Separates, and the Philadelphia, the Charleston, and the Kehukee Associations were called Regular Baptists" (Burkitt and Read).

There were from the accounts of the day many evidences that the Baptists were aggressive. The Pedobaptist preacher at Edenton, March 26, 1766, was disturbed, for he called for “tracts that may be effective for the confutation of dissenters and Skeptics in general. As that Parish abounds with such, especially those of the Quaker and Anabaptist kind; and some proper kinds of tracts distributed among the Parishioners would, I hope, be very prevalent for Exploding their Heterdox and Skeptical Tenets as their prejudices don't permit them to come to hear sermons preached by orthodox ministers” (The Colonial Records of North Carolina, VII. 192, 193).

Governor Tryon, March 20, 1769, complained “that the parish is full of quakers and anabaptists, the first no friend, the latter an avowed enemy to the mother church. It is certain the preeminence of the Church of England has been obtained over the sectaries by legislative authority and has drawn upon her their jealousies. The disturbances in the provinces have inspired no religious sentiments among us, and the difficulty in raising the taxes for a want of medium to pay them, makes many parishes very slack to encourage public worship” (Colonial Records, VIII. 14) .

Alex Stewart, of St. Thomas' Bath Town, October 10, 1760, writing to the Secretary of his Church, says: “When I mentioned I baptized a person by immersion I should be sorry that it should be thought by the society that it was either through affectation or singularity. I assure you, sir (tho' I know that it is conformable to our Rubric, to the practice of the primitive Christians of the Apostles and of the Jews before the coming of our Saviour, generally to Baptize in that way) that it is only to keep people from falling off from the Church, that these persons and some others not mentioned, have been baptized that way by me, for of late years this province is overrun with a people that at first called themselves anabaptists, but having now refined upon that scheme, have run into so many errors and have so bewildered and, I may say also, bewitched the minds of people, that scarcely will they listen to anything that can be said in defense of the church we belong to. As far as my capacity and abilities would admit I have done my best endeavors to confute their errors” (Colonial Records, VI. 316).

Mr. Woodmason, in 1766, gives the following account of the Baptists: “The most zealous among the sects to propagate their notions and form establishments are the anabaptists....For the Anabaptists of Pennsylvania,

resolving themselves into a body and determined to settle their principles in every vacant quarter, began to establish meeting houses also on the Borders. So that the Baptists are now the most numerous and formidable body of people which the Church has to encounter within the interior and back parts of the Province....But the Baptists have great prevalence and footing and have taken such deep root there in North Carolina that it will require a long time and pains to grub up their layers” (Colonial Records, VII. 287, 288).

John Reed, of Newbern, June 20, 1760, gives the following account: There are a “great number of dissenters of all denominations come and settled amongst us from New England, particularly, Anabaptists, Methodists, Quakers and Presbyterians. The Anabaptists are obstinate, illiterate, censorious and uncharitable; the Quakers, rigid; but the Presbyterians are pretty moderate except here and there a bigot or rigid Calvinist” (Colonial Records, VI. 265) .

There were Baptists in North West Parish, April 12, 1735, so John Boyd says to the Bishop of London: “We are very happy in having no different sects or opinions in this part of the country, but I have great reason to complain of a Laodicean luke warmness immorality. But lower down in the country there are a great many Quakers and Anabaptists. In my last journey I had a great many of them as Auditors” (Colonial Records, IV. 7).

Mr. Reed said that on the arrival of Mr. Morton, July 20, 1766, at Brunswick, “he was very creditably and, I believe, very timely informed, that the inhabitants of the County evaded the Vestry Act by electing the most rigid dissenters for vestrymen who would not qualify; that the County abounded with Dissenters of various denominations and particularly with Covenanters, Seceders, Anabaptists and New Lights; that he would meet with a very cold, if any reception at all and have few or no hearers and lead a very uneasy life” (Colonial Records, VII. 241).

C. E. Taylor, August 25, 1772, reports from North Hampton country: “In my last, I acquainted you there were being a great many Dissenters in this part of the country. I don’t know what they call themselves, some term them Anabaptists, some New Light Baptists, and others Baptists. I have talked with some of their preachers, who are surprisingly ignorant, and pretend to Illumination and assurance, they are so obstinately and wilfully ignorant themselves and teach their fellows to be so too, that they will hearken to no

reason whatever, but are obstinately bent to follow their own absurd Notions. They increase surprisingly in Virginia, and in some parts of Carolina, but I bless God they rather decrease in my parish” (Colonial Records, IX. 326).

Thodore S. Drage, reports from St. Luke’s Parish, Salisbury, February 28, 1771, as follows: “The Dissenters countenance any fellow who will stand up and preach in any part of the Parish, but in their settlements in order to distract and make confusion amongst the rest of the people. This under the name of Anabaptists and to what they in part apply for under protection of Law, they have and do practice against the Laws which are in force at present, marry of their own Justices and Itinerate preachers, bidding me defiance and paying no marriage Fees. The Courts of Law are open to me, and the Penalty five pounds but they would represent me as litigious, and it might submit me to peculiar insult” (Colonial Records, VIII. 505) .

The Church Warden of Hanover county, October 1, 1759, says: “He is obliged to attend 6 different places, in order to render the benefits of his preaching more diffusive, and curb (if possible) an Enthusiastic sect who call themselves anabaptists which is numerous and daily increasing in this parish and which we affirm has already received a check from his labors” (Colonial Records, VI. 59).

There was an uprising in North Carolina in 1771 in which the Baptists were charged by Governor Tyron with having a part. Morgan Edwards makes the following curious remarks in regard to the battle: “Next to Virginia Southward is North Carolina, a poor and unhappy province where superiors make complaints of the people, and the people of the superiors, which complaints, if just, show the body politic to be like that of Israel in the house of Isaiah, ‘from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head without any soundness, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores.’ These complaints rose to hostilities at Almannance Creek May 10<sup>th</sup>, 1771, where about 6,000 appeared in arms and fought each other 4,000 Regulators killed three Tyronians and 2,000 (Tyronians) killing twelve Regulators besides lodging in the trees an incredible number of balls which the hunters have since picked out and killed more deer and Turkeys than they killed of their antagonists.”

The historian goes on to relate the part the Baptists had in the affair: “Governor Tyron is said to have represented a faction of Quakers and Baptists who aimed at overturning the Church of England. If the Governor

said as here suggested he must be misinformed for I made it my business to inquire into the matter and can aver that among the 4,000 Regulators there were but 7 of the denomination of the Baptists; and these were expelled from the societies they belonged unto, in consequence of the resolve of the Baptist Association held at Sandy Creek the Second Saturday in Oct. 1769, ‘If any of our members shall take up arms against the legal authority or aid and abet them that do so, he shall be excommunicated, &c. When this was known abroad, one of the four chiefs of the Regulators with an armed company broke into the assembly and demanded if there was such a resolve entered into by the Association. The answer was evasive, for they were in bodily fear. This checked the design much; and the author of the Impartial Relation, page 16, ‘There in (Sandy Creek) the scene met with some opposition on account that .it was too hot and rash and in some things not legal; &c. One of the 7 Baptists by the name of Merrill was executed; and he, at the point of death, did not justify his conduct, but bitterly condemned it and blamed two men (of very different religion) for deceiving him into the rebellion” (Colonial Records, VIII. 655, 656).

John Barnett, Northampton, September 15, 1770, writes: “Last Saturday, Monday and Wednesday, two, three and four New Light Baptist teachers attended our service with many of their people; the teachers, I am informed, have since delivered themselves in more respectful terms of the Church of England than they were before accustomed. That sect has very much increased in the country among us; however, I am in great hopes that frequent weekly Lectures will fix the wavering, and draw back many of those who have strayed from us” (Colonial Records, VIII. 228, 229).

James Moir, Edgecomb county, November 22, 1748, writes: “When I was preparing to leave this province in the Spring, many of our communion told me they thought it my duty to continue not only because they were pleased with my labors, but more especially because a great number in County had turned Baptists for want of a clergyman” (Colonial Records, IV. 878).

Governor Richard Everard writes to the Bishop of London, from Edenton, October 12, 1729, as follows:

“When I find Quakers and Baptists flourish among the No Carolinians, it behooved me that as the Gov here to enquire and look into the Original cause, which on the strictest examination and

nicest scrutiny I can make, find it owing to the want of Clergymen amongst us. We in this great Province have never a one, and truly my Lord both Quakers and Baptists in this vacancy are very busy making Proselytes and holding meetings daily *in* every Part of this Govt. Indeed one new County next Virginia is well supplied by the Indefatigable Paines and industry of the Revd Mr. Jones of Nansemond who has the Character of a Pious, Good' and Worthy man but he is old and infirm. My Lord, when I came first here, there were no Dissenters but Quakers in the Govt and now by the means of one Paul Palmer the Baptist Teacher, he has gained hundreds and to prevent it, tis impossible," &c. (Colonial Records, III. 48).

Jas. Macarthey, Granville county and Parish, October 28, 1769, writes: "There are likewise many Baptists here, who are great Bigots; but be well assured, Reverend Sir, that I will (from a sense of my Duty and gratitude to the Society) take every prudent method I am capable of to abolish Dissention and make converts to the Church" (Colonial Records, VIII. 86).

John Barnett, Brunswick Cape, February 3, 1766, writes: "New Light baptists are very numerous in the southern points in this parish. The most illiterate among them are their Teachers, even Negroes speak in their meetings. They lately sent to one to offer the use of their meeting house when I propose to officiate in two months" (Colonial Records, VII. 164) .

There is no question from these Colonial Records, representing hostile accounts, that the Baptists were numerous; growing with great rapidity; and that they were giving the rectors of the Church of England much uneasiness.

Effort was made at this time to unite the Separate and Regular Baptists, but as yet this did not succeed.

The Whitefield revival was the occasion of introducing Baptists into Georgia. The first account of the appearance of Baptists in Georgia was in the year 1757. Mr. Nicholas Bedgewood, who was employed in the capacity of agent to the Orphanage of Whitefield, near Savannah, had several years previously been convinced of Baptist sentiments. In that year he went to Charleston, and was baptized by Oliver Hart, the pastor of the Baptist church in that city. He was soon licensed to preach, and his ordination to the ministry took place in 1759. In 1763, he baptized several persons in and about the Orphan House, among whom was Benjamin Stirk, who afterwards became a minister of the

gospel. To these persons, who probably formed a branch of the Charleston church, Bedgewood administered the Lord's Supper, the first Baptist communion ever held in the province.

Stirk appears to have been a man of good learning, fine natural parts, and eminent for piety and zeal. As there was no Baptist church in Georgia, he united with the Baptist church at Euhaw, South Carolina. He soon began to preach, and set up places of meeting, at his house, and at Tuckaseeking, twenty miles higher up in the country, where there were a few Baptists, who constituted a branch of the Euhaw church. But of the useful labors of this servant of Christ they were soon deprived, as he was called to his reward in the year 1770. This is the second sign of a Baptist church in the State; indeed, it is not certain that it ever became a regular church.

In the meantime Botsford, a young licentiate of the Charleston church, while on a visit to the Euhaw church, received an invitation to come over and help this feeble church and destitute field. Encouraged by the mother church, and accompanied by the pastor, he came and preached to them his first sermon, June 27, 1771. His labors were highly acceptable, he yielded to their solicitations and remained with them for more than a year. His anxious spirit would not permit him to remain in one place. He traveled extensively, preached in all the surrounding country; and toward the close of the next year, he went still higher up the river and commenced an establishment at what was first called New Savannah, but now Botsford's Old Meeting House, about twenty-five miles below Augusta. Here he had the pleasure of seeing the work of the Lord prosper in his hands.

The following incident, which is characteristic of the times, is related of Botsford: In parts of Georgia where he labored the inhabitants were a mixed multitude of emigrants from many different places; most of whom were destitute of any form of religion, and the few who paid any regard to it were zealous Churchmen and Lutherans, and violently opposed to the Baptists. He preached in the court house in Burk county. The assembly at first paid decent attention; but, toward the close of the sermon, one of them bawled out with a great oath, "The rum has come." Out he rushed; others followed; the assembly was soon left small; and, by the time Botsford got out to his horse, he had the unhappiness to find many of his hearers intoxicated and fighting. An old gentleman came up to him, took his horse by the bridle, and in a

profane dialect most highly extolling him and his discourse, swore he must drink with him, and come and preach in his neighborhood. It was now no time to reason or reprove; and as preaching was Botsford's business, he accepted the old man's invitation, and made an appointment. His first sermon was blessed in the awakening of his host's wife; one of his sons also became religious, and others in the settlement, to the number of fifteen, were in a short time brought to the knowledge of the truth, and the old man himself became sober and attentive to religion, although he never made a profession of it.

A little previous to the coming of Botsford to Tuckaseeking, Daniel Marshall, with other Baptist emigrants, arrived and settled at Kiokee Creek, about twenty miles above Augusta. He began forthwith to preach in the surrounding country. His principal establishment was on the Big Kiokee, and from this circumstance it received the name of the Kiokee Meeting House. It was located on the site now occupied by the public buildings of Columbia county, called Applington.

The following record is given of one of his services: "The scene is in a sylvan grove, and Daniel Marshall is on his knees making the opening prayer. While he beseeches the Throne of Grace, a hand is laid on his shoulders, and he hears a voice say: 'You are my prisoner.'

"Rising, the sedate, earnest minded man of God, whose sober mien and silvery locks indicate the sixty-five years which have passed since his birth, finds himself confronted by the officer of the law. He is astonished at being arrested, under such circumstances, 'according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England.' Rev. Abraham Marshall, in his sketch of his father, published in the *Analytical Repository*, 1802, says that the arrested preacher was made to give security for his appearance in Augusta on the following Monday to answer for this violation of the law, adding: 'Accordingly, he stood trial, and after his meekness and patience were sufficiently exercised, he was ordered to come no more to Georgia.' The reply of Daniel Marshall was similar to that of the Apostles under similar circumstances, 'Whether it be right to obey God or man, judge ye'; and, 'consistently with this just and spirited replication, he pursued his luminous course'" (*History of the Baptists in Georgia*, 13, 14. Atlanta, 1881).

Daniel Marshall was born at Winsor, Connecticut, in 1706, of Presbyterian

parents. He was a man of great natural ardor and holy zeal. Becoming convinced that it was his duty to assist in converting the heathen, he went, with his wife and three children, and preached for three years to the Mohawk Indians, near the headwaters of the Susquehannah river, at a town called Onnaquaggy. War among the savage tribes compelled his removal, first to Connogogig in Pennsylvania, and then to Winchester, Virginia, where he became a convert to Baptist views, and was immersed at the age of forty-eight. His wife also submitted to the ordinance at the same time. He was soon licensed by the church with which he united and, having removed to North Carolina, he built up a flourishing church, of which he was ordained pastor by his two brothers-in-law, Rev. Henry Ledbetter and Shubeal Stearns. From North Carolina he removed to South Carolina, and from South Carolina to Georgia, in each State constituting new and flourishing churches. On January 1, 1771, he settled in what is now Columbia county, Georgia, on Kiokee Creek. He was a man of pure life, unbounded faith, fervent spirit, holy zeal, indefatigable in religious labors, and possessing the highest moral courage.

Although Marshall was neither profoundly learned nor very eloquent as a preacher, yet he was fervent, the Lord was with him, and he soon had the happiness of seeing many converts baptized. These with the emigrant Baptists were constituted into a church, in the year 1772. This was the first church constituted in Georgia. At this time he was the only ordained Baptist preacher in the State; but there were several licentiates including Abraham Marshall. By these the word was proclaimed in all the upper country, and many were in the remote forests.

The following is the act of incorporation of this ancient church at Kiokee:

The Act of incorporating the Anabaptist church on the Kioka, in the county of Richmond.

WHEREAS, a religious society has, for many years, been established on the Kioka, in the county of Richmond, called and known by the name of "The Anabaptist church of Kioka";

*Be it enacted*, That Abraham Marshall, William Willingham, Edmund Cartledge, John Landers, James Simms, Joseph Ray and Lewis Gardener be, and they are hereby, declared to be a body corporate, by the name and style of "The Trustees of the Anabaptist church of Kioka."

*And be it further enacted,* That the Trustees (the same names are here given) of the said Anabaptist church, shall hold their office for the term of three years; and, on the third Saturday of November, in every third year, after the passing of this Act, the supporters of the Gospel in said church shall convene at the meeting house of the said church, and there, between the hours of ten and four, elect from among the supporters of the Gospel in said church seven discreet persons as Trustees, &c.

Seaborn Jones, *Speaker.*

Edward Telfair, *Governor.*

Nathan Brownson, *President Senate.*

December 23d, 1789.

It was, however, in Virginia that the Separates succeeded in the most marked degree. They were here persecuted more vigorously than elsewhere, but they also met with the greatest success. “Here they pushed forward their operations with an ardor approaching the primitive times, amidst all that kind of vexations, ill-bred, illnatured, and tantalizing hostility, which the minions of a declining hierarchy with but the shadow of power were able to maintain.”

Stearns and Marshall remained in Virginia only a comparatively brief period. But “the power of God was effectual in the conversion of Samuel Harris, a man of great distinction in those parts. Besides being burgess of the county and colonel of the militia, he held several other offices. Upon being honored of God, he laid aside all his worldly honors and became a laborer in the Lord’s vineyard” (Semple). His conversion was effected by two illiterate preachers, Joseph and William Murphy, and he was baptized by Daniel Marshall.

It was a rare thing, in those times, for men of his worldly distinction to unite with the people who were, in the fullest sense of the passage, everywhere spoken against. His expansive benevolence in the use of his abundant means for doing good; the childlike simplicity which he always displayed after his conversion; his freedom of intercourse with the people of all conditions among his new and, for the most part, poor and despised associates; his blameless life; and, finally, his pious and irrepressible ardor in the ministerial service had a tendency to bind him to the denomination by strong and lasting

ties. He was the evangel for the entire State.

He gave up all for Christ. "Being in easy circumstances," says Semple, "when he became religious, he devoted not only himself, but almost all his property, to religious objects. He had begun a large new dwelling house, suitable to his former dignity; which, as soon as it was finished, he appropriated to the use of public worship, continuing to live in the old one. After maintaining his family in a very frugal manner, he distributed the surplus income to charitable purposes."

In labors he was abundant. "He was destined of God to labor more extensively in Virginia than in any other State. Having done much good in the circumjacent parts, the time was now arrived for him to lengthen his chords. In January, 1765, Allen Wyley, an inhabitant of Culpeper, and who had been baptized by David Thomas, hearing of the Separate Baptist preachers, traveled from Culpeper to Pittsylvania in order to get one or more of them to come and preach in Culpeper. He traveled on, scarcely knowing whither he went. An unseen hand directed his course. He providentially fell into one of Mr. Harris' meetings. When he came into the meeting house Mr. Harris fixed his eyes on him, being impressed previously that he had some extraordinary message. He asked him whence he came, and Mr. Wyley told him his errand. Upon which, after some deliberation, believing him to be sent of God, Mr. Harris agreed to go. Taking three days to prepare, he started with Wyley, having no meetings on the way, yet exhorting and praying in every house where he went.

"Arriving at Culpeper, his first meeting was in Wyley's own house. He preached the first day without interruption, and appointed for the next. He the next day began to preach, but the opposers immediately raised violent opposition, appearing with whips, sticks, clubs, &c., so as to hinder his labors; in consequence of which he went that night over to Orange county, and preached with much effect. He continued many days preaching from place to place, attended by great crowds and followed throughout the meeting by several persons, who had been lately converted or seriously awakened under the ministry of the Regular Baptists, and by many who had been alarmed by his own labors. When Mr. Harris left them he exhorted them to be steadfast, and advised some (in whom he discovered talents) to commence the exercise of their gifts to hold meetings among themselves.

“In this ministerial journey Mr. Harris sowed many good seed, yielding afterwards great increase. The young converts took his advice and began to hold meetings every Sabbath, and almost every night in the week, taking a tobacco house for their meetings. After proceeding in this way for some time they applied to Mr. David Thomas, who lived somewhere north of the Rappahannock, to come and preach for them, and to teach them the ways of God more perfectly. He came, but in his preaching expressed some disapprobation of the preaching of such weak and illiterate persons. This was like throwing cold water upon their flaming zeal. They took umbrage, and resolved to send once more for Mr. Harris.

“Sometime in the year 1766, and a short time after Mr. Thomas’ preaching, three of the parties, viz.: Elijah Craig and two others, traveled to Mr. Harris’ house in order to procure his services in Orange and the adjacent parts to preach and baptize the new converts. They found to their surprise that he had not been ordained to the administration of the ordinances. To remedy this inconvenience he carried them about sixty miles into North Carolina to get James Read, who was ordained” (Semple). It was in this manner that the Separates labored and won converts.

Harris was not persecuted to the degree that some of the other Baptist preachers were; but he was called upon to suffer for the glory of God. He was once arrested and carried into court as a disturber of the peace. In the court he was vehemently accused as a vagabond, a heretic and a disturber of the peace. On one occasion, in Orange County, he was pulled down as he was preaching and dragged about by the hair of his head, and sometimes by a leg. His friends rescued him. On another time he was knocked down by a rude fellow while he was preaching. But he was not dismayed by these, or any other difficulties.

A singular thing connected with the Baptists of Virginia was that Col. Harris, and some others were elected and served as bishops. Many of these Baptists were of the General type from England who were strongly monarchial and prelatical. It may readily be perceived, with the democratic principles of the Baptists of Virginia, that such a plan would not ultimately succeed.

The whole procedure is thus explained by Semple:

At this Association the query respecting the proper interpretation of Ephesians 4<sup>th</sup> chapter, 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, and 13<sup>th</sup> verses, was again debated,

and by an almost unanimous vote, three excepted, it was resolved that the said offices are now in use in Christ's church, and the said three submitted to the majority. It was further resolved that the said offices be immediately established, by the appointment of certain persons to fill them, provided any possessed of such gifts be found among them.

They then proceeded to the choice of an apostle, by private poll, and the lot fell, by unanimous consent, upon Elder Samuel Harris. For the discipline of this high officer, the following rule is entered in the minutes, viz.: If our messenger or apostle shall transgress in any manner, he shall be liable to dealing in any church where the transgression is committed, and the said church is instructed to call helps from two or three neighboring churches, and, if by them found a transgressor, a general council of the churches shall be called to restore or excommunicate him. They then proceeded to ordain him, according to the following method:

The day being set apart as a fast day, we immediately proceeded to ordain him, and the hands of every ordained minister was laid on him. Public prayers were made by John Waller, E. Craig, and John Williams. John Waller gave a public charge, and the whole Association gave him the right hand of fellowship.

His work was to pervade the churches; to do, or at least to see to, the work of ordination, and to set in order things that were wanting, and to make report to the next Association.

The discussion on this subject caused no little warmth on both sides. Jeremiah Walker first agitated it, and it was supported by most of the preachers of popular talents, not without suspicion of vanity and ambition. The opposition was headed by Reuben Ford, followed by a numerous *party* in the Northern District. Walker wrote a piece upon the subject, entitled *Free Thoughts*, etc., in which, as also in his arguments, both in Associations and private companies, he very ingeniously maintained that *all the offices mentioned in the above texts were still in use*. Mr. Ford also wrote a pamphlet in answer to Mr. Walker's in which he rebutted the arguments with considerable ability. Both of these were read before the Association. The majority

avored Mr. Walker's system and an experiment was made.

At an Association holden for the Northern District this fall, John Waller and E. Craig were appointed apostles for the north side of the river.

It is sufficient to inform our readers that this scheme did not succeed. Either the spirit of free government ran too high among the churches to submit to such an officer or the thing was wrong in itself, and, not being from God, soon fell. These apostles made their report to the next Association, rather in discouraging terms, and no others were ever appointed.

The judicious reader will quickly discover that this is only the old plan of bishops, etc., under a new name.

In the last decision it was agreed that the office of apostles, like that of prophets, was the effect of miraculous inspiration and did not belong to ordinary times (Semple).

#### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

J. M. Campbell, *Georgia Baptists: Historical and Biographical*. Macon, 1874.

Charles B. Williams, *A History of the Baptists in North Carolina*. Raleigh, 1901.

## II. THE PERIOD OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

### CHAPTER I

#### THE BAPTISTS IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Thirteen Colonies—The Policy of England—The Discovery of the Valley of the Ohio—The Population of the Country—The Social, Political and Religious Conditions—Political and Religious Freedom—The Forces Against America—George III—The Attitude of Pope Pius VI—John Adams on the situation—The Position of Canada—The Quebec Act—The Roman Catholics of Great Britain—The Attitude of America Toward the Roman Catholics—The Mercenaries from Germany—The Roman Catholics of Ireland—Of America—The Clergy of the Established Church of England—Rev. Charles Inglis—Foreign Born Citizens—A Conspiracy Against Washington—William Pitt—The Baptists of England—Dr. Rippon—The Baptists of America—The Warren Association—The Philadelphia Association—An Appeal to the Continental Congress—Rhode Island Favors Independence—The Baptists of Virginia—A Memorial to Congress—Soldiers—Chaplains in the Army—Oliver Hart—John Hart.

The thirteen colonies were feeble settlements in the wilderness, scattered along the coast of a continent, little connected with each other, and almost unknown to the world. Their affairs were superintended by a Board of Commissioners for Trade and Plantations. This Board had no representative in the cabinet or access to the king, hence there was always confusion. The Duke of Bedford was the Secretary at the time—a man of inflexible honesty and good will to his country, untainted by duplicity or timidity—of considerable ability though not brilliant—fearless, positive, uncompromising, energetic, without sagacity, stubborn, and with a narrow range of thought. In a short while plans were laid for the taxation of the colonies, and in 1748 a convention was held at Albany with the ostensible purpose of providing against the French and Indian incursions, but the officers made known their desire to tax the colonies. The Governor of New York, followed by others, resisted this proposition.

While these plans were being put into execution the Valley of the Ohio had been discovered. This vast wilderness with broad prairies, giant forests and cloud-piercing mountains was soon to be open to colonization. The great question was, would it be English or French? The English cabinet became enlisted and sent George Washington to the French commander. This ultimately brought on the war.

At the time of this convention at Albany the following estimate is given by the historian Bancroft of the population of this country:

They (the thirteen colonies) contained at this date (1754) about one million, one hundred and sixty-five thousand white inhabitants, and two hundred and sixty thousand negroes; in all, one million four hundred and three thousand in Connecticut; in New England, therefore, four hundred twenty-five thousand souls. Of persons of European ancestry perhaps fifty thousand dwelt in New Hampshire, two hundred and seven thousand in Massachusetts, thirty-five thousand in Rhode Island, and one hundred and twenty-five thousand. Of the middle colonies, New York may have had eighty-five thousand; New Jersey, seventy-three thousand; Pennsylvania, with Delaware, one hundred and ninety-five thousand; Maryland, one hundred and four thousand; in all, not far from four hundred and fifty-seven thousand. For the Southern Provinces, where the mild climate invited emigrants to the inland glades-where the crown lands were often occupied on warrants of surveys without patents, or even warrants-where the people were never assembled but at musters, there was room for glaring mistakes in the enumerations. To Virginia may be assigned one hundred and sixty-eight thousand white inhabitants; to North Carolina, scarcely less than seventy thousand; to South Carolina, forty thousand; to Georgia not more than five thousand; to the whole country south of the Potomac, two hundred and eighty-three thousand. The white population of any of five, or perhaps even of six of the American Provinces was greater singly than that of all Canada, and the aggregate in America exceeded that in Canada fourteen fold. Of persons of the African lineage their home was chiefly determined by climate. New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Maine may have had three thousand negroes; Rhode Island, four thousand five hundred; Connecticut, three thousand five hundred; all New England, therefore, about eleven thousand. New York alone had not far from eleven thousand; New Jersey, about half of that number; Pennsylvania, with Maryland, eleven thousand; the central colonies collectively, seventy-one thousand. In Virginia there were not less than one hundred and sixteen thousand; in North Carolina, perhaps, more

than twenty thousand; in South Carolina, full forty thousand; in Georgia, about two thousand; so that the country south of the Potomac may have had one hundred and seventy-eight thousand.

The following is a condensed account of the social, religious and political condition of the country at the time:

Of the Southern group, Georgia, the chosen asylum of misfortune, had been languishing under the guardianship of a corporation, whose benefits had not equaled the benevolence of its designs. South Carolina prospered and was happy. Its fiery people had increased their power by every method of encroachment on the executive and every claim of legislative self-direction. The love for rural life prevailed universally. The frugal planter enjoyed the undivided returns of his enterprise, doubling his capital in three or four years; while the thrifty mechanic exchanged his workshop, and the merchant left the risks of the sea, to cultivate estates of their own. North Carolina had not one considerable village. Its rich swamps near the sea produced rice; its alluvial lands teemed with maize; free labor, little aided by Negroes, drew turpentine and tar from the pines of its white, sandy plains; a hardy, free and increasing people lay scattered among the fertile uplands. Careless emigrants occupied lands without an owner. Their swine had the range of the forests; the open greenwood was the pasture of their herds; their young men trolled along the brooks for fish, or trapped the beaver, or with, gun and pouch lay in wait for the deer, as it slaked its thirst in the running stream; while they reposed from their toils in pleasant sleep under the forest tree. In Virginia, the country within its tide water was divided among planters, who, in the culture of tobacco, were favored by British legislation. Insulated on their estates, they were cordially hospitable. In the quiet solitude of their life, unaided by an active press, they were philosophers, after the pattern of Montaigne, without having heard of him, learning from nature to bound their freedom of mind only by self-circumscribed limits. The horse was their pride, the county courts their holidays; the race course their delight. Maryland enjoyed unbroken quiet, furnished no levies for the army, and small contributions of money. The scattered planters led in their delightful climate as undisturbed and as happy a

life as was compatible with the prevalence of Negro slavery and the limitations on popular power by the privileges of Lord Baltimore, as prince palatine. The laws established for Pennsylvania complete enfranchisement in the domain of thought. But New York was the central point of political interest. Its position invited it to foster American union. Having the most convenient harbor on the Atlantic, with bays expanding on either hand, and a navigable river penetrating in the interior, it held the keys of Canada and the lakes. Crown Point and Niagara, monuments of French ambition, were encroaching upon its limits. Its unsurveyed island frontier, sweeping round on the north. Disputed with New Hampshire the land between Lake Champlain and the Connecticut, and extended into unmeasured distances in the West. Within its bosom, at Onondaga, burned the council fire of the Six Nations, whose irregular bands had seated themselves near Montreal, on the northern shore of Ontario, and on the Ohio; whose hunters roamed over the northwest and west; whose war parties had for ages strolled to Carolina. Here were concentrated by far the most important Indian relations, round which the great idea of a general union was shaping itself into reality. It was to still the hereditary warfare of the Six Nations with the Southern Indians, that South Carolina and Massachusetts first met at Albany; it was to confirm friendship with them and their allies, that New England, and all the Central States but New Jersey, had assembled in Congress. But a higher principle was needed to blend the several colonies under one sovereignty; that principle existed on the banks of the Hudson, and the statesmen of New York clung perseveringly and without wavering to faith in a united American Empire.

New York had been settled under large patents of lands to individuals; New England under grants of towns; and the institution of towns was its glory and its strength. Yet in these democracies, the hope of independence, as a near event, had not dawned. The inhabitants of New England clung to the land of their ancestry, the people of their kindred, and the nationality of their language. They were of homogeneous origin, nearly all tracing their descent to English emigrants of the reigns of Charles the First and Charles the

Second. They were a frugal and industrious race. Along the sea side, wherever there was a good harbor, fishermen, familiar with the ocean, gathered in hamlets; and each returning season saw them with an ever increasing number of mariners and vessels, taking the cod and the mackerel, and sometimes pursuing the whale into the icy labyrinths of the Northern seas; yet loving home, and deeply attached to their modest freeholds. In the settlements which grew up in the interior, on the margin of the greenwood, the plain meeting house of the congregation for public worship was everywhere the central point; near it stood the public school, by the side of the very broad road, over which wheels enough did not pass to do more than mark the path by ribbons in the sward. The snug farm houses, owned as freeholds, without quitrents, were dotted along the way; and the village pastor among his people, enjoyed the calm raptures of devotion, “appearing like such a little white flower as we see in the spring of the year, low and humble, on the ground, standing peacefully and lovingly in the midst of the flowers round about; all, in like manner, opening their bosoms to drink in the light of the sun.” In every hand was the Bible; every home was a house of prayer; in every village all had been taught, many had comprehended, a methodical theory of the divine purpose of creation, and of the destiny of man.

The great dominating idea of America at this time was political liberty. They understood to a less degree the liberty of the human conscience, and do not fully grasp that conception even now. They were approximating the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The contest was certain to be long continued; and would demand exertions and sacrifices beyond anything the colonies had hitherto experienced.

The forces arrayed against them at home and abroad were formidable, George III had allied himself with many persons and nations opposed to liberty. He was on good terms with pope Pius VI. Two of the brothers of George III, William Henry, Duke of Gloucester, and Prince Edward Augustus, were received by the pope with great honor in 1777. He wrote to the Roman Catholic bishops, vicars-apostolic, in that kingdom, to include obedience to that monarch. “The good will of George III,” said the pope, “makes this virtue a goodness. He is the best of sovereigns; his authority is

full of mildness to Catholics. They do not bear so hard and heavy a yoke; they have been delivered from a part of the severe laws and hard conditions to which they were subjected. They now possess privileges; our brethren may serve in the army, and have obtained Catholic schools for youth. Nor has the beneficent monarch shown his goodness only to Catholics of his kingdom; he has favored and supported them in the vast Indian realms subject to his authority” (Chevelier Artant de Montor, *The Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs*, II). The pope was likewise opposed to republics and favored monarchies. “Monarchy,” says he, “is the most natural form of government,” and “the populace . . . follow no wisdom and no counsel, and has no understanding of things.” The appointment of the Roman Catholic clergy in Great Britain was made by Cardinal York, who was a kinsman of George III.

The hostility of the pope was well understood by the Americans. John Adams, afterwards President of the United States, writing to the President of Congress, in an official manner, August 4, 1770, says:

The Court of Rome, attached to ancient customs, would be one of the last to acknowledge our independence, if we were to solicit it. But Congress will probably send a Minister to his Holiness, who can do them no service, upon condition of receiving a Catholic legate in return; or, in other words, an ecclesiastical tyrant, which, it is to be hoped, the United States will be too wise ever to admit into their territories (Adams, *Works*, VII).

The reasons for Roman Catholic hostility were manifest. Practically all of the colonies had severe anti-papal laws on their statute books. Likewise, the House of Bourbon had banished the Jesuits from France, and the French favored the claims of the United States. “The rancor of the Jesuits,” says Bancroft, “against the house of Bourbon for exiling them from France and Spain was relentless. The Roman Catholic clergy in the insurgent British colonies had been superintended by a person who resided in London; and during the war they were directed by Jesuits who favored the British” (Bancroft, *History of the Constitution*, I). Marbois, the French Minister, wrote to Rayneval, from Philadelphia, August 15, 1784, as follows: “The Catholics, always directed by the Jesuits in the country, have been illdisposed to the Revolution, they are not better disposed toward us” (Bancroft, I.).

It was hoped by some that Canada would make the fourteenth State in the

American Union. The Quebec Act was passed by Parliament, June, 1774, the effect of which was to make Canada a Roman Catholic province. Some of the wisest and best men in England opposed this measure. The spirit of the opposition to the Act in England may be seen in the attitude of Sergeant Glynn, backed by many other members of Parliament. He represented Middlesex and was the Recorder of London. Lord Chatham described him as being “a most ingenious, solid, pleasing man, and the spirit of the constitution itself” (Chatham, *Correspondence*, III). Mr. Glynn said:

Considering, therefore, Sir, that the laws about to be given to the Canadians are the French laws; that the religion, as far as it becomes a subject of legal attention, is to be the Roman Catholic religion; that the Protestant religion is no wise taken notice of than as being one that ought to be tolerated; and that, whatever the disposition of the governor from whom they receive those laws may be, the government will be as absolute as any king of France could make it, and that without an irresistible necessity. I am persuaded that no gentleman, who carefully attends to the subject, and reflects upon the consequences, can, as a friend to the British Constitution, give his consent to the bill now before us (Cavendish, *Debates in the House of Commons*, A.D., 1774).

Perhaps there was not a prominent Roman Catholic in Great Britain who did not endorse the war against America. There is an important paper to that effect called “an Address of the Roman Catholic Peers and Commons of Great Britain,” to the king, dated May 2, 1776, published in the *London Gazette*. It expresses their appreciation of the constitution and their loyalty to it. And that for years “their conduct has been irreproachable,” they are going to stand by the king in “public danger,” and are “perfectly ready, on every occasion, to give proofs of our fidelity.” The address further says:

We beg to assure your majesty, that our dissent from the legal establishment, in matters of religion, is purely conscientious; that we hold no opinions averse to Your Majesty’s government, or repugnant to the duties of good citizens. And we trust that this has been shown decisively by our irreproachable conduct for many years past, under circumstances of public discountenance and displeasure, than it can be manifested by any declaration whatever.

In a time of public danger, when Your Majesty's subjects can have but one interest, and ought to have but one wish and one sentiment, we humbly hope it would not be deemed improper to assure Your Majesty of our unreserved affection to your government, of our unalterable attachment to the cause and welfare of this our common country and our utter detestation of the designs and views of any foreign power, against the dignity of your Majesty's crown, and safety and tranquility of Your Majesty's subjects.

The delicacy of our situation is such that we do not presume to point out the particular means by which we may be allowed to testify our zeal to Your Majesty, and our wishes to serve our country; but we entreat leave faithfully to assure Your Majesty, that we shall be perfectly ready, on every occasion, to give such proofs of our fidelity, and the purity of our intentions, as Your Majesty's wisdom, and the sense of the nation, shall at any time deem excellent (Almon, *The Remembrancer*, VI, 133-135).

This Address was signed by two hundred and five Peers and Commoners, all Roman Catholics.

The acts of the British government were followed by the most solemn protests from all parts of the country; the crown was asked not to sign the Quebec Act; and there were many riots. The American Congress, October 21, 1774, sent an Address to the people of Great Britain. It not only gives the attitude of the Americans in general; but in particular is clear upon the religious side of the controversy. Altogether it is a fearless and plainspoken expression of convictions. It was signed by George Washington and many others.

At the risk of length some of the statements are here quoted:

We think the legislature of Great Britain is not authorized, by the constitution, to establish a religion, fraught with sanguinary and impious tenets, or to erect an arbitrary form of government, in any quarter of the globe. Those rights we, as well as you, deem sacred; and yet, sacred as they are, they have with many others, been repeatedly and flagrantly violated.

At the conclusion of the late war—a war rendered glorious by the abilities and integrity of a Minister to whose efforts the British

Empire owes its safety and its fame: At the conclusion of the war which was succeeded by an inglorious peace, formed under the auspices of a Minister of principles and of a family unfriendly to the Protestant cause and inimical to liberty: We say, at this period and under the influence of that man, a plan for the enslaving of your fellow subjects in America was concerted, and has been ever since pertinaciously carried into execution.

Nor mark the progression of the ministerial plan for enslaving us. Well aware that such hardy attempts to take our property from us, to deprive us of that valuable right of trial by jury, to seize our persons and to carry us for trial to Great Britain, to blockade our ports, to destroy our charters, and to change our form of government, would occasion great discontent in the Colonies, which might produce opposition to these measures, an act was passed to protect, indemnify and screen from punishment, such as might be guilty even of murder, in endeavoring to carry their oppressive edicts into execution; and by another act the Dominion of Canada is to be extended, modeled and governed, as by being disunited from us, detached from our interests, by civil as well as religious prejudices, that by their numbers daily swelling with Catholic emigrants from Europe, and by their devotion to administration so friendly to their religion, they might become formidable to us, and on occasion be fit instruments, in the hands of power, to reduce the free Protestant Colonies to the same state of slavery with themselves.

This was evidently the object of the act; and in this view, being extremely dangerous to our liberties and quiet, we cannot further forbear complaining of it, as hostile to British America. Superadded to these considerations we cannot help deploring the unhappy condition to which it has reduced the many English settlers, encouraged by the royal proclamation, promised the enjoyment of all of their rights, have purchased estates in that country. That they are now the subjects of an arbitrary government, deprived of trial by jury, and when imprisoned, cannot claim the benefit of the *habeas corpus* act, that great bulwark and palladium of English liberty. Nor can we suppress our astonishment, that a British Parliament can ever consent to establish in that country a religion that has deluged your

island in blood and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world. This being a true state of facts, let us beseech you to consider what end they lead (Journal of Congress, 1774, I. 27, 30).

The mercenaries sent over from Germany by Great Britain to fight the Americans were the soldiers of a Roman Catholic prince, Frederick II, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. "This prince," says Lowell, "was the Catholic ruler of a Protestant country. His first wife had been an English princess, a daughter of George II. She had separated herself from the Landgrave on his conversion to Catholicism, and returned to Henau, with her precious son.

"Frederich had led a merry life of it at Cassel. He had taken to himself a cast-off mistress of the Duc de Bullion, but he set up no pretensions to fidelity, and is said to have had more than one hundred children. A French theater, with a corp de ballet, was maintained. French adventurers, with good letters, obtained a welcome, and even responsible positions of State" (Lowell, *The Hessians*).

The Roman Catholics of Ireland were mustered into the service as soldiers. The methods used by the priests and others to induce them to enlist in the army are very interesting.

At first many of the Irish Catholics of America enlisted in the colonial army; but under the pressure of the priesthood many of them deserted and went over to the enemy. In reply to Dr. Shea, a Roman Catholic author, who said: "The Catholics spontaneously, universally and energetically give their adhesion to the cause of America, and, when the time came, to American independence" (Shea, *Catholics and Catholicity in the Days of the American Revolution*). Martin I. Griffin, a very able Roman Catholic, wrote as follows:

Every sentence is an error. When we know how Catholics had fared at the hands of their fellow colonists, and remember the deep anti-Catholic hostility to "Papists" in the early days of the Revolution, as we will find in the neat *Researches* fully set forth, we regard it to the credit of the Catholics who were Tories, rather than an ignominy. Think of how they were reviled, even in Pennsylvania, where, "alone their rights were recognized" by law, and think if possible that all would ally themselves with the haters of their faith; just as probable that Catholics of our day would do so with the church

burners of 1844, or the Know Nothings of later or present days.

Then apart from the religious aspect, but viewing the contest politically, why should Catholics have been all on one side? Could none have honestly thought the demands of the Colonists unfounded in law or justice? Could none have honestly declined to be approvers of the many outrages which were committed and which were sought to be excused because “much must be pardoned in the spirit of liberty?” Were no Catholic subject to British official or personal influence and moved to no self-interest to take the side of Britain? If it is such a glory to have been “a Whig” that it is eternal infamy to have been a Loyalist, then the Catholics of Canada, who by the authority of the clergy were kept loyal, must now merit execration for their obedience, as they suffered by excommunication for assisting “the Bostonians” (*American Catholic Historical Researches*, VI).

Likewise consideration must be taken of the attitude of the clergy of the Established Church of England. Some of the people adhered to the mother country, but that number was not large. At the close of the Revolutionary War scarcely an Episcopal clergyman remained in the country. That church was completely destroyed. At the beginning of the struggle a large number of the clergy at once assumed a position on the side of England, and against the liberty of the colonies. They brought the subject into their pulpits; they denounced the people as insurrectionists and traitors; and commanded them to abandon the rebellion, and submit, without resistance, to their legitimate rulers. So offensive were the sermons of some of them, that the citizens felt themselves insufferably outraged. On one occasion at least, a clergyman, after a Sunday’s vamping in the pulpit, was seized by the congregation, carried into a neighboring forest, fastened to a tree, and there received thirty-nine lashes vigorously administered. Another, to avoid a like fate, carried his pistols into the pulpit, and laying them by the side of his prayer book, in the presence of the assembly, told the congregation that he should proceed with the service; that England had a right to govern them; that he would read all the prayers for the king, the royal family, and the government; and that he would shoot any man who attempted to restrain him. Not many of the clergy, however, were so intrepid. The fearful and the fainthearted, therefore, fled with all practical haste (Howell, *The Early Baptists of Virginia*).

The attitude of the clergy of the Episcopal Church is well illustrated by the extract given below from a letter written from New York by Rev. Charles Inglis, Rector of Trinity Church, under date of October 31, 1776, addressed to Dr. Hind, of England.

The present rebellion is certainly one of the most causeless, unprovoked, and unnatural that ever disgraced any country; a rebellion with peculiarly aggravated circumstances of guilt and ingratitude...

The (Episcopal) clergy, amidst this scene of tumult and disorder, went on steadily with their duty; in their sermons, confining themselves to the doctrines of the Gospel, without touching on politics; using their influence to allay our hearts and cherish a spirit of loyalty among their people. This conduct, however harmless, gave great offence to our flaming patriots, who laid it down as a maxim, "That those who were not for them were against them."

Thus matters continued; the clergy proceeding regularly in the discharge of their duty where the hands of violence did not interfere, until the beginning of last July, when Congress thought proper to make an explicit declaration of independency, by which all connection with Great Britain was to be broken off, and the Americans released from any allegiance to our gracious sovereign...The only course which they (the clergy) could pursue, was to suspend the public exercise of their function, and shut up their churches.

This was accordingly done. It was very remarkable that although the clergy of those provinces I have mentioned did not, and, indeed, could not, consult each other on this interesting occasion, yet all fell upon the same method in shutting up their churches (*The Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1860, II. 312).

Surrounded as the patriots were by Tories and opposed by foreign armies yet they had friends in England. When William Pitt stated in the House of Commons, May 30, 1781, that "the American war was conceived in injustice and nurtured in folly, and that it exhibited the highest moral turpitude and depravity, and that England had nothing but victories over men struggling in the holy cause of liberty, or defeats which filled the land with mourning for

the loss of dear and valuable relatives slain in a detested and impious quarrel”; and when six months later, in the same assembly, and two days after the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown had been published in England, the eloquent Fox adopted the words of Chatham, uttered at the beginning of the Revolution, and said: ‘Thank God that America has resisted the claims of the mother country!’ (Hums, Smollett and Farr, *History of England*, III); and Burke and others in the same legislature, spoke words of kindred import, full of peril to themselves, they expressed the sentiments of the Dissenters of England, and especially those of the Baptists.

When Robert Hall, the future eloquent preacher, was a little boy, he heard John Ryland, of Northampton, a man of commanding influence among the Baptists, say to his father:

If I were Washington I would summon all the American officers, they should form a circle around me, and I would address them, and we would offer a libation in our own blood, and I would order one of them to bring a lancet and a punch bowl, and we would bare our arms and be bled; and when the bowl was full, when we all had been bled, I would call on every man to consecrate himself to the work by dipping his sword into the bowl and entering into a solemn covenant engagement by oath, one to another, and we would swear by Him that sits upon the throne and liveth forever and ever, that we would never sheathe our swords while there was an English soldier in arms remaining in America (Robert Hall, *Works*, IV.).

Dr. Rippon, of London, in a letter written to President Manning, of Rhode Island College, May 1, 1784, says:

I believe all of our Baptist ministers in town, except two, and most of our brethren in the country were on the side of the Americans in the late dispute...We wept when the thirsty plains drank the blood of our departed heroes, and the shout of a king was among us when your well fought battles were crowned with victory; and to this hour we believe that the independence of America will, for a while, secure the liberty of this country, but if that continent had been reduced, Britain would not have long been free (Backus, II).

So great was the peril and the uncertainty of the actions of foreign born persons that the generals in the army could only trust native born citizens.

General Gates issued the following orders from headquarters, Cambridge, July 7, 1775:

The General has great reason, and is highly displeased with the negligence and inattention of those officers who have placed as sentries at the outposts men with whose characters they are not acquainted. He therefore orders that for the future no man shall be appointed to these important stations who is not a native of this country, or has a wife and family in it, to whom he is known to be attached. This order is to be understood as a standing one, and the officers are to give obedience to it, at their peril (*American Archives*, 4<sup>th</sup> Series, II. 1834).

The next day the General gave orders for the enlistment of men as follows:

You are not to enlist any person who is not an American born, unless such a person has a wife and family, and is a settled resident of this country (*American Archives*, II. 1868).

After the great conspiracy on the life of Washington the life guard was reorganized, April 30, 1777. Washington was then at Morristown, New Jersey. He sent to the commanders the following confidential letter:

Sir: I want to form a company for my guard. In doing so I wish to be extremely cautious, because it is no more than probable that in the course of the campaign my baggage, papers and other matter of great public import may be committed to the sole care of these men.

This being promised, in order to impress you with proper attention in the choice, I have to request that you will immediately furnish me with four men of your regiment; and as it is my further wish that this company should look well, and be nearly of a size, I desire that none of the men shall exceed in stature 5 feet 10 inches, nor fall short of 5 feet 9 inches—that possesses the pride of appearing neat and soldier like—am satisfied that there can be no absolute security for the fidelity of this class of people, but yet I think it most likely to be found in those who have family connections in the country. You will, therefore, send me none but natives. I must insist in making the choice you will give no intimation of my preference for natives, as I do not want to create any invidious distinction between them and foreigners (*Philadelphia Ledger*, December 14, 1896, from the *New*

*York Sun*).

These statements give a good insight into the perils which surrounded the Americans in the period of the Revolutionary War. They were surrounded with enemies from without; and Tories and traitors within. The most careful watchfulness was demanded. Only patriots could be trusted; and true men with the American spirit and liberty were imperatively demanded. The Baptists were such men. They were accustomed to a hardy life; had long been trained in the rugged school of experience; were loyal and trusted citizens; and above all were endued with the spirit of wisdom and liberty. Not a man of them proved a traitor. They cast their united strength into the American cause.

The Baptists were among the first of the religious bodies to recognize the authority of the Continental Congress. The Warren Association of New England recognized the Congress as the highest civil resort. A Convention in the county of Suffolk, at this time the head county in Massachusetts, gave countenance to the Congress, in these words: "This county, confiding in the wisdom and integrity of the Continental Congress, now sitting in Philadelphia, will pay all due respect and submission to such measures as may be recommended by them to the colonies, for the restoration and establishment of our just rights, civil and religious." These resolves were carried by Backus to the Continental Congress and were as follows, as represented by the Warren Association:

To the Honorable Delegates of the several colonies in North America, met in a general Congress in Philadelphia

Honorable Gentlemen: As the Antipedobaptist churches in New England are most heartily concerned for the preservation and defense of the rights and privileges of the country, and are deeply affected by the encroachments of the same, which have lately been made by the British parliament, and are willing to unite with our dear countrymen, vigorously to pursue every prudent measure for relief, so we would beg leave to say that, as a distinct denomination of Protestants, we conceive that we have an equal claim to charter rights, with the rest of our fellow subjects; and yet have long been denied the free and full enjoyment of those rights, as to the support of religious worship. Therefore we, the elders and brethren of the

twenty Baptist churches met in Association in Medfield, twenty miles from Boston, September 14, 1744, have unanimously chosen and sent unto you the reverend and beloved Isaac Backus as our agent, to lay our case, in these respects, before you, or otherwise to use all the prudent means he can for our relief.

John Gano, *Moderator*,  
Hezekiah Smith, *Clerk*.

(Backus, *A History of New England with particular reference to the Denomination of Christians called Baptists*, II).

All kinds of indignities were cast upon the Baptists. It is related that on one occasion they met in a field by the river side, where prayers were made, and a sermon begun, when the chief officers of the town, with many followers, came and interrupted their worship. The owner of the field warned them to depart out of it if they would not peaceably; but they refused to go. The Baptist ministers desired them to act like men, if they would not act like Christians; and reminded them of the liberty of conscience which is generally allowed, and even by the powers with which we were at war, and began to open the divine warrant therefor, upon which an officer said: "Don't quote Scripture here!" Another of them, who was a communicant in their church, cast the odious name, Tory, upon one of those candidates for baptism. And he no sooner attempted to discover the injustice thereof, than the officer said, "Hold your tongue, I'll beat your teeth down your throat!" And a dog was carried into the river and plunged, in evident contempt of our sentiments. A gentleman of the town then invited the Baptists to hold their meetings at his house, which was near another river. They accepted the invitation, and so went through with their worship; at the close of which a man was hired with a bowl of liquor to go into the river, and dip another two or three times over; where also two or three more dogs were plunged after which three officers of the town came into the house where the Baptist ministers were, and advised them immediately to depart out of the town for their own safety. Being asked whether their lives would be in danger if they did not depart, no answer was returned. But seeing their temper, the Baptists agreed to disperse, and to meet at a different place of water; which was done, and those six persons were decently baptized, though further abuse was offered at the close of it.

The grievances in the Philadelphia Association were likewise severe. That

Association, in 1774, stated:

The case of our brethren suffering under ecclesiastical oppression in New England, being taken under consideration, it was agreed to recommend to our churches to contribute to their necessities, agreeable to the pattern of the primitive churches, who contributed to the relief of the distressed brethren in Judea. And that the money raised for them be remitted to Mr. Backus, in conjunction with the committee of advice in said colony, distributed to the brethren.

The case of our brethren above considered induced us to appoint a committee of grievances, who may from time to time receive accounts of the sufferings and difficulties of our friends and brethren in the neighboring colonies; and meet as often as shall appear needful in the city of Philadelphia, to consult upon and to prosecute such measures for their relief, as they shall judge most expedient; and may correspond with the Baptist committee in the Massachusetts Bay, or elsewhere (*Minutes of the Philadelphia Association*, 141, 142).

On that committee, among others, was appointed Rev. Samuel Jones, who cooperated with Backus in presenting the Baptist petition to the Continental Congress. In the year 1807 he preached the “Century Sermon” before the Association. He made the following remarks:

When the first Congress met in this city, I was one of the committee under the appointment of your body, that, in company with the late Rev. Isaac Backus, Massachusetts, met the delegates in the Congress from that State, in yonder State House, to see if we could not obtain some security for that liberty, for which we were then fighting and bleeding by their side. It seemed unreasonable to us, that we should be called upon to stand up with them in defence of liberty, if, after all, it was to be liberty of one party to oppress the other.

But our endeavors availed us nothing. One of them told us that if we meant to effect a change in their measures, respecting religion, we might as well attempt to change the course of the sun in the heavens (*Minutes*, 459, 460).

The Continental Congress made the following reply to the petition of the Baptists:

In Provincial Congress, Cambridge, December 9, 1774.

On reading the memorial of the Reverend Isaac Backus, agent of the Baptist churches in this government:

*Resolved*, That the establishment of civil and religious liberty, to each denomination in the province, is the sincere wish of this Congress. But being by no means vested with powers of civil government, whereby they can redress the grievances of any person whatever, they therefore recommend to the Baptist churches, that when a General Assembly shall be convened in this colony, they lay the real grievances of said churches before the same, when and where their petition will most certainly meet with all that attention due to the memorial of a denomination of Christians so well disposed to the public weal of their country.

By order of Congress.

John Hancock, *President*.

A true extract from the minutes.

Benjamin Lincoln, *Secretary*.

(Backus, II).

The first colony to take an official stand against Great Britain was Rhode Island (Benjamin Cowell, *The Spirit of '76 in Rhode Island*, 42, Boston, 1850). This was twenty-two days before Virginia acted. However reluctant other portions of the continent may have been to entertain the idea of a final separation from the Mother Country, in this colony the desire for absolute independence was early conceived and steadily followed. The democratic character of Rhode Island enabled the legislature to represent fairly and fully the will of the people, and their will was, at all hazards, to preserve that charter, albeit at the expense of their former loyalty.

“The Baptists have always been,” says Morgan Edwards, “more numerous than any other sect of Christians in Rhode Island; two-fifths of the inhabitants, at least, are reputed Baptists. The governors, deputy-governors, judges, assembly men and officers, civil and military, are chiefly of that persuasion.

“The first work of the Rhode Islanders after their incorporation in 1644, was to make a law that ‘Every man who submits peaceably to civil government in

this Colony shall worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience without molestation”” (*Collections of the Rhode Island Historical Society*, VI. 304) .

The date of the withdrawal of the colony from Great Britain was May 4, 1776, two months before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. The matter came up on an act to repeal an act entitled: “An act for the more effectually securing to his Majesty the allegiance of his subjects, in his colony and dominion of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations,” and altering the forms of commissions, of all writs and processes in the Courts, and of the oaths prescribed by law. The following recital of the misdeeds of George III is included in the act:

WHEREAS, in all States, existing by compact, protection and allegiance are reciprocal, the latter being only due in consequence of the former; and, WHEREAS, George the Third, King of Great Britain, forgetting his dignity, regardless of the compact most solemnly entered into, ratified and confirmed to the inhabitants of this colony, by his illustrious ancestors, and, till of late, fully recognized by him, —and entirely departing from the duties and character of a good king, instead of protecting, is endeavoring to destroy the good people of this Colony, and of all the United Colonies, by sending fleets and armies to America, to confiscate our property, and spread fire, sword, and desolation throughout our country, in order to compel us to submit to the most debasing and detestable tyranny; whereby we are obliged by necessity, and it becomes our highest duty, to use every means which God and nature have furnished us, in support of our invaluable rights and privileges, to oppose that power which is exerted only for our destruction (Arnold, *History of the State of Rhode Island*, II).

The people were tremendously in earnest. They immediately removed the artillery from the royal fort to be used by the colonists. When the Declaration of Independence was announced they were enthusiastic with shouts of “Liberty o’er and o’er the globe.” “The Rhode Islanders were such ardent patriots,” says Farr, “that after the capture of the island by Sir Peter Parker, it required a great body of men to be kept there, in perfect idleness for three years to retain them in subjection” (Hume, Smollett and Farr, *History of*

*England*, III). Governor Green, in a dispatch to General Washington, says that “some times every sencible man in the State, sometimes a third, other times a fourth part, was called out for duty” (*Collections of Rhode Island Historical Society*, VI, 290).

The Baptists in Virginia took a bold stand. “The Baptists,” says Dr. Hawks, “were not slow to discover the advantageous position in which the political troubles of the country placed them. Their numerical strength was such as to make it important to both sides to secure their influence. They knew this, and therefore determined to turn the circumstance to their profit as a sect. Persecution had taught them not to love the Establishment, and they now saw before them a reasonable prospect of overturning it entirely. In their Association, they had calmly discussed the matter, and resolved upon their course; in this course they were consistent to the end, and the war which they waged against the church was a war of extermination” (Hawks, *Contributions to Ecclesiastical History*).

The Baptists of South Carolina likewise took a noble stand. Richard Furman, a young man, was pastor in Charleston. “He was an ardent advocate of rebellion. Everywhere, on stumps and in barns, as well as in pulpits, he preached resistance to Britain. Pursued by the Tories, young Furman fled to the American camp, and there by his prayers and eloquent appeals so reassured the patriots that Cornwallis is said to have remarked that ‘he feared the prayers of that godly youth more than the armies of Sumter and Marion’” (McCrary, *History of South Carolina under the Royal Government*, 456, New York, 1899).

The colonists did not decide on a final resistance to England till 1776. The Baptists, in 1775, anticipated this action by a year. In a Memorial to the House of Burgesses soldiers were promised; the overthrow of the Establishment suggested; and the parity of all ministers requested. The Memorial is quite informing and is as follows:

*To the Hon. Peyton Randolph, Esq., and the several delegated Gentlemen, convened at Richmond, to concert Measures conducive to the Good and Wellbeing of this Colony and Dominion, the humble Address of Virginia Baptists, now Associated in Cumberland, by Delegates from the several Churches.*

Gentlemen of the Convention—While you are (pursuant to the

important Trust reposed in you) acting as the Guardians of the Rights of your Constituents, and pointing out to them the Road of Freedom, it must needs afford you an exalted satisfaction to find your Determinations not only applauded, but cheerfully complied with by a brave and spirited people. We, however, distinguished from the Body of our Countrymen by appellatives and sentiments of a religious nature, do nevertheless look upon ourselves as Members of the same Commonwealth, and, therefore, with respect to matters of a civil nature, embarked in the same common Cause.

Alarmed at the shocking Oppression which in a British Cloud hangs over the American Continent, we, as a Society and part of the distressed State, have in our Association consid'd what part might be most prudent for the Baptists to act in the present unhappy Contest. After we had determined "that in some Cases it was lawful to go to War, and also for us to make a Military resistance against Great Britain, in regard to their unjust Invasion, and tyrannical Oppression of, and repeated Hostilities against America," our people were all left to act at Discretion with respect to inlisting, without falling under Censure of our Community. And as some have inlisted, and many more likely to do so, who will have earnest Desires for their Ministers to preach to them during the Campaign, we therefore delegate and appoint our well beloved Brethren in the Ministry, Elijah Craig, Jeremiah Walker and John Williams, to present this address and to petition you that they may have free Liberty to preach to the Troops at convenient Times without molestation or abuse; and we are conscious of their strong attachment to American Liberty, as well as their soundness in the principles of the Christian Religion, and great usefulness in the Work of the Ministry, we are willing that they may come under your examination in any Matters you may think requisite.

We conclude with our earnest prayers to Almighty God for his Divine Blessing on your patriotic and laudable Resolves, for the good of Mankind and American Freedom, and for the success of our Armies in Defence of our Lives, Liberties and Properties. Amen.

Sign'd by order and in behalf of the Association the 14<sup>th</sup> of August,

1775.

Sam'l Harries, *Moderator*.

John Waller, *Clerk*.

(*American Archives*, Fourth Series, 1775, III, 383).

In reply the *Convention* passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That it be an instruction to the commanding officers of the regiment or troops to be raised, that they permit *dissenting* clergymen to celebrate divine worship, and to preach to the soldiers, or to exhort from time to time, as the various operations of the military service may permit, for the ease of such scrupulous consciences as may not choose to attend divine service as celebrated by the chaplain (*Journal of the Convention of 1775*, 17).

The growing influence of the Baptists and their unanimity made them most formidable in elections. "The influence of the denomination," says Howison, "was strong among the common people, and was beginning to be felt in high places. In two points they were distinguished. No class of people in America were more devoted advocates of the principles of the Revolution; none more willing to give their money and goods to their country; none more prompt to march to the field of battle, and none more heroic in actual combat than the Baptists of Virginia. Secondly, in their hatred of the church Establishment" (Howison, *History of Virginia*, II. 170. Richmond, 1848).

Thoughtfully "they had considered what part it would be proper to take in the unhappy contest, and had determined that they ought to make a military resistance to Great Britain in her unjust invasion, tyrannical oppression, and repeated hostilities" (Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution*, 250. New York, 1864). They proclaimed that to "a man they were in favor of the Revolution" (Semple).

Several Baptist preachers did great service in the army as chaplains. The Baptist General Association of Virginia sent, in 1775, Jeremiah Walker and John Williams to preach to the soldiers. These were the most popular preachers in the Old 'Dominion. McClanahan raised a company chiefly composed of Baptists, whom he commanded as captain and preached to as chaplain. Charles Thompson, of Massachusetts, served as chaplain three years, and Hezekiah Smith was from the same State.

J. M. Peck gives the following interesting account of Hezekiah Smith:

Dr. Smith was full six feet high, of an erect gate, and majestic aspect. His manners were uncommonly bland and courteous, and his noble heart full of love to God and man. When he went to Haverhill, the Congregational church had just divided upon the subject of *new* and *old* light. One of the parties, supposing Mr. Smith to be a Pedobaptist minister, invited him to preach. They were all delighted with him, and wished to settle him as their minister “right off.” But he informed them that he was a Baptist, and this soon turned the tide of affairs; their admiration gave way to contempt, and their love to hatred. They could not even bear his presence, and the selectmen of the town commissioned an officer to warn him out of the place. The poor man who was sent to read the notice was so awed by Mr. Smith’s dignified presence that he could not read it, but tremblingly stammered out, “I-I-warn you off God’s earth” “Why man,” said the Doctor, “where shall I go?” “To the Isle of Shoales, if you have a mind to,” replied the man and then ran off. Mr. Smith did not obey the lordly mandate of his Pedobaptist inquisitors, but continued to preach the gospel—treated every one with kindness and courtesy, treated the opposition in the spirit of Christian love, and finally overcame it. He was never known to say an unkind word, or meet the abusive conduct of his enemies except with generous allowance and compassion. He was chaplain in the Revolutionary Army, and gained the esteem of officers and men. His preaching was truly evangelical, rich and impressive. He was a great friend to ministerial education, and advocated the doctrine of giving pastors and preachers an adequate support—sentiments exceedingly unpopular in those days. He never disputed or contended about his opinions, but would state them calmly, deliberately and kindly, quoting the words of God as his authority, and then leave them to produce their effect. He was preeminently a godly man. There was a *heavenliness* in his conversation which at once interested and delighted. His labors were greatly blessed in the conversion of souls. He died A. D. 1804, universally beloved and lamented (*The Baptist Banner and Pioneer*, June 27, 1839. IV. 2).

Rev. Samuel Rogers of Philadelphia was one of the foremost preachers of his

day. He was appointed chaplain of a brigade by the legislature. David Jones followed Gates through two campaigns.

John Gano was the foremost chaplain of the American Revolution. "As a minister of Christ he shone like a star of the first magnitude in the American churches, and moved in a widely extended field of action." He was a Huguenot by extraction. He was born in Hopewell, New Jersey, July 22, 1727. "He was in person," says Dr. Furman, "below the middle stature, and, when young, of a slender form; but of firm, vigorous constitution, well fitted for performing active service with ease, and for suffering labors and privations with constancy. In the more advanced stages of life, his body tended to corpulency; but not to such a degree as to burden or render him inactive. His presence was manly, open and engaging. His voice strong and commanding, yet agreeable and capable of all those inflections which are suited to express either the strong or tender emotions of an intelligent, feeling mind. In mental endowments and acquired abilities he appeared highly respectable; with clear conception and penetrating discernment, he formed, readily, a correct judgment of men and things. His acquaintance with the learned languages and science did not commence till he arrived at manhood, and was obtained chiefly by private instruction; but under the direction of a clerical gentleman, well qualified for the office. To the refinements of learning he did not aspire-his chief desire was such a competent acquaintance with its principles as would enable him to apply them with advantage to purposes of general usefulness in religion, and the most important uses of society; and to this he attained" (Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, VI).

Such was the trusted friend of Washington. He was brave and true, and made an indelible impression on the soldiers with whom he was associated.

There were several other Baptists who served in conspicuous positions in various capacities. Oliver Hart was one of the foremost pastors in South Carolina. He was useful not only as a minister, but as a citizen, and especially in connection with the events of the Revolution. In 1775, he was appointed by the Council of Safety, which then exercised the executive authority in South Carolina, to travel, in conjunction with Hon. William H. Drayton and the Rev. William Tennent, into the interior of the State, to enlighten the people in regard to their political interests, and reconcile them to certain Congressional measures of which they were disposed to complain.

He was very impressive in his personality. “In his person he was somewhat tall, well proportioned and of graceful appearance; of an active, vigorous constitution, before it was impaired by close application to his studies and by abundant labors. His countenance was open and manly, his voice clear, harmonious and commanding; the powers of his mind were strong and capacious, and enriched by a fund of useful knowledge; his taste was elegant and refined” (Sprague, VI).

Of his usefulness as a citizen there is no doubt, Dr. Furman says of his actions as a citizen:

To all of which may be added his usefulness as a citizen of America. Prompt in his judgment, ardent in his love of liberty, and rationally jealous for the rights of his country, he took an early and decided part in those measures which led our patriots to successful opposition against the encroachments of arbitrary power, and brought us to possess all the blessings of our happy independence. Yet he did not mix politico with the Gospel, nor desert the duties of his station to pursue them; but, attending to each in its proper place, he gave weight to his political sentiments, by the propriety and uprightness of his conduct; and the influence of it was felt by many (Sprague, VI.).

The story of John Hart, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, is pathetic. “The father of Mr. Hart,” says Cathcart, “was a man of courage and patriotism; he raised a company of volunteers, which was led to Quebec, and with them he fought bravely on the Plains of Abraham against the French. The son inherited his spirit, and was universally regarded as one of the best men in New Jersey. He was well informed on Colonial and European questions, and thoroughly understood the inalienable rights of mankind. He was held in such high esteem that he was generally selected to settle the disputes of the neighbors, who spoke of him affectionately as ‘Honest .john Hart.’ In the social relations of life he was a man of great modesty and benevolence, and his highest ambition was to serve God and promote the best interests of his countrymen. He had no taste for political life, and in the conventions of his fellow citizens he expressed himself by brave deeds rather than by eloquent speeches. When he entered the Continental Congress of 1774 he was about sixty years of age. He

resigned from Congress in 1775, and became Vice-President of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey. He was again elected in 1776 and took his place among the patriots and heroes who sent forth the immortal Declaration. It was issued July 4, 1776. When first published it had only the name of John Hancock as President and Charles Thompson as Secretary. Two days before it was given to the world the British landed a powerful army on Staten Island, and to impart greater weight to the Declaration it was signed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of the month after its adoption by all the members and circulated extensively throughout the colonies. Mr. Hart had passed beyond the age of ambition and vigorous activity, and the period of life when men voluntarily make sacrifices and even imperil their property or safety, but he considered nothing but his country's liberty. He owned a valuable farm, grist, saw and fulling mills; he had a wife and family whose happiness and security were dear to him; his residence was on the highway of the enemy and his signature was sure to bring down vengeance in a week or two; he knew that everything which he owned except the soil would be destroyed, his dear ones scattered, and his life taken if by the providence of the Evil One he was captured, and yet he did not hesitate to sign the Declaration of Independence, though it might prove his own death warrant, and though it could hardly fail to inflict the heaviest losses and the most painful sufferings on him and his. The enemy soon found out his patriotism and the happy home of Mr. Hart. His children fled, his property was wasted, and though an old man heavily laden of years he was compelled to leave his residence and conceal himself. He was pursued with unusual fury and malice, and could not with safety sleep twice in the same place. One night he had the house of a dog for a shelter and its owner for his companion. Added to the intensity of the bitterness of his persecutions, he was driven from the couch of his dying wife, whose anguish he was not permitted to assuage" (Cathcart, *The Baptists and the American Revolution*).

He built the Baptist meeting house at Hopewell and gave it the burying ground. A shaft of Quincy marble now marks his resting place, which was dedicated by the Governor of the State.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Robert Boyle C. Howell, *The Early Baptists of Virginia*. Philadelphia, 1857.

John A. Broadus, The American Baptist Ministry of one hundred years ago, *The Baptist Quarterly*, IX, 1-20. Philadelphia, 1875.

## CHAPTER II

### THE BAPTISTS AND THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION

The Constitution—The Ratification—Two Objections to the Constitution—Liberty not Sufficiently Guarded—Massachusetts—James Manning—Virginia—James Madison and John Leland—J. S. Barbour—Governor Briggs on Leland—Patrick Henry Against the Constitution—John Adams—and Religious Liberty—Thomas Jefferson—First Amendment to the Constitution—The Baptists of Virginia Propose the Amendment—The Forces Working for Liberty—Leonard Bacon—Ruffini.

At the close of the war a congress of representatives from the States was called to draft a Constitution for the United States. The new Constitution was submitted for ratification by the various States September 17, 1787. There was much opposition to the proposed Constitution, especially as it determined that there should be no religious tests. For a long time it seemed doubtful if the Constitution would be ratified. The issue hung upon the action of two States, Massachusetts and Virginia. In each of these States the Baptists held the balance of power.

There were two currents of thought against the article on religion, the one finding it excessive and dangerous, the other insufficient and maimed. It was feared by some of the opponents of the articles that the power might pass into the hands of the Roman Catholics, the Jews or infidels; “even the Pope of Rome,” one horrified delegate exclaimed, “might become President of the United States.” The opposition was particularly strong in Massachusetts, where the liberal ideas were combated by the legislature. Other States were unable to find in the article a sufficiently wide and certain guarantee of religious liberty, and therefore they proposed amendments.

January 9, 1788, a convention of delegates assembled in Boston, Massachusetts, from all parts of the State. The debate was long; and the issue uncertain. Some of the Baptists looked upon the Constitution with suspicion as not giving full guarantee of freedom. James Manning, President of Rhode Island College, was an earnest advocate of the adoption of the Constitution and he had much influence in the body. He fully believed that on the adoption of that measure the future well-being of the country was suspended. Being aware that several Baptist ministers were members of the convention, and that they generally looked upon the proposed Constitution with a jealous eye, he went to Boston with a view to exert whatever influence he could to disarm

his brethren of their prejudices, and to bring them to act as he fully believed the interest of the nation required. In this effort he was seconded by his intimate friend, Dr. Samuel Stillman, who was himself a member of the body, with two or three other very influential ministers. The question of ratification was finally carried by a majority of nineteen. Just before the final vote, Governor Hancock, the President of the Convention, called upon Dr. Manning to pray; and, though the request took him by surprise, he fell upon his knees, and offered a prayer in which patriotism and piety were most delightfully blended, and which left an extraordinary impression upon the whole assembly. On his return to Providence, after the Convention had closed its sessions, he met his friends with the warmest congratulations, and could scarcely find language strong enough to express his sense of the importance of the result which had been reached (Sprague, VI.).

The opposition to the Constitution in Virginia was led by strong and popular men. The people were about equally divided on the measure. The Convention met in Richmond, in June, 1788. The Baptists in Williams meeting house, Goochland county, March 7, had canvassed the Constitution and reached the following conclusion:

Whether the new Federal Constitution, which had now lately made its appearance in public, made sufficient provision for the secure enjoyment of religious liberty; on which, it was agreed unanimously that, in the opinion of the General Committee, it did not (Semple).

The leader in favor of the Constitution was James Madison, and opposed to it was Patrick Henry. Madison had been absent in Philadelphia, and the candidate for Orange county was John Leland. It was a great Baptist county and the probabilities were that Leland would be elected. Madison called on Leland, spent half a day with him, and Leland came down from the race and supported Madison. He believed Madison would properly represent the cause.

The celebrated lawyer, J. S. Barbour, in an eulogy upon Madison, said that “the credit of adopting the Constitution of the United States properly belonged to a Baptist clergyman, formerly of Virginia, by the name of Leland; and he reached his conclusion in this way—he said that if Madison had not been in the Virginia Convention, the Constitution would not have been ratified by that State; and, as the approval of nine States was required to

give effect to this instrument, and as Virginia was the ninth State, if it had been rejected by her, the Constitution would have failed; and that it was by Elder Leland's influence that Madison was elected to the Convention."

Governor Briggs, of Massachusetts, who was a great friend of Leland, gives the following account of the affair:

Soon after the Convention, which framed the Constitution of the United States, had finished their work, and submitted it to the people for their action, two strong and active parties were formed in the State of Virginia, on the subject of its adoption. The State was nearly equally divided. One party was opposed to its adoption, unless certain amendments, which they maintained that the safety of the people required, should be incorporated into it, before it was ratified by them. At the head of this great party stood Patrick Henry, the Orator of the Revolution, and one of Virginia's favorite sons. The other party agreed with their opponents said as to the character and necessity of the amendments proposed, but they contended that the people should have the power, and could as well incorporate these amendments into the Constitution after its adoption as before; that it was a great crisis in the affairs of the country, and if the Constitution, then presented to the people by the Convention, should be rejected by them, such would be the state of the public mind, that there was little or no reason to believe that another would be agreed upon by a future Convention; and, in such an event,—so much to be dreaded,—the hopes of constitutional liberty and a confederated and free Republic would be lost. At the head of this party stood James Madison. The strength of the two parties was to be tested by the election of County Delegates to the State Convention. That Convention would have to adopt or reject the Constitution. Mr. Madison was named as the candidate in favor of its adoption for the County of Orange, in which he resided. Elder Leland, also, at that time, lived in the County of Orange, and his sympathies, he said, were with Henry and his party. He was named as the candidate opposed to adoption, and in opposition to Mr. Madison. Orange was a strong Baptist county; and his friends had an undoubted confidence in his election. Though reluctant to be a candidate, he yielded to the solicitations of the opponents of the Constitution, and

accepted the nomination.

For three months after the members of the Convention at Philadelphia had completed their labors, and returned to their homes, Mr. Madison, with John Jay and Alexander Hamilton, had remained in that city for the purpose of preparing those political articles that now constitute *The Federalist*. This gave the party opposed to Madison, with Henry at their head, the start of him, in canvassing the State in his absence. At length, when Mr. Madison was about ready to return to Virginia, a public meeting was appointed in the County of Orange, at which the candidates for the Convention,—Madison on the one side, and Leland on the other, were to address the people from the stump. Up to that time he had but a partial acquaintance with Mr. Madison, but he had a high respect for his talents, his candor, and the uprightness and purity of his private character. On his way home from Philadelphia, Mr. Madison went some distance out of his direct road to call upon him. After the ordinary salutations, Mr. Madison began to apologize for troubling him with a call at that time; but he assured Mr. M. that no apology was necessary—"I know your errand here," said he, "it is to talk with me about the Constitution. I am glad to see you, and to have an opportunity of hearing your views on the subject." Mr. Madison spent half a day with him, and fully and unreservedly communicated to him his opinions upon the great matters which were then agitating the people of the State and Confederacy.

Then they separated to meet again very soon, as opposing candidates before the electors, on the stump. The day came, and they met, and with them nearly all the voters of the County of Orange, to hear their candidates respectively discuss the important questions upon which the people of Virginia were so soon to act. "Mr. Madison," said the venerable man, "first took the stump, which was a hogshead of tobacco, standing on one end. For two hours, he addressed his fellow citizens in a calm, candid and statesman-like manner, arguing his side of the case, and fairly meeting and replying to the arguments which had been put forth by his opponents, in the general canvass of the State. Though Mr. Madison was not particularly a pleasing or eloquent speaker, the people listened with

respectful attention. He left the hogshead, and my friends called on me. I took it—and went in for Mr. Madison; and he was elected without difficulty. “This,” said he, “is, I suppose, what Mr. Barbour alluded to.” A noble Christian patriot I That single act, with the motives which prompted it, entitled him to the respect of mankind (Sprague, VI).

When the Convention assembled, Patrick Henry spoke against the Constitution with a vehemence never surpassed by himself on any occasion in his whole life, and with a power that sometimes was overwhelming. Once, while this matchless orator was addressing the Convention, a wild storm broke over Richmond; the heavens were ablaze with lightning, the thunder roared, and the rain came down in torrents; at this moment Henry seemed to see the anger of heaven threatening the State, if it should consummate the guilty act of adopting the Constitution, and he invoked celestial witnesses to view and compassionate his distracted country in this grand crisis of its history. And such was the effect of his speech on the occasion; that the Convention immediately dispersed (Howison, II).

But Madison and his party prevailed. The Convention, when the final vote of ratification was taken, only gave a majority of ten in favor of the Constitution. Eighty-nine cast their votes for it, and seventy-nine against it (Howe, Virginia Historical Collections, 124. Charleston, 1846).

In this manner the Constitution of the United States was adopted. Already, it has been seen that the Baptists did not think that the Constitution secured religious liberty. Imperfect as it was considered, through Mr. Madison and the Baptists, the Constitution had been ratified. There was large opposition to any amendments. Many noble men were in favor of the union of Church and State. Massachusetts was wedded to an establishment. John Adams, her favorite son and afterwards President of the United States, was indignant that the Baptists addressed the Congress in Philadelphia praying for religious liberty. He wrote as follows to Benjamin Kent:

I am for the most liberal toleration of all denominations, but I hope Congress will never meddle with religion further than to say their own prayers...Let every Colony have its own religion without molestation (Adams, *Works by Charles Francis Adams*, IX.).

As late as the beginning of the nineteenth century there was a dream of a

State Church. Thomas Jefferson, writing to Benjamin Rush, says:

The successful experiment made under the prevalence of that delusion (of a State Church) on the clause of the Constitution, which, while it secures the freedom of the press, covered also the freedom of religion, had given to the clergy a very favorable hope of obtaining an establishment of a particular form of Christianity through the United States; and as every met believes its own form the true one, every one perhaps hoped for his own, but especially the Episcopalians and the Congregationalists. The returning good sense of our country threatens abortion to their hopes, and they believe that any portion of power confided to me, will be exerted in opposition to their schemes. And they believe rightly; for I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the minds of men (Jefferson, *Writings*, X, 174, 175. Washington, 1904).

Massachusetts did not ratify the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States (Backus, II). The suggested amendment came from the Baptists. “Denominationally,” says Cathcart, “no community asked for this change in the Constitution but the Baptists. The Quakers probably would have petitioned it, if they had thought of it, but they did not. John Adams and the Congregationalists did not desire it; the Episcopalians did not wish it; it went too far for most Presbyterians in Revolutionary times, or in our days, when we hear so much about putting the divine name in the Constitution. The Baptists asked it through Washington; the request commended itself to his judgment and to the generous soul of Madison; and to the Baptists, beyond a doubt, belongs the glory of engrafting its best articles on the noblest Constitution ever framed for the government of mankind” (Cathcart, *Centennial Offering*).

On account of his well-known views there was much opposition to Madison in Virginia. Through the influence of Patrick Henry he was defeated for the United States Senate. The Congressional Districts were so gerrymandered that it was thought he could not be elected to the House of Representatives. Here again, the Baptists, believing in his integrity, threw their influence to him and he was elected to Congress.

On the general subject of amendments to the Constitution Madison, in a

speech delivered June 8, 1789, said:

I will state my reasons why I think it proper to propose amendments, and state the amendments themselves, so far as I think they ought to be proposed. If I thought I could fulfill the duty I owe to myself and my constituents, to let the subject pass over in silence, I would most certainly not trespass on the indulgence of the House. But I cannot do this, and am, therefore, compelled to beg a patient hearing to what I have to lay before you . . . It appears to me that this House is bound by every motive of prudence not to let the first session pass over without proposing to the State Legislature some things to be incorporated into the Constitution that will render it acceptable to the whole people of the United States as it has been found acceptable to a majority of them. I wish, among other reasons why something should be done, that those who have been friendly to the adoption of the Constitution may have the opportunity of proving to those who were opposed to it that they were as sincerely devoted to liberty and a republican government as those who charged them with wishing the adoption of this Constitution in order to lay the foundation of an aristocracy or despotism. It will be a desirable thing to extinguish from the bosom of every member of the community any apprehensions that there are those among his countrymen who wish to deprive them of the liberty for which they valiantly fought and honorably bled. And if there are amendments desired of such a nature as will not injure the Constitution, and they can be engrafted so as to give satisfaction to the doubting part of our fellow citizens, the friends of the Federal Government will evince the spirit of deference and concession for which they have been hitherto distinguished...It cannot be a secret to the gentlemen of this House that, notwithstanding the ratification of this system of government by eleven of the thirteen United States, in some cases unanimously, in others by large majorities, yet still there is a great number of our constituents who are dissatisfied with it, among whom are many respectable for their talents and patriotism, and respectable for the jealousy they have for their liberty, which, though mistaken in its object, is laudable in its motive. There is a great body of the people falling under this description, who at

present feel much inclined to, join their support to the cause of Federalism, if they were satisfied on this point . . . But perhaps there is a stronger motive than this for one going into a consideration of the subject. It is to provide those securities for liberty which are required by a part of the community. I allude in a particular manner to those two States (Rhode Island and North Carolina) that have not thought fit to throw themselves into the bosom of the confederacy. It is a desirable thing, on our part as well as theirs, that a reunion should take place as soon as possible . . . But I will candidly acknowledge that, over and above all of these considerations, I do conceive that the Constitution may be amended; that is to say, if all powers of the general Government may be guarded against in a more secure manner than it is now done, while no one advantage arising from the exercise of that power shall be damaged or endangered by it. We have in this way something to gain; and, if we proceed with caution, nothing to lose (*Annals of Congress*, I).

Upon the advice of Madison the subject was presented to Washington. The petition was prepared by John Leland and is as follows:

Address of the Committee of the United Baptist Churches of Virginia, assembled in the city of Richmond, August 8, 1789, to the President of the United States of America

Sir,—Among the many shouts of congratulation that you receive from cities, societies, States and the whole world, we wish to take an active part in the universal chows, in expressing our great satisfaction in your appointment to the first office in the nation. When America, on a former occasion, was reduced to the necessity of appealing to arms to defend her natural and civil rights, a Washington was found fully adequate to the exigencies of the dangerous attempt; who, by the philanthropy of his heart and the prudence of his head, led forth her untutored troops into the field of battle, and, by the skillfulness of his hands, baffled the projects of the insulting foe and pointed out the road to independence, even at a time when the energy of the Cabinet was not sufficient to bring into action the natural aid of the confederation, from its respective sources.

The grand object being obtained, the independence of the States acknowledged, free from ambition, devoid of the thirst of blood, our hero returned, with those he commanded, and laid down the sword at the feet of those who gave it to him. "Such an example to the world is new." Like other nations, we experienced that it requires as great valor and wisdom to make an advantage of a conquest as to gain one.

The want of efficiency in the confederation, the redundancy of laws, and their partial administration in the States, called aloud for a new arrangement in our systems. The wisdom of the States for that purpose was collected in a grand convention, over which you, sir, had the honor to preside. A national government, in all its parts, was recommended as the only preservation of the Union, which plan of government is now in actual operation.

When the constitution first made its appearance in Virginia, we, as a society, had unusual struggles of mind, fearing that the liberty of conscience, dearer to us than property or life, was not sufficiently secured. Perhaps our jealousies were heightened by the usage we received in Virginia under the regal government, when mobs, fines, bonds, and prisons were our frequent repast.

Convinced, on the one hand, that without an effective national government the States would fall into disunion and all the consequent evils, and on the other hand, fearing that we would be accessory to some religious oppression, should any one society in the union predominate over the rest; amidst all these inquietudes of mind our consolation arose from this consideration, viz.: the plan must be good, for it has the signature of a tried, trusty friend, and if religious liberty is rather insecure in the Constitution, "the Administration will certainly prevent all oppressions, for a Washington will preside." According to our wishes, the unanimous voice of the Union has called you, sir, from your beloved retreat, to launch forth again into the faithless seas of human affairs, to guide the helm of States. May the divine munificence which covered your head in battle make you yet a greater blessing to your admiring country in time of peace! Should the horrid evils that have been so

pestiferous in Asia and Europe—faction, ambition, war, perfidy, fraud and persecution for conscience sake, ever approach the borders of our happy nation, may the name and administration of our beloved President, like the radiant source of day, scatter all those dark clouds from the American hemisphere.

And, while we speak freely the language of our hearts, we are satisfied that we express the sentiments of our brethren whom we represent. The very name of Washington is music in our ears, and, although the great evil in the States, is the want of mutual confidence between the rulers and the people, yet we have the utmost confidence in the President of the States; and it is our fervent prayer to Almighty God that the Federal Government, and the governments of the respective States, without rivalship, may cooperate together as to make the numerous people over which you preside the happiest nation on earth, and you, sir, the happiest man, in seeing the people whom, by the smiles of Providence, you saved from vassalage by your valor and made wise by your maxims, sitting securely under their vines and fig trees, enjoying the perfection of human felicity. May God long preserve your life and health for a blessing to the world in general, and the United States in particular; and when, like the sun, you have finished your course of great and unparalleled services, and go the way of all the earth, may the Divine Being, who will reward every man according to his works, grant unto you a glorious admission into the everlasting kingdom, through Jesus Christ. This, sir, is the prayer of your happy admirers. By order of the Committee.

Samuel Harris, *Chairman*.

Reuben Ford, *Clerk* (Leland, *Works*).

Washington made the following reply:

To the General Committee, Representing the United Baptist Churches in Virginia:

Gentlemen—I request that you will accept my best acknowledgments for your congratulations on my appointment to the first office of the nation. The kind manner in which you mention my past conduct equally claims the expression of my gratitude.

After we had, by the smiles of Divine Providence on our exertions, obtained the object for which we contended, I retired at the conclusion of the war, with the idea that my country could have no further occasion for my services, and with the intention of never again entering public life. But when the exigencies of my country seemed to require me once more to engage in public affairs, my honest conviction of duty superceded my former resolution, and became my apology for deviating from the happy plan which I had adopted.

If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed by the Convention, where I had the honor to preside, might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you that none will be persuaded, that none will be more zealous than myself to establish effective barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny and every species of religious persecution; for you doubtless remember I have often expressed my sentiments, that any man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

While I recollect with satisfaction that the religious society of which you are members, throughout America, uniformly and almost unanimously were the firm friends of civil liberty, and the persevering promoters of our glorious revolution, I cannot hesitate to believe that they will be the faithful supporters of a free, yet efficient, general government. Under this pleasing expectation, I rejoice to assure them that they may rely upon my best wishes and endeavors to promote their prosperity.

In the meantime, be assured, gentlemen, that I entertain a proper sense of your fervent supplications to God for my temporal and eternal happiness.

I am, Gentlemen, your most obedient servant,

George Washington.  
(Sparks, *Writings of Washington*, XII).

One of the first things Madison proposed on entering Congress, June 8, 1789, was the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The Baptists felt secure under this new provision of the Constitution. Long afterwards, March 2, 1819, Madison wrote to Robert Walsh, from Montpelier, as follows:

It was the universal opinion of the century preceding the last that civil government could not stand without the prop of a religious establishment, and that the Christian religion itself would perish, if not supported by a legal provision for its clergy. The experience of Virginia conspicuously corroborates the disproof of both opinions. The civil government, though bereft of everything like an associated hierarchy, possesses the requisite stability and performs its functions with complete success; whilst the number, the industry, and the morality of the priesthood, and the devotion of the people, have been manifestly increased by the total separation of the Church from the State.

The forces which worked for liberty have thus been summed up by Bacon:

“In the establishment of the American principle of the non-interference of the State with religion, and the equality of all religious communions before the law, much was due, no doubt, to the mutual jealousies of the sects, no one or two of which were strong enough to maintain exceptional pretensions over the rest combined. Much also is to be imputed to the in-differentism and sometimes the anti-religious sentiment of an important and numerous class of doctrinaire politicians of which Jefferson may be taken as a type. So far as this work was a work of intelligent conviction and religious faith, the chief honor of it must be given to the Baptists. Other sects, notably the Presbyterians, had been energetic and efficient in demanding their own liberties; the Friends

and Baptists agreed in demanding liberty of conscience and worship, and equality before the law, for all alike. But the active labor in this cause was mainly done by the Baptists. It is to their consistency and constancy in the warfare against the privileges of the powerful ‘Standing Order’ of New England, and of the moribund establishments in the South, that we are chiefly indebted for the final triumph, in this country, of that principle of the separation of church and state, which is one of the largest contributions of the New World to civilization and the church universal” (Bacon, *A History of American Christianity*).

Ruffini has summed up the provisions of this amendment in the following discriminating manner: “By this the United States solemnly promised that they would never elevate any one form of belief to the rank of the official religion of the Confederation, but that, on the contrary, equal liberty would be conceded to all the churches. It was, therefore, the most absolute separation of the two powers which the United States, at the moment of constituting themselves into a Republic, placed at the basis of their relations with Churches, and to that separation they entrusted the guarantee of the fullest religious liberty.

“There is, however, one thing that must be especially noted. The Constitution of the United States did not abolish the union between the State and the Church within those particular States in which the separation had not already taken place. Now, no separation had been effected, nor was it realized for a whole century, in the New England States. Again, the Constitution did not guarantee full religious liberty except in federal relationships, and it did not remove those restrictions in the internal relations of single States . . . Some of them (the States), however, still remained intolerant in spite of and after the Federal Constitution” (Ruffini).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

The Writings of Thomas Jefferson containing his Autobiography, Notes on Virginia, Parliamentary Manual, Official Papers, Messages and Addresses, and other Writings Official and Private. Andrew A. Lipscomb, Editor in Chief, Albert Ellery Bergh, Managing Editor. 18 volumes.

The Writings of George Washington being the Correspondence, Addresses,

Messages and other Papers, Official and Private by Jared Sparks, Boston, 1838. 12 volume.

J. T. Smith, Life and Times of Rev. John Leland, *The Baptist Quarterly*, V, 230-256. Philadelphia, 1871.

Reuben A. Guild, The Denominational Work of President Manning, *The Baptist Review*, III. 74-85. Cincinnati, 1881.

John T. Christian, The Religion of Thomas Jefferson, *The Review and Expositor*, XVI. 295-307. Louisville, 1919.

## CHAPTER III

### THE PERIOD OF IMPRISONMENT AND STRIFE IN VIRGINIA

The Persecutions in Virginia—Imprisonments—Spotsylvania—Lewis Craig—Letter of John Blair—Waller forty—Three Days in Jail—The Members of the Establishment Enraged—Others Imprisoned—William Fristoe on Persecutions—The Baptists Greatly Increase in Number—James Madison Writes Letters—The Action of the House of Burgesses—Baptists Present Petitions—The Baptists Attack the Establishment.

Heretofore, as has been seen, the Baptists were much persecuted. At their baptisms they were annoyed, and on one occasion a clergyman of the Establishment rode into the water and badgered them. They had been whipped, branded and banished. Now there was a systematic effort made to entirely overthrow them.

“The first instance of actual imprisonment,” says Semple, “we believe, that ever took place in Virginia, was in the county of Spotsylvania. On the 4<sup>th</sup> of June, 1768, John Waller, Lewis Craig, James Childs, &c., were seized by the sheriff and hauled before three magistrates, who stood in the meeting-house yard, and who bound them in the penalty of one thousand pounds, to appear in court two days after. At court they were arraigned as disturbers of the peace; on their trial, they were vehemently accused, by a certain lawyer, who said to the court, ‘May it please your worships, these men are great disturbers of the peace; they cannot meet a man upon the road, but they must ram a text of Scripture down his throat.’ Mr. Waller made his own and his brethren’s defense so ingeniously that they were somewhat puzzled to know how to dispose of them. They offered to release them if they would promise to preach no more in the county for a year and a day. This they refused; and, therefore, were sent into close jail. As they moved on, from the court house to the prison, through the streets of Fredericksburg, they sung the hymn,

*‘Broad is the road that leads to death, &c.’*

This had an awful appearance. After four weeks’ confinement, Lewis Craig was released from prison and immediately went to Williamsburg to get a release for his companions. He waited on the deputy governor, the Hon. John Blair, stated the case before him, and received the following letter, directed to the King’s attorney in Spotsylvania:

Sir,—I lately received a letter, signed by a good number of worthy

gentlemen, who are not here, complaining of the Baptists; the particular of their misbehavior are not told, any further than the running into private houses and making dissensions. Mr. Craig and Mr. Benjamin Waller are now with me and deny the charge; and tell me that they are willing to take the oaths as others have; I told them I had consulted the attorney general, who is of opinion that the general court only have a right to grant licenses, and therefore I referred them to the court; but, on their application to the attorney general, they brought me his letter, advising me to write to you. That their petition was a matter of right, and that you may not molest these conscientious people so long as they behave themselves in a manner becoming pious Christians and in obedience to the laws till the court, when they intend to apply for license, and when the gentlemen who complain may make their objections and be heard. The act of toleration (it being found by experience that persecuting dissenters increases their numbers) has given them a right to apply, in a proper manner, for licensed houses for the worship of God, according to their consciences; and I persuade myself that the gentlemen will quietly overlook their meetings till the court. I am told they administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, near the manner we do, and differ from our church in nothing but in the fact of baptism, and in their renewing the ancient discipline; by which they have reformed some sinners and brought them to be truly penitent. Nay, if a man of theirs is idle and neglects to labor and provide for his family as he ought, he incurs their censures, which have had good effects. If this be their behaviour, it were to be wished we had more of it among us. But at least, I hope all may remain quiet till the court.

I am, with great respect,  
To the gentlemen, &c.  
Your humble serv't  
John Blair.

Williamsburg, July 16, 1768 (Campbell, *History of the Colony of the Ancient Dominion of Virginia*, p. 554. Philadelphia, 1860).

“When the letter came to the attorney he would have nothing to say in this

affair. Waller and the others continued in jail forty-three days, and were discharged without conditions. While in prison they constantly preached through the gates. The mobs without using every exertion to prevent the people from hearing, but to little purpose. Many heard, indeed, upon whom the Word was in power and demonstration.”

“After their discharge, which was a kind of triumph, Waller, Craig, and their compeers in the ministry, resumed their labors with redoubled vigor, gathering fortitude from their late sufferings, thanking God that they were counted worthy to suffer for Christ and his Gospel. Day and night, and indeed almost every day and night, they held meetings in their own and adjacent neighborhoods. The spread of the Gospel and Baptist principles was equal to all of their exertions; insomuch that in a few sections of Virginia did the Baptist cause appear more formidable to its enemies and more consoling to its friends than in Spotsylvania; and we may add, so it is to this day” (Semple).

The outcome of this affair seems to have further enraged the members of the Establishment. They everywhere attempted to strengthen their cause. A petition was presented by them to the House of Burgesses, May 5, 1769, to the following effect:

A petition was presented from the “minister and sundry inhabitants of the parish of Hamilton,” praying for a division of the parish into two, the reasons being that the parish was “so large that many of the inhabitants reside so far from their parish churches that they can but seldom attend public worship; from which causes, dissenters have opportunity and encouragement to propagate their pernicious doctrines.”

The persecutors were exceedingly active. At Middlesex, William Webber, John Waller, James Greenwood, and Robert Ware were thrown into a filthy jail “which swarmed with fleas.” Untold indignities were placed upon the men. “On September the 10<sup>th</sup> they were allowed the prison bounds, by which they were much relieved; yet they were frequently under the necessity of resorting to the jail to avoid the rage of the persecutors. The Lord daily opened the hearts of the people; the rich sent many presents—things calculated to nourish them in their sufferings and to alleviate their sorrows. William Webber fell sick. This excited the sympathy of their friends in a

higher degree; they paid him great attention. The persecutors found that the imprisonment of the preachers tended rather to the furtherance of the Gospel. They preached regularly in prison; crowds attended; the preaching seemed to have double weight when coming from the jail; many viewed it with superstitious reverence, so that their enemies became desirous to be rid of them. Accordingly, on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, after having been thirty days in close confinement and sixteen days in the bounds, they were liberated upon giving a bond for good behavior.

“The rage of persecutors had in nowise abated; they seemed, sometimes, to strive to treat the Baptists and their worship with as much rudeness and indecency as was possible. They often insulted the preachers in time of service, and would ride into the water and make sport when they administered baptism; they frequently fabricated and spread the most groundless reports, which were injurious to the character of the Baptists. When any Baptist fell into any improper conduct, it was always exaggerated to the utmost extent. On one occasion when Robert Ware was preaching, there came one Davis and one Kemp, two sons of Belial, and stood before him with a bottle, and drank, offering the bottle to him, cursing him. As soon as he closed his service they drew out a pack of cards and began to play on the stage where he had been standing, wishing him to reprove them that they might beat him” (Semple).

In regard to these persecutions William Fristoe says:

The enemy, not content with ridicule and defamation, manifested their abhorrence to the Baptists in another way. By a law then in force in Virginia, all were under obligation to go to Church several times in the year; the failure subjected them to a fine. Little notice was taken of the omission, if members of the Established Church; but so soon as the “Newlights” were absent, they were presented by the grand jury, and fined according to law...Soon they began to take other steps to deter the Baptist preachers and obstruct the progress of the gospel, by objecting to their preaching until they obtained license from the General Court, whose place of sitting at that time was old Williamsburg. Until such times that license was obtained, they were exposed to be apprehended and imprisoned...When persecutors found that religion could not be stopped in its progress

by ridicule, defamation, and abusive language, the resolution was to take a different step and see, what would do; and the preachers in different places were apprehended by magisterial authority, some of whom were imprisoned and some escaped. Before this step was taken, the parson of the parish was consulted (in some instances, at least), and his judgment confided in. His counsel was that the “Newlights” ought to be taken and imprisoned, as necessary for the peace and harmony of the old church. As formerly the high priest took the ‘lead in persecuting the followers of Christ, in like manner the high priests have conducted in latter days, and seldom there has been a persecution but that a high priest has been at the head of it. (Fristoe, *History of the Ketocton Association*).

The results of the persecution were inevitable. “Religious tyranny produced its accustomed effects; the Baptists increased on every side. If one preacher was imprisoned, two arose to take his place; if one congregation was dispersed, a larger assembled on the next opportunity. Twenty years before the Revolution, few of this sect could have been found in the Colony, and yet, in 1774, the Separates alone, had thirty churches south of the James river, and twenty-five on its north, and the Regulars, though not so numerous, had grown with rapidity. The influence of the denomination was strong among the common people, and was beginning to be felt in higher places. In two points they were distinguished. First in their love of freedom. No class of the people of America were more devoted advocates of the principles of the Revolution; none more willing to give their money and goods to the country; none more prompt to march to the field of battle, and none more heroic in an actual combat, than the Baptists of Virginia. Secondly, in their hatred of the Church establishment. They hated not :w ministers, but its principles. They had seen its operation and had felt its practical influence. Common sense pointed out its deformities, and clamored against its injustice. To a man they were united in the resolve never to relax their efforts until it was utterly destroyed” (Howison, II).

These harsh measures brought many petitions to the House of Burgesses for relief. Such petitions did not bring liberty to the Baptists. The state of affairs is well pictured by James Madison in a letter to his friend Bradford, of Philadelphia, January 24, 1774, when he says:

I very believe that the frequent assaults that have been made on America (Boston especially) will in the end prove of real advantage. If the Church of England had been the established and general religion in all the Northern colonies, as it has been among us here, an uninterrupted harmony had prevailed throughout the continent, it is clear to me that slavery and subjection might and would have been gradually insinuated among us. Union of religious sentiments begets a surprising confidence, and ecclesiastical establishments tend to great ignorance and corruption, all of which facilitates the execution of mischievous projects . . . I want again to breathe your free air. I expect that it will mend my constitution and confirm my principles. I have, indeed, as good an atmosphere at home as the climate will allow, but have nothing to brag of as to the state and liberty of my country. Poverty and luxury prevail among all sorts; pride, ignorance and knavery among the priesthood, and vice and wickedness among the laity. This is bad enough; but it is not tire worst I have to tell you. That diabolical hell conceived principle of persecution rages among some, and, their eternal infamy, the clergy can furnish their quota of imps for such purposes. There are at this time in an adjacent county not less than five or six well meaning men in close jail for publishing their religious sentiments, which, in the main, are very orthodox. I have neither patience to hear, talk, or think any thing relative to this matter; for I have squabbled and scolded, abused and ridiculed so long about it, to little purpose, that I am without common patience. So I must beg you to pity me, and pray for liberty of conscience for all (Rives, *Life and Times of Madison*, I).

On April 1, 1774, he again writes to Bradford as follows:

Our Assembly is to meet the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, when it is expected that something will be done in behalf of the dissenters. Petitions, I hear, are already forming among the persecuted Baptists, and I fancy that it is in the thought of the Presbyterians also to intercede for greater liberty in matters of religion. For my own part, I cannot help being very doubtful of their succeeding in the attempt. The affair was on the carpet during the last session; but such incredible and extravagant stories were told in the House of the monstrous effects

of the enthusiasm prevalent among the sectaries, and so greedily swallowed by their enemies, that I believe they lost footing by it. And the bad name they still have with those who pretend to such contempt to examine into their principles and conduct, and are too much devoted to ecclesiastical establishment to hear of the toleration of the dissentients, I am apprehensive, will be made again a pretext for rejecting their requests . . . The sentiments of our people of fortune and fashion on this subject are vastly different from what you have been used to. That liberal, catholic, and equitable way of thinking, as to the rights of conscience, which is one of the characteristics of a free people, and so strongly marks the people of your province, is little known among the zealous adherents of our hierarchy. We have, it is true, some persons in the Legislature of generous principles, both in religion and politics; but number, not merit, you know, is necessary to carry points there. Besides, the clergy are a numerous and powerful body, have great influence at home by reason of their connection with and dependence on the bishops and crown, and will naturally employ all of their arts and interests to depress their rising adversaries; for such they must consider dissentients, who rob them of their good will of the people, and in time endanger their livings and security (Rives, I).

In the meantime a tremendous struggle had been going on to secure the passage of a law of toleration in the House of Burgesses. The movement in favor of such a law began in 1769. The Baptists, irritated at their ill treatment, complained and the Assembly awakened to the fact that it would be advisable to confirm the Toleration Act of 1699. "The attempt to prevent the spread of dissent, which fell so heavily on the Baptists from the year 1768 onwards convinced the more thoughtful Episcopalians that some degree of restricted toleration must be granted to the citizens of Virginia, or society must be shaken to its foundation. To appease the agitated community a bill was proposed granting privileges to the dissenters" (Foote, I).

The House of Burgesses ordered, May 11, 1769, "that it be an Instruction to the Committee, for Religion, that they prepare and bring in a Bill for exempting his Majesty's Protestant Dissenters from the Penalties of certain Laws" (*Journal of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1766-1769*, p. 205. Richmond, 1906); but the bill was not introduced. For a second time it was

ordered, November 10, 1769 (Ibid, p. 252), but again it was not presented.

Petitions began to come in from various Baptist churches. “A Petition of several Persons of the County of Luenburg, whose names are thereunto subscribed, was presented to the House, and read; setting forth that the Petitioners, being the Society of Christians, called Baptists, find themselves restricted in the Exercise of their Religion, their Teachers imprisoned under various Pretences, and the Benefits of the Toleration Act denied them, although they are willing to conform to the spirit of that Act, and are loyal and obedient Subjects; and therefore praying that they may be treated with the same kind Indulgence, in religious matters, as Quakers, Presbyterians, and other Protestant Dissenters, enjoy” (*Journal of the House*, 1770-1772, pp. 160, 161).

February 2, 1772, the Baptists of the county of Mecklenburg presented the same petition (Ibid, pp. 182, 183); and on March 14, the Carolina Baptists (Ibid, p. 245) presented their petitions. There was likewise a petition of several persons of the county of Amelia “whose names are thereunto subscribed, setting forth, that the Petitioners, being of the Community of Christians who worship God under the Denomination of Baptists, are restricted in their religious Exercises; that, if the Act of Toleration does not extend to this Colony, they are exposed to severe Persecution; and, if its does extend hither, and the Power of granting Licenses to Teachers be lodged, as is supposed, in the General Court alone, the Petitioners must suffer considerable Inconveniences, not only because that Court sits not oftener than twice in the year and then at a Place far remote, but because the said Court will admit a single Meeting House and no more in one County; and that the Petitioners are loyal and quiet Subjects, whose Tenets in no wise affect the State; and therefore praying a Redress of their Grievances, and the Liberty of Conscience may be secured to them (*Journal*, pp. 185, 186).

These petitions were referred to a committee which reported back, February 25, that “so far as they relate to allowing the petitioners the same Toleration in matters of Religion, as is enjoyed by his Majesty’s dissenting Protestant Subjects of Great Britain, under different Acts of Parliament, is reasonable” (Ibid, p. 188). It was ordered that the committee on Religion “do inquire into the state of the established Religion in this Colony and Report the same, as it shall appear to them, to the House” (Ibid, p. 189).

An amended bill on the subject of toleration was presented to the House and engrossed March 17 (Ibid, p. 249). This bill was not satisfactory to the Baptists, so on May 12, 1774, they protested that “not admitting public Worship, except in day time, is inconsistent with the laws of England, as well as the Practice and Usage of the Primitive Churches, and even of the English Church itself,” that the night season may be sometimes better spared by the Petitioners from the necessary duty of their callings; and that they wish for no indulgences which may disturb the Peace of the Government; and therefore praying the House to take their Case into Consideration, and to grant them suitable redress (Ibid, p. 102).

The bill did not become a law. A Revolution was on and now the Baptists boldly and effectively attacked the Establishment itself, and won the victory for liberty of conscience.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

George E. Dabney, Religious Persecutions in Virginia, *The Christian Review*, XXIII. pp. 49-74, 199-218. Baltimore, 1858.

William Thomson Hanzsche, Church and State in the American Colonies before the Revolution, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXXII, pp. 23-48. St. Louis, 1925.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE BAPTISTS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT

The Evils of the Establishment in Virginia—The Baptists Render Service to the Country—Dr. Hawks on the Situation—The Convention at Williamsburg—Petition of the Clergy—Terrible Charges Against the Baptists—The Statement of Fristoe—The Tax Law Suspended—Counter Memorials—The Law Repealed—The Statement of Rayner—The Historians Speak—The Glebe Lands—The General Assessment Proposed—The Presbyterians—The Reasons the Baptists Opposed the Measure—The Bill Examined and Rejected—The Bill of Thomas Jefferson—Bishop Perry on the Baptists—Jefferson and the Baptists—The Union of the Regular and Separate Baptists—The Terms of Union—A Revival.

Another phase of the liberty of conscience must now be recorded. Already the persecutions of the past, the enlistment of soldiers in the army, the struggles of the War of the Revolution, the adoption of the Constitution and the first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States have been considered. In all these measures the Baptists had an honorable part. There was proceeding at the same time another conflict which was scarcely less intense. Several of the States had establishments of religion incorporated into the government by law. The most oppressive of these was in Virginia. The laws supporting this Establishment were exacting and had been administered with severity. Dissenters were loaded with taxes to support a system of religion for which they had no love; the marriage laws were unsatisfactory; the glebe lands belonging to the Church brought in rich revenues which were a constant menace to the peace of the people, and, indeed, there were many vexatious things which disturbed the public welfare. Entrenched as was the Establishment in the laws of the land, endorsed by the aristocracy and by many time servers, it was a tremendous problem to overthrow such an institution. It was this task that the Baptists, together with Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and other noble heroes, undertook to accomplish.

Something toward this end, by 1776, had been accomplished. Persecutions had greatly added to the numbers and determination of the Baptists. They were patriotic and hearty supporters of the Revolution. This brought them into favor with Washington and assisted their cause. Their ministers were officially permitted to preach among the soldiers; and thus, so far as the army was concerned were on a level with the others.

Dr. Hawks sums up the matter as follows:

No dissenters in Virginia experienced, for a time, harsher treatment than did the Baptists. They were beaten and imprisoned, and cruelty taxed its ingenuity to devise new modes of punishment and annoyance; but the men, who were not permitted to speak in public, found willing auditors in the sympathizing crowds who gathered around the prisons to hear them preach from grated windows.

Persecution had taught the Baptists not to love the Establishment, and they now saw before them a reasonable prospect of the overturning it altogether. In their Association they had calmly discussed the matter and resolved on their course; in this course they were constant to the end; and the war which they waged against the Church was a war of extermination. They seemed to know no relentings, and their hostility never ceased for seven and twenty years. They revenged themselves for their sufferings by the almost total ruin of the Church; and now commenced the assault, for, inspired by the ardor of patriotism, which accorded with their interests, they addressed the convention, and informed that body that their religious tenets presented no obstacle to their taking up arms and fighting for their country; and they tended the services of their pastors in promoting the enlistment of the youth of their persuasion. A complimentary answer was returned, and the ministers of all denominations, in accordance with the address, placed on an equal footing. This, it is believed, was the first step toward religious liberty in America (Hawks, *Contributions to Ecclesiastical History in the United States*, I. p. 121. New York, 1836-1839).

The Convention at Williamsburg, June 12, 1776, passed a Declaration of Rights, of which Article 16, is as follows:

That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, that all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other (Rives, *Life and Times of James Madison*, I. p. 142).

This action incorporated the rights of conscience in the fundamental law of the State.

There is interest in the viewpoint of the contestants. A petition of certain of the clergy of the Establishment was presented, November 8, 1776, to the legislature, which is as follows:

A memorial of a considerable number of the clergy of the Established Church was presented, November 8, 1776, to the legislature, which was as follows:

A memorial of a considerable number of the clergy of the Established Church of Virginia was presented to the House and read: setting forth that, having understood that various petitions have been presented to the Assembly praying the abolition of the Established Church in the State, wish to represent that, when they undertook the charge of parishes in Virginia, they depended on the public faith for receiving that recompense for their services during life or good behavior which the laws of the land promised, a tenure which to them appears of the same sacred nature as that by which every man in the State holds, and has secured to him his private property, and that such of them as are not yet provided for entering into holy orders expecting to receive the several emoluments which such religious establishment offered; that from the nature of their education they are precluded from gaining a tolerable subsistence in any other way of life, and that therefore they think it would be inconsistent with justice either to deprive the present incumbents of parishes of any right or profits they hold or enjoy, or to cut off from such as are now in orders and unbeneficed those expectations which originated from the laws of the land, and which have been the means of disqualifying them for any other profession or way of life; also, that, though they are far from favoring encroachments on the religious rights of any sect or denomination of men, yet they conceive that a religious establishment in a State is conducive to peace and happiness; they think the opinions of mankind have a very considerable influence over their practice, and that it, therefore, cannot be improper for the legislative body of a State to consider how such opinions as are most consonant to reason and of the best

efficiency in human affairs may be propagated and supported; that they are of the opinion the doctrines of Christianity have a greater tendency to produce virtue amongst men than any human laws or institutions, and that these can be best taught and preserved in their purity in an established church, which gives encouragement to men to study and acquire a competent knowledge of the scriptures; and they think that, if these great purposes can be answered by a religious establishment, the hardships which such a regulation might impose on individuals, or even bodies of men, ought not to be considered, etc. (*Journal of the House of Deputies*, for 1776, p. 47).

Likewise terrible charges were brought against the Baptists and others for their preaching and methods. The following is a fair sample of some of the charges made by members of the Establishment “setting forth that they are greatly alarmed at the progress which some of the dissenters from the church as by law established are daily making in various parts of the country by persuading the ignorant and the unwary to embrace their erroneous tenets, which the petitioners conceive to be not only opposite to the doctrines of Christianity, but subservient of the morals of the people and destructive of the peace of families, tending to alienate the affection of slaves from their masters, and injurious to the happiness of the public; that while such attempts are making to pull down all the barriers which the wisdom of our ancestors has erected to secure the church from the inroads of the sectaries, it would argue a culpable lukewarmness tamely to sit still and not to make known their sentiments, so contrary to such innovations; that all of these bad effects have been already experienced in their country, and the parts adjacent, to the dismal consequences of the doctrines of these new teachers; that through their means they have seen, with grief, great discontent made between husbands and their wives; and there have been nightly meetings of slaves to receive the instructions of these teachers, without the consent of their masters, which have produced very bad consequences; that the petitioners, not actuated by the narrow and bloodthirsty spirit of persecution, wish to see a well-regulated toleration established; by which these conscientious brethren, who, from principle, cannot join with the church, may be permitted to serve God in their own way, without molestation. But they wish, also, that nightly meetings may be prohibited under severe penalties, and that those who, after due examination of their morals, shall be found worthy may be

authorized to preach, and that only in such public meeting-houses as it may be thought proper to license for the purpose; that they apprehend those purposes may be answered without destroying those gentle and wholesome restraints which the wisdom of ages and the policy of our laws have established; and praying that the church may be maintained in all its legal rights, and that the sectaries may be indulged with such a regulated toleration as shall be thought reasonable, and that the clergy of the Established Church may be made accountable for their conduct, and removable for misbehavior.”

The Baptists were, however, unrelenting in their warfare upon the Establishment. They were criticized that during the Revolutionary War they pursued their opposition to the Church. They felt now that above all other periods they were likely to secure their rights. “The Baptists having labored under oppression for a long time,” says Frisloe, “inclines them to seek redress as soon as a favorable opportunity offered. In the year 1776, they united in a petition to the Assembly of Virginia, stating the several grievances they labored under, requesting a repeal of all such laws as might occasion an odious distinction among citizens.”

“This position the Baptists were determined to persevere in presenting to the Assembly till such times they were attended to and they were rescued from the hand of oppression, and their just liberties were secured to them. And it appeared at this juncture the most favorable opportunity offered that had ever been—a time when the nation was struggling for civil liberty and casting off British tyranny—a time of aiming to support their independence and relieving themselves from monarchical usurpation. It became a common saying about this time, ‘United we stand, divided we fall.’ There was a necessity for a unanimity among all ranks, sects, denominations of people, when we had to withstand a powerful nation and expel her by force of arms or submit to her arbitrary measures, and the State Legislature became sensible that division among the people would be fatal to this country; but the Assembly being chiefly of the Episcopalian order, and being in the habit heretofore of governing with rigor, it was with great reluctance they could pass a law favorable to dissenters and raise them upon a level with themselves. What inclined dissenters to be more anxiously engaged for their liberty was that, if time passed away and no repeal of these injurious laws, and the nation to whom we belonged succeeded in supporting their independence, and our government settled down with these old prejudices in

the hearts of those in power, and an establishment of religion survive our revolution, and religious tyranny raise its banner in our infant country, it would leave us to the sore reflection: What have we been struggling for? For what have we spent so much treasure? Why was it from sentiment we united with our fellow citizens in the cause of liberty, girded on our sword or took our musket on our shoulder, endured the hardships of a tedious war? Why clash to arms? Why hear the heart affecting shrieks of the wounded and the awful scene of garments enrolled in blood, together with the entire loss of many of our relations, friends, acquaintances, fellow citizens, and, after all of this, to be exposed to religious oppression and the deprivation of the rights of conscience in discharge of the duties of religion, in which we are accountable to God alone, and not to man? The consideration of these things stimulated and excited the Baptists in Virginia to use every effort and adopt every measure embracing the particular crisis as the fittest time to succeed, which, if past by, might never offer again, and they and their posterity remain in perpetual fetters under an ecclesiastical tyranny” (Fristoe).

The only point gained by the Baptists, in the Legislature of 1776, was that the law taxing dissenters for the support of the clergy of the Establishment was “suspended.” Jefferson sums up the proceedings of that Legislature as follows:

Against this inactivity (of the clergy), the zeal and industry of sectarian preachers had an open and an undisputed field; and by the time of the revolution a majority of the inhabitants had become dissenters from the established church, but were still obliged to pay contributions to support the pastors of the minority. This unrighteous compulsion, to maintain teachers of what they deemed religious errors, was grievously felt during the regal government, and without a hope of relief. But the first republican legislature, which met in ‘76, was crowded with petitions to abolish this spiritual tyranny. These brought on the severest contests in which I have ever been engaged. Our great opponents were Mr. Pendleton and Robert Carter Nicholas; honest men, but zealous churchmen. The petitions were referred to the committee of the whole house on the state of the country; and, after desperate contests in that committee, almost daily from the 11<sup>th</sup> of October to the 5<sup>th</sup> of December, we prevailed so far only, as to repeal the laws which rendered criminal the maintenance

of any religious opinions, the forbearance of repairing to the church, or the exercise of any mode of worship; and further, to exempt dissenters from the contributions to the support of the established church; and to suspend, only unto the next session, levies on the members of that church for the salaries of their own incumbents. For although the majority of the citizens were dissenters, as has been observed, a majority of the legislature were churchmen. Among these, however, were some responsible and liberal men, who enabled us, on some points, to obtain feeble majorities. But our opponents carried, in the general resolutions of the committee of November 19, a declaration that religious assemblies ought to be regulated, and that provisions ought to be made for continuing the succession of the clergy, and superintending their conduct. And, in this bill now passed, was inserted an express reservation of the question, whether a general assessment should not be established by law, on every one, to the support of the pastor of his choice; or whether all should be left to voluntary contributions; and on this question, debated at every session, from '76 to '79, (some of our dissenting allies, having now secured their particular object, going over to the advocates of a general assessment), we could only obtain a suspension from session to session until '79, when the question against a general assessment was finally carried, and the establishment of the Anglican church entirely put down (Jefferson, *Writings*, I.).

It is mentioned by Jefferson in the above extract that Edmund Pendleton was a determined opponent of the Baptists, and a most ardent churchman. The following letter from him will show something of his zeal and methods:

Caroline, Sept. 25, 1777.

Revd. Sir;—Understanding that the Baptists and the Methodist Societies, encouraged by something which passed last Session, mean to push their application, for the sale of the Glebes and Churches, to the Assembly at the next. It may be necessary to meet them by Counter memorials, which induced me to throw upon paper my thoughts on the subject as annexed; which though in the form of a memorial, was rather intended as a historical statement of the laws

and facts on the Subject, from whence to form one, and therefore I have not attempted to shorten or correct it, but left it, imperfect as it is for your consideration.

My reason for taking the liberty of enclosing it to you, besides a wish to have it correct, is that it occurred to me that you might, after perfecting one, think proper to have a copy struck off and forwarded to each parish, to preserve uniformity of sentiments, which might otherwise Clash and do mischief; but this is as you please, if not approved, I will thank you to forward me a corrected copy; Or if you judge it best to leave each Parish to its own mode, and reserve yourself for a Conventional one, be pleased to return mine, and excuse the trouble I shall have given you, when I will endeavor to correct and have it subscribed.

As I have never been present at Public discussions of the Subject, nor heard it much Canvassed in private, from a recluse life, my Sentiments are drawn chiefly from contemplation, and may not meet their grounds, your information may supply and correct this. The distinction between it being a Public of parochial claim, seems to me to be well founded, and to be very important in the decision. With sentiments of much respect and esteem, I am sir, Your Mo. Obt. Servt

Edmd. Pendleton.

(*Proceedings Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1908-1909, XLII. pp. 346, 347).

The final vote on the measure came December 13, 1779, when the law enforcing the Established Church was repealed. This destroyed the Establishment in Virginia. "We are not to understand," says Semple, "that this important ecclesiastical revolution was effected wholly by the Baptists. They were certainly the most active; but they were also joined by other dissenters. Nor was the dissenting interest, all united, by any means at that time, equal to the accomplishment of such a revolution. We must turn our eyes to the political state of the country to find adequate causes for such a change.

"The British yoke galled to the quick; and the Virginians; as having the most tender necks, were among the first to wince. Republican principles had gained much ground, and were fast advancing to superiority. The leading men

of that side viewed the Established clergy and the Established religion as inseparable appendages of monarchy—one of the pillars by which it was supported. The dissenters, at least the Baptists, were republicans from interest as well as principle; it was known that their influence was great among the common people; and the common people of every country are, more or less, republicans. To resist the British oppressions effectually, it was necessary to soothe the minds of the people by every species of policy. The dissenters were too powerful to be slighted, and they were too watchful to be cheated by any ineffectual sacrifice. There had been a time when they would have been satisfied to have paid their tithes if they could have had liberty of conscience; but now the crisis was such that nothing less than a total overthrow of all ecclesiastical distinctions would satisfy their sanguine hopes. Having started the decaying edifice, every dissenter put to his shoulder to push it into irretrievable ruin. The revolutionary party found that the sacrifice must be made, and they made it.

“It is said, however, and probably not without truth, that many of the Episcopalians who voted for the abolishing of the Establishment did it upon an expectation that it would be succeeded by a general assessment. And considering that most of the men of wealth were on that side, they supposed that their funds would be lessened very little. This, it appeared in the sequel, was a vain expectation. The people having once shaken off their fetters, would not again permit themselves to be bound. Moreover, the war now rising to its height, they were in too much need of funds to permit any of their resources to be devoted to any other purpose during that period; and we shall see that when it was attempted, a few years after the expiration of the war, the people set their faces against it” (Semple, 44, 45).

The historians all agree to the share the Baptists had in the passing of this measure.

Hawks says:

The Baptists were the principal promoters of this work, and in truth aided more than any other denomination in its accomplishment (Hawks).

Bishop Meade says:

They took the lead in dissent, and were the chief objects of persecution by the magistrates, and the most violent and persevering

afterward in seeking the downfall of the Establishment (Meade, *Old Churches of Virginia*, I.).

Campbell says:

The Baptists, having suffered persecution under the Establishment, were of all others the most inimical to it, and the most active in its subversion (Campbell, *History of Virginia*).

Tucker says:

In the two following years, the question of providing for the ministers of religion by law, or leaving it to individual contributors, was renewed; but the advocates of the latter plan were only able to obtain at each session a suspension of those laws which provided salaries for the clergy—the natural progress in favor of liberal sentiments being counterbalanced by the fact that some of the dissenting sects, with the exception of the Baptists, satisfied with having been relieved from a tax which they felt to be both unjust and degrading, had no objection to a general assessment, and on this question voted with the friends of the church. But the advocates of religious freedom finally prevailed, after five suspended acts, the laws for the support of the clergy were, at the second session of 1779, unconditionally repealed (Tucker, *Life of Jefferson*, I.).

Randall says:

This was the best arrangement the Anglican church could now hope for, and most of the dissenters, it would seem (the Baptists being said to be the only exception, as a church), were ready to join the former on this ground and unite in a strenuous effort in favor of the measure (Randall, *Life of Jefferson*, I.).

Rayner says:

This question, the last prop of the tottering hierarchy, reduced the struggle to one of pure principle. The particular object of the dissenters being secured, they deserted the voluntary champion of their cause, and went over in troops to the advocates of the general assessment. This step, the natural proclivity of the sectarian mind, showed them incapable of religious liberty upon an expansive scale, or broader than their own interests, as schismatics. But the defection

of the dissenters, painful as it was, only stimulated his desire for total abolition, as it developed more palpably the evidence of its necessity. He remained unshaken at his post, and brought on the reserved question at every session from 1776 to 1779, during which time he could only obtain a suspension of the levies from year to year, until the session of 1779, when, by his unwearied exertions, the question was carried definitely against a general assessment, and the establishment of the Anglican church was entirely overthrown (Rayner, *Life of Jefferson*).

The bill cut the purse strings of the Establishment, so that the clergy were no longer supported by taxation. But they still obtained possession of the rich glebes, and enjoyed a practical monopoly of marriage fees. It was at this session of the legislature that the famous bill of Jefferson on Religious Freedom was introduced. The bill attracted both favorable and unfavorable notice. It was reported to the house June, 1779, just after Jefferson was elected governor to succeed Patrick Henry. Several years elapsed before it became a law.

A complete victory was not yet won. The period which followed the Revolution was favorable to a renewal of an Establishment upon a more liberal basis than formerly; and it came dangerously near a passage. Various petitions were sent up by religious bodies asking for such an Establishment. The Baptists alone stood firm.

The "Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of Religion," otherwise known as the "General Assessment Bill," was reported to the legislature December 3, 1784. The preamble was as follows:

WHEREAS the general diffusion of Christian knowledge hath a natural tendency to correct the morals of men, restrain their vices, and preserve the peace of society, which cannot be effected without a competent provision for learned teachers, who may be thereby enabled to devote their time and attention to the duty of instructing such citizens as from their circumstances and want of education cannot otherwise attain such knowledge; and it is judged that such provision may be made by the legislature, without counteracting the liberal principle heretofore adopted and intended to be preserved, by abolishing all distinctions of preeminence amongst the different

societies or communions of Christians.

The bill passed its third reading but was finally postponed until the fourth Thursday, November, 1785. With the Episcopalians, Presbyterians and others supporting it the passage seemed inevitable. Foote, the Presbyterian historian, explains the relation of the Presbyterians to the measure. He says:

When the bill for a general assessment was brought forward, with such an advocate as Patrick Henry, and with the Episcopal church to support it, it was generally supposed that it would certainly become a law. To those who had been paying to support their own church and another, foreign to it, this bill proposed relief; they were to pay only for the support of the church of their choice. As it was a relief from their former burdens, and as the Presbyterian congregations would not be called on to pay more for the support of their own ministers than they would cheerfully give by voluntary subscription, Mr. Graham was agreed with his brethren to send up a memorial which gives their sentiments on the subject of support of religion, disclaiming all legislative interference, and, under the conviction that the law would in some form pass, proposed the least offensive form in which the assessment could be levied (Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, I.).

The Baptists on the other hand “considered themselves under the necessity of appearing again on the public theater and expressing their disapprobation of the above proposition, and using their influence to prevent its passage into a law.” The Baptists opposed the bill for the following reasons:

**First**, it was contrary to their principles and avowed sentiments, the making provision for the support of religion by law; that the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical governments ought to be kept up blending them together; that Christ Jesus has given laws for the government of his kingdom and direction of his subjects, and gave instruction concerning collections for the various purposes of religion, and therefore needs not legislative interferences.

**Secondly**, Should a legislative body undertake to pass laws for the government of the church, for them to say what doctrines shall be believed, in what mode worship shall be performed, and what the sum collected shall be, what a dreadful precedent it would establish;

for when such a right is claimed by a legislature, and given up by the people, by the same rule they decide in one instance they may in every instance. Religion in this is like the press; if government limits the press, and says this shall be printed and that shall not, in the event it will destroy the freedom of the press; so when legislatures undertake to pass laws about religion, religion loses its form, and Christianity is reduced to *a* system of worldly policy.

**Thirdly**, it has been believed by us that that Almighty Power that instituted religion will support his own cause; that in the course of divine Providence events will be overruled and the influence of grace on the hearts of the Lord's people will incline them to afford and contribute what is necessary for the support of religion, and therefore there is no need for compulsory measures.

**Fourthly**, it would give an opportunity to the party that were numerous (and, of course, possessed the ruling power) to use their influence and exercise their art and cunning, and multiply signers to their own party, and last, the most deserving, the faithful preacher, who in a pointed manner reprov'd sin and bore testimony against every species of vice and dissipation, would, in all probability, have been profited very little by such a law, while men-pleasers, the gay and the fashionable, who can wink at sin, and daub his hearers with untemper'd mortar, saying, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace, who can lay out his oratory in dealing out smooth things mingled with deception, the wicked, it is clear, would like to have it so; and it follows the irreligious and carnal part of the people would richly reward them for their flattery, and the undeserving go off with the gain (Fristoe, *History of the Ketaocton Association*).

The bill was printed and circulated throughout the various counties of the State. A reaction took place among the people upon the examination of the provisions of the bill. Madison wrote to Monroe, May 29, 1785, that "the adversaries of the assessment begin to think the prospect here flattering to their wishes. The printed bill has excited great discussion, and is likely to prove the sense of the community to be in favor of the liberty now enjoyed. I have heard of several counties where the representatives have been laid aside for voting for the bill, and not a single one where the reverse has happened.

The Presbyterian clergy, too, who were in general friends to the scheme, are already in another tone, either compelled by the laity of that sect or alarmed at the probability of further interference of the Legislature, if they begin to dictate matters of religion” (Rives, I.). So that it came to pass on October 17, 1785, the bill died in committee.

The bill of Jefferson was again introduced and on December 17, 1785, was passed and upon January 19, 1786, was signed by the Speaker. It is as follows:

Be it enacted by the General Assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place or ministry whatsoever; nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.

Bishop Perry describes the attitude of the Baptists and the results of their enmity upon the Established Church. “The most unrelenting opposition to the Church,” says the Bishop, “as an establishment came from the Baptists, who, in the decade preceding the opening of the war of the Revolution had grown from an inconsiderable sect to a body of numerical strength sufficient to make their influence and support worth any price when the question of loyalty or revolution was to be settled. They had not been slow to take advantage of the position in which they found themselves at the opening of the war. Remembering the harsh treatment that had been ‘meted out to them by the royal authorities, their ministers being ‘imprisoned and the disciples buffeted,’ as their chronicles describe it, they readily embraced the opportunity of weakening the ‘establishment’ as well as opposing the crown. Thus their dislike of the church and state was gratified at the same time. Conscious that a large part of the clergy, influenced by the ties of birth and the obligations of their oaths of allegiance, had espoused the cause of the king, they showed themselves to be ‘inspired by the ardors of a patriotism which accorded with their interests,’ and ‘were willing to avail themselves of a favorable opportunity to present an advantageous contrast to a part of the church.’ Consequently they formally addressed the Convention of the

delegates to the Virginia Legislature, which succeeded the last royal assembly ever convened in the 'Old Dominion,' with a proffer of their cordial support. Their tenets placed no hindrance in the way of their members taking up arms for their country, and their preachers professed their readiness to further the enlistment of their young men. They accompanied this tender of service with a petition 'that they might be allowed to worship God in their own way without interruption; that they might be permitted to maintain their own ministers, separate from others; that they might be married, buried, and the like, without paying the clergy of other denominations.' This was the beginning of a series of assaults against the 'establishment' and the Church itself in which all the dissenters, with the exception of the Methodists, who had not at this time formally separated from the Church, united with zeal and untiring energy till the end was gained, and the 'establishment' was destroyed.

"The result was such as had been anticipated by those who had strenuously opposed the act of the Legislature. Deprived of their livings, the clergy, many of whom were politically, if not personally, obnoxious to the majority of their parishioners, found themselves reduced to the necessity of abandoning their calling, in the exercise of which they could no longer hope for support. Many left the country; the sacraments were no longer administered in the parishes thus abandoned, and, although a few faithful priests traveled over large circuits for the purpose of administering baptism and the holy communion, they could not supply the lack of the constant and regular services and administrations which had been of old. The churches, deserted and uncared for, went rapidly into decay. Often required for public uses in the necessities of the State arising from the struggle then going on; more frequently despoiled and desecrated by the hands of the sacrilegious and sordid, who coveted and appropriated for their private uses the very materials of the fabric of the Church of God; there was every prospect that the Church, whose officers were first celebrated on Virginia soil, would be utterly uprooted and destroyed. The gates of hell had prevailed against her" (Perry, *History of the American Episcopal Church*, II.).

The undermining of the State Church was a long process. "Upheld by the law of the seventeenth century," says Jennings Cooper Wise, "it was not until a later date, when the state as well as the church had been honeycombed by free thinker, that the old structure fell and the masses, who had long

supported the religion of the minority, asserted their doctrinal independence. As we follow the history of the Eastern Shore, we find the Puritan from New England and New Netherlands, the Quaker, and the Presbyterian, each in turn seeking the shores of the remote peninsula as a resting place, where unmolested the new sects might hatch out their doctrines. The effect upon the people of such a process of religious incubation among them cannot be overestimated, and as we take the history of the peninsula in the following century, we shall see how the Baptists and Methodists also prospered upon these shores” (Wise, *Ye Kingdom of Accawmacke or the Eastern Shore of Virginia*, pp. 250, 251. Richmond, 1911).

Jefferson was the statesman of the Revolution, Washington the general and Franklin the sage. The attitude of Jefferson toward liberty and the Establishment brought upon him much obloquy. He was thoroughly hated by that class and especially the New England clergy. They called him an infidel and an atheist. As a matter of fact he was an Episcopalian with Unitarian tendencies.

On the other hand the Baptists loved and supported him. His views on liberty were so closely united with theirs that they were his devoted friends. When he was elected President the church at Cheshire, Massachusetts, made a cheese, which weighed fourteen hundred and fifty pounds, and sent it to Washington to Jefferson, in 1801, by the celebrated John Leland, their pastor, as an expression of the warm regard they entertained for their great leader in the battle of freedom. John Leland was a man of singular ability, independence, frankness, humor and piety. He wrote for the Baptists to the State papers.

Jefferson associated with the Baptists. They admired him, and he admired them. A few of his statements in regard to them are here recorded.

A letter addressed to Levi Lincoln, the Attorney General, January 1, 1802, was the occasion of the following comment on the general position of the Baptists:

The Baptist address, now enclosed, admits of a condemnation of the alliance between Church and State, under the authority of the Constitution. It furnishes an occasion, too, which I have long wished to find, of saying why I do not proclaim Fastings and thanksgivings, as my predecessors did. The address, to be sure, does not point at

this, and its introduction is awkward. But I foresee no opportunity of doing it more pertinently. I know it will give great offense to the New England clergy; but the advocate of religious freedom is to expect neither peace nor forgiveness from them (Jefferson, *Writings*, X.).

He addressed the members of the Baltimore Baptist Association, October 17, 1808, as follows:

I receive with great pleasure the friendly address of the Baltimore Baptist Association, and am sensible how much I am indebted to the kind dispositions which dictated it.

In our early struggle for liberty, religious freedom could not fail to become a primary object. All men felt the right, and a just animation to obtain it was exhibited by all. I was only one among the many who befriended its establishment, and am entitled but in common with others to a portion of that approbation which follows the fulfillment of duty.

Excited by wrongs to reject a foreign government which directed our concerns according to its own interests, and not to ours, the principles which justified us were obvious to all understandings, they were imprinted in the breast of every human being; and Providence ever pleased to direct the issue of our contest in favor of that side where justice was. Since the happy separation, our nation has wisely avoided entangling itself in the systems of European interests, and has taken no side between its rival powers, attached itself to none of its ever changing confederacies. Their peace is desirable; and you do me justice in saying that to preserve and secure this, has been the constant aim of my administration. The difficulties which involve it, however, are now at their ultimate term, and what will be their issue, time alone will disclose. But be it what it may, a recollection of our former vassalage in religion and civil government, will unite the zeal of every heart, and the energy of every hand, to preserve that independence in both which, under the favor of Heaven, a disinterested devotion to the public cause first achieved, and a disinterested sacrifice to private interest will now maintain.

I am happy in your approbation of my reasons for determining to retire from a station, in which the favor of my fellow citizens has so long continued and supported me; I return your kind prayers with supplications to the same Almighty Being for your future welfare and that of our beloved country (Jefferson, XVI.).

He addressed the members of the Ketchikan Baptist Association, October 18, 1808, as follows:

The views you express of the conduct of the belligerent powers are as correct as they are afflicting to the lovers of justice and humanity. Those moral principles and conventional usages which have heretofore been the bond of civilized nations, which have so often preserved their peace by furnishing common rules for the measure of their rights, have now given way to force, the law of Barbarians, and the nineteenth century dawns with Vandalism of the fifth. Nothing has been spared on our part to preserve the peace of our country, during this distempered state of the world (Jefferson, XVI.).

The remainder of the above letter is the same as that addressed to the Baltimore Association. The following letter was written to the General Meeting of Correspondence of the Six Baptist Associations represented at Chesterfield, Virginia, November 21, 1808:

Thank you, fellow citizens, for your affectionate address, and I receive with satisfaction your approbation of my motives for retirement. In reviewing the history of the times through which we have passed, no portion of it gives greater satisfaction, on reflection, than that which presents the efforts of the friends of religious freedom, and the success with which they were crowned. We have solved by fair experiment, the great and interesting question whether freedom of religion is compatible with order in government, and obedience to the laws. And we have experienced the quiet as well as the comfort which results from leaving every one to profess freely and openly those principles of religion which are the inductions of his own reason, and the serious convictions of his own inquiries.

It is a source of great contentment to me to learn that the measures which have been pursued in the administration of your affairs have met with your approbation. Too often we have had but a choice

among difficulties; and the situation characterizes remarkably the present moment. But, fellow citizens, if we are faithful to our country, if we acquiesce, with good will, in the decisions of the majority, and the nation moves in mass in the same direction although it may not be that which every individual thinks best, we have nothing to fear from any quarter.

I thank you sincerely for your kind wishes for my welfare, and with equal sincerity implore the favor of a protecting Providence for yourselves (Jefferson, XVI. pp. 320, 321).

On his return from Washington he received a letter of congratulations from the Baptist church of Buck Mountain, Albemarle county. In reply, April 13, 1808, he says:

Your approbation of my conduct is the more valued as you have best known me, and is an ample reward for my services I may have rendered. We have acted together from the origin to the end of a memorable revolution, and we have contributed, each in the line allotted us, our endeavors to render its issue a permanent blessing to our country.

These persecutions and victories brought about a very desirable union between the Regular and Separate Baptists. In origin, and frequently in methods, they were diverse; while in doctrines there were variations, yet in some points substantial agreement. It was felt that the union of the two parties was desirable.

The actual union was slow of accomplishment. The first public movement was inaugurated in 1767 but received no definite form. Three years afterwards the Ketchikan a Regular, or Calvinistic Association in Northern Virginia, addressed the Sandy Creek, a Separate, or Arminian Association, in Southern Virginia, but mostly in North Carolina, on the subject. They said in their letter:

Beloved in our Lord Jesus Christ

The bearers of this letter (Garrett, Mager, and Saunders) will acquaint you with the design of writing it. Their errand is peace, and their business is a reconciliation, if there is any difference subsisting. If we are all Christians, all Baptists, all New Lights, why

are we divided? Must the little appellatives, Regular and Separate, break the golden band of charity, and set the sons and daughters of God at variance? Behold how good and how pleasant for brethren to dwell together in unity! But how bad and how bitter is for them to live asunder and in discord! To indulge ourselves in prejudice is surely disorder, and to quarrel about nothing is irregularity with a witness. Oh, dear brethren, let us endeavor for the future to avoid this calamity.

The messengers were cordially received, the address was read, and the subject entertained and mutually considered. It was allowed that some details remained to be adjusted. The Sandy Creek Association, which then embraced large districts in Virginia, North Carolina, and western South Carolina, was soon divided into other associations and the project failed.

The Kahukee Association, in 1772, occupied a part of South Carolina, and all the region of Virginia south of the James river. To this body the General Association, which was composed of both parties, addressed themselves and sent Samuel Harris, Elijah Craig, John Waller and David Thompson, to treat with them.

At the meeting of the General Association there was much excitement. There were two meetings but in contiguous places. The Regulars asked the assent of the Separates on two propositions, that “salvation is of the special electing grace of God,” and that “salvation is without merit on the part of the creature.”

The Separates, after consultation, sent the following reply:

Dear Brethren: A study union with you makes us willing to be more explicit in our answer to your terms of reconciliation proposed. We do not deny the former part of your proposition, respecting particular election of grace, still retaining our liberty with regard to construction. And as to the latter part, respecting merit in the creature, we are free to profess that there is none.

To this reply the Regulars sent the following answer:

Dear Brethren: Inasmuch as your Christian fellowship seems nearly as dear to us as our lives, and seeing our difficulties concerning your principles with respect to merit in the creature, particular election,

and final perseverance of the saints are in hopeful measure removing, we do willingly retain your fellowship, not raising the least bar, but do heartily wish and pray that God in his kind providence in his own time may bring it to pass, when all Israel shall be of one mind, speaking the same things.

The decision of the General Association was generally received with much joy. When, however, some years afterwards the General Association was dissolved and the General Committee, composed of chosen messengers from all of the associations in the State, was instituted to take its place, much solicitude was felt on the subject. At a meeting of the General Committee on Saturday, August 5, 1786, the whole subject of union was taken up. "The schism which took place among the Regulars and Separate Baptists soon after their rise in Virginia had never been, as yet, entirely removed, although a very friendly intercourse had been occasionally kept up among them."

The time was now at hand when all differences and party spirit were about to be forever wiped off. The Ketchikan or Regular Baptist Association sent delegates to this General Committee, and they were received upon equal footing with those of the other Associations. This gave rise to the following recommendation:

It is recommended to the different Associations to appoint delegates to attend the next General Committee for the purpose of forming an union with the Regular Baptists.

Upon Friday, August 10, 1787, "agreeable to appointment the subject of the union of the Regular and Separate Baptists was taken up, and a happy and effectual reconciliation was accomplished.

"The objections on the part of the Separates related chiefly to matters of trivial importance. On the other hand, the Regulars complained that the Separates were not sufficiently explicit in their principles, having never published or sanctioned any confession of faith; and that they kept within their communion many who were professed Arminians, etc. To these things it was answered by the Separates that a large majority of them believed as much in their confession of faith as they did themselves, although they did not entirely approve of the practice of religious societies binding themselves too strictly by confessions of faith, seeing there was danger of their finally usurping too high a place; that if there were some among them who leaned

too much toward the Arminian system they were generally men of exemplary piety and great usefulness in the Redeemer's kingdom, and they conceived it better to bear with some diversity of opinion in doctrines than to break with men whose Christian deportment rendered them amiable in the estimation of all true lovers of genuine goodness. Indeed, that some of them had now become fathers in the Gospel, who, previous to the bias which their minds had received, had borne the brunt and heat of persecution, whose labors and sufferings God had blessed, and still blessed to the great advantage of his cause. To exclude such as these from their communion would be like tearing the limbs from the body.

“These and such like arguments were agitated both in public and private, so that all minds were much mollified before the final and successful attempt. At union.

“The terms of the union were entered in the minutes in the following words, viz.:

The committee appointed to consider the terms of union with our Regular brethren reported that they conceive the manner in which the Regular Baptist confession of faith has been received by a former Association is the ground work for such a union.

“After considerable debate as to the propriety of having any confession of faith at all, the report of the committee was received with the following explanation:

To prevent the confession of faith from usurping a tyrannical power over the conscience of any, we do not mean that every person is bound to the strict observance of everything therein contained; yet that it holds forth the essential truths of the Gospel, and that the doctrine of salvation by Christ and free, unmerited grace alone ought to be believed by every Christian and maintained by every minister of the Gospel. Upon these terms we are united; and desire hereafter that the names *Regular* and *Separate* be buried in oblivion, and that, from henceforth, we shall be known by the name of the *United Baptist Churches of Christ in Virginia* (Semple).

Semple, the Virginia Baptist historian, in 1809, says that “this union has now continued upwards of twenty-two years without an interruption. The bonds of union are apparently much stronger than at first. It is quite pleasing

sometimes to find that members and even ministers of intelligence among Baptists have manifested a total unacquaintance with the terms Regular and Separate, when they have been occasionally mentioned in their company. From this it is plain that all party spirit is now laid aside, and that it was a union of hearts as well as parties.

“It is worthy of remark that this conjunction of dissevered brethren took place at a time when a great revival of religion had already commenced, and not far from the time when it burst, forth on the right hand and left throughout the State. Some of our reflecting readers will impute this to a providential interference of God, disposing the hearts of the people to love and peace in order to prepare them for the day of his power. Others may say rather the work already having begun, a revival of true religion always tends to open the hearts of the friends of God and make them stretch the robe of charity so as really to cover a multitude of faults. Whether to one or the other, or to both these causes may be ascribed the accommodating temper of the two parties, certain it is that nothing could be more salutary.” The results of this union were far-reaching in their effects.

The war, though very propitious to the liberty of the Baptists, had an opposite effect upon the life of religion among them. As if persecution was more favorable to vital piety than unrestrained liberty, they seem to have abated their zeal, upon being unshackled from their manacles. They had been much engrossed with thoughts and schemes for effecting the revolution. They had much engaged in political strife. The opening of free trade by peace served as a powerful bait to entrap professors. There were many wild speculations in lands. From whatever cause, certain it was that there was a wintry season. With exceptions the declension was general throughout the country. The love of many waxed cold. Iniquity greatly abounded. Associations were thinly attended, and the business was badly conducted.

Fortunately, about the year 1785, a revival began. It was not general but it covered many sections of the country. John Taylor had a season of refreshing in Clear Creek Church, Woodford county, Kentucky. In Virginia “thousands were converted and baptized, besides many who joined the Methodists and Presbyterians.” The revival, however, did not produce many young preachers. John Leland says:

In the late great additions that have been made to the churches, there

are but few who have engaged in the work of the ministry. Whether it is because the old preachers stand in the way, or whether it is because the people do not pray the Lord of the Harvest to thrust out laborers, or whether it is not rather a judgment of God upon the people for neglecting those who are already in the work, not communicating to them in all good things, I cannot say.

The revival continued in many places until 1792; but in its effects it was limited.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Charles F. James, *Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia*. Lynchburg, Va., 1900.

### III. THE PERIOD OF GROWTH AND ORGANIZATION

#### CHAPTER I

##### THE BAPTISTS IN KENTUCKY

The Ohio Valley—Kentucky—John Finlay—Hunters from North Carolina—Daniel Boone—Lexington—The Customs of the People—The County of Fincastle—Baptists the Pioneers—John Lythe Holds “Divine Service” at Harrodsburg—Bishop Smith on the Baptists—Thomas Tinsley and William Hickman—John Taylor—William Marshall—Severn’s Valley Church—Cedar Creek Church—The Traveling Church—Lewis Craig—Other Famous Preachers—The Negro Servant Peter—The Land and Water Routes to Kentucky—Calvinistic and Separate Churches—Religious Conditions—The Revival—John Gano—The Elkhorn Association—Foot Washing—United Baptists—Augustine Eastin and James Garrard—Cooper Run Church—A Horrible Murder—The Unitarian Movement—The Universalists.

The discovery and occupation of the Ohio Valley was a matter of the greatest political and religious importance. The issue was, should it be French and Roman Catholic, or English and Protestant? The settlement of Kentucky was the key to this vexed problem. So the occupation of Kentucky became a question of international moment.

The delightful country of Kentucky, with its majestic rivers, from time immemorial had been the resort of wild beasts and of men no less savage, when in the year 1767 it was visited by John Finlay, and a few wandering white men, from the British colony of North Carolina, lured to the wilderness by a love for hunting, and the desire of trading with the Indians, who were then understood to be at peace. “The country once seen,” says Marshall, one of the earliest Kentucky historians, “held out abundant inducements to be revisited, and better known. Among the circumstances best adapted to engage the attention, and impress the feelings of the adventurous hunters of North Carolina, may be selected the uncommon fertility of the soil, and the great abundance of wild game, so conspicuous at this time. And we are assured that the effect lost nothing of the cause. Forests those hunters had seen—mountains they had ascended—valleys they had traversed—deer they had killed—and bears they had successfully hunted. They had heard the howl of the wolf, the whine of the panther, and the heartrending yell of the savage man with corresponding sensations of delight, or horror. But these were all lost to memory, in the contemplation of Kentucky; animated with all the

enchancing variety, and adorned with all the magnificent grace and boldness of nature's creative energy. To nature's children, she herself is eloquent, and affecting. Never before had the feelings of those rude hunters experienced so much of the pathetic, the sublime, the marvelous" (Marshall, *The History of Kentucky*, I. 4. Frankfort, 1824).

Finlay was the pilot of Daniel Boone, and 1769 is the memorable date of the latter's arrival in Kentucky. He was not encumbered with worldly goods; had no local attachments; he possessed only high health and vigorous constitution, supported by great muscular strength and nervous activity. With the exception of a few traders who had passed the Cumberland Gap "and viewed with delight the landscape that stretched away toward the setting sun like an undulating sea of verdure" (Finlay, *Topographical Description of the Western Territory*), this whole sweep of country bordering on the Ohio, was entirely unknown. There were no permanent settlers in this region and in it no particular interest.

This was a momentous period in American history. These early emigrants came during the struggle and triumphs of civil and religious liberty in America. On April 17, 1775, occurred the famous battle of Lexington, near Boston, Massachusetts. About two months afterwards "a party of hunters had kindled their evening fire and were seated on their buffalo robes around a cheerful blaze, deliberating, as may be supposed, about the name by which they should designate the newly settled site, when the news arrived of the momentous battle fought in Massachusetts on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April, 1775. In the enthusiasm of the moment the spot was called Lexington, to commemorate the event" (Flint, *History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley*, I. 356. Cincinnati, 1833).

Such was the land of Kentucky. The customs of the people who settled this country were not less noteworthy. An intelligent observer who was reared under the conditions then existing has described them as follows:

It is no reproach to the first settlers of the country, to say, that they were enured to danger, to labor, and to rough living—they were chiefly from the frontier settlements, or had recently been such, in Virginia, or the neighboring States—and had served an apprenticeship, to their condition in Kentucky, before they came here. Indeed, it is of such, that new countries are made. For who else

has that sort of Spartan virtue, necessary to conquer nature, in her most obdurate forms? But Kentucky was destined to ameliorate their condition. And this history, faithful to the transitory pictures of real life, will exhibit the contrast, of what *they were* and what *they are*, after the lapse of forty years.

Then, the women did the offices of the household—milked the cows—cooked the mess—prepared the flax—spun, wove, and made the garment, of linen, or linsey; the men hunted, and brought in the meat—they planted, ploughed, and gathered in the corn—grinding it into meal, at the hand mill, or pounded it into hominy, in the mortar, was occasionally the work ‘of either; or the joint labor of both. The men exposed themselves alone to danger; they fought with the Indians; they cleared the land; they reared the hut, or built the fort—in which the women were placed for safety. Much use was made of the skin of deer, for dress, while the buffalo, the bear skins, were consigned to the floor, for beds, and covering. There might accidentally be a few articles, brought to the country for sale, in a private way; but there was no store for supply. Wooden vessels, either *turned* or *coopered* were in common use, as table furniture. A tin cup was an article of delicate luxury; almost as rare as an iron fork. Every hunter carried his knife; it was no less the implement of a warrior. Not unfrequently the rest of the family was left with but one, or two, for the use of all. A like workmanship, composed the table, and the stool, a slab, hewed with the axe—and sticks of a similar manufacture, set in, for legs, supported both. When the bed was by chance, or refinement, elevated above the floor, and given a fixed place, it was often laid on slabs, placed across poles, supported on forks, set in the earthen floor; or where the floor was puncheons—the bedstead, was hewed pieces, pinned on upright posts, or let into them by auger holes. Other utensils and furniture, were of corresponding description-applicable to the time. These facts depict the condition, and circumstances of the country; therefore they merit notice (Marshall, I.).

Virginia under favorable royal patents had vast possessions. The territory of Kentucky was included in the county of Fincastle, and shortly afterwards it was constituted into the county of Kentucky. Virginia had furnished many

soldiers in the French and English wars on the Continent, and at the close of the Revolution the soldiers were paid in Landscript and were permitted to settle four hundred acres of land in Kentucky. These grants, along with favorable reports of the country, brought immense numbers of people to the territory, especially at the close of the Revolutionary War. Says Lewis Collins: “No country was settled by men of more distinct character from the great mass, and the infusion of those traits was so common to the population of the early emigrants, that it will take centuries to eradicate it from their descendants. More of the gallant officers of the American Revolution, and no less gallant soldiers, found a retreat in Kentucky than in any other part of America, and they brought with them to the West the young men of enterprise, talent and courage, who like Sidney, were to find how to make a way to distinction” (Collins, *History of Kentucky*, 308. First edition).

The Baptists were the pioneers of religion in Kentucky. They came with the earliest permanent settlers. Such is the statement of Collins (p. 108). The Rev. John Lythe, an Episcopal clergyman, was a member of the legislative assembly, in Transylvania, May 23, 1775 (Perrin, *History of Kentucky*), and on Sunday, May 27, he held “divine service the first time” (Judge Richard Henderson, *Journal of a Trip to Kentucky and of events at Boonesborough*). He is not elsewhere mentioned and there is no evidence that he preached in Kentucky. The old antagonisms were transferred from Virginia to Kentucky, and the Episcopal Church found no encouragement in the new settlements. It was known only as “an organized body of Arminians enlisted in the service of despotism” (Perrin). Humphrey Marshall, himself an Episcopalian and thoroughly conversant with the facts, says:

There were in the country, and chiefly from Virginia, many Episcopalians; but who had formed no church—there being no parson, or minister, of that denomination to take charge of it. Persons of that description seem not to like new countries; or to be deficient in seal, were it not cherished, by parish or tithes—as was the case in Kentucky (Marshall, I.).

Of Methodists and Presbyterians at this period there is no mention.

Previous to the year 1781 there was not a Baptist church in the State. There were, however, many Baptists in Kentucky. There were several Baptist preachers who had emigrated to the State, and the story of the eight years of

beginnings is intensely interesting. After mentioning that the Baptists were the first settlers, Bishop B. B. Smith, the celebrated Episcopal Bishop of Kentucky, in an annual address in 1863, says of these early Kentucky Baptists:

Many of these Baptist dogmas rung like a tocsin in the ears of the poor white people. An unlettered clergy, nor haughtily superior to the poor; a laborious unpaid clergy, shared in the daily-toils, and thankful for the rough hospitality of the poorest farmer; forms of religion, which made the wild wood and the mountain stream, ever dear to the heart of the backwoodsman the most fit and welcome temple of Jehovah, and in their estimation, the only consecrated font of baptism. No stately altars, no dignified vestments, no costly sacramental vases, no pompous dignitaries, no far fetched ministerial commission, no sober forms of prayer for them. Their sons and brothers, in everyday attire, often in their shirt sleeves, and with their own home-spun modes of speech, rich in the embroidering of inspired sentences, and eloquent with all the ardor of impassioned earnestness, preached to them the unsearchable riches of Christ, and labored for them freely as their servants in the gospel for Jesus' sake. Add to this, the stern enthusiasm of the Calvinistic creed, the fond allurements of a republican form of government, and the prestige of an imposing primitive rite, administered in a mode plainly consonant with the Scripture, and who can wonder that they carried all before them.

It was a bright Sunday in April, 1776, that the sound of a horn called the little settlement of Harrodsburg to worship. The whole population of Kentucky at the time numbered less than one hundred. The meeting was held near the spring under an expanding elm tree. The preacher was Thomas Tinsley, assisted by William Hickman, who was not yet ordained as a minister. Not much is known of Tinsley, but he was described as a "son of thunder." Hickman filled a large place in Kentucky Baptist history. John Taylor says "this man had a great range in Kentucky for nearly forty years." "Though now about seventy-six years old," continues Taylor, "he walks and stands as erect as a palm tree, being at least six feet high, rather of lean texture, his whole deportment solemn and grave, and like Caleb, the servant of the Lord of old, at four score years of age, was as capable of going to war as when he

was young” (Taylor, *A History of the Ten Churches*).

John Taylor was himself a man of great power. He labored hard on his farm. After mentioning a certain day’s work which he had accomplished that seemed to be impossible, he remarked: “I name this day’s work that it may be accounted for how I cleared nearly four hundred acres of land in the heavy forests of Kentucky, besides making other improvements.” He then remarks

We had to pack corn forty miles, and then send a mile to grind it at a handmill, before we could get bread; as to meat, it must come from the woods, and myself no hunter; I would at times go out with hunters and they with the common generosity of hunters would admit me a share in the profits so far as meat went. Soon after I settled in my little cabin (sixteen feet square, with no floor except the natural earth, without table, bedstead or stool) I found that an old buck had his lodge a few hundred steps from my cabin among the nettles, high as a man’s shoulders, and interlocked with pea vines; those nettles, the next winter we found to be very useful, in getting the lint and with the help of buffalo wool, made good clothing for our black people—however, I went every morning to visit the old buck lodge, hoping to get a shot at him, I could sometimes see him—but I at length got a fire at him and accidentally shot him through the heart, this was a greater treat for my family than the largest bullock I have ever killed since, for he was large and fat (Taylor).

He was equally laborious as a minister. George Stokes Smith was a “man of great responsibility, a doctrinal preacher of simplicity and plainness.” William Marshall was the first permanent preacher in the State. “His tall, graceful form, dark piercing eye and engaging manners made him the pride of the circle in which he moved.” There were six Baptist preachers in Kentucky as early as 1780, but there were no churches.

The Severn’s Valley Church, the first in Kentucky, was organized, June 18, 1781. It is now known as Elizabethtown. The ministers present were Joseph Barnett, John Whitaker and John Gerrard. Gerrard was called as pastor and ordained to the ministry. He was the first pastor of a church in Kentucky. His was the voice of one crying in the wilderness. The church was organized under a green sugar tree. There were eighteen members, three of whom were colored, in the constitution of the church.

The Cedar Creek Church, five miles from Bardstown, was organized July 4, 1781. This was the second church in Kentucky. It was probably from patriotic motives that the church was constituted on Independence Day. This was while the Revolutionary War was still in progress. The church was gathered by Joseph Barnett and he was assisted by John Gerrard. Barnett was pastor for some years. Two of the members, Judge James Slaughter and James Rogers, were members of the Danville Convention.

The famous Traveling Church worshiped for the first time at Gilbert's Creek, Lincoln county, the second Lord's day in December, 1781 (Ford, History of Kentucky Baptists, *The Christian Repository*, March, 1856). This story dates far back in Virginia history, as has already been seen, when Craig had fallen under the heavy hand of the Established Church. Craig was far from possessing a cultivated mind, but being a sensible man, and having a very musical voice, with agreeable manners, and, especially going forth under the constraining influence of the love of Christ, he excited much interest among the people whom he addressed. He traveled continually, and under his pungent preaching, and impassioned earnestness he won multitudes of converts. The Baptist church organized, between the James and the Rappahannock rivers, called Lower Spotsylvania, afterwards Craig's, was the fruit of his labor. He became pastor and the church greatly prospered.

He was continually annoyed by members of the Establishment and more than once imprisoned. The time had come for Craig and his church to emigrate to Kentucky. It was perhaps on the church meeting day, September 2, 1781, that he announced his purpose. An appointed day was set when all who would go to "a foreign land" would meet at the church house. Many were the ministers who assembled on the set day. Among them were Elijah Craig, who had eaten rye bread in prison; Ambrose Dudley, who had often labored with him; William E. Waller and the aged shepherd William Ellis; and John Waller, the most picturesque of the early Baptist ministers of Virginia, was also there. These men of God embraced and parted, some of them, forever. The feelings of Waller were expressed in rude poetry. About two hundred of the members agreed to go into the wilderness land. This left but few behind. Preachers were not lacking in the expedition itself. Joseph Bledsoe of the Wilderness Church and father of the afterwards noted Senator James Bledsoe of Kentucky; Joseph Craig "the man who laid down in the road"; William Cave and Simeon Watson were four of a number of preachers who accompanied it.

So the church, the pastor and the clerk with the old church book started upon the journey. It was in the month of October. The church had been constituted in 1767 by Read Harris and Dutton Lane.

This was the most considerable company that had yet gone to Kentucky. The old historian calls Kentucky “the vortex of Baptist preachers.” Semple adds: “It is questionable with some whether half of the Baptist preachers raised in Virginia have not emigrated. To the Western country.” This exodus was no small affair for its day and generation. The moving train included church members, their children, negro slaves, and other emigrants, who, for better protection, had attached themselves to an organized expedition, between five and six hundred souls (Ranck, *The Traveling Church*, 13. Louisville, 1891). The women rode on horseback carrying the children; the men walked probably the entire distance of more than six hundred miles. On arriving at Gilbert’s Creek, William Marshall preached on Sunday.

Craig had anticipated the needs of his church. Early the year before his removal he had sent his old Negro servant, Peter, to go to the new place and make a crop of corn. Peter was a member of the Spotsylvania Church and a very effective preacher. With a two-horse wagon, and farming implements, he had gone through the wilderness. In the spring he planted a crop of corn, but about the time the corn tasseled an excursion of Indians laid all to waste. Discouraged, the Negro returned and arrived in Virginia about the time the church began to move. Peter became the guide of the church to its new home. He was long a faithful preacher among his people. The fort was built and the people became settled in their new home. Finally the church removed north of the river and organized South Elkhorn Church.

One can hardly appreciate the sufferings and sacrifices of these early Baptists. There were two routes open to Kentucky, one by land, the other by water. It is difficult to say which was the more dangerous and toilsome. Lewis Craig traveled by land, John Taylor by water. He landed on his way to Craig’s station in December, 1783, at Bear Grass, near Louisville. Taylor says of his journey:

It was a gloomy thing at that time of day, to move to Kentucky—but I had seen the place, and when I found a growing family to provide for, this overweighed all, and without a single friend or acquaintance to accompany me, with my young helpless family, to feel all the

horrors that then lay in the way to Kentucky—we took water at Redstone, and for want of a better opening, I paid for a passage, in a lonely ill-fixed boat of strangers—the River being low, this lonesome boat, was about seven weeks before she landed at Beargrass; not a soul was then settled on the Ohio between Wheeling and Louisville, a space of five or six hundred miles, and not one hour, day or night, in safety. Though it was not winter, not a soul in all Beargrass settlement was in safety but by being in a fort—I then meditated about traveling about eighty miles, to Craig’s station on Gilbert’s Creek, in Lincoln county; we set out in a few days—nearly all I owned was then at stake, I had three horses, two of them were packed, the other my wife rode, with as much lumber besides as the beast could bear; I had four black people, one man and three smaller ones. The pack horses were led, one by myself, the other by my man—the trace, what there was, being so narrow and bad, we had no chance but to wade through all the mud, rivers and creeks we came to. Salt River, with a number of its large branches we had to deal with often; those waters being flush, we often must wade to our middle, and though the weather was very cold, the ice was not very troublesome, those struggles often made us forget the danger we were in from the Indians—we only encamped in the woods one night, where we could only look for protection from the Lord, one Indian might have defeated us, for though I had a rifle, I had very little use of it; after six days painful travel of this kind, we arrived at Craig’s Station, a little before Christmas and about three months after our start from Virginia. Through all of this rugged travel my wife was in a very helpless state, for about one month after our arrival my son Ben was born (Taylor).

The three churches organized in Kentucky in 1781 were all Calvinistic or the Regular Baptists. The Regular Baptist preachers were Barnett, Whitaker, Marshall, Lewis Craig, and probably Richard Cave and George Stokes Smith. All of these except the first two were Separate Baptists in Virginia. The Separate Baptists as yet had organized no churches. In the whole country there were but three churches and nine preachers. There were probably two churches organized the next year and both were of the Separate order. At the close of the year 1784 there were eight small churches in the State, and not

one house of worship. The winter of this year was unprecedented for coldness and many of the inhabitants were forced to eat dead carcasses.

The religious condition of the people was even worse than their temporal affairs. John Taylor says of this period:

Embarrassed as my worldly circumstances were, the face of things, as to religion, gave me more pain of mind; there were a number of Baptist scattered about, but we all seemed cold as death. Everybody had so much to do that religion was scarcely talked of, even on Sundays. All our meetings seemed only the name of things, with but little of the spirit of devotion (Taylor).

There is likewise the testimony of David Rice, a Presbyterian minister. He had previously visited the State, and he moved there in October, 1783. The Presbyterians had become numerous and he says of them:

After I had been here some weeks, and had preached at several places, I found scarcely one man, and but few women, who supported a credible profession of religion. Some were grossly ignorant of the first principles of religion. Some were given to quarreling and fighting, some to profane swearing, some to intemperance, and perhaps the most of them totally negligent of the forms of religion in their own houses. I could not think that a church formed of such materials as these could properly be called a church of Christ. With this I was considerably distressed, and made to cry, Where am I? What situation am I in? Many of these produced certificates of their having been regular members in full communion and good standing in the churches from whence they had emigrated, and this they thought entitled them to what they called Christian privileges here. Others would be angry and raise a quarrel with their neighbors if they did not certify, contrary to their knowledge and belief, that the bearer was a good moral character. I found indeed very few on whose information I could rely respecting the moral character of those who wished to be church members (Rice, *Memoirs*).

The year 1785 brought a fruitful revival among the churches of Kentucky. The good work spread into many communities and churches. The revival drew the churches and pastors closer together. At the close of this year there

had been constituted in Kentucky, eighteen churches, eleven of Regular Baptists, and seven of Separate Baptists. There were in Kentucky at the same time nineteen Baptist preachers (Spencer, *History of Kentucky Baptists*, I.) Of the first twenty-five Baptist preachers who settled in Kentucky, twenty are known to have been Separate Baptists in Virginia and North Carolina; of the other five, only Joseph Barnett is known to have been a Regular Baptist. Yet, after they settled, eighteen of the twenty-five subscribed to the Philadelphia Confession of Faith and identified themselves with the Regular Baptists. The Separate Baptists organized most of the churches on the south side of the Kentucky river, constituted previous to the year 1786, and two on the north side of that stream. The Regular Baptists had two churches on the south side of that river (Spencer I.).

The revival having drawn the Baptists of Kentucky together, and the need of organization being acknowledged by all, it was hoped that all could unite in one body. But though the doctrinal differences were not great, and the methods not radically different, harmony was not at this time attained. The Separates were not willing to form an association; but the Regular Baptists, in 1785, constituted two associations, the Elkhorn and the Salem. The Elkhorn Association had thirteen churches and five hundred and fifty-nine members. A writer in *Rippon's Register* for 1790 reports the meeting of the Association at Lexington as follows:

The increase since the last meeting amounted to 222, and their whole number was 1,383. There has been a considerable addition to some of our churches since the association. The Calvinistic system prevails much; we have a number of General Baptists in Kentucky, some Presbyterians, a few of the Church of England, with a variety of other sects. *Liberty of conscience is unlimited among us.* I never remember the ministers of Christ more strengthened to preach the truth, than they are of late... The Rev. John Gano was surely sent hither by Providence; he is a blessing to our new country; he and his family are in health. He is a valuable preacher.

The coming of John Gano was indeed a blessing. It was very fitting upon the sitting of the first Legislature of Kentucky, in Lexington, Monday, June 4, 1792, he was chosen chaplain of both houses.

The history of the organization of the South Association of Separate Baptists

is involved in obscurity. It would appear that a preliminary meeting was held in October, 1787, and in May, 1788, the organization was completed. Asplund in his *Register* for 1790 says of them:

Adopted no articles of faith, only the Bible; they hold to general provision. Correspond only with the General Committee, by letter, and sometimes delegates. Their annual meeting is held on the second Thursday in October, and besides this, they have two occasional associations in May and August, hold three days.

In 1792 they reaffirmed their principles as follows:

1. What was the Separate Baptists first constituted upon, in Kentucky? Ans. The Bible.
2. How did we become united with the Baptists of Virginia, called United Baptists? Ans. On a letter the Committee of Baptists in Virginia, in Richmond, directed to be written to us, in Kentucky, bearing date, October 2, 1788, from under the signature of Reuben Ford and William Webber.
3. Did those terms oblige us to receive any part of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith? Ans. No.
4. Do we agree to abide by the constitution and terms of union with the United Baptists of Virginia? Ans. We do.

The South Kentucky Association decided against all creeds and accepted the Bible alone as their confession of faith. They decided in favor of foot washing. At their preliminary meeting the following decisions were published:

1. Declared that they thought that all ministerial difficulties should be settled by a company of ministers, and that, if any minister was supposed to preach any unsound doctrine, two ministers might suspend or atop him from preaching, until he could be tried by a sufficient number of ministers; and it was provided also, that the churches should have power to cite anyone, suspected of preaching unsound doctrine, before the ministers, in order for trial.
2. They also defined what power there was in a gospel church, viz.: To receive into her communion, and expel from it, such members as she may choose, according to the gospel discipline; also to choose

their own pastor, to refuse him, when it shall appear that he is no longer their pastor; also to excommunicate him for immoral conduct, as any other member.

The union between these two parties was not effected till the year 1801. By this time those little party asperities, which had unhappily prevailed, were much mollified and diminished; their cold and indifferent charity for each other was inflamed; and with the most of them their notion of doctrine was found to be not so different as they had supposed. A union was now proposed in earnest, and soon effected with ease. Both associations had become large, containing together some seven or eight thousand members. Committees were appointed by both sides to confer on the subject of union, and after mature deliberation agreed upon the following terms:

1. That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the infallible Word of God and the only rule of faith and practice.
2. That there is only one true God, and in the Godhead or Divine Essence there are Father, Son and Holy Ghost.
3. That by nature we are fallen and depraved creatures:
4. That salvation, regeneration, sanctification and justification are by the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ.
5. That saints will persevere through grace to glory.
6. That believers' baptism, by immersion, is necessary to receive the Lord's Supper.
7. That the salvation of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked will be eternal.
8. That it is a duty to be tender and affectionate to one another, and to study the happiness of the children of God in general; to be engaged singly to promote the honor of God.
9. That preaching Christ tasted death for every man shall be no bar to communion.
10. And that each church may keep up their association and church government as to them may seem best.
11. That a free correspondence and communion be kept up between the churches thus united.

Unanimously agreed to by the joint committee.

Ambrose Dudley, David Ramsey  
John Price, Thomas J. Chilton  
Joseph Redding, Moses Bledsoe  
Robert Elkin, Samuel Johnson.

Thus were the names Regular and Separate no longer used and the name assumed was that of United Baptists.

A harsh note of discord was heard just as the sweet melody of the revival and brotherly love began to subside, and before they had ceased. It originated in the Cooper Run Church, Bourbon county, near the present site of Paris. This was an old and honored church, having been constituted in 1787, and was probably gathered by Augustine Eastin and James Garrard. The church had been organized in the midst of privations and dangers, the contemplation of which still chills the blood. The following incident is recorded of the church:

On the night of the 11<sup>th</sup> of April, nine months after the establishment of the church, a widow, named Shanks, a member of Cooper Run church, lived in a lonely cabin in a lonely part of the country. Two sons, a widowed daughter, with an infant at her breast, and three unmarried daughters, composed the pious, but bereaved family. At midnight, hurried steps were heard, succeeded by sudden knocks at the door, and accompanied by the usual exclamation, "Who keeps house here?" The lady at once recognized the Indian accent, and springing from her bed, waked her sons. Efforts were made to force the door; but the discharge of the young men's rifles obliged the Indians to shift the attack to a less exposed point. The three girls were in another part of the humble cabin. The door was discovered and soon forced from its hinges, the oldest daughter tomahawked, the second made a prisoner, whilst the youngest fled in confusion, and ran around the cabin, wringing her hands with imploring cries. The mother and brothers within heard her cries, and would have attempted to save her; but a scream, a moan, and all was silent. They knew she had fallen under the hatchet of the merciless foe. Soon the other end of the cabin was in flames. Rapidly they spread, revealing to the helpless inmates the smile of triumph on the dark countenances of their murderers. All was lost. A brief prayer went

up from the aged widow, expressing her trust in him to whom her spirit would soon return. They unbarred the door; and as she reached the style, amid the bright blaze of the burning cabin, she fell dead. The youngest son defended his endeared sister and babe, and they escaped, while his corpse lay beside that of his mother; and the older brother, wounded, and bleeding, after displaying the most intrepid valor, also escaped. These three survivors, and the five who fell, were members of the Cooper Run church (Ford, History of Kentucky Baptists, *The Christian Repository*, 362. July, 1856).

It was in such a church as this honored by martyrs, and having a highly intellectual membership, that the trouble began. James Garrard was elected Governor of Kentucky. Marshall says of this event:

General B. Logan, and James Garrard, Esq., perhaps, he should be styled, "Reverend—" as he had recently been, or was then a preacher in the Baptist society; were the candidates, for the office of governor. Both were thought to be sufficiently democratic; and the votes were nearly equal; Garrard was certified to be governor. The first of June, he entered into the office, and chose for his secretary, Harry Toulmin, who had been a follower of Dr. Priestly in England, and recently a preacher, of the Unitarian sort. Hence they preached no more—and applied themselves to the more immediate duties of their respective offices; which they discharged to general satisfaction (Marshall, II.).

Toulmin, who was a polished Unitarian preacher, was appointed Secretary of State by Governor Garrard for both terms in which he served as governor. He had come to the State with complimentary letters from Thomas Jefferson. He was received as a Baptist preacher, but he was in reality a Unitarian in his beliefs. He had an elevated character, and was highly regarded for his learning and piety. Toward the close of his second term Toulmin converted Garrard to his opinions.

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees of Transylvania University, February 5, 1794, Toulmin was elected by a majority vote President of that institution. This election was the signal for open warfare upon the University by the Presbyterians and others. Dr. Davidson says:

The Presbyterian members of the Board strongly remonstrated

against this procedure, and exerted all their influence to prevent its mischievous consequences; but they were overruled by a mad and misguided majority, and a fatal blow was thus given to the prosperity of the school (Robert Peter, *The History of Transylvania University*, Filson Club Publications).

He was also opposed by Ambrose Dudley. There was constant trouble in the University till he resigned in April, 1796.

About the year 1802 Governor Garrard and Augustine Eastin began to promulgate Arian, or rather Socinian sentiments. The majority of the church, and several neighboring churches to which Eastin preached; espoused the doctrines of Garrard and their minister. The introduction of Arian doctrines in this manner was no small affair among the Baptists of Kentucky.

James Garrard was one of the most intellectual, influential and popular men in Kentucky (Butler, *History of Kentucky*). He was born January 14, 1749, in Virginia, and served as an officer in the militia in the War of the Revolution, and later he was elected to the Virginia legislature. Semple says of him:

While in Virginia he was distinguished by his fellow citizens, and elected to the Assembly and military appointments. After he moved to Kentucky he began to preach, and was thought to possess talents for the pulpit. He continued to preach until he was made governor. For the honors of men he resigned the office of God. He relinquished the clerical robe for the more splendid mantle of human power. The prophet says to Asa: "If ye forsake God, he will forsake you." It is not strange that Colonel Garrard, after such a course, should fall into many foolish and hurtful snares.

Let it be tried a thousand times, and in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases it will be found that preachers who aim at worldly honors will be completely ruined or greatly depreciated as preachers.

It is due to Governor Garrard to say that his conduct has been orderly and, indeed, gentlemanly, and that he has honored every other character which he has ever assumed, except the one which, of all others, he ought to have valued (Semple, 407).

To him, however, belongs much of the honor of securing religious freedom in the Virginia Legislature. Collins says: "He contributed by his zeal and

prudence, as much, or perhaps more than any other individual, to the passage of the famous act securing religious freedom” (Collins, *Historical Sketches of Kentucky*) Collins continues:

He was an early emigrant to Kentucky, and was exposed to all the perils and dangers incident to the settlement and occupation of the country. He was repeatedly called ‘by the voice of his fellow citizens to represent their interests of the State; and finally, by two successive elections, was elected to the chief magistracy of the commonwealth, a trust which, for eight years, he discharged with wisdom, prudence and vigor.

As a man, Governor Garrard had few equals; and, in the various scenes and different stations of life, he acted with firmness, prudence and decision. At an early age, he embraced and professed the religion of Christ, giving it, through life, the preference over all sublunary things. In the private circle he was a man of great practical usefulness, and discharged with fidelity and tenderness the social and relative duties of husband, parent, neighbor, master. He died on the 19<sup>th</sup> of January, at his residence, Mount Lebanon, in Bourbon county, in the seventy-fourth year of his age.

For ten years he served the Elkhorn Association as moderator. He was not a ready public speaker but he never declined to address his fellow men on the subject of religion. The defection of such a man was of no small moment.

Augustine Eastin was likewise a man of note. He was the only pastor Cooper Run Church had ever had. He came from Goochland county, Virginia, and for a time he was in Chesterfield jail for his religious convictions. But he was unstable in his ways. Semple says of him:

Augustine Eastin, who removed to Kentucky, and who, though a man of some talent, was never any credit to the cause of truth. He appears always to have been carried away with the opinions of others whom he wished to imitate. Sometimes he was a professed and positive Calvinist; and then shifting about he becomes warm as an Arminian. And then to the right about again he is reconvinced that Calvinism is the only true way. Having removed to Kentucky he finds some professors of high standing in civil life who lean to the Arian scheme. Mr. Eastin soon became their champion, and even

writes a pamphlet in defense of Arianism. This last change has made much noise among the Baptists of Kentucky... Mr. Eastin's moral character has not been impeached. On this head he and his coadjutors are men of high respectability (Semple).

Every effort was made to reclaim these individuals and churches. A committee consisting of David Barrow, John Price, Ambrose Dudley, Joseph Redding and Carter Tarrant was appointed by the Elkhorn Association to visit Cooper Run Church, Flat Lick, Indian Creek and Union Churches and try to convince them of their error on the subject of the Trinity. The Association in the meantime reaffirmed the old articles of faith on the subject. The attempt at reclamation was unsuccessful and the Association reluctantly dropped them from connection and correspondence. For some time, the minds of many were much agitated by these new subjects of speculation; and the eminence and ability of the men by whom they were propagated excited fearful apprehensions of their extensive prevalence. It may be recorded to the credit of the Baptists, that although Garrard and Eastin were much beloved, and of powerful influence, yet they could but take a very inconsiderable faction with them, which declined gradually and noiselessly away. Unitarianism never obtained favor with the Baptists of Kentucky (Benedict, II. 231).

From this date on the Baptists consistently opposed Unitarianism. When Dr. Holley, a Unitarian minister, from Boston, was elected President of Transylvania University he was "deserted by the three leading denominations of Christians, the Baptists, the Methodists and the Presbyterians, and the (school) was sinking and must perish without a change" (*The Western Luminary*, a weekly Presbyterian paper, published from June 14, 1824, to July 6, 1825, p. 403. April). He was opposed among the Baptists by Dr. James Fishback, and whatever may have been his vagaries, which subjected him to much adverse criticism, he was an avowed opponent of Unitarianism. He said that Dr. Holly was "a natural religionist" and claimed that "whatever Christianity contained in distinction to natural religion was useless and false" (Davidson, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*). This incident will suggest the attitude of the Baptists toward the Unitarians.

About this time, in the South Kentucky Association of Separate Baptists, a popular minister, John Bailey, embraced the sentiments of the Restorationists

or universalists. He was generally believed to be a pious man, and a majority of the association was devotedly attached to him; and insisted, although he had preached this doctrine, that he did. It in a manner not to offend the most delicate ear (Collins). On this account the association was miserably rent asunder.

“Hell Redemption,” as it was called, first came up in the association in 1791. Bailey had been preaching the doctrine and William Bledsoe also embraced it. The association took action as follows:

**Query.** Whether the Association will hold a member in society, that propagates the doctrine of Restoration from hell? Agreed, they would not.

Bailey voted in the affirmative and two others were neutral. A, presbytery was appointed to examine Bailey and demand of him his credentials if it was thought fit. James Smith, one of the Committee, was accused of saying that he believed that all men, for whom Christ died, would be saved. This accusation was proved. But upon his examination the association agreed that he did not teach Redemption from Hell. At this juncture, the body saw fit to agree “to abide by the plan upon which the churches of our union were constituted in October, 1787, and May, 1788.”

The way was opened in 1799 for the return of Bailey without enquiring into his private sentiments, provided he lived an orderly life. He was a brilliant orator and a popular man. There were many divisions and much strife. The associations of the State ceased correspondence with them. The association entertained many loose opinions and finally went off with the anti-missionary movement.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

*History of Kentucky*, by the late Lewis Collins, revised, enlarged fourfold, and brought down to the year 1874 by his son, Richard H. Collins. Covington, 1878. 2 volumes.

Robert McNutt McElroy, *Kentucky in the Nation's History*. New York, 1909.

J. H. Spencer, *A History of Kentucky Baptists from 1769 to 1885*, including more than 800 Biographical Sketches. Printed for the Author, 1886. 2 volumes.

William Dudley Nowlin, *Kentucky Baptist History 1770-1922*. Louisville, 1922.

## CHAPTER II

### THE BAPTISTS OF THE OHIO VALLEY

The Ohio Valley—The Conditions—George Rogers Clark—The American Settlers—The French Settlers—The First Churches in Ohio—John Smith and James Lee—The Indians—The Miami Association—Illinois—J. M. Peek—Indiana—Isaac McCoy and George Waller—Judge Holman—Missouri—Hardships—Bethel Church—Fee Fee Church—Tennessee—Middle Tennessee—Alabama—Revivals in Alabama.

The settlement of Kentucky brought vast changes in other sections of the Ohio Valley. The movements here involve almost the entire early history of this country. At first the territory was largely under the influence of the French Roman Catholics. The Jesuit missionary was often in advance of even the explorer and the fur trader, and while he was eagerly seeking to make converts of the Indian tribes, the missions planted by him became centers of Roman Catholic colonization. While such adventurers as La Salle, Joliet, and Nicolet, were extending westward and southward the limits of discovery, Marquette and his associates were no less active, and with no less of daring and self sacrifice, in preparing the way for what was meant should be a definite and permanent settlement in the country.

“Soldiers and fur traders,” says Parkman, “followed where these pioneers of the church led the way. Forts were built here and there throughout the country, and the cabins of the settlers clustered about the mission houses.” The “new colonists, emigrants from Canada or disbanded soldiers of French regiments,” however wild in their habits of life, were devout Catholics, and wherever a little community of them gathered there was a center of the Roman faith. The missionaries were animated, no doubt, in the main by intense desire for the conversion of the native tribes. “While the colder apostles of Protestantism labored on the outskirts of heathendom, these champions of the cross, the forlorn hope of the army of Rome, pierced to the heart of its dark and dreary domain, confronted death at every step and were well repaid for all, could they but sprinkle a few drops of water on the forehead of a child, or hang a golden crucifix round the neck of some warrior, pleased with the glittering trinket” (Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, II.). None the less they were the instruments of designs far more secular in character.

As intimated in the first words of the above extract, Protestantism found no

such fervid championship. The day was to come when a different form of effort for conversion of the natives should be made by ministers of a truer faith and with better results than those just described. At this time, Protestantism was represented simply in the person of the American pioneer, seeking a home farther and farther in the depths of the western wilderness, perhaps with his religious instructor and guide sharing with him the rude conditions of the wilderness life, perhaps not, yet. In either case representative of ideas which must mean in western development something far different from all that appeared in the Jesuit missionary of the Canadian settler (Smith, *A History of the Baptists in the Western States East of the Mississippi*).

Under such conditions collisions were inevitable. As French adventurers and colonization moved westward by way of the great lakes, and southward and westward to the Ohio and the Mississippi, they found after a time their right of occupancy disputed. Meantime, while French and English were contending on battlefields in Europe, it could not fail to happen that wherever representatives of those two nationalities should meet in the new world, it must be as enemies, not as friends.

The conquest of the country by General George Rogers Clark, in 1778, and the organization of a civil government by Virginia, opened the way for an American emigration. "All that rich domain northwest of the Ohio was secured to the public at the peace of 1783, in consequence of the prowess of Clark" (Appleton, *Cyclopedia of American Biography*. Article, George Rogers Clark).

These early American settlers have been thus described by Hon. John Moses:

The larger proportion of these first American settlers came from Virginia and Maryland. While a few had received a rudimentary education, and had lived among communities which may be said to have been comparatively cultured, the most of them were hardy, rough, uncultivated backwoodsmen. They had been accustomed only to the ways of the frontier and camp. Many of them had served in the war of the Revolution, and all of them in the border wars with the Indians. While they were brave, hospitable, and generous, they were more at ease beneath the forest bivouac than in the "living room" of the log cabin, and to swing a woodsman's axe among the

lofty trees of the primeval forest was a pursuit far more congenial to their rough nature and active temperament than to mingle with society in settled communities. Their habits and manners were plain, simple, and unostentatious. Their clothing was generally made of the dressed skins of the deer, wolf, or fox, while those of the buffalo and elk supplied them with covering for their feet and hands. Their log cabins were destitute of glass, nails, hinges, or locks. Their furniture and utensils were in harmony with the primitive appearance and rude character of their dwellings, being all home made, and here and there a few pewter spoons, dishes and iron knives and forks. With muscles of iron and hearts of oak, they united a tenderness for the weak and a capability for self-sacrifice worthy of an ideal knight of chivalry, and their indomitable will, which recognized no obstacle as insuperable, was equaled only by integrity which regarded dishonesty . as an offense as contemptible as cowardice (Moses, Illinois, Historical and Statistical).

Over and against these were the French settlers. Parkman thus describes the colony at Kaskaskia, Illinois:

The Creole of the Illinois, contented, light-hearted, and thriftless, by no means fulfilled the injunction to increase and multiply, and the colony languished in spite of the fertile soil. The people labored long enough to gain a bare subsistence for each passing day, and spent the rest of their time in dancing. And merry making, smoking, gossiping, and hunting. Their native gayety was irrepressible, and they found means to stimulate it with wine made from the fruit of the wild grapevines. Thus they passed their days, at peace with themselves, hand and glove with their Indian neighbors, and ignorant of all the world besides. Money was scarcely known among them. Skins and furs were the prevailing currency, and in every village a great portion of the land was held in common (Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, II.).

The religious conditions of this section of the country have been well described by Thomas Flint. He says of the religious character of the Western people:

An experiment is making in this vast country, which must ultimately

contain so many millions of people, on the broadest scale on which it has ever been made, whether religion, as a national distinction of character, can be maintained without any legislative aid, or even recognition by the government. If there be any reference to religion, in any of the constitutions and enactments in the western country, beyond the simple, occasional granting of a distinct incorporation, it manifests itself in a guarded jealousy of the interference of religious feeling, or influence with the tenor of legislation. In most of the constitutions, ministers of the Gospel are expressly interdicted from any office of profit or trust, in the gift of the people. In none of the enactments are there any provisions for the support of any form of worship whatever. But if it be inferred from this, that religion occupies little or no place in the thoughts of the people, that there are no forms of worship, and few ministers of the Gospel, no inference can be wider from the fact. It is the settled political maxim of the west, that religion is a concern entirely between the conscience and God, and ought to be left solely to his guardianship and care.

Ministers are not settled.

Except among the Catholics, there are few settled pastors, in the sense in which that phrase is understood in New England and the Atlantic cities. Most of the ministers, that are in some sense permanent, discharge pastoral duties, not only in their individual societies, but in a wide district about them. The range of duties, the emolument, the estimation, the fact, the whole condition of a western pastor, are widely different from an Atlantic minister.

There are prejudices against contracts between pastors and people.

The people are generally averse to binding themselves by any previous legal obligations to a pastor for services stipulated to be performed. It is the general impression, that he ought to derive his support from voluntary contribution after services performed, and uninfluenced by any antecedent contract or understanding. There are many towns and villages, where other modes prevail; but such is the general standing feeling of the west.

The west is not destitute of religious instruction.

It has been a hundred times represented, and in every form of intelligence, in the eastern religious publications, that there were but few preachers in the country, and that whole wide districts had no religious instruction, or forms of worship whatever. We believe from a survey, certainly very general, and we trust, faithful, that there are as many preachers, in proportion to the people, as there are in the Atlantic country. A circulating phalanx of Methodists, Baptists, and Cumberland Presbyterians, of Atlantic missionaries, and of young elders of the Catholic theological seminaries pervades this great valley with its numerous detachments, from Pittsburg, the mountains, the lakes, the Missouri, to the gulf of Mexico.

The ministers are generally itinerants.

There are stationary preachers in towns, particularly in Ohio. But in the rural congregations through the western country beyond Ohio, it is seldom a minister is stationary for more than two months. Nine-tenths of the Religious instruction of the country is given by the people, who itinerate, and who are, with very few exceptions, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, men of great zeal and sanctity.

A description of Camp Meetings.

Suppose the scene to be, where the most frequent camp meetings have been, during the past two years, in one of the beautiful and fertile valleys among the mountains of Tennessee. On the appointed day, coaches, chaises, wagons, carts, people on horseback, and multitudes traveling from a distance on foot, wagons with provisions, mattresses; tents, and arrangements for the stay of a week, are seen hurrying from every point toward the central spot. It is in the midst of a grove of those beautiful and lofty trees natural to the valleys of Tennessee, in its deepest verdure, and beside a spring branch, for the requisite supply of water.

The line of tents is pitched; and the religious city grows up in a few hours under the trees, beside the stream. Lamps are hung in lines among the branches; and the effect of their glare upon the surrounding forest, is as of magic. By this time the moon, for they take thought to appoint the meeting at the proper time of the moon,

begins to show its disk above the dark summits of the mountains, and a few stars are seen glimmering through the intervals of the branches. The whole constitutes a temple worthy of the grandeur of God. An old man, in a dress of the quaintest simplicity ascends a platform, wipes the dust from his spectacles, and in a voice of suppressed emotion, gives out the hymn of which the whole assembled multitude can recite the words,-and an air in which every voice can join. We should deem poorly of the heart that would not thrill, as the song is heard like the “sound of many waters,” echoing from among the hills and mountains. The hoary orator tells of God, of eternity, a judgment to come, and all that is impressive beyond. He speaks of his experiences; his toils and travels, his persecutions and welcomes, and how many he has seen in hope, in peace and triumph, gathered to their fathers; and when he speaks of the short space which remains to him, his only regret is, that he can no more proclaim, in the silence of death, the mercies of his crucified Redeemer.

#### The effects of Camp Meetings.

Notwithstanding all that has been said in derision of these spectacles, so common in these regions, it cannot be denied, that the influence, on the whole, is salutary, and the general bearing upon the great interests of community, good. The gambling and drinking shops are deserted; and the people that used to congregate there, now go to the religious meetings.

#### The usefulness of Methodist and Baptist ministers, missionaries from the East.

The Methodists, too, have done great and incalculable good. They are generally of a character, education, and training, that prepare them for the element upon which they are destined to operate. They speak the dialect, understand the interests, and enter into the feelings of their audience. They exert a prodigious and incalculable bearing upon the rough backwoodsmen, and do good, where more polished and trained ministers would preach without effect. No mind but his for whom they labor can know how many profane they have reclaimed, drunkards they have reformed, and wanderers they have

brought home to God.

The Baptists, too, and the missionaries from the Atlantic country, seeing such a wide and open field before them, labor with great diligence and earnestness, operating generally upon another class of community (Thomas Flint, *The History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley*. Second Edition. Cincinnati, 1832).

The Baptists were the first to enter this territory and to organize a church. The first church was planted in Ohio, called Columbia, now Cincinnati, in 1790. This company has been thus described: It was on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November, 1788, that a company of twenty-three men, some of them hardly grown, three women and two children, (the oldest only five years of age) landed from the flat boat on which they had floated from Pittsburgh and began to erect the cabins in which they proposed to spend the winter, awaiting the arrival of other relatives—fathers and mothers, and wives and children—in the spring. Most of these people had come from Essex county, New Jersey, and several of them had been members of the old Scotch Plains Baptist Church, from which the First Baptist Church of New York City had been organized, and of which Rev. John Gano, noted for having been among the most efficient and influential chaplains in the army of the Revolution had been pastor. The leader of that company of Pioneers was Major Benjamin Stites, who later became very prominent in this church. There was also General John Gano and wife (*The Journal and Messenger*, July, 1889). Rev. Stephen Gano, of Providence, Rhode Island, visited this little band, in 1790, baptized three persons and organized the church.

The next May the church chose John Smith to be their pastor. He was a Virginian, a very able, talented man, an excellent orator, whose voice could be heard at a great distance in the open air, and thus admirably adapted to a new country. He was everywhere heard gladly. For several years he was very useful, till he became involved in politics, the great mistake of his life, as he himself admitted. He was a member of the Convention for the adoption of a State Constitution for Ohio, and one of the first senators in Congress. He became intimately acquainted with Aaron Burr, and entertained him for a week or more at his home in Cincinnati. When Burr was suspected of treason, suspicion also fell on Smith. He was tried in the Senate, and although not proved guilty, there were so many against him, that he resigned. In 1808

he left Cincinnati for Louisiana, where he lived in obscurity for fifteen or sixteen years till his death. Some of his enemies were bitter persecutors, but those who knew him best had great confidence in him.

Associated with John Smith was James Lee of Virginia. He was a man of marked personality. He has been thus described:

He could not read even when of age, but seemed evidently called of God to preach the gospel. He had hardly heard a sermon till his majority but was soon after licensed to preach by some church in Kentucky. In an excursion through the Miami country he called upon Elder Smith on Saturday, and on his way to church Sunday morning, Elder Smith learned that he was a preacher, and urged him to preach, though having been traveling for several weeks he was in no condition to appear in the pulpit. But he yielded to entreaty and ventured to speak to the people both morning and evening. This was God's introduction for his servant to some twenty-five years of usefulness in the Miami Association.

These and other ministers were assisted by distinguished lay men. Two of these were Judge Francis Dunlevy and Judge Matthias Corwin. Judge Dunlevy "was one of the early Baptists of the Northwestern Territory, and in the pioneer history of the territory actively shared. He became a member of the Columbia Church in 1792; was one of the conference which took the first steps toward organizing the Miami Association and, it was said long after, drew up the articles of faith agreed upon by the Association. He continued an active member of the church in Miami Valley until his death, November 6, 1839, a period of forty-seven years, and had been a member of the Baptist church some five or six years previous to his uniting with the Columbia Church" (A. H. Dunlevy, *History of the Miami Association*.). Judge Matthias Corwin had likewise held important political positions. "When at home he was always at his post; and so constant was his attendance upon the meetings of the church that if he was missed at any time, when at home, it was known that something unusual had detained him. He was frequently one of the messengers of the church in the association, often a messenger of the association to some corresponding body, and on several occasions was appointed to prepare circular and corresponding letters of the association as well as the letters of his own church" (Dunlevy).

“This settlement was made in perilous times,” says Benedict. “The Indians made every exertion to cut them off and prevent their settlement. They tried many stratagems to decoy them ashore on their passage down the river; and after they settled they were continually lurking to destroy them. They were obliged, for a number of years, to live mostly in forts and blockhouses; but, notwithstanding all of their precautions a number of the first settlers fell victims to the rage of their savage neighbors” (Benedict).

The Miami Association was founded in 1797, of four churches, with about one hundred members in all. In 1805 the Scioto Association was formed from this one, with four churches, and three years afterwards six other churches were dismissed from the Red Stone Association and formed into a new organization.

The emigration to Ohio, being principally from those parts of New England where Baptists were few, did not increase in proportion to the population. About 1825 a great revival was experienced in all the Baptist churches of the State. The beginnings followed the powerful preaching of Jeremiah Vardeman, then of Kentucky, who held a series of meetings in Cincinnati with great success, several hundred being converted under his ministry in the course of a few weeks. The revival spread through the churches adjacent, and the organization of the Ninth Street Church, Cincinnati, was one of the results (S. H. Ford, *Planting and Progress of Baptist Churches in the Valley*, *The Christian Repository*, October, 1875. XVII. 241).

The Baptists were the first, after the Roman Catholics, to enter the territory of Illinois. The following narrative of their introduction into this State is largely taken from the account of J. M. Peck, who was more conversant with the facts than any other man: About the year 1786 a number of families had settled in the American Bottom, and in the hill country of what is now called Monroe county. They came chiefly from western Virginia and Kentucky. In 1787, James Smith, a Baptist minister, whose name is found in the first table of Kentucky, made them a visit, and preached the gospel with good effect. A few families from their first settlement had been in the habit of keeping the Sabbath, governing their children, and holding meetings for religious purposes. At that period there were none who had been members of churches. Their method of observing the Sabbath was to meet, sing hymns, and one would read a chapter of the Scriptures, or a sermon from some author. No

public prayer was made until after the visit of Smith, and some had professed to be converted. It deserves to be noted that the descendants of these families are now exceedingly numerous, that a very large proportion are professors of religion, that are marked for industry, sobriety and good order in their families, and in one of the families there are five ministers of the gospel.

James Smith visited the settlements in Illinois three times. The Indians made frequent depredations, and on one occasion, they captured Smith, and conveyed him prisoner to their town on the Wabash. The people of Illinois, though extremely poor, raised the ransom of one hundred and seventy dollars.

In January, 1794, Josiah Dodge, originally from Connecticut, but one of the pioneers of Kentucky, visited Illinois and in February baptized four converts. One of those baptized was James Lemen, Sr., who became a preacher, and left four sons who were preachers. No church was organized on this occasion. In the spring of 1796 David Badgley removed his family from Virginia to this territory, preached among the people for several weeks, baptized fifteen persons, and with the aid of Joseph Chance, organized the New Design Baptist Church of twenty-eight members. The work prospered and shortly afterwards, in 1798, the two men organized another church of fifteen members in the American Bottom. The churches in Illinois soon became sadly divided on the subject of slavery and other causes.

These Baptists of Illinois lived a genuinely pioneer life. "Many a family," says one who was associated with these heroes of the faith, "long after the New Design was settled, was exterminated, tomahawked, and scalped by the Indians. The cougar, the coyote, the bear, the Indian, had to be met in those days, by one class of men, while another class turned the sod, tilled the soils reaped the grain, and still another had to plant, build and sustain the churches. All of these onerous duties were often performed by one and the same class. The man went to the place of worship clad in a suit of dressed buckskin, with moccasins on his feet, shot pouch swung to his side, and the ever present rifle on his shoulder, and preached the gospel to the few neighbors gathered inside the log cabin while others were stationed as pickets."

In this company of pioneers J. M. Peck was a mighty man. Born in Litchfield, Connecticut, in 1789, a descendant of one of those by whom the New England colonies were planted, with imperfect advantages of early education, reared as a Congregationalist, but becoming a Baptist through independent

study of the New Testament, ordained at Catskill, New York, in 1813, after a brief pastorate in Amenia, in that State, he removed in 1816 to Philadelphia, where he studied theology under Dr. Stoughton, and having later caught the missionary spirit from Luther Rice, devoted his life thenceforth to missionary services in the West. His home was at first in St. Louis and St. Charles, Missouri, but after some years he fixed it finally at Rock Spring, Illinois. From this time on he became a principal figure in Illinois Baptist history, until his death in 1858. "He was," says Sprague, "undoubtedly one of the most remarkable self-made men of his day."

He was among Baptists in Home Mission work in the West what Judson was to then in Foreign Work. After a long and tiresome trip he reached St. Louis, which for a time was the base of his operations.

In this new country he had assumed a most discouraging task, and his Journal sets forth the extreme difficulties which he encountered. "The people," said he "throughout these extreme frontier settlements were quite ignorant; few could read, and fewer families had Bibles. They knew not the name of a single missionary on earth, and could not comprehend the reasons why money should be raised for the expenses, or why ministers should leave their own neighborhoods to preach the gospel to the destitute. They manifested the same apathy in their worldly business. A small corn field and a truck patch were the height of their ambition. Venison, bear meat, and hog meat dressed and cooked in the most slovenly and filthy manner, with cornbread baked in form of a pone, and when cold as hard as a bricket, constituted their provisions. Coffee and tea were prohibited articles amongst this class; for had they possessed these articles, not one woman in ten knew how to cook them. Not a school had existed. A kind of half-savage life appeared to be their choice. Doubtless in a few years, when the land came into market, this class of 'squatters' cleared out for the frontier range in Arkansas."

His directions for spending a comfortable night in the open are interesting. He says:

The first thing is to select the right place in some hollow or ravine protected from the wind, and if possible behind some old forest giant which the storms of winter have prostrated. And then, reader, don't build your fire against the tree, for this is the place for your head and shoulders to lie, and around which the smoke and heated

air may curl. Then don't be so childish as to lie on the wet or cold frozen earth, without a bed. Gather a quantity of grass, leaves, and small brush, and after you have cleared away the snow, and provided for protection from the wet or cold earth, you may sleep comfortably. If you have a piece of jerked venison, and a bit of pone with a cup of water, you may make out a splendid supper, provided you think so, "for as a man thinketh so he is."

He was never a great speaker but he was a great organizer. He saw in the new country the need of schools. On a visit to the Bethel Association in Missouri he put in operation a plan of a society which worked wonders. When he was called on by the association "to speak upon the subject of missions he presented a copy of the annual report of the Board, and then enlarged at length upon the value of missionary work, and the opportunities which were opening for large and successful undertakings by the denomination. He also suggested that the association through its corresponding secretary enter into a correspondence with the Board of Foreign Missions. Then he outlined the plan of a proposed society to embrace all Baptist churches in Missouri and Illinois which should desire to affiliate with it. He submitted for discussion a carefully prepared Constitution. According to its provisions the objects of the new society were to be two-fold,—to aid the Western Mission in spreading the gospel and in providing common schools in the western part of America, both among the whites and the Indians. A person of good moral character could become a member on payment of an annual fee of five dollars. Each Baptist association contributing to the work could send two missionaries to the annual meeting.

"One of the matters particularly emphasized was the consideration of means whereby prospective school teachers and ministers could be aided in obtaining an education. It was not the purpose of the founders to use any of the funds of the society to pay the salaries of teachers amongst the white settlers. This would be done by the local communities. But the society was to aid worthy young people to prepare for the ministry or for a profession; and it was also to be on the lookout constantly for good teachers, to import them from the East, if deemed advisable, and to introduce them to the. Schools. In other words, it was to combine, in this department of activity, the functions of a Teachers' Recruiting Station, a Board of Education and a Teachers' Agency.

“In spite of the opposition of two visiting preachers from the Boone’s Lick Country, who were anti-mission and anti-everything, the Bethel Association voted heartily to endorse the plan embodied in the Constitution which had been submitted. It was formally adopted by the Illinois Association on October 10<sup>th</sup>, and by the Missouri Association October 24<sup>th</sup>. Following its adoption by the latter body the organization of the society was completed; and, under the vigorous leadership of Mr. Peck, it began operation almost immediately. It was the first society of any denomination to be organized west of the Mississippi for philanthropic purposes.

“It is natural for ardent natures to dream dreams. It is easy and fascinating to form plans and to translate them into constitutions and by-laws. The new society was a vision and an ambition. Was it anything more? The provisions already outlined, for instance, with regard to the oversight of teachers and the improvement of educational facilities sound impressive, and rather statesmanlike, but were they workable? Distances were great; facilities for travel were at a minimum; the churches were poor and widely scattered; the preachers were ignorant; the sentiment against schools and education was strong; the people were occupied with the immediate tasks of clearing the land and making a livelihood; all the conditions of life were primitive; immorality was prevalent and religious indifference was almost universal. How was the strong and positive influence of a new educational system to be made effective? It is difficult to say just how it was done; but that it was really accomplished is shown by the facts. Within three years after the formation of the new society more than fifty schools were established in Missouri and Illinois, where common nuisances, with drunken, with illiterate Irish Catholics at their head, had before existed. This seems startling, almost inconceivable, yet the fact stands” (Austen Kennedy de Blois, *John Mason Peck*, 34, 35. New York, 1917). Out of this movement came Shurtleff College.

About the year 1800 the immense stretch of country from the Ohio to the Lakes, and thence to the Mississippi, was known as the Northwest Territory. It was divided into seven counties. Wayne county included the whole of Michigan, and Knox county the most of Indiana and a part of Illinois.

When the settlers in this wilderness began to clear small patches of ground, William McCoy, of Shelby county, Kentucky, made frequent visits to Indiana,

and preached the gospel with good results. He was the father of Isaac McCoy, who became the apostle to the Indians in this section. As a result of these visits he organized a church about the year 1798 called Silver Creek. There has been some dispute in regard to this church for it appears to have been at times likewise called "Owen's Creek, Knox county."

He had a son, Isaac McCoy, who was associated with George Waller of Kentucky. Together they explored the wilderness of the Indian Territory as far as Vincennes, preaching wherever they could gather a few persons in cabins and in the woods. Through their instrumentality a church was organized eight miles north of Vincennes, in 1806, and the same year a church called Bethel, further down the Wabash. These were followed by the organization of Patoka, Salem, Moriah and Pigeon Creek churches. These six churches with six ministers, Alexander Devens, James Martin, Isaac McCoy, and Stephen Strickland, were formed into an association called Wabash. It met in the Bethel meeting house, Knox county, and the sermon was preached by George Waller. The churches numbered one hundred and thirty-three communicants. This was three years before the organization of the Silver Creek Association, whose churches were planted earlier. The remoteness of the Wabash from other associations doubtless hastened the organization. The Silver Creek Association was formed in 1812 from churches mostly dismissed from the Long Run Association, in Kentucky. These associations were followed by others in this section (J. M. Peck, Historical Sketches, *The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle*, 197, 198. July, 1842).

In the southwestern portion of the State a few Baptists settled in 1809. George Hume, from Campbellsburg, Kentucky, made repeated visits to the Laughrey, a stream which empties into the great Miami a few miles below Cincinnati. His labors were blessed, and in 1811, a revival followed, in which a great number were baptized. Thus, the Laughrey Church was formed, and built the first house of worship, costing three hundred dollars. This was the first church house in this district. An association was soon formed. The two foremost men were John Watts and Jesse Holman. Watts was a man of great gifts, but gave up the ministry to become a United States Senator. Holman was born near Danville, Kentucky. He became the Supreme Judge of the State and afterwards a Federal Judge. He did not give up the ministry and was a tower of strength for the Baptist cause.

The following story of the removal of Judge Holman to Indiana was published after his death and will give some idea of the sacrifices and hardships of these early settlers. He says:

I sent my household furniture, a very small stock, by water, in time to reach Verdestan before my arrival. The weather had been remarkably fine for several days, and on Monday evening, when we crossed the river into Indiana, there seemed to be a fair prospect of its continuance, but about the time we started on Tuesday morning it commenced snowing, and the snow continued to fall all day. My wife's health was still delicate, and her babe but two months old, yet we persevered in our journey. In fact, there was but little prospect of doing better, as there were very few families living on the road, and not much promise of accommodation, in any of them. When we reached our cabin, we were cold, hungry, and fatigued—and what a prospect was presented! The eye of civilized woman scarcely ever looked upon a more lonely, dreary, desolate habitation. The men who had charge of my furniture had not arrived; no mark of human feet—no, nor the feet of any animal—had disturbed the smooth surface of the snow. All was still—as uniform—as unbroken, as if no living thing had ever been there, or had long since departed. The inside of the hut was as chilling and cheerless as the prospect without. The snow had drifted through the crevices in the roof, and down the open chimney, and covered the floor, and in some places was as deep as it was without. There was no fire, and it was more than a mile down the long river hill to the nearest dwelling, and night was setting in. And there we were—myself weary—my wife sinking with exhaustion, chilled and shivering with cold—our sweet, tender infant—it was no time for thought, but for action. Not that we don't think in such emergencies; but thoughts rush in such rapid succession that scarcely a moment is employed in thinking. I had a small feather bed and some blankets which I had used while preparing my habitation. I scraped the snow from a part of the floor, and there laid the bed, and folded my wife and baby in the blankets, then laid them on the bed, and wrapped it over them—cheered and encouraged the dear woman with the assurance that she should have all the comforts it was in my power to give her lips and heart all the

warmth my kisses could impart and then secured my horses and sought the nearest habitation. There are very few who can outrun me when I put forth my utmost speed, and never had I such a motive for such speed before. I had run when I thought the Indian's tomahawk just behind me—I had run from the fangs of the surly bear and the ferocious wolf—but I never before ran to prevent my wife and child from perishing with cold. Seldom, if ever, was such a distance traversed by man in so short a time. The strides I made in descending the hill could afterwards be seen in the snow, and they were prodigious; but I could have run no further. I instantly dispatched two men, inspired with something of the energy with which I was nerved. I had to pause and breathe a few minutes myself, but my wife and child were too dear to me to let me linger while I was able to move. I returned, however, much slower than I came. My two neighbors, with a zeal and diligence for which I shall always feel grateful, had built up a large blazing fire, and swept the snow from the floor, and my wife with a bright countenance was soon seated before the fire, on one of the few stools which were my only seats. Our neighbors having rendered all the assistance we needed, returned home. I had a coffee pot and some tin cups, in which we made and drank our tea, not the most palatable to refined tea drinkers; but we were thankful for it—after which I read a chapter in the Bible, and we for the first time in our lives, knelt down together and gave thanks to God for the mercies we had enjoyed, and committed ourselves to his paternal care. There is not much of this world's goods that are absolutely necessary to happiness, and we laid down that night on our very humble couch with feelings as cheerful as we had ever enjoyed when surrounded with all the comforts, the luxuries, and the splendors of life. So it was with me, and so I believe it was with my wife. She was far less accustomed to privations than I was; but she always said, and I believe she said truly, that she could be happy with me in any situation. But she was now and for a long time put severely to the test.

Our furniture did not arrive; we looked for it day after day, but it came not; we were suffering for the want of it; and our neighbors

were too few, too far distant, and too destitute themselves to lend us any, and there was none to be purchased. I borrowed a single chair, and one or two trifling articles, and with these we lived for about a week. I was compelled to go out several times among the neighbors, in order to procure the means of subsistence, and we had few nearer than three or four miles. On these occasions Betsey was left alone with the infant in a solitary wild, where no human beings were to be seen, and she knew not where to be found in case she needed assistance or protection. Transported at once from a populous region, swarming with inhabitants; from the border of a highway, along which a stream of passengers was incessantly flowing, to an unpeopled wilderness, which the retiring savages had recently given up to the wild beasts and a few backwoods Americans, her imagination had full room for dreary pictures and dark apprehensions. Everything tended to invite gloom and foreboding. My presence insured protection; my smile lightened the solitary scenery; but in my absence, all was startling loneliness (*The Banner and Western Pioneer*, 1842).

From 1731 to 1803, the condition of the governmental affairs of the province of Louisiana, which then included what is now the State of Missouri, was far from being settled. The question of Spanish or French rule was not arranged to the satisfaction of the people. Yet for years the “Upper Territory” was under the control of a Spanish governor whose headquarters were at Cape Girardeau. Here he ruled with the pomp and severity of an oriental prince. He was never without a retinue of priestly advisers. Influenced by these vassals of the pope, he at one time issued an order that all the people who resided within a distance of fifteen miles from his mansion, should, on a certain day, attend “mass” at Cape Girardeau. The few Baptists then in the province, and residing in the district named in the order, dared to disobey the command. And it was only by what the priests termed “the neglect of the governor,” that they narrowly escaped the penalties of their heretical insubordination (Duncan, *A History of the Baptists of Missouri*).

During the Franco-Spanish period some Baptists ventured to leave their homes under the protection of the Stars and Stripes and take up residence in the wilds of Missouri. It appears that the Baptists were the first non-Roman Catholics among the whites who settled in this territory. These were found in

1796 a few miles south of where the town of Jackson, in Cape Girardeau county, is now located. These adventurous Christians made their homes in the forests. Besides these few settlers there were in that immediate section no other human beings except the savage red man. The institutions of Christianity had not found a home in the forest, and the few Baptists assembled only occasionally to read the Scriptures, and have song and prayer in their lonely cabins. But in 1799 an aged Baptist preacher named Thomas Johnson came among them. He was from the State of Georgia where he had been a missionary among the Cherokee Indians. He was on a voluntary missionary tour at his own charges and at the risk of his life. His preaching was in violation of the established government of the country, but his preaching was a great comfort to these poor people. He was the first to administer baptism in the State of Missouri. The subject was Mrs. Ballow who was baptized in Randall's Creek (Pope Yeaman, *A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association*).

The first church organized in the State was in the Tywappity Bottom under the preaching of David Green, a native of Virginia, who had spent much time in preaching in North Carolina and had early gone to Kentucky. After preaching here for a period he returned and fixed his home in Cape Girardeau county. This Tywappity church was a feeble body from the beginning and became extinct after a few years.

These settlers suffered most distressing hardships for many years. As late as November 15, 1817, an eye-witness describes the conditions existing among them as follows:

When we left Shawneetown, there was not half a barrel of flour in the place, and it was by special favor that we got two loaves of bread. We had laid in a supply of fresh beef, and the captain had a small stock of hard sea biscuit. A supply of eatables of some sort must be had at the first settlement, and this proved to be Tywappity Bottom, on Sunday at 12 o'clock. Here I found two Baptist families, learned some important facts about the state of religion and schools in this part of the territory, but no milk and no meal could be had. We obtained a few ears of damp corn from the field, and a bushel of potatoes. The mills, such as then existed, were out of repair, and no family enjoyed the benefit of corn dodgers. Hominy was the

substitute for bread.

Bethel church, the second in the territory, was organized July 19, 1806, in the same county. David Green, the minister, and deacons George Lawrence and Henry Cockerham officiated in the constitution. The first house of worship erected in Missouri, save by the Roman Catholics, was erected not long after its organization by the Bethel church. It was constructed mainly of very large yellow poplar logs well hewn. The building was about twenty by thirty feet. Several churches were organized out of this one, notably the one in Jackson.

J. M. Peck, who visited the church in 1818, gives the following description:

“On the 7<sup>th</sup> of November—Saturday—I met the church in Bethel meeting house. Eld. William Street, who had come from a settlement down the St. Francois, had preached before my arrival. The church sat in order and transacted business. I then preached from Isaiah 53:1, and Eld. James P. Edwards followed me from John 14:6. The people tarried through all of these exercises with apparent satisfaction. Custom and common sense are the best guides in such matters. Dinner was never thought of on meeting days. The Cape Girardeau Society, auxiliary to the United Society, had already been formed in this vicinity, and there were more real friends and liberal contributors to missions in this church than in any other in the territory. Yet in a few years, from the formation of Jackson and a few other churches from this, the death of some valuable members, and the removal of others of a different spirit, Bethel church had ‘Ichabod’ written on her doors. It became a selfish, lifeless, and antimission body.”

The first Baptists of St. Louis county formed three settlements, the Spanish Pond, Bridgeton and Fee Fee’s Creek. For several years these emigrants were destitute of preaching. Finally, in 1798, came John Clark, the first “preacher, other than Roman Catholic, that ever set foot on the western shore of the Mississippi River.” He was born in Scotland, November, 29, 1758. His family connections for many generations had been strict Presbyterians. He had received a liberal education in the common branches. In 1787 he removed to Georgia and settled on the banks of the Savannah River, where he was ordained a Methodist deacon by Bishop Asbury. Having become dissatisfied with the episcopal form of government of that church, he severed

his connection with it. About the year 1803 he became a Baptist in the following singular manner: He was intimate with an independent Methodist minister by the name of Talbot. Both were dissatisfied with their baptism. A meeting was appointed. Talbot baptized Clark, who in turn baptized Talbot and several others. "At the next meeting a month later, Mr. Clark baptized two or three others of his society . . . It was ten or twelve years after this before he became regularly connected with the Baptist denomination."

Clark was the pioneer preacher of Missouri. His mode of travel was on foot, for there were no railroads or steamboats in those days. At length some friends furnished him with a pony, saddle, bridle and saddle bags and induced him to ride. He was much troubled lest the pony would either hurt him or itself. Whenever he came to a creek or a muddy slough, he would dismount, throw his saddle bags over his shoulder, take off his nether garments, and carefully lead his horse through mud and water, often to the depths of three feet. His thoughts were so distracted by the pony that on his return home, he entreated his friends to take back the horse which interfered with his religious duties. He would travel through heat and cold, wet and dry, rather than miss an appointment. On one occasion he traveled all night to reach his destination.

He was soon afterwards followed by Thomas R. Musick who was the first permanent Baptist preacher in Missouri.

The first sermon preached in Iowa was by a Baptist, John Logan, of McDonough county, Illinois, in a rude cabin, the home of Noble Housley, Des Moines county, October 19, 1834.

Among the first settlers in this part of the Territory were a few Baptists from Illinois and Kentucky, who desired to be organized into a church, and so they invited two ministers, Logan and Bartlett, to visit them. After a sermon on the next day by Logan, eleven persons were enrolled as a church. The articles of faith adopted had been copied by William Manly, one of the members, from the Brush Creek Baptist Church, Green county, Kentucky. The church was named the Regular Baptist Church of Long Creek, and is now known as the Danville Baptist Church.

At the time of the organization Iowa was a vast wilderness, and what is now known as the city of Burlington was a village of a half-dozen rude log huts. There was no minister of any denomination in all this country, and no

religious service of any kind. Logan continued his visits to this little flock for about eighteen months. The records of the church show that there were baptisms in 1838, but no mention is made of the administrator. The first mention of a pastor is in June, 1840. The minutes of the meeting read:

Called Eld. A. Evans for one year, for which the church agreed to contribute for the support \$75.00. Eld. Evans labored as pastor about four years, and was succeeded by Eld. H. Burnett. Of the success attending the early labors of these brethren, Eld. R. King, the present pastor writes: One peculiar feature of the early history of the church, is the gradual and constant increase.

Conversions seem to take place through the entire year, and baptisms are reported at twenty-three regular meetings, during a period of four years and ten months.

Two other churches, Rock Spring and Pisgah, were formed in 1838, and the three numbered at this time ninety members. In August, 1839, in a grove near Danville, the Iowa Baptist Association was formed. There were ten messengers present from the three little churches, and the ministers were J. Todd, A. Evans and H. Johnson. Todd was chosen moderator, and the other nine sat on a log while he stood before them resting on the back of a chair; and thus they transacted business.

In 1842 the Davenport Association was organized, and the name of the body was changed to Des Moines, to denote better its location. Later it was divided into other associations. In June, 1842, twenty-six brethren met in Iowa City and organized the Iowa General Association. Some of these persons walked seventy-five miles to attend this meeting. The object of the organization was stated to be: "To Promote the Preaching of the Gospel, Ministerial Education, and all the General Objects of Benevolence throughout the Territory (George W. Robey, *Planting and Progress of the Baptist Cause in Iowa*; *The Christian Repository*, December, 1876. XXII. 410).

After the Revolutionary War Tennessee was called The Deceded Territory of North Carolina. There was an attempt made in 1754 by North Carolinians to settle in Tennessee, but they were driven off by the Indians. Following the waters of the Holston and Clinch rivers, they located near Knoxville as early as 1756, and were soon followed by a few others. The Baptists were the first to plant churches in the State. Baptist churches were organized as early as

1765 in East Tennessee on the above rivers. They were broken up by the Indian War of 1774, but they were soon reinforced by new settlers. One on Clinch river, by the name of Glad Hollow, was reorganized the next year. "Amidst these scenes of disorder and violence," says Ramsey, "the Christian ministry began to shed its benign influence. Tidence Lane, a Baptist preacher, organized a congregation this year, 1779. A house of public worship was erected on Buffalo Ridge" (Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee*).

The historian Benedict gives the following account:

"But the beginning of the first churches, which have had a permanent standing, was in the following manner: about the year 1780, William Murphy, James Keel, Thomas Murrell, Tidence Lane, Isaac Barton, Matthew Talbot, Joshua Kelby, and John Chastain, moved into what is called the Holston country, when it was a wilderness state, and much exposed to the ravages and depredations of the Indians. These ministers were all Virginians, except Mr. Lane, who was from North Carolina. They were accompanied by a considerable number of their brethren from the churches which they left, and were followed shortly after by Jonathan Mulky, William Reno, and some other ministers and brethren, and among other emigrants there was a small body, which went out in something like a church capacity. They removed from the old church at Sandy creek in North Carolina, which was planted by Shubeal Stearns; and as a branch of the mother church, they emigrated to the wilderness and settled on Boon's creek" (Benedict).

Next year six churches had been organized, which held semiannual conferences, until 1786, when the Holston Association was organized, with seven churches and six ministers. Revivals of religion were enjoyed, converts were multiplied, and in 1793 the Holston Association included sixteen churches, twelve ordained ministers, and 1,033 communicants. The Baptists of East Tennessee, were a mixture of Regulars and Separates, though the Calvinistic principles prevailed in the Association.

The settlements in Middle Tennessee were not commenced till a number of years after those in East Tennessee had become large and flourishing. In the year 1780, a party of about forty families, invited by the richness of the Cumberland country, under the guidance and direction of Gen. James

Robertson, passed through a wilderness of at least three hundred miles to the French Lick, and there founded the city of Nashville, on the Cumberland, and commenced settlements in that vicinity. There were some few Baptists in this company of emigrants.

Several churches were gathered and an association organized, called Mero District, in 1796. By 1801 the association had increased to 18 churches, 16 ordained ministers, and about 1,200 members (J. M. Peck, Baptists in the Mississippi Valley, *The Christian Review*, October, 1852. XVII. 489). In 1810 there was one church belonging to the South Kentucky Association. It was located at “the forks of Sulphur and Red rivers; John Grammar, pastor; number of members 30, constituted in 1786.” This church became extinct, and “they must have been an adventurous set of people to settle in such a remote region, where they were continually exposed to distractive depredations of the Indians.” This church was constituted by preachers from the Elkhorn Association in Kentucky. This is now Robertson county.

Another church was soon after located at the head of Sulphur Fork. It was constituted in North Carolina as a traveling church, and settled near Fort Station. Other churches followed—Mill Creek and Richland Creek, near Nashville. An association was formed of fifteen churches in 1803, and in three years increased to thirty-nine churches, with 1,900 members. Soon after the Red River Association was formed, embracing the churches south of the Cumberland and along the Kentucky line. Concord Association was organized in 1810, and included the churches in and around Nashville. Three associations were organized early in the nineteenth century between the Tennessee and Mississippi rivers—Forked Deer, Central and the Big Hatchie.

The settlement of Alabama was of comparative late date. Perhaps Hosea Holcombe gives the best account of the rise of the Baptists in this State. He says: “The northern part of the State, i.e., north of the Tennessee river, particularly Madison county, which is a beautiful and fertile county, was settled many years before any other part of the state, except a small section on the Tombigbee River, about St. Stephens. In the first settling of Madison county there were some Baptists. Elder John Nicholson, who became pastor of the first church constituted in Madison county, John Canterbury and Zadock Baker, were, as we learn, among the first Baptist ministers, who labored in this wilderness. The beauty of the country—fertility of the soil—

the excellent springs of water, combined with many other advantages, soon drew a dense population into this region, and in the course of a few years, a number of Baptist churches were formed. Worldly inducements brought a number of ministers into this region; some of whom died in a short time; and others removed; and although there were those who stood high in the estimation of the people, yet, as we have mentioned in the history of the Flint River Association, it appears that they labored in vain. The hearts of preachers and people were fixed too much on the fleeting things of time and sense. It was easy to accumulate wealth, and professors of religion as well as others, gave themselves up to the flattering prospects of gain. Elders R. Shackelford, W. Eddins, and Bennet Wood, were among the early ministers in this country; men, whose names will live long in the recollections of many; others settled about the same time, among whom were Jeremiah Tucker, George Tucker, John Smith, J. C. Latta, and J. Thompson, all of whom have since died, or left the country.

“About the year 1808, or earlier, some Baptists were found in the southern part, near the Tombigbee river, in Clarke and Washington counties. Wm. Cochran, a licensed preacher from Georgia, is said to have been the first in Clarke county, and a Mr. Gorham, who died in a short time, the first in Washington county. The last named county lies on the west side of the river, and Clarke on the east. In the latter, a church was organized in 1810, by Eld. J. Courtney, Elder Joseph McGee, who was highly esteemed as a minister of Christ, settled here shortly after. There was no great increase of Baptists in this country until after Jackson’s purchase was made. In 1815 and 1816 the tide of emigration began to flow into this Indian country, and on until 1820; and after that there was a continual flood, pouring in from almost every State in the Union. From the Tennessee river to Florida; and from the Coosa to the Tombigbee, there was scarcely a spot but what was visited by emigrants, or those who wished to be such. Churches were formed in almost every part of the State, and a number of laborious, and indefatigable ministers of the gospel, came in and settled this country.

“Houses for the worship of God were scarce for several years after the writer came to this country in 1818; and many of those which were erected, were more like Indian wigwams than anything else; only they were, more open and uncomfortable. It was common in those days when the weather was favorable, for the minister to take his stand under some convenient shady

bower, while the people would seat themselves around him on the ground. In many instances, *large congregations* would assemble; and they were far more attentive to the Word than they are at this time in many comfortable places, as in some instances a hard shower of rain would disperse them” (Holcombe, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Alabama*).

Holcombe gives an account of the revival services held, which soon became common in the South. “The first camp meeting,” says he, “perhaps, ever known in Alabama, was held with the church, where the writer has his membership. This meeting took place about the first of October, 1831 it continued for five or six days, and twelve or fifteen families tented on the ground. Here the Lord made bare his arm, and displayed his power in the salvation of many precious souls. The groans and cries of repenting sinners, the songs and prayers, the shouts and praises of Christians, formed an awful, and yet delightful harmony. At this meeting there commenced the greatest general revival ever known at that time, in middle Alabama; it continued over twelve months; during which period there were near 500 baptized in three or four churches. One of the happiest seasons of the life of the author was the cold winter of 1831, and ‘32; during which he baptized over 150. From that time camp meetings became common among the Baptists in different parts of the State; yet some churches disapproved of the course. That there were extravagances at some of those meetings, we think few will deny; yet there was much good done. ‘It was not unusual to have a large portion of the congregation prostrated on the ground; and in some instances they appeared to have lost the use of their limbs. No distinct articulation could be heard; screams, cries, shouts, notes of grief, and notes of joy, all heard at the same time, made much confusion,—a sort of indescribable concert. At associations, and other great meetings, where there were several ministers present, many of them would exercise their gifts at the same time, in different parts of the congregation; some in exhortation, others in prayer for the distressed; and others again, in argument with opposers. A number of the preachers did not approve of this kind of work; they thought it extravagant. Others fanned it as a fire from heaven.’ When the winnowing time *calve* on, it was clearly demonstrated that there was much good wheat; notwithstanding, there was a considerable quantity of chaff” (Holcombe, 45, 46).

## BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:

Justin A. Smith, *A History of the Baptists in the Western States East of the Mississippi*. Philadelphia, 1896.

R. S. Duncan, *A History of the Baptists in Missouri*, embracing an Account of the Organization and Growth of Baptist Churches and Associations; Biographical sketches of Ministers of the Gospel and other Prominent Members of the Denomination; the founding of Baptist Institutions, Periodicals, &c. Saint Louis, 1882.

W. Pope Yeaman, *A History of the Missouri Baptist General Association*. Columbia, Mo., 1899.

Hosea Holcombe, *A History of the Rise and Progress of the Baptists in Alabama*. Philadelphia, 1840.

B. F. Riley, *A Memorial History of the Baptists of Alabama*, being an Account of the Struggles and Achievements of the Denomination from 1808 to 1923. Philadelphia, 1923.

J. M. Peck, Baptists in the Mississippi Valley, *The Christian Review*, XVII. 481-514. New York, 1852.

J. M. Peck, Religious Progress of the Mississippi Valley, *The Christian Review*, XIX. 570-590.

B. B. Edwards, Obligations of the Eastern Churches to the Home Missionary Enterprise, *The Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review*, II. 621-636. New York, 1845.

## CHAPTER III

### THE BAPTISTS IN MISSISSIPPI, LOUISIANA, FLORIDA AND ARKANSAS

Spanish America—The Inquisition—Florida—New Mexico—The French Occupy Louisiana—The Conditions—The Mississippi Country—The Claim of Great Britain—The Uprising Against Spain—Emigrants in the Natchez Country—Richard Curtis—Journey by Flatboats—Religious Liberty—Salem Church—Meetings Held at Night—The Spanish Officers—The Flight of Curtis—In South Carolina—The Return of Curtis—The Dissensions of the Salem Church—The Baptists Enter Louisiana—Mills and Smith—The Conditions in Louisiana—Persecutions—Bailey E. Chaney—Half Moon Bluff Church—Baptists in New Orleans.

The story of the Spanish occupation of America is romantic and cruel. Spain at the time of the discovery of this country was dominated by a blind religious fanaticism, the expression of which was the Inquisition. The very year, 1492, that Columbus discovered America the Inquisition in Spain had done its fiercest work. Isabella afterwards expressed herself as follows: "For the love of Christ and the virgin mother I have caused great misery, and have depopulated towns and districts, provinces and kingdoms."

"The discovery of America by Columbus," says Goodspeed, "opened to Spain an opportunity such as never again fell to the lot of that ignorant and expiring nation. She had passed the summit of her glory, had sanctioned the barbarities of innumerable conquests, and had witnessed the moth-like delight of her fawning nobles; but with fatuous blindness had wholly disregarded the call of the scythe and the grateful peans of the plow. Her civilization had sprung from the gospel of the Inquisition, from the creak of the rack, from the expulsion of learning, from the death chants of burning heretics, and from the nightmare of distorted, brutal and barbarous Christianity. The husbandman and his family were classed with the swine that root in the ground. He was kicked, cowed, cursed and robbed by court and church, by state and supernumerary. The glory of Spain had become the exile and degradation of labor and the enthronement and deification of caste, ignorance and priest-craft. The blasting stupidity of the priests perverted the religion established by the Almighty and proclaimed to all mankind by Jesus of Nazareth. The priestly orders gave their consent to murderous conquest, crime for gold and the unprincipled splendors of church and state. The wealth of the nation in rippling fields of grain, homes of intelligent and happy

children, the reign of liberty's beneficent laws, the nobility of labor, and the piety of perpetual peace, were undreamed of and unknown to the swaggering grandees, who thronged the fair Spanish cities and jeered at the laborer rooting in the adjacent soil. The nation that took delight in the hideous spectacle of the Spanish bull fights could not be expected to emblazon 'Kindness' on its bloody banner. A people who regarded all persons other than Catholics as heretics fit only for the rack or the stake found an easy excuse for the deliberate slaughter of the Indian heretics of the New World. In the name of God—Jesus—Mary—the glittering Toledo blades of De Soto's grandees and Coronado's cavaliers drank the blood of the natives with the sanction of the priests, just as the Inquisition destroyed other unbelievers in Old Spain. The religion of Castile and Aragon was the murder of heretics; and murderous conquest was the Spanish colonial policy. So the golden opportunity of adding to this miserable civilization a splendid realm of domestic happiness and industrial wealth was wholly unappreciated by the priests and the nobility who dominated the Spanish court. She passed blunderingly by a magnificent empire, which later shone in the West like a star, inviting wise men of the East to come here to worship at the shrine of domestic happiness and a just Christianity. But her wise men were wanting. They had overridden their camels of conquest and were lost in the desert of their own crimes. She was doomed to decadence from the inherited evil festering in her own cruel and ignorant heart." (Goodspeed, *The Province and the States, A History of the Province of Louisiana under France and Spain, and of the Territories and States of the United States formed therefrom*, I. 17, 18. Madison, Wis., 1904).

The same awful conditions were transferred to the Spanish possessions in America. A vast system of government was set up on these lines from Florida to the Dakotas, everywhere characterized by cruelty.

The occupation of Florida by the Spanish had every appearance of success. For one hundred and fifteen years Spain and the Spanish missionaries had exclusive possession of Florida, and it was during this period that those imposing results were achieved. In 1680 a settlement of Scotch Presbyterians at Port Royal in South Carolina seemed to menace the Spanish domination. It was wholly characteristic of the Spanish colony to seize the sword at once and destroy its nearest Christian neighbor. It took the sword and perished by the sword. The war of races thus inaugurated went on, with intervals of quiet,

until the Treaty of Paris in 1763, when Florida was transferred to the British crown. No longer sustained by the terror of the Spanish arms and by subsidies from the Spanish treasury, the whole fabric of Spanish civilization and Christianization, at the end of a history of almost two centuries, tumbled at once to complete ruin and extinction (Bacon, *A History of American Christianity*).

When the Spaniards left Florida, the English found little to possess but the country. "The whole number of its inhabitants," says Bancroft, "men, women, children and servants, was three thousand; and of these the men were nearly all in the pay of the Catholic king. The possession of it had cost him nearly two hundred and thirty thousand dollars annually; and now, as a compensation for Havana, he made over to England the territory which occasioned this fruitless expense. Most of the people received from the Spanish treasury indemnity for their losses, migrated to Cuba, taking with them the bones of their saints and the ashes of their distinguished dead, leaving in St. Augustine their houses of stone, and even the graves without occupants" (Bancroft, *History of the United States*, III. 403. Centennial Edition).

The same thing happened in New Mexico and all the West. Louisiana and a part of Mississippi came under the same domination. Thomas O'Gorman, of the Catholic University at Washington, recounts the extraordinary successes and failures of this Spanish regime. He says: "Over an hundred thousand of the aborigines were brought to the knowledge of Christianity, and introduced, if not into the palace, at least into the antechamber of civilization. It was a glorious work, and the recital of it impresses us by the vastness and success of the toil. Yet, as we look around to-day, we can find nothing of it that remains. Names of saints in melodious Spanish stand out from maps in all that section where the Spanish monk trod, toiled and died. A few thousand Christian Indians, descendants of those they converted and civilized, still survive in New Mexico and Arizona, and that is all" (O'Gorman, *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*).

The French in a most brilliant series of exploits sought to occupy America. Large sums of money were used to subsidize their expeditions, only finally to meet with failure. Their system of colonization was not a success. There was a want of men and permanent population. This was the condition in

Louisiana. “Such was Louisiana for more than half a century,” says Bancroft, “after the first attempt of colonization by La Salle. Its population may have been five thousand whites and half that number of blacks. Louis XIV had fostered it with pride and liberal expenditures; an opulent merchant, famed for his successful enterprise, assumed the direction; the company of the Mississippi, aided by boundless but transient credit, had made it the foundation of their hopes, and, again, Fleury and Louis XV had sought to advance its fortunes. Priests and friars, dispersed through nations, from Biloxi to the Dakotas, propitiated the favor of the savages. But still the valley of the Mississippi was a wilderness. All its patrons—though among them it counted kings and ministers of state—had not accomplished for it, in half a century, a tithe of the prosperity which, within the same period, sprung naturally from the benevolence of William Penn to the peaceful settlers on the Delaware” (Bancroft, *History of the Colonization of the United States*, III.).

The whole of the Mississippi country had come under the domination of Spain. The conviction of the settlers was that the country belonged to Great Britain. In April, 1782, there was an uprising against Spain in favor of the control of England. As might have been expected, Spain put down the revolt. The harsh treatment of the French malcontents, in New Orleans, by Governor O’Reilly was then recalled. Many fled the country precipitately, taking with them their families as best they could. Few incidents in the early history of Mississippi caused more suffering or distress than the flight of the men and women of that day. Claiborne gives the following pathetic account of the sufferings of a large number of fugitives:

A more precipitate and distressing exodus never occurred. Leaving their homes, which they had made comfortable by severe toil, their property, which had been accumulated by patient industry; with no transportation but a few pack horses, with no luggage but their blankets and some scanty stores, they gathered their wives and children and struck into the wilderness. Fearful of pursuit, fearful of ambush, dogged by famine, tortured by thirst, exposed to every vicissitude of weather, weakened by disease, more than decimated by death, the women and children dying every day, this terrible journey makes the darkest page of our record. But the courage and perseverance they evinced, the uncomplaining patience and fortitude

of refined and delicate women, and the period of suffering and peril, shed a glow of sunshine over the story, and their descendants, still numerous in Mississippi, will read it with mingled pity and admiration (Claiborne, *Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State*, I.).

Fortunately, those who remained were treated better by the Spanish governor than might have been expected. Speaking of the Spanish governors Claiborne says:

The successive commandants at Natchez, and the governor-general of Louisiana, were accomplished gentlemen, trained to arms, stately but courteous, punctilious, fond of etiquette and pomp, but hospitable, generous and forbearing. They were Catholics, of course, and such was the religion of the kingdom and its provinces, and those who emigrated to the country came with a full knowledge of the fact. A large majority of the settlers were Protestants, and enjoyed their faith and the right of private worship. No attempt was made to proselyte or proscribe them, nor was there any *official interference* unless the parties in their zeal, or under indiscreet advisors, became offensively demonstrative (Claiborne, I.).

This language of Claiborne is guarded, and has in it a number of limiting clauses. A little further on he justifies the action of the Spanish governors by contrasting their actions with those of some of the Protestants in New England. So far as Baptists are concerned the point holds good. They no more escape the wrath of the Roman Catholics in Mississippi and Louisiana than they did that of the Puritans of New England. "It was a community of Protestants," says Lowry and McCardle, "under a strictly Catholic dynasty, in an age of intolerance" (Lowry and McCardle, *A History of Mississippi*). And that probably relates the story.

It was under conditions like these that in the spring of 1780, a number of emigrants left South Carolina for the Natchez country. In this company there were ten or twelve Baptists. There was Richard Curtis, Sr., who was the father of a large family and a deacon; Richard Curtis, Jr., who had a small family and was a licensed preacher; John Courtney, John Stampley, Daniel and William Ogden, and Mr. Perkins, friends and neighbors. Richard Curtis, the preacher, was from Virginia, and had settled previous to the War of

Independence, in South Carolina, on the Great Pedee river, some sixty miles from Charleston. During the war the elder Curtis and his sons were soldiers in the command of General Francis Marion. They remained in the service until their homes and their substance were destroyed by the British and the Tories. Exposed as they were to the constant attacks of the enemy they saw that their only hope was to emigrate to the Wee.; (Charles H. Otkin, *Richard Curtis in the Country of the Natchez*, The Mississippi Historical Society Publications, III. 148-153. Oxford, 1900).

After enduring hardships incident to a journey through an unbroken forest, the company reached the Holston river in the year 1780. Here they halted to make needed preparation for the voyage by water. When this had been accomplished, three flatboats started down the Holston river. When toward the close of the year the waters of the Holston river had attained a sufficient depth for navigation, they embarked in their boats, and committed themselves to the protection of God. The Rev. J. G. Jones, who was a member of the Mississippi Conference of the M. E. Church, South, and a lineal descendant of one of these pioneers, gives a graphic description of the journey. He says:

Such were the natural difficulties in the way of navigation in those early times that it was, at best, a hazardous undertaking to descend the Holston, Tennessee, Ohio and Mississippi rivers in such water craft as they were then able to construct; but what made it doubly hazardous was the belligerent stand which the Cherokee Indians had taken against all emigration through their country. They often availed themselves of the narrows, shoals and sudden turns in the Holston and Tennessee rivers to attack immigrant boats. Our voyagers being fully aware of that fact, went as well prepared for it as their limited resources would allow, and kept a constant watch for the approach of their stealthy foe. We who have, until lately, generally had "peace and truth in our days," think it strange that our pious forefathers would thus not only peril their own lives, but also the lives of their wives and little ones; but they had already become inured to the horrors and dangers of war, and viewed such adventures very differently from what we do. These emigrants, for the sake of mutual protection, had agreed to float as near each other as they conveniently could. The foremost boat contained Richard Curtis, senior, and his immediate family, and his own sons and

daughters with their families. The second boat contained two brothers by the name of Daniel and William Ogden, and a man by the name of Perkins, with their families, most of whom were Baptists. We have no record of the names of those in the third boat. They seem to have fallen in with the others for the sake of protection in descending to Natchez. The voyagers in the last boat had in some way contracted the smallpox and, to prevent the contagion from spreading to the other boats, they were required to float a few hundred yards in the rear and to occupy a different landing at night. After floating unmolested for several days, the hostile savages espied the boats somewhere near the mouth of Clinch river, and fixed on a short bend in the Tennessee river, near the northwestern corner of Georgia, as the place of attack. Having to float near the shore to keep in the channel, the foremost boat was violently assailed by the lurking Cherokees. All hands on board commenced a vigorous and well directed defense. That her husband might be released to use his rifle on the assailants, Mrs. Jones put her eldest son, William, then in his twelfth year, at the oar, while she held up a thick, poplar stool between him and the bullets; and it was well she did, for it was pierced by one of the Indian leaden missiles. After the danger was all over, Mrs. Jones laughingly remarked that "the guns were weak, as they did not make a deep impression on her stool." Another lady heroically took the steering oar from her husband that he might ply his rifle on the foe, and, with unfaltering courage, guided the boat until disabled by a wound in the back. Hannah Courtney was grazed on the head by a ball, and Jonathan Curtis was slightly wounded on the wrist, but, so far as the writer knows, no life was lost. While the attention of the assailants was directed to the first boat, the second floated by the point of attack unharmed.

The excited and bloodthirsty savages now directed their whole force to the capture of the third and last boat, and as it was passing through the narrows they boarded it full force and massacred all on board except one lady, whom they retained as captive about three years, until, by treaty, she was restored to her friends. But this was a dearly bought victory to the Cherokees, for, either from the captured

lady, or the clothing and other articles taken from the boat, they contracted the smallpox, which passed through their villages like the destroying angel, until multitudes of them died. When suffering from the raging fever and thirst occasioned by the terrible epidemic, they sought relief by lying in the waters of the Tennessee, which only made it the more fatal. Their descendants have, to this day, a traditional horror of that terrible pestilence. It was impossible, from the slow and unwieldy movements of their flatboats, for those who had escaped to round to and land enough to afford the captured boat any assistance, even if they had not been so far outnumbered as to render the attempt worse than fruitless; so, with gratitude to God for their deliverance, and sadness and lasting sorrow for their lost fellow voyagers they pursued their dangerous way until they landed in safety at the mouth of Cole's Creek, about twenty miles above Natchez by land (Jones, *A Concise History of the Introduction of Protestantism into Mississippi and the Southeast*, 25-27. St. Louis, 1866).

They settled some ten miles from the river. For several years they endured many hardships and deprivations incident to a new country, which was but poorly supplied with the necessities of life. They were a people of sound morals. Richard Curtis, Jr., was their instructor in religion. It was said that there was not a cabin in the community in which the Bible was not read, and from which prayers did not ascend to God. Firm in their convictions, they neither prescribed nor proscribed creeds. The idea of religious liberty. Had taken deep root in the thoughts of this people.

This community was called the Salem Baptist Church; but it was constituted, not only without a presbytery of ministers, but without the presence of a single ordained minister. "They simply agreed to meet together statedly," says Bond, "and worship God according to his Word, and to exercise good discipline over one another, and called Elder' Curtis to preach to them, whose labors were greatly blessed eventually. This course was a matter of necessity with them, and it seemed that the Lord owned and blessed their efforts; and in process of time sinners were converted to God, and professed hope in the Saviour, and desired baptism" (Bond, *A Republication of the Minutes of the Mississippi Association from its Organization in 1806 to the Present Time*, 3, 4. New Orleans, 1849).

This brought up in the minds of these pioneer workmen in the Lord's vineyard a very interesting question for solution. Who could administer the ordinance of baptism according to the faith and order of the church? Curtis was only a licentiate, and was not authorized, according to the polity of Baptist churches, to administer baptism, and yet there were persons desiring the ordinance, who exhibited the usual evidences of conversion. The matter was postponed until by letter they could consult the parent church in Carolina. The church in that State on receiving this interesting communication from the "Natchez Country," took the matter under consideration and returned the answer: "That there was no law against necessity, and under the present stress of circumstances the members ought to assemble and formally appoint one of their number, by election, to baptize the converts." This advice was acted upon and Richard Curtis baptized the converts. Thus the first church in Mississippi was organized without a presbytery of ordained ministers.

From this period to 1793, Bond informs us, little is known about the church, only that it continued to exist and increase in numbers. Other emigrants had come in, among whom were some Baptists. At this time is found the name of William Chaney, an ordained deacon, among them, from South Carolina; also, Bailey Chaney, who was a preacher, but not ordained, also a man by the name of Harigail, Barton Hannan, and William Owen, all of whom, it appears, preached, but none of them was ordained, as far as can be learned; and it is not known whether they began preaching here, or came here as licensed preachers.

To avoid the detection of the Spanish Catholics, on at least one occasion baptism was administered by torch light. About this time there was an occurrence which greatly incensed the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church. Stephen De Alvo renounced the Catholics and united with the Baptists. The opposition of the Catholics broke into a blaze of persecution, and the Baptists were peremptorily ordered to "desist from their heretical psalm-singing, praying and preaching in public or they would be subjected to sundry pains and penalties." This coercive act was followed by another, in 1795, through Don Manuel Gayoso de Lemos, the Spanish Commandant at Natchez, the tenor of which was that "if nine persons were found worshipping together except according to the forms of the Roman Catholic Church, they should suffer imprisonment." It was at this time that the Spanish governor

wrote an “expostulatory letter to Mr. Curtis demanding that he should desist from what was considered violative to the laws of the province, and against the peace and safety of the country” (*Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida and Arkansas*. 335. III. 149). To this letter Curtis replied with bluntness, and informed him that he intended to do his duty.

The immediate arrest of Curtis was now ordered, and on April 6, 1795, he stood a prisoner before Governor Gayoso. He was given to understand that if he did not desist from preaching publicly he would be sent with Hamberlin, De Alvo, and others to the mines in Mexico. For some two or three months only night meetings were held. About this time Curtis married a couple and this further inflamed the authorities.

“The officers of the provincial government,” says Jones, “instigated by the priesthood, made diligent inquiry as to the time and place of holding their meetings for exhortation, prayer and Christian intercourse, and devised plans for the capture of Messrs. Richard Curtis, William Hamberlin and Stephen De Alvo.” Orders for their arrest were secretly issued on or just previous to the 23<sup>rd</sup> of August, 1795. The 23<sup>rd</sup> of August was a quiet Sabbath, with all of its holy associations inviting the devout worshipers to assemble at the house of prayer. It was the private residence of one of their number, in what was then and is still known as “Stampley’s Settlement” on the south fork of Cole’s Creek.

“The pickets had been promptly posted on all the roads, and the little persecuted fraternity of Baptists were, in subdued tones, conducting their worship, when the sentinel on the Natchez road came in hurriedly and announced the appearance of five men whom he took to be a Spanish officer and his *posse*. The religious exercises closed immediately, and Messrs. Curtis, Hamberlin and De Alvo hastened to a neighboring thicket to conceal themselves, knowing that they were particularly obnoxious to the hierarchy at Natchez. The others adjusted themselves with apparent carelessness about the house and yard, when the unwelcome visitors rode up, with characteristic self-importance, inquired, ‘What are you all doing here?’ They replied: ‘We are not harming anybody; we always suspend our secular avocations on the Sabbath, and either rest at home or spend our time in such intercourse with each other as suits us.’ ‘We wish to see Dick Curtis, Bill Hamberlin and Steve

De Alvo—either one or all of them; where are they to be found this morning?” authoritatively enquired this embodiment of papal intolerance, to which an evasive answer was given, such as, ‘We don’t know *exactly, somewhere* in the neighborhood, we suppose.’ The officer then announced that he had come with orders from Governor Gayoso to arrest those three rebels, preparatory to their being sent to the mines to work the remainder of their lives, and if any man should be found aiding and abetting either their concealment or escape, he should suffer the like penalty.

“It therefore became necessary that for security these men should leave the country. They were provided with horses. But no man must be found ‘aiding and abetting’ them in their escape. ‘Who will take their supplies to their place of concealment, on Bayou Pierre?’ The problem was solved by a daring woman of the neighborhood, Cloe Holt. ‘If the *men* in the neighborhood,’ said she, ‘are so faint hearted that not one of them can be prevailed upon to take Dick Curtis and his companions in exile their promised supplies, in order to secure their escape from the clutches of these gospel-hating Catholics, if they will furnish me with a good horse surmounted with a *man’s saddle*, I will go in spite of the Spaniards, and they can catch me if they can.’ All things being ready, she made her appearance, dressed in a man’s clothes, she mounted her horse and boldly dashed off.

“In due process of time Curtis and his companions reached the Great Pedee, in South Carolina, where they remained for two years and one-half. In the meantime Curtis was an active and acceptable preacher, and was ordained to the gospel ministry by Elders Benjamin Horseley and Matthew Cullins. The Natchez country had in the meantime passed under the control of Georgia, and was recognized as United States territory. While this much desired event was verging to maturity, the Baptist community in the Natchez were not idle spectators. They resumed their meetings for public worship. They had written to their long banished brethren in South Carolina to return home, and expectation was on tiptoe to hail their arrival.

“The return of Curtis and his companions was most affecting. With light hearts and buoyant hopes they commenced their homeward journey. Now they could sing . . . On Saturday night they were in a half day’s journey home. At early dawn they resumed their journey, thinking it no harm to travel a little on Sunday under such circumstances. They separated, and each was

making for his home, when Mr. Curtis fell in with cheerful companions of former acquaintances on their way to the 'House of Prayer.' They assured him that he would not find his wife and children at home, for by that hour they were certainly on their way to the Church, so he turned with the company to the house of God. When they arrived at Church Mrs. Curtis, with her household, had not yet made their appearance, but he was assured that all were well, and that they certainly would be there; and as the hour for the preaching had come the brethren insisted on his going immediately into the pulpit and preaching them a sermon. He submitted, and while, with his head depressed below the book board, he was turning to his hymn and text, his wife came in, unobserved by him, and quietly took her usual place by the wall. The congregation being mostly within doors—and waiting one for another—no one gave her an intimation of the presence of her long exiled husband. When he arose she looked at the pulpit to see who was going to officiate, and seeing that it was her own beloved, long lost, but now restored husband, it was more than her womanly heart could endure. She shrieked and swooned away, and was borne from the house in an unconscious state. Cold ablutions were resorted to, and consciousness soon returned; and the cordial greetings and soothing words of her husband soon quieted her nerves. All returned to the Church, and Elder Curtis preached an appropriate sermon” (Jones).

The story had an happy ending. “Within the year,” continues Jones, “preceding the evacuation of the Natchez district by the Spanish government, and pending the negotiations between the representatives of the United States and those of the Court at Madrid, there was a great deal of ill feeling between the adherents of the two governments, and also between the Protestants and the Catholics. Believing the day of their freedom from Papal rule to be near at hand, the Baptists began to rally their forces and to demand the re-establishment of their public worship. The state of affairs brought to light several prominent members and licensed preachers of the Baptist church not hitherto known in its history. Among them we find the names of William and Bailey Chaney, from South Carolina. William Chaney had been ordained a deacon in the Church, and several persons desiring baptism before the return of Elder Curtis, he was appointed by the members to administer the ordinance, from which we infer that he was a man of gifts as well as grace. Bailey Chaney was a licensed preacher, and probably preached the first

sermon in Natchez after the Spanish Government was superseded by that of the United States. Soon after the Spaniards left, the Americans erected a large bush arbor and supplied it with a temporary pulpit and seats, and invited Mr. Cheney to preach them a sermon under the 'Stars and Stripes,' which he did to an immense congregation."

The Salem Church had a troubled career and finally on account of internal dissensions dissolved. The church made a request of the United States Government for a grant of land. President Madison rejected this petition. In a letter dated June 3, 1811, addressed to some churches in North Carolina, he gives his reason for this action in the following words:

I have received, fellow citizens, your address approving my objection to the bill containing a grant of public land to the Baptist church at Salem meeting house, Mississippi Territory. Having always regarded the practical distinction between religion and civil government as essential to the purity of both, and as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, I could not otherwise have discharged my duty on the occasion which presented itself. Among the various religious societies in our country, none has been more vigilant and consistent in maintaining that distinction than the society of which you make a part; and it is an honorable proof of your sincerity and integrity that you are ready to do so in a case favoring the interest of your brethren, as in other cases. It is but just, at the same time, to the Baptist church at Salem meeting house to remark that their application to the national legislature does not appear to have contemplated a grant of the land in question, but on terms that might be equitable to the public as well as to themselves.

Other churches were speedily gathered, and so in 1806 five churches sent messengers to Cole's Creek Church and the Mississippi Baptist Association was organized. This association became the mother of all the other associations in Mississippi and Louisiana.

North Mississippi, or the Chickasaw countries, was not opened to settlers till the fourth decade of the century. The government land office was at Pontatoc. People poured into the country with amazing rapidity. *The Pontatoc Union*, in February, 1838, gives the following account of the growth in North Mississippi:

At the Governor's election, two years ago, there were less than five hundred votes polled in the whole Chickasaw nation, now subdivided into twelve counties. At the late election the returns so far as received disclose four thousand eighty-seven votes polled for Governor in nine of those counties, showing the astonishing and unparalleled increase in our population of one thousand per cent, in two years! We do not believe there is, in the history of the United States, an instance of the peopling of a country, just emerging from the domain of savage, with the same rapidity. We attribute this to climate unsurpassed on the American continent—to a soil of universal and inexhaustible fertility—well watered, and presenting the means of enjoying all the blessings of life in as great perfection and profusion as can fall to the lot of man.

Through the Natchez country of Mississippi the Baptists entered into Louisiana. This territory was ceded to the United States by France April 30, 1803. Previous to that date, and long afterwards, the religious condition of the State was distressing. There is some very interesting information written from New Orleans, under date of April 8, 1815, by Messrs. Mills and Smith, to the Massachusetts Bible Society. They were agents of that organization and presented the following "View of Louisiana":

We left Natchez on the 12<sup>th</sup> of March, and went on board of a flat-bottomed boat, where our accommodations were indifferent. The weather was generally pleasant, and we arrived in New Orleans on the 19<sup>th</sup>. The distance is three hundred miles. For 100 miles above New Orleans the banks of the river were cleared, and in descending the river you pass many elegant plantations. The whole of this distance the banks appear like one continued village. The greater part of the inhabitants are ignorant of almost everything except what relates to the increase of their property; destitute of schools, Bible and religious instruction. In attempting to learn the religious state of the people we were frequently told that they had no Bibles and that the priest did not allow of their distribution among them. An American who had resided two or three years at a place which had the appearance of being a flourishing settlement, informed me that he had not seen a Bible during his stay at the settlement. He added that he had heard that a woman from the State of New York had

lately brought one into the place (*Publications of the Louisiana Historical Society*, 1916).

Mr. Mills, accompanied by the Rev. Daniel Smith, made a second missionary journey to Louisiana, in 1816. He says:

There are American families in that part of the country who never saw a Bible nor heard of Jesus Christ. It is a fact that ought not to be forgotten that so late as March, 1815, a Bible in any language could not be found for sale, or to be given away, in New Orleans (*Ibid*, 64).

These gentlemen likewise give the following information in regard to the State:

In 1810 Louisiana contained 76,556 inhabitants, 34,600 were slaves. Since that time its population is doubtless considerably increased; but to what extent, we are unable to say. The principal settlements, out of New Orleans, and above the northernmost boundary of the State, are almost wholly occupied by Frenchmen, Acadians and Germans who speak the French language. The settlements in the counties of Attakapas and Opelousas are very considerable and have a mixture of French and American inhabitants. There are in the State two Methodist circuits, but there is no Baptist preacher, as we could ascertain, out of New Orleans, no Presbyterian minister. A very large portion of the State has never, as we could learn, been visited by a Presbyterian preacher. Many of the American inhabitants were originally Presbyterians and very many would rejoice to see a respectable missionary among them. It is, therefore, of immense importance that one should be sent to explore the country and learn its moral and religious state, and introduce, as far as possible, the institutions of the gospel. Such a man might not only be useful to the Americans; he might exert a salutary influence on the French also. He would doubtless promote the farther distribution of the French Scriptures. Religious tracts in that language, might be very soon circulated among the people. And a prudent and diligent use of such means, we have reason to hope, would result in happiest consequences (*Publications of the Louisiana Historical Society*, IX. 69, 70).

The country had been under the complete control of the Roman Catholics. Protestantism was not tolerated in the Province. The Spanish authorities were on the alert for the appearance of heresy in the Louisiana Territory. Baron de Cardondelet had been succeeded as governor by Don Manuel Gayoso de Lemos, a brigadier general of the royal armies. *In* the month of January, 1799, he issued, among other regulations, the following:

6. Liberty of conscience is not to be extended beyond the first generation; the children of the emigrant must be Catholic; and emigrants not agreeing to this must not be admitted, but removed, even when they bring property with them. This is to be explained to settlers who do not profess the Catholic religion.

7. It is expressly recommended to commandants to watch that no preacher of any religion but the Catholic comes into the province (Martin, *History of Louisiana*).

These regulations were not new and they did not prevent Baptist preachers from entering the province. They had suffered too long and cruelly to be deterred by such threats as these. No more heroic men ever lived than these early preachers in Louisiana and Mississippi.

The first Baptist preacher, indeed the first Protestant preacher, was Bailey E. Chaney. During the persecution of Curtis he remained in concealment. He had removed from South Carolina, about the year 1790, and settled near Natchez. In 1799 he visited an American settlement near Baton Rouge and preached. He was arrested by the authorities and released upon the promise not to preach any more. He was not able to organize a church, but he did have the honor of being the first Baptist preacher in Louisiana.

The first Baptist church in Louisiana was organized in Washington parish, near Bogue Chitto river, and was known as the Half Moon Bluff Church. It was constituted October 12, 1812. This church is now extinct. The Calvary Baptist Church, Bayou Chicot, St. Landry parish, was organized November 13, 1812. The centennial of these two churches was observed in 1912 with fitting ceremonies. The following record is made of that notable event:

We call attention to this, the centennial year of the history of Louisiana Baptists. In the early years of the nineteenth century, missionaries from other States entered this territory. The first Baptist church organized in this State was the Half Moon Bluff Baptist

Church in Washington parish in 1812. This church had a brief life and recently the brethren celebrated its birth over its grave near Franklinton. The first Baptist church organized west of the Mississippi river and the oldest living Baptist church in the State is the Calvary Baptist Church at Bayou Chicot, St. Landry parish. It was organized November 13<sup>th</sup>, 1812, and has had a continuous history up to this good hour. It was this church, with a few others that went out from it, that organized the Louisiana Association. We gathered on this historic spot and thanked God for the preservation of this church and for the pioneer servants of Jesus Christ who laid the foundation for our Baptist cause in Louisiana (*Minutes of the Louisiana Convention*, 1912, pp. 77, 78).

The Baptist cause was slow of beginning in New Orleans. The first Baptist missionary to New Orleans was James A. Raynoldson. He was a messenger from North Carolina to the Triennial Convention in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May, 1814. He came to New Orleans in the winter of 1816-17 as a missionary from that body. The Baptist cause passed through many vicissitudes in that city. The first Baptist church there was organized December 28, 1843.

Florida was discovered by Ponce de Leon, 1512, on the festival occasion of Pascua de Flores, hence it is known as the land of flowers, or Florida. It was purchased by the United States from Spain in 1819 by treaty, which was formally signed in 1822, constituted into a colony in 1825, admitted into the Union as a State in 1845.

Since the peninsula was settled by the Spanish the religion was the Roman Catholic. A number of priests accompanied the army of occupation and preached to the aborigines. It was under the French flag that Protestantism was introduced into Florida by the Huguenots, in 1562. They were of the Reformed or Calvinistic order. They landed near the mouth of the St. Johns river, raised the French flag at Fort Caroline. An army of Spaniards came down from St. Augustine, fell upon the French and massacred the entire colony. Later the British occupied the country.

Baptist work began in this State early in the nineteenth century. A number of Christian men came into Florida, in 1812, as a part of the army to suppress the Indian uprisings. The War Department, in Washington, records the march

of General John McIntosh Houston against these offenders in 1812. With this company was Wilson Conner, probably the first Baptist preacher in Florida. General David Blackshers, who was sent to aid General McIntosh, says of him: "The Rev. Wilson Conner was a man of magnificent stature, fine features and voice, with a commanding personality. While uneducated, he was a man of great vigor, of sympathetic personality, very spiritual, and having a fine delivery." Later he was followed by other Baptist ministers.

Bethlehem, the first Baptist church in Florida, was constituted in an oak grove on the red hills of West Florida, Jackson county, March 12, 1825. The record is as follows:

West Florida, Jackson County, March 12, 1825.

Pursuant to a resolution of the church of Christ at Bethlehem in said county, in conference this day, for the better government and union of the Church and for the glory of God, we believe it to be expedient for us to adopt Constitution, covenant and decorum.

WHEREAS we have reason to believe that God in his goodness has made known the riches of his grace to a number of our souls to be formed into a church.

We therefore called our beloved brethren, Jeremiah Kimbril and E. H. Calloway and they have inquired into our faith and manner of life, thought proper to constitute us into a church upon an equal footing with other churches of the same faith and order.

Articles of faith were recorded, and the church covenant signed by:

Sexton Camp, Nancy Phillips, Benjamin Hawkins  
Elizabeth Daniel, Richard Lonchsten, Martha Parker  
John Beasley, Elizabeth Taylor, James Chason  
Lucy Chason, W. Peacock, Sarah Williams  
Ephraim Chambless, Martha Peacock, Clark Jackson  
Miller Brady, Sarah Brady

March 13<sup>th</sup>, 1825.

The church being constituted, met in conference, appointed Brethren James Chason and Clark Jackson, deacons of the church. Brethren Jeremiah Kimbril and E. H. Calloway were called upon by the church to ordain the two deacons, which was done by them.

Appointed Brother William Brady, Church Clerk, and chose Brother E. H. Calloway pastor of the church. Opened the doors of the church, received Brother E. H. Calloway and Sister Elizabeth Calloway by letter. Sister Elizabeth Owens was taken under the watchcare of the church.

Conference adjourned.

Miller Brady, *Clerk*.

The second church was constituted at Indian Springs in Leon county, in 1828. Other churches were constituted in rapid succession (S. B. Rogers, *A Brief History of Florida Baptists*, 1825-1925).

It is not certain who was the first Baptist preacher, but one of the pioneers was John Young Lindsey, who held services in the northern part of the State before Arkansas Territory was organized. His father, Caleb Lindsey, came to Arkansas in 1815, and settled in that part of Lawrence county now Randolph. He was a surveyor and an educated man. One of the earliest schools in that section of the State was taught by Caleb Lindsey in a cave, Without pay or thought of pay.

It was told of John Young Lindsey that he would preach sometimes for two hours and then invite the entire congregation to go over to his house for dinner. Later, some of the congregation sometimes invited the minister home with them for dinner.

Benedict says: "At what point or by what men the sentiments of the Baptists were first propagated in Arkansas, I have found it difficult to ascertain. Rev. David Orr appears to have been the instrument of planting a considerable number of the first church of which I have gained any information; contemporary with Mr. Orr, or perhaps a short time before him on this ground, were Benjamin Clark, Jesse James and J. P. Edwards. The first church of our order in this then territory of Arkansas was at Fouche a Thomas, in Lawrence county." (Benedict.)

The first house of worship in Little Rock was built in 1825 by the Baptists. It stood on the south side of Third street between Main and Scott. Silas Toncray was the pastor from 1824 to 1829. This church was disrupted by the followers of Alexander Campbell; the few that remained faithful afterwards organized the present First Baptist Church.

Spring River, the oldest association, soon dissolved. The White River Association was organized) in 1840.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Z. T. Leavell and T. J. Bailey, *A Complete History of Mississippi Baptists from the Earliest Times*. Jackson, Mississippi, 1904. 2 volumes.

W. E. Paxton, *A History of the Baptists of Louisiana*, from the earliest Times to the Present. St. Louis, 1888.

John T. Christian, *A History of the Baptists of Louisiana*. Shreveport, 1923.

John M. Peck, The Annexation of Louisiana, *The Christian Review*, XVI. 555-580. New York, 1861.

Dallas T. Herndon, *Centennial History of Arkansas*. Little Rock, 1922. 3 volumes.

*Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Eastern Arkansas*. St. Louie, 1890.

Weston Arthur Goodspeed, *The Province and the States*. A History of the Province of Louisiana under France and Spain, and of the Territories and States of the United States formed therefrom. Madison, Wis., 1904. 7 volumes.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE GREAT REVIVAL OF 1800

The Deplorable Conditions of the Country—Low State of Morals—Terrible Practices—Deistical Opinions of the French and Indian Wars—Alliance of America and France—The Effects of French Infidelity—Thomas Paine—Infidel Clubs—Illuminism—Want of Religious Instruction—Baptist and Presbyterian Ministers—Dull Preaching—Conditions in the Colleges—Kentucky and Tennessee—Logan County—The Great Revival—James McGready—His Sermons—The Camp Meeting at Casper River—The Account of McGready—The Meeting Described—Barton W. Stone—Other Meetings—Extravagances—Lorenzo Dow—The Jerks and Other Violent Exercises—Disorders—Such Meetings Continued for Years—The Revival Did Great Good—Testimonies—Results Among the Baptists—Effects Felt Throughout the United States.

At the close of the eighteenth century the prospects of Christianity in the United States were most deplorably unfavorable. All parties testified to this state of affairs. The Revolutionary War had brought about a great deal of license, and all classes of witnesses testify to the low state of morals. George Mason wrote, in 1783; to Patrick Henry as follows: “With some few exceptions, the declension was general throughout the State” (Rowland, *Life of Mason*, II). Dr. William Hill said: “The demoralizing effects of the war left religion and the church in a most deplorable condition” (Foote, I.). Semple says: “The war, though very propitious to the liberty of the Baptists, had the opposite effect upon the life of religion among them” (Semple). Richard Henry Lee said: “Refiners may weave reason into as fine a web as they please, but the experience of all times shows religion to be the guardian of morals; and he must be a very inattentive observer in our country who does not see that avarice is accomplishing the destruction of religion for want of legal obligation to contribute something to its support” (Lee, *Richard Henry Lee*, II.).

A general declension of religion followed the earlier revivals, and a low standard of religion and morals prevailed. Family worship was neglected, and little attention was paid to the training of youth in the fear of God. The Indian wars having terminated, an immense tide of immigration poured into the older settlements. The protracted wars with the Indians had exerted a demoralizing influence to a wide extent; but the introduction and manufacture of alcoholic liquors followed, and their use, in almost every

family, was frightfully destructive. Brandy was distilled from the peach, and wine fermented from the grape, and beer from the persimmon. As early as 1783 whisky had been distilled from corn, and that was now in use daily as mint julep or as grog or toddy. Those who could afford it had Madeira wine and Jamaica rum on their tables, but the ordinary drink was whisky. The Green River Country, as the southern part of Kentucky was called, became famous for vicious practices. Universal cupidity prevailed over the whole country, stimulated by boundless opportunities for its gratification. Speculators were eager to invest their capital in lands, hoping to realize princely fortunes thereby. Many of the pioneers who had located lands lost all their possessions on account of imperfect titles. Land jobbing feuds and heart burnings retarded the moral improvement of the country.

Deistical opinions were really introduced into America during the French and Indian wars (1754-1763). In these wars American citizens were brought into close relations with English officers and soldiers who had accepted deistical sentiments. “Most of their American companions had never heard the divine origin of the Scriptures questioned, and their minds were, of course, unprovided with answers even to the most common objections. To such objections as were actually made was added the force of authority. The British officers were from the mother country—a phase of high import—until after the commencement of the Revolution. They came from a country renowned for arts and arms, and regarded by the people of New England as the birthplace of science and wisdom. These gentlemen were also, at the same time, possessed of engaging manners; they practiced all those genteel vices which, when recommended by such manners, generally fascinated young men of gay, ambitious minds, and are often considered as conferring an enviable distinction on those who adopt them. Many of the Americans were far from being dull proficient in this school. The vices they loved, and soon found the principles necessary to quiet their consciences. When they returned home they had drunk too deeply of the cup to exchange their new principles and practices for the sober doctrines of their countrymen. The means that had been pursued to corrupt them they now employed to corrupt others. From the *prima mali labes* the contagion spread, not indeed through the great multitudes, but in little circles surrounding the individuals originally infected. As these amounted to a considerable number, and lived in a general dispersion through the country, most parts of it shared in the malady”

(Dwight, *Travels in New England and New York*, IV).

The alliance of America with France likewise brought a low state of morals, which menaced the nation with political destruction. Collins, the historian of Kentucky, thus describes the situation:

Early in the spring of 1793, circumstances occurred which fanned the passions of the people into a perfect flame of dissatisfaction. The French Revolution had sounded a tocsin which reverberated throughout the whole civilized world. The worn out despotisms of Europe, after standing aghast for a moment, in doubtful inactivity, and awakened at length into ill-concerted combinations against the young Republic, and France was engaged in a life and death struggle, against Spain, Britain, Prussia, Austria and the German principalities. With this war the United States had, strictly, nothing to do, and the best interests of the country clearly required a rigid neutrality; which President Washington had not only sagacity to see, but firmness to enforce by a proclamation, early in 1793. The passions of the people, however, far outran all consideration of prudence or interest, and displayed themselves in favor of France, with a frantic enthusiasm which threatened perpetually to involve the country in a disastrous war with all the rest of Europe. The terrible energy which the French Republic displayed, against such fearful odds, the haughty crest with which she confronted her enemies and repelled them from her frontier on every point, presented a spectacle calculated to dazzle the friends of democracy throughout the world. The horrible atrocities which accompanied these brilliant efforts of courage were overlooked in favor of a passionate sympathy, or attributed, in part, to the exaggerations of the British press.

The American people loved France as their ally in the Revolution, and now regarded her as a sister republic contending for freedom against banded despots (Collins, *Historical Sketches of Kentucky*).

French infidelity threatened to sweep away every trace of Christianity. Our country had innumerable difficulties with England, which had resulted from the cruel Indian wars. France had been our friend in the War of Independence. The very name of liberty was dear to every American heart,

and in the mystery of Providence, infidelity and liberalism were combined against despotism. Infidelity became prevalent in high places, and was identical in the public mind with liberal principles in government. "It was the general opinion among intelligent Christians, toward the close of the century, a majority of the population were either avowedly infidels or skeptically inclined. There were but few men in the profession of law and physics who would avow their belief in Christianity. Amongst the less informed classes the 'Age of Reason' was a most popular book, and obtained extensive circulation, while Bibles were obtained with difficulty, and found a place only in religious families" (J. M. Peck, Baptists in Mississippi Valley, *The Christian Review*, XVII. 500. October, 1852).

Of Thomas Paine much has been written. He is thus described by McMaster:

We doubt whether any name in our Revolutionary history, not excepting that of Benedict Arnold, is quite so odious as that of Thomas Paine. Arnold was a traitor, Paine was an infidel.... Since the day when the *Age of Reason* came forth from the press the number of infidels has increased much more rapidly than it did before that book was written. The truth is, he was one of the most remarkable men of his time. It would be a difficult matter to find anywhere another such compound of baseness and nobleness, of goodness and badness, of greatness and littleness, of so powerful a mind left unbalanced and led astray by the worst of animal passions... Of all the human kind he is the filthiest and nastiest, and his disgusting habits grew upon him with his years. In his old age, when the frugal gifts of two States which remembered his good work and placed him beyond immediate want, he became a sight to behold. It was rare that he was sober; it was still rarer that he washed himself, and he suffered his nails to grow till, in the language of one who knew him well, they resembled the claws of birds. What gratitude was he did not know (McMaster, *History of the United States*, I. 150. New York, 1884).

The *Age of Reason* was introduced into this country about the close of the century. There was great activity manifested by the infidels of Europe in disseminating their views in the new country. In the year 1800 John Adams, then President of the United States, received a letter from Germany,

proposing to introduce into the United States “a company of school-masters, painters and poets, etc., all the disciples of Thomas Paine.” Adams replied:

I had rather countenance the introduction of Ariel and Caliban with a troupe of spirits the most mischievous from the fairy land (Adams, *Life and Works*, IX.).

Politico-infidel clubs were organized throughout the United States, and so great was the threatened danger that President Adams referred to them in a public proclamation. A society was formed in this country called the *Illuminati* set on foot by the Grand Orient of France. The facts are set forth as follows:

*Illuminism* had been systematically embraced by various bodies of men who associated for its propaganda. President Adams, in a proclamation in which he briefly disclosed the dangers that threatened the country, had said: “The most precious interests of the United States are still held in jeopardy by the hostile designs and insidious arts of a foreign nation (France), as well as by the dissemination among them of those principles subversive of the foundations of religious, moral and social obligations, that have produced mischiefs and misery in other countries.” The violent assaults which were made upon this passage of the proclamation proved the truth and accuracy of the sentiment. Enraged at this public disclosure of their plans the whole faction attacked it (*Memoir of Thomas Jefferson*, 1809).

The extent to which these infidel clubs went is now almost unbelievable. “The Tree of Liberty” and “the Cap of Liberty” were everywhere popular. “It is scarcely credible to what extent the absurdities, devised and practised by the French demagogues to influence the passions of the mob, were adopted and applauded by multitudes of the hitherto staid and reflecting citizens of the United States” (Jay, *Life of the Hon. John Jay*, 319. New York, 1832). William Jay further says:

Posterity will with difficulty believe the prostituted state to which Genet (the French Ambassador) and his satellites, the democratic societies, had brought the public feeling. By a variety of those artifices which familiarized the heart to cruelty, they had enured the multitude to the contemplation of bloodshed and to habitual ferocity.

At a dinner in Philadelphia, at which Governor Miffin and his friend Dallas were present, a roasted pig was introduced as the representative of the unfortunate Louis XVI. It was the joyful celebration of the anniversary of his murder. The head, being severed from the body, was carried round to each at the table, who, after putting on the liberty cap, pronounced the word "Tyrant!" and gave the head a chop with his knife (*Memoirs of Hon. Thomas Jefferson, Progress of French Influence and French Principles in the United States, I.*).

In America as well as in France the most atrocious villainies were maintained to be patriotic acts. Robbery was held to be moral and correct justice; murder was maintained to be laudable; and those most execrable of all crimes, treason and rebellion, were dignified by the name of national justice, because Jacobinized France gave the fashion to the morals and the opinions of this country, and fidelity to her, under her new rulers, was best asserted by treason to every other country (Ibid).

The object of these societies was to destroy Christianity and to revolutionize governments. The belief in a God, the immortality of the soul, moral obligation, civil and domestic government, marriage, chastity and decency were the objects of their hatred and conspiracy. Wherever they prevailed the most gross and brutish manners and shameless immorality followed (Dorchester).

Dr. Peck further says:

The only Bibles in the country were those brought by immigrants. If a young couple, who were Christian professors, had formed the domestic relationship in a log cabin in the West, they had no Bible to read perchance, after many months waiting, some kind friend brought one in his saddle bags, across the mountains, from the old states. A manuscript volume of hymns is in our possession, compiled by one of the pioneer preachers of Kentucky for his own use as an itinerant, and it bears marks of being well thumbed by the preacher. Nor were tracts then circulated; and few religious books of any kind had found their way into the Valley.

And what strength had the Christian ministry to cope with such an enemy, learned, proud, philosophical, speculative and subtle? The

Baptists had ninety-five preachers of every grade, not one of whom was a classical scholar, or had the skill, or understood the tactics of the opponents of the Scripture. They had never been trained in, nor could they put on the armor of, the “schools of the prophets.” They had no pretensions to the arts of the logician in debate. There were about a dozen Methodist preachers in the Valley, equally deficient in education, and unskilled as casuists. Of the Presbyterian ministers, there were about forty, all of whom made some claim to a classical and collegiate education.

In reality the Presbyterians were far worse off in ministers than were the Baptists. Their historian, Dr. Davidson, has in no manner exaggerated the picture. He says:

Had they all been men of marked ability, devoted piety, and unblemished reputation, the salutary influence they might have exerted in moulding the character and institutions of the growing West would have been incalculable. Unhappily, with two or three shining exceptions, the majority were men barely of respectable talents, and a few above mediocrity; and so far from being patterns of flaming zeal and apostolic devotion, a dull formality seems to have been their general characteristics (Davidson, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky*).

The Presbyterian General Assembly, in 1798, describes the existing condition of the country in these terms:

Formidable innovations and convulsions in Europe threaten destruction to morals and religion. Scenes of devastation and bloodshed unexampled in the history of modern nations have convulsed the world, and our country is threatened with similar calamities. We perceive with pain and fearful apprehension a general dereliction of religious principles and practice among our fellow citizens, and a visible and prevailing impiety and contempt for the laws and institutions of religion, and an abounding infidelity, which in many instances tends to atheism itself. The profligacy and corruption of the public morals have advanced with a progress proportionate to our declension in religion. Profaneness, pride, luxury, injustice, intemperance, lewdness, and every species of

debauchery and loose indulgence abound.

There is no question that throughout the country there was much dull preaching. Extreme Calvinism had brought coldness and a decline in religious life. There was some warmth among the Methodists, which brought their preaching in sharp contrast with some others. At this time Jesse Lee was their great evangelist. He began preaching in North Carolina, but was especially drawn to New England. Dr. Joseph B. Clark, a Congregational historian, describes him as follows:

In his doctrinal teaching, Jesse Lee, the pioneer of Methodism in these parts, suited such as were of Arminian tendencies; in his fervent style of address he was acceptable to many warm hearted Calvinists tired of dull preaching! The wild enthusiasm of the Quakers had long since disappeared, and their numbers were diminishing. The martyr spirit which animated the first generation of Baptists had subsided with the removal of their *civil* disabilities, and their religious zeal suffered a proportionate decline. If Jesse Lee had not come into Massachusetts, some one else pressed in spirit, like Paul at Athens, "when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry," would have found utterance, and would have had followers.

These conditions affected every section of the country. The condition of New England is set forth by Lyman Beecher, in 1795, on the accession of President Dwight to Yale College. He says:

Before he came the college was in a most ungodly state. The college church was almost extinct. Most of the students were skeptical, and rowdies were plenty. Wine and liquors were kept in many rooms; intemperance, profanity, gambling, and licentiousness were common. I hardly know how I escaped .... Boys that dressed flax in the barn, as I used to do, read Tom Paine and believed him; I read and fought him all the way never had any propensity to infidelity. But most of the class before me were infidels, and called each other Voltaire, D'Alembert, &c. (*The Autobiography of Lyman Beecher*, I.).

The religious condition of Kentucky and Tennessee was particularly deplorable. Infidel clubs were organized, and their evil influences extended far and wide. The character of the people was described as: "Politically they

were violent and dogmatic; morally they were corrupting; and, in respect of religion, they were utterly infidel.” The legislature dispensed with a chaplain, and the university was turned over to infidel management.

The autobiography of that famous pioneer preacher, Peter Cartwright, gives a lively picture of Kentucky society, in 1793, as he remembered it in his old age. He says:

Logan county, when my father moved into it, was called “Rogues’ Harbor.” Here many refugees from all parts of the Union fled to escape punishment or justice; for although there was law, yet it could not be executed, and it was a desperate state of society. Murderers, horse thieves, highway robbers, and counterfeiters fled there, until they combined and actually formed a majority. Those who favored a better state of morals were called “Regulators.” But they encountered fierce opposition from the “Rogues,” and a battle was fought with guns, pistols, dirks, knives and clubs, in which the “Regulators” were defeated (*Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*).

At this juncture, when hope was ready to expire, an unlooked for and an astounding change suddenly took place. The event was the great revival of 1800, so called for its wide extent and influence. This extraordinary excitement was called the revival of 1800 because its remarkable developments occurred mostly at that date, though its influence covered two or three years. This revival began in Virginia, but broke out almost simultaneously in many sections of the country. The movement originated among and was largely forwarded by the Presbyterians. In Kentucky the excitement began in the Presbyterian congregation at Gasper River and extended thence to the congregations at Muddy and Red river’s, in Logan county, under the pastoral care of Rev. James McGready. This James McGready is described as one of the Sons of Thunder, a Boanerges both in manner and matter, and an uncompromising reprover of sin in every shape. The curses of the Law lost none of their severity in falling from his lips; and, like Mirabeau, the fierceness of his invectives derived additional terror from the hideousness of his visage and the thunder of his tones. He had left a congregation in Orange county, North Carolina, but a few months since, in

consequence of the odium which his unsparing censures had drawn upon him from the ungodly. Some of his former hearers having removed to Kentucky, and forwarded him an invitation to become their pastor, he resolved to accept the call; and accordingly arrived in the fall of 1796, being now about thirty-three years of age, and full of fiery zeal (Davidson).

It was not long until the effects of his impassioned preaching were visible. Regeneration, repentance and faith were his favorite topics; and an anxious and general concern were awakened among his hearers on the subject of experimental religion. The language of his sermons was often lurid. The following extracts from his sermon on “The Character, History and End of the Fool” will give some idea of his message:

Time would fail me to pursue the history of the fool through middle life, and on to old age. I must pass over a variety of occurrences in his life; how he obtained the victory over his conscience; how the Holy Spirit gave him his last call; and, when this was resisted, how he left him forever; how the Lord Jesus Christ sealed his heart under the curse, so that all the powers of heaven and earth could not open it; how he went on from sin to sin with horrid rapidity, till his cup of wrath was full to the brim, and he was ripe for hell. On these particulars I cannot dwell, I would, therefore, hasten to the end.

And suffice it to say, he died accursed of God when his soul was separated from the body, and the black flaming vultures of hell began to encircle him on every side; his conscience awoke from its long sleep, and roared like ten thousand peals of thunder; then all the horrid crimes of his past life stared him in his face in all their glowing colors; then the remembrance of misimproved sermons and sacramental occasions, flared like streams of forked lightning through his tortured soul; then the reflection that he had slighted the mercy and blood of the Son of God; that he had despised and rejected him, was like a poisoned arrow piercing his heart; when the fiends of hell dragged him into the infernal gulf he roared and screamed and yelled like a devil; when, while Indians, Pagans, and Mohametans, stood amazed, and upbraided him, falling, like Lucifer, from the meridian blaze of the Gospel and the threshold of

heaven, sinking into the liquid boiling waves of hell, and accursed sinners of Tyre, and Sidon, and Sodom, and Gomorrah, sprang to the right and the left, and made way for him to pass them, and fall lower down even to the deepest caverns in the flaming abyss—here his conscience, like a never dying worm, stings him and forever gnaws his soul, and the slightest blood of the Son of God communicates ten thousand hells in one. Now through the blazing flames of hell he sees that heaven he has lost; that exceeding great and eternal weight of glory he has sold for the devil's pottage. In those pure regions he sees his father and mother, his sisters or brothers, and those persons who sat under the same means of grace with him, and whom he derided as fools, fanatics and hypocrites. They are far beyond the impassable gulf; they shine brighter than the sun when shining in his strength, and walk the golden streets of the new Jerusalem; but he is lost and damned forever (*The Posthumous Works of the Reverend and Pious James M'Gready*, late Minister of the Gospel in Henderson, Ky., 148, 149. Nashville, Tenn., 1837).

Under such preaching as this it is no wonder that men were stirred to the depths of their souls. Among the means adopted by this zealous pastor to awaken the flock was a written covenant binding all who appended their signatures to observe a monthly fast, a twilight concert of prayer, and a sunrise concert. The year 1799 witnessed a renewal of the excitement, but it reached its height in 1800 and 1801.

In a letter to a friend, dated Logan County, Kentucky, October 23, 1801, M'Gready gives a "Narrative of the Commencement and Progress of the Revival of 1800." In the interest of historical accuracy, though a little long, the letter is here recorded, and is as follows:

But I promised to give you a short statement of our blessed revival; on which you will at once say, the Lord has done great things for us in the wilderness, and the solitary place has been made glad; the desert has rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

In the month of May, 1797, which was the spring after I came to this country, the Lord graciously visited Gasper River Congregation (an infant church then under my charge). The doctrines of *Regeneration, Faith and Repentance*, which I uniformly preached,

seemed to call the attention of the people to a serious inquiry. During the winter the question was often proposed to me, Is *Religion* a sensible thing? If I were converted would I feel it, and know it? In May, as I said before, the work began.

A woman, who had been a professor, in full communion with the church, found her old hope false and delusive—she was struck with deep conviction, and in a few days was filled with joy and peace in believing. She immediately visited her friends and relatives, from house to house, and warned them of their danger in a most solemn, faithful manner, and plead with them to repent and seek religion. This, as a means, was accompanied with divine blessing to the awakening of many. About this time the ears of all that congregation seemed to be open to receive the word preached and almost every sermon was accompanied with the power of God, to the awakening of sinners. During the summer, about ten persons in the congregation were brought to Christ. In the fall of the year a general deadness seemed to creep on apace. Conviction and conversion work, in a great measure, ceased; and no visible alteration for the better took place, until the summer of 1798, at the administration of the sacrament of the supper, which was in July. On Monday the Lord graciously poured out his *Spirit*; a very general awakening took place; perhaps but a few families in the congregation could be found who, less or more, were not struck with an awful sense of their lost estate. During the week following but few persons attended to worldly business, their attention to the business of their souls was so great. On the first Sabbath of September, the sacrament was administered at Muddy Creek (one of my congregations). At the meeting the Lord graciously poured forth his spirit, to the awakening of many careless sinners. Through these two congregations already mentioned, and through Red River, my other congregation, awakening work went on with power under every sermon. The people seemed to hear, for eternity. In every house, and almost in every company, the whole conversation with people, was about the state of their souls. About this time the Rev. J. B. came here, and found a Mr. R. to join him. In a little while he involved our infant churches in confusion, disputation, &c., opposed the doctrines

preached here; ridiculed the whole work of the revival; formed a considerable party, &c., &c. In a few weeks this seemed to have put a final stop to the whole work, and our infant congregation remained in a state of deadness and darkness from the fall, through the winter, and until the month of July, 1799, at the administration of the sacrament at Red River. This was a very solemn time throughout. On Monday, the power of God seemed to fill the congregation; the boldest, daring sinners in the country covered their faces and wept bitterly. After the congregation was dismissed, a large number of the people stayed about the doors, unwilling to go away. Some of the ministers proposed to me to collect the people in the meeting house again, and to perform prayer with them; accordingly we went in, and joined in prayer and exhortation. The mighty power of God came amongst us like a shower from the everlasting hills—God’s people were quickened and comforted; yea, some of them were filled with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Sinners were powerfully alarmed, and some precious souls were brought to feel the pardoning love of Jesus.

At Gasper River (at this time under the care of Mr. Rankin, a precious instrument in the hands of God) the sacrament was administered in August. This was one of the days of the son of Man, indeed, especially on Monday. I preached a plain gospel sermon on Heb. 11 and 16. The better country. A great solemnity continued during the sermon. After sermon Mr. Rankin gave a solemn exhortation—the congregation was then dismissed; but the people all kept their seats for a considerable space, whilst awful solemnity appeared in the countenances of a large majority. Presently several persons under deep convictions broke forth in a loud outcry—many fell to the ground and lay powerless, groaning, praying and crying for mercy. As I passed through the multitude, a woman, lying in awful distress, called me to her. Said she, “I lived in your congregation in Carolina; I was a professor, and often went to the communion; but I was deceived; I have no religion; I am going to hell.” In another place an old grey headed man lay in an agony of distress, addressing his weeping wife and children in such language as this: “We are all going to hell together; we have lived prayerless,

ungodly lives; the work of our souls is yet to begin; we must get religion, or we will all be damned.” But time would fail me to mention every instance of this kind.

At Muddy Creek the sacrament was administered in September. The power of God was gloriously present on this occasion. The circumstances of it are equal, if not superior, to those of Gasper River. Many souls were solemnly awakened; a number, we hope, converted—whilst the people of God feasted on the hidden manna, and, with propriety, might be said to sing the new song. But the year 1800 exceeds all that my eyes ever beheld on earth. All that I have related is only, as it were, an introduction. Although many souls in these congregations, during the three preceding years, have been savingly converted, and now give living evidences of their union to Christ; yet all that work is like only to a few drops before a mighty rain, when compared with the wonders of Almighty Grace, that took place in the year 1800.

In June, the sacrament was administered at Red River. This was the greatest time we had ever seen before. On Monday multitudes were struck down under awful conviction; the cries of the distressed filled the whole house. There you might see profane swearers, and sabbath breakers pricked to the heart, and crying out, “what shall we do to be saved?” There frolicers, and dancers crying for mercy. There you might see little children of ten, eleven and twelve years of age, praying and crying for redemption, in the blood of Jesus, in agonies of distress. During this sacrament, and until the Tuesday following, ten persons we believe, were savingly brought home to Christ.

In July, the sacrament was administered in Gasper River Congregation. Here multitudes crowded from all parts of the country to see a strange work, from the distance of forty, fifty and even a hundred miles; whole families came in their wagons; between twenty and thirty wagons were brought to the place, loaded with people, and their provisions, in order to encamp at the meeting house. On Friday, nothing more appeared during the day, than a decent solemnity. On Saturday, matters continued in the same way, until in the evening. Two pious women were sitting together,

conversing about their exercises; which conversations seemed to affect some of the by-standers; instantly the divine flame spread through the whole multitude. Presently you might have seen sinners lying powerless in every part of the house, praying and crying for mercy. Ministers and private Christians were kept busy during the night conversing with the distressed. This night a goodly number of awakened souls were delivered by sweet believing views of glory, fullness and sufficiency of Christ, to save to the uttermost. Amongst these were some children—a striking proof of the religion of Jesus. Of many instances to which I have been an eye witness, I shall only mention one, viz., a little girl. I stood by her whilst she lay across her mother's lap almost in despair. I was conversing with her when the first gleam of light broke in upon her mind—She started to her feet, and in an ecstasy of joy, she cried out, “O he is willing, he is willing—he is come, he is come—O what a sweet Christ he is—O what a precious Christ he is—O what a fullness I see in him—O what a beauty I see in him—O why was it I never could believe! That I never could come to Christ before, when Christ was so willing to save me?” Then turning around, she addressed sinners, and told them of the glory, willingness and preciousness of Christ, and plead with them to repent; and still this in language so heavenly, and at the same time, so rational and scriptural, that I was filled with astonishment. But were I to write you every particular of this kind that I have been an eye and ear witness to, during the two past years, it would fill many sheets of paper.

At this sacrament a great many people from Cumberland, particularly from *Shiloh* Congregation, came with great curiosity to see the work, yet prepossessed with strong prejudices against it; about five of whom, I trust, were savingly and powerfully converted before they left the place. A circumstance worthy of observation, they were sober professors in full communion. I was truly affected to see them lying powerless, crying for mercy, and speaking to their friends and relations, in such language as this: “Oh, we despised the work we heard of in *Logan*; but, oh, we were deceived—I have no religion; I know now that there is a reality in these things; three days ago I would have despised any person that would have behaved as I

am doing now; but, oh, I feel the very pains of hell in my soul.” This was the language of a precious soul, just before the hour of deliverance came. When they went home, their conversation to their friends and neighbors, was the means of commencing a glorious work that has overspread all the Cumberland settlements to the conversion of hundreds of precious souls. The work continued night and day at this sacrament, whilst the vast multitude continued upon the ground till Tuesday morning. According to the best computation, we believe, that forty-five souls were brought to Christ on this occasion.

Muddy River sacrament, in all its circumstances, was equal, and in some respects superior, to that of Gasper River. This sacrament was in August. We believe about fifty persons, at this time, obtained religion.

At Ridge Sacrament, in Cumberland, the second Sabbath in September, about forty-five souls, we believe, obtained religion. At Shiloh Sacrament, the third Sabbath in September, about seventy persons. At Mr. Craighead’s Sacrament, *congregation*, in Logan county, in October, eight persons. At Little Muddy Creek Sacrament, in November, about twelve persons. At Montgomery’s Meeting House, in Cumberland, about forty. At Hopewell Sacrament, in Cumberland, in November, about twenty persons. To mention the circumstances of more private occasions, common days preaching, and societies, would swell a letter to a volume.

The present season has been a blessed season likewise; yet not equal to last year in conversion work. I shall just give you a list of our sacraments, and the number, we believe, experienced religion at each, during the present year, 1801.

Here follows a list of the sacraments, and the statement that 144 persons professed religion. He then continues:

I would just remark that, among the great numbers in our country that professed to obtain religion, I scarcely know an instance of any that gave comfortable ground of hope to the people of God, that they had religion, and have been admitted to the privileges of the church, that have in any degree, disgraced their profession, or given us any

ground to doubt their religion.

Were I to mention to you the rapid progress of this work, in vacant congregations, carried on by means of a few supplies and by praying societies—such as Stone’s River, Cedar Creek, Goose Creek, the Red Banks, the Fountain Head, and many other places—it would be more than time, or the bounds of a letter would admit of. Mr. M’G. And myself administered the sacrament at the Red Banks, on the Ohio, about a month ago—a vacant congregation, nearly an hundred miles distant from any regular organized society, formerly a place famed for wickedness, and a perfect synagogue of Satan. I visited them twice at an early period; Mr. R. twice, and Mr. H. once. These supplies the Lord blessed, as a means to start his work and their praying societies were attended with the power of God, to the conversion of almost whole families. When we administered the sacrament among them, they appeared to be the most blessed little society I ever saw. I obtained ten elders among them, all precious Christians; three of which, two years ago were professed deists, now living monuments of Almighty Grace.

James M’Gready.

*(The Posthumous Works of James M’Gready, vii-xi).*

The first regular Camp Meeting, as has been seen, was held at Gasper River, July, 1800. Much pains was taken to advertise the meeting, and it was announced that people were expected to come and encamp on the grounds; and the whole community, and ministers especially, were earnestly invited to attend and witness the wonderful scene that was anticipated (*Methodist Episcopal Herald*, II.). Impelled by curiosity, a great concourse assembled, from distances as far as one hundred miles. A regular encampment was formed. Some occupied tents, while others slept in covered wagons. The whole was arranged to form a hollow square, the interior of which was fitted up for public worship. Near the center was the stand, a rude platform or temporary pulpit, constructed of logs, and surmounted by a hand rail. The meeting lasted four days and pungent conviction for sin was followed by relief through faith in Christ.

Barton W. Stone, then a Presbyterian minister, who was present at this meeting in Logan county, describes it as follows:

There, on the edge of a prairie in Logan county, Kentucky, the multitudes came together and continued a number of days and nights encamped on the ground, during which time worship was carried on in some part of the encampment. The scene was new to me and passing strange. It baffled description. Many, very many, fell down as men slain in battle, and continued for hours together in an apparently breathless and motionless state, sometimes for a few moments reviving and exhibiting symptoms of life by a deep groan or piercing shriek, or by a prayer for mercy fervently uttered. After lying there for hours they obtained deliverance. The gloomy cloud that had covered their faces seemed gradually and visibly to disappear, and hope, in smiles, brightened into joy. They would rise, shouting deliverance, and then would address the surrounding multitude in language truly eloquent and impressive. With astonishment did I hear men, women, and children declaring the wonderful works of God and the glorious mysteries of the gospel. Their appeals were solemn, heart-penetrating, bold, and free. Under such circumstances many others would fall down into the same state from which the speakers had just been delivered.

Two others of my particular acquaintances from a distance were struck down. I sat patiently by one of them, I knew to be a careless sinner, for hours, and observed with critical attention everything that passed, from the beginning to the end. I noticed the momentary revivings as from death. The humble confession of sin, the fervent prayer, and the ultimate deliverance; then the solemn thanks and praise to God, and affectionate exhortation to companions and the people around to repent and come to Jesus. I was astonished at the amount of gospel truth displayed in the address. The effect was that several sank down into the same appearance of death. After attending to many such cases, my conviction was complete that it was a good work—the work of God; nor has my mind wavered since on the subject. Much did I see then, that I considered to be fanaticism; but this should not condemn the work. The devil always tries to ape the works of God, to bring them into disrepute; but that cannot be a Satanic work which brings men to humble confession, to forsaking sin, to prayer, fervent praise and thanksgiving, and a

sincere and affectionate exhortation to sinners to repent and come to Jesus the Saviour.

Camp meetings once introduced, the plan spread like wild fire. One after another was held in rapid succession. The woods and paths seemed alive with people, and the number reported attending is almost incredible. The laborer quit his task; age snatched his crutch; youth forgot his pastime; the plow was left in the furrow; the deer enjoyed a respite in the mountains; business of all kinds was suspended; dwelling houses were deserted; whole neighborhoods were emptied; bold hunters and noble matrons, young women, maidens and little children, flocked to the common center of attraction; every difficulty was surmounted, every risk ventured, to be present at the Camp Meeting (McNemar, History of *the Kentucky Revival*).

The meetings were often protracted till two o'clock in the morning. Everything was done to produce boiling heat, and the "singing ecstasy" assisted in adding fuel to the fire. The number of persons who fell is estimated at 3,000. Among the most zealous advocates of the new measure, were Matthew Houston, Barton W. Stone and Robert Marshall. These men had always inclined to a fervent and excited style of preaching, and their peculiarities had gained them great popularity, and a reputation for extraordinary zeal. Houston was constitutionally of a warm and sanguine temperament; Marshall was a bold and stern enthusiast; Stone differed from them both in cooler sagacity, an appearance of tender feeling, and a bland, insinuating address; all were calculated to be leaders, as they equally loved influence and the stimulus of thronged assemblies. It is not wonderful, therefore, that, aided by the enthusiasm of the times, they succeeded in stealing the hearts of the people, even captivating by great appearance of devotion. To men so predisposed, the Camp Meeting presented precisely such a theater of operation as they desired, and everything was accordingly to their purposes.

The extravagances witnessed under animal feeling were far beyond anything ever known before and opened a new chapter in the history of the human mind. They have merited both the attention of the physician and the psychologist. These bodily exercises and the new light were of an extraordinary character. The performances have been divided into seven exercises as follows: The falling, jerking, rolling, running, dancing, barking,

and visions and trances.

“I have passed a meeting house,” says the eccentric Lorenzo Dow, “where I observed the undergrowth had been cut for a camp meeting, and from fifty to an hundred saplings were left breast high on purpose for persons who were ‘jerked’ to hold on to. I observed where they had held on they had kicked up the earth as a horse stamping flies . . . I believe it does not affect those naturalists who wish to get it to philosophize about it; and rarely those who are the most pious; but the lukewarm, lazy professor is subject to it. The wicked fear it and are subject to it; but the persecutors are more subject to it than any, and they have sometimes cursed and sworn and damned while jerking.”

After a rousing exhortation or during spirited singing, when the body was exhausted by copious weeping, one or another in the audience, sometimes to the number of scores, would suddenly fall prostrate to the ground, and swoon away. No sex or age was exempt; the young and the old, men as well as women, fell; even large, robust men, of the age of twenty, and in one instance all who fell were men. This would be accompanied by piercing shrieks. In this condition the person would lie from fifteen minutes to three hours, it is recorded in one instance that a woman did not eat or speak for nine days. During the syncope, even when conscious and speaking of religious subjects, the patient was free from pain.

Swoons and convulsive fallings have not been without precedent, but what is known as the jerks was altogether unprecedented in Christian lands. The person was instantaneously seized with spasms or convulsions in every muscle, nerve, and tendon. The head was jerked and thrown from side to side with such rapidity that it was impossible to distinguish the visage, and the most lively fears were awakened lest the neck be dislocated or the brains dashed out. Those who mocked often were stricken down.

Men would double up with their head and feet together, and roll over and over like a wheel, or turn swiftly over and over sidewise like a log. Another would take a sudden start and run with amazing swiftness as if in a race till his strength was exhausted. The dancing exercise was a later improvement; “the privilege of exhibiting by a bold faith, what others were moved to by blind impulse” (McNemar). The barks frequently accompanied the jerks, though of later origin. The exercise consisted of an individual taking the

position of a dog, moving about on all fours, snapping the teeth, and barking, with such exactness of imitation to deceive any one whose eyes were not directed to the spot. The persons frequently affected were the most cultivated and refined. Those affected by trances and who saw visions were innumerable.

Unfortunately the greatest disorders accompanied the meetings. "At first appearance," says McNemar, "these meetings exhibited nothing to the spectator but a scene of confusion that could scarcely be put into human language" (McNemar). Mr. Lyle says that "he never saw a more confused, careless audience since the world began" (Lyle, Diary). Stone's people, he says, "were wild and disorderly more than was needful." No wonder, for Stone was the ring leader in some of these meetings. While Mr. McPheeters was preaching Mr. Stone got down on his knees and began to pray, while the people observing, caught the flame, and began to pray also. In ten minutes the noise was so great that the preacher had to cease. They kept up the praying till nine o'clock. The rest of the congregation left the place in disgust (Lyle).

Meetings of this character continued for many years, and extended throughout the entire country. The following description is of a Methodist meeting in Philadelphia by an eye witness:

I went at 8 o'clock in the evening. The door was locked; but the windows being open, I placed myself at one of them, and saw that the church within was crowded almost to suffocation. The preacher indulged in long pauses, and occasionally of loud elevations of voice, which were always answered by the audience with deep groans. When the prayer which followed the sermon had ended, the minister descended from the pulpit, the doors were thrown open, and a considerable number of the audience departed. Understanding, however, that something was yet to follow, with considerable difficulty I obtained admission. The minister had departed, the doors were again closed, but about four hundred persons remained. One (apparently) of the leading members gave out a hymn, then a brother was called upon to pray; he roared and ranted like a maniac; the male part of the audience groaned, the females shrieked; a man sitting next to me shouted; a youth standing before me continued for

half an hour bawling, "O Jesus! come down, come down. Jesus my dear Jesus, I see you, bless me, O Jesus! Oh! Oh! Oh! Come down, Jesus!" A small space further on, a girl about 11 years of age was in convulsion: an old woman, whom I concluded was her mother, stood on a seat, holding her up in her arms, that her ecstasies might be visible to the whole assembly. In another place there was a convocation of holy sisters, sending forth most awful yells . . . A brother addressed them with a voice which might almost rival a peal of thunder, the whole congregation occasionally joining responsive to his notes. The madness now became threefold increased, and such a scene presented itself as I could never have pictured to my imagination, and as I trust, for the honor of true religion and of human nature, I shall never see again. Had the inhabitants of Bedlam been let loose, they could not have exceeded it. From forty to fifty were praying aloud and extemporaneously at the same moment of time; some were kicking, many jumping, all clapping their hands, and crying out in chorus, Glory (Fearson, *Narrative of a Journey*).

There were not sufficient salutary influences thrown around these meetings, it is certain. Davidson says of the meetings in Kentucky:

The late hours that were kept no doubt aided the tendency to a morbid excitement of the nervous system. They continued up, sometimes till two, sometimes till four o'clock in the morning. It was no uncommon thing to spend the whole night in these orgies. To compensate for this loss of sleep, they would deliberately spread their great coats and take a nap during the sermon. The truth seems to be, that there were no regular hours for anything, nor regular intermissions for eating and sleeping; there were no stated hours for public worship, and the meeting might be said to last day and night. Cooking, eating, sleeping and the like processes, were all going on simultaneously with the religious services.

Tradition whispers in an undertone of wild fellows from adjoining towns frequenting the camp to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the prevailing license and disorder, just as they would at a masquerade. That dissolute characters of both sexes resorted thither can easily be gathered from

those who have written upon the revival.

The question has been raised by earnest and serious men, did the revival do more good than harm? That there were evil results that came from it is beyond doubt. Aside from any disorderly elements which may be mentioned, there were sown doctrinal differences and schisms which have not been healed to this day. Out of the revival came acrimonious debates and criticisms which have not been easy to allay. There can be no question that there were numbers of genuine conversions. It slew infidelity in Kentucky. Dr. George A. Baxter, an eminent Presbyterian minister and President of Washington Academy, came to Kentucky to look into the effects of the revival. His report was most favorable: He says:

On my way to Kentucky I was informed by settlers on the road that the character of Kentucky travelers was entirely, changed; that they were now as remarkable for sobriety as they had formerly been for dissoluteness and immorality. And, indeed, I found Kentucky, to appearances, the most moral place I had ever seen. A profane expression was hardly ever heard. A religious awe seemed to pervade the country; and some deistical characters had confessed that, from whatever cause the revival might proceed, it made the people better. Its influence was not less visible in promoting a friendly temper among the people . . . . Some neighborhoods visited by the revival were formerly notorious for private animosities and contentions; and many petty lawsuits had commenced on that ground. When the parties in these quarrels were impressed with religion, the first thing was to send for their antagonists, and it was often very affecting to see their meeting. They had both seen their faults, and both contended they ought to make the acknowledgement, till at last they were obliged to request one another to forbear all mention of the past, and to receive each other as friends and brothers for the future (Baxter, *The Great Revival in Kentucky*, *The Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*, II. 354. March, 1802, Hartford).

Dr. Richard Furman, of South Carolina, was more conservative in his statement. In a letter which he wrote to Dr. Rippon, London, England, he says:

I hope the direct good obtained from these meetings will much more than counterbalance the incidental evil (Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, II.).

The extravagances above related and illustrated prevailed among the Presbyterians and with such assistance as the Methodists could afford. The Baptists profited greatly by the revival, but had little or no connection with the excitement. Lewis Collins, the historian of Kentucky, relates:

The Baptists almost entirely escaped these extraordinary and disgraceful scenes produced by the jerks, the rolling and barking exercises, etc., which extensively obtained among some other persuasions of those days. The work among the Baptists was deep, solemn and powerful; but comporting with that decency so emphatically enjoined by the scriptures (Collins, *Historical Sketches of Kentucky*).

The Baptists were great gainers by the revival and multitudes were added to the churches. "This great revival (among the Baptists) in Kentucky," says Benedict, "began in Boone county on the Ohio River, and in its progress extended up the Ohio, Licking and Kentucky rivers, branching out into the settlements adjoining them. It spread fast in different directions, and in a short time almost every part of the State was affected by its influence. It was computed that about ten thousand were baptized and added to the Baptist churches in the course of two or three years. This great work progressed among the Baptists in much more regular manner than people abroad generally supposed. They were indeed zealously affected, and much engaged. Many of their ministers baptized in a number of neighboring churches from two to four hundred each. And two of them baptized about five hundred each in the course of the revival. But throughout the whole they preserved a good degree of decorum and order" (Benedict, II.).

Collins gives a good deal of detailed information on this point. He says: "During the revival, large additions were made to the churches in every quarter of the State. The Elkhorn Association, at its annual meeting in 1801, reported an addition of 3,011 members by baptism during the current year; and in 1802, an accession of twelve churches was reported, making the whole number of members 5,300." To the South Kentucky, the accessions were almost equal to those of the Elkhorn Association. "The Tate's Creek

Association reported in 1801, the addition of 1,148 members by baptism, The Salem Association also shared largely in the blessings of the revival. It received upwards of 2,000 members.”

Dr. Spencer, the Kentucky Baptist historian, thus sums up the situation: “Among the Baptists in Northern Kentucky, where they were by far the most numerous, the revival began, and continued to its close, in a decorous, orderly manner. In the upper Green River country and East Tennessee, where the Separate Baptists were most numerous, there was more excitement, and some *falling* and *jerking*. In Middle Tennessee (then called West Tennessee), ‘the strange exercises’ did not prevail among the Baptists. In the lower Green River country, there were but few Baptists at the beginning of the revival, and we hear of no disorder among them. It is certain that the Baptists of Kentucky were generally exempt from the excesses of the great revival of 1800, that so sorely afflicted the Presbyterians. And instead of it resulting in discord, it healed the only schism there was among them.

“The revival had an especially happy effect on the Baptists, in disposing them to make more efforts to heal some unhappy divisions that existed among them, and in enlarging the spirit of missions. Hitherto their missionary operations had been confined to sending their ministers to look after their destitute brethren in Kentucky, and in the adjacent borders of Tennessee, Indiana and Ohio. But, in 1801, at the meeting of the Elkhorn Association, which comprised one-third of the Baptists in the State, and probably more than two-thirds of their wealth and influence, a request came up from the South Elkhorn. Church, ‘to send missionaries to the Indian nations’” (Spencer, *History of Kentucky Baptists*, I.).

The revival was, however, not confined to this section, but extended to every part of the Union. To the Minutes of the Georgia Association for 1803, Jesse Mercer appended the following note:

Doubtless there is a glorious revival of the religion of Jesus. The wicked of every description have been despoiled of their boasted coat of mail; even deists, who stood in the front of the battle, have had their right arm broken, their hopes disappointed, and their prognostications metamorphosed into falsehood. As the fruit of this work there have been added to the churches of the Georgia Association, more than 1,400; to those of the Sarepta, more than

1,000 a year ago, and we doubt not that number has greatly increased by this time (actually 375 had been added to the Sarepta during 1803; while for the years 1801, 1802, and 1803, there were added to the churches of the Sarepta Association, 1,803 by baptism). To those of Bethel (a South Carolina Association) more than 2,000. There is and continues a great work in some of the churches in the Hephzibah and Savannah (Associations), and is kindly in others. More than one hundred have been added to one church in the Charleston Association. We are authorized to say that, in six Associations in Kentucky, there are at least 10,000 young converts. To all of which we add that other accounts from different distant parts, verbally received, state that the Lord is doing excellent things in the earth.

There was a great awakening in the First Baptist Church, of Boston, under the pastoral care of Samuel Stillman. In the *Baptist Magazine* of 1804-5 this work is thus described:

A special seriousness made its appearance in both Baptist churches early in 1803. Its first indications were a solemn stillness, and a deep, fixed attention on the Sabbath. The work gradually continued to extend from week to week, through two or three years.

It has been unusual, during the fall, winter and spring months, while the evenings were sufficiently long, for the people to tarry after the blessing, and frequently some minister present has again addressed them. Sometimes two or three have spoken and prayed. The custom seems to arise out of the feelings of the people. They appeared loth to leave the place. There is no doubt that they would have tarried until midnight, had the exhortations been continued. The number gathered into the First Church was 127; into the second, 185. Although these two societies have been the principal sharers in this work it has not been confined to them. Persons from almost every society in town, and numbers from adjacent towns, have frequently attended on our lectures; and we have reason to believe that many have reaped saving advantages.

The work was still, and without confusion. The gospel preached was principally blessed, almost everything seemed to preach. The

converts generally had a deep sense of the depravity of their own hearts; of the infinite evil of sin, as committed against a holy God. It reclaimed the profane swearer, the gambler, and the Sabbath breaker. It made the young men sober minded.

Great revivals were experienced throughout New England. Bennett Tyler says:

Within a period of five or six years, commencing with 1797, not less than one hundred and fifty churches in New England were visited with “times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord” (Tyler, *New England Revivals*).

Ebenezer Porter, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary says:

The day dawned which was to succeed a night of more than sixty years. As in the valley of Ezekiel’s vision, there was a great shaking. Dry bones, animated by the breath of the Almighty, stood up new born believers. The children of Zion beheld with overflowing souls, and with thankful hearts acknowledged “this is the finger of God.” The work was stamped conspicuously with the impress of the Divine author, and its joyful effects no other than the agency of Omnipotence.

Edward D. Grin says:

I could stand in my door at New Hartford, Litchfield county, Connecticut, and number fifty or sixty contiguous congregations laid down in one field of Divine wonders, and as many more in different parts of New England (Sprague, *Lectures on Revivals*, Appendix).

The Cayuga Association, New York, reported, in 1802, that every church in the Association received additions to their number.

There were many notable conversions. Among this number was Samuel Mills who had much to do with the beginning of missionary operations in this country (*American Quarterly Register*, 1840, I. 346). “Taken altogether the revival period at the close of the last (eighteenth) century and the beginning of the present (nineteenth) furnishes ample materials for a long and glorious chapter in the history of redemption” (Humphrey, *Revival Sketches*). This revival brought on the great missionary era among Baptists.

## **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

McNemar, *History of the Kentucky Revival*.

Sprague, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*. Boston, 1835.

Porter, *Letters on Religious Revivals about the Beginning of the Present Century*. Boston, 1858.

## CHAPTER V

### THE RISE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AMONG AMERICAN BAPTISTS

The Opinion of Southey —The Baptists of the United States Missionary—Had Not Undertaken Foreign Mission Work—The Appeals of Carey and Others—The Contributions to India—Early Missionary Enterprises—No General Organization—The Spirit of the Times—The Congregationalists—The American Board of Commissioners—Young Men in the Andover Theological Seminary—Hall, Mills, Judson, Nott and Luther Rice—Americans Seek to Be Sent Out from England—The Missionaries Ordained—They Sail for Foreign Lands— Adoniram Judson— Studies the Subject of Baptism—Becomes a Baptist—Informs the American Board—Appeals to the Baptists—Accepted by the Baptists—Judson in Burmah—The Return of Luther Rice.

The rise and progress of the missionary spirit,” says the celebrated Dr. Southey, “which is at this time prevailing throughout the Protestant world, will be one of the most remarkable features in the history of the present age. It has not been sudden and violent, like that of the Crusades; and yet it may be doubted whether the impulse whereby that great movement was produced extended so widely through all classes of society, or was felt with equal force. Its rise was so obscure as hardly to be noticed. Little attention had been excited by the Danish missionaries; scarcely any by what the Dutch had effected in their Asiatic possessions; and the labors of the Moravians would hardly have been known beyond the bounds of their own little community, if it had not been for Crantz’s account of their extraordinary exertions in Greenland, and the entire success of that painful mission. By that book this singular labor of love was made known to a few general readers, and to what was then the still smaller number of persons who felt a religious interest in such subjects. But no general feeling was excited. The honor of giving the first impulse to public feeling belongs to the English Baptists” (*London Eclectic Review*, January, 1830). This impulse was felt by the Baptists of the United States.

The Baptists of the United States had always been missionary in their tendencies and practices. The old Philadelphia Association, and other associations in all sections of the country, had sent out missionaries: The moral purpose of the denomination was behind missionary operations and frequently money had been collected for such purposes. Missionaries duly

accredited had traveled hundreds of miles, and in their long journeys had remained for months from home.

As yet the Baptists of America had not undertaken, on their own account, any foreign mission tasks. They had no general organization, for the district association was their only unit of procedure. They had been a scattered and feeble folk, just emerging from dire persecutions, and hence had not mobilized for foreign service. But when William Carey entered India from England as a missionary there was an intense response from many Baptists in America (S. Pearce Carey, *William Carey*, New York, 1923). Some of his best friends and most ardent supporters were in this nation.

The letters and appeals of Carey, Ward, and Marshman were widely circulated, and read with deepening interest in this country. "The Star of the East," preached and published in England, in 1808, by Claudius Buchanan, the Scottish chaplain of the East India Company, who gave to the world, in 1804, the first translation of the New Testament in Persian and Hindostanese, had also stirred the souls of the lovers of Jesus all over the land. As early as 1802, the Massachusetts Missionary Society was organized to preach the gospel in new settlements of the United States, "and further if circumstances 'should render it proper.'" "Mite Societies" for missions were formed in many of the larger churches. In November, 1811, the Boston Association of Baptist ministers recommended contributions to the "Eastern Translations"; and offered to transmit funds contributed for the object. In 1812, \$4,650 was given for this purpose in Boston and Salem alone (Tupper, *Foreign Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention*).

Some of the associations immediately responded to the Foreign Mission call. The Cayuga Association, New York, in 1814, is an example. Says Belden:

At an earlier date, a strong and heartfelt sympathy for the perishing heathen had been awakened by the news which had reached this country, of the success which had crowned the efforts of "The English Baptist Missionary Society" in Bengal. In their circular addressed to the churches in 1813, one year previous to the formation of the American Board of Foreign Missions, they say,—"A flame of love seems to have been enkindled among our brethren in England, for the souls of the poor benighted Hindoos; and God in his boundless mercy, hath crowned their labors with

astonishing success; hundreds, yea thousands of those poor pagans, have, through their instrumentality, become the hopeful heirs of salvation. These will eternally sing the triumphs of sovereign grace, and adore God for sending the gospel among them. These things *animate* us, and we wish to enquire what *we have done* to send the gospel among our destitute brethren.” Thus God was preparing the hearts of his people to receive the news of those singular providences which established an American Baptist Mission in Burmah, and furnished the means which have been so successfully employed and so signally blessed in the salvation of heathen souls. And when that news arrived, Cayuga Association was among the first to offer to the Board of the General Convention, her cooperation in the great and glorious work of sending to the heathen the preached gospel (Belden, *History of the Cayuga Association*).

Robert Rallston, Esq., of Philadelphia, at one time remitted to the Baptist mission at Serampore, for himself and others, three thousand three hundred and fifty-seven dollars and sixty-three cents. Dr. Carey acknowledged the receipt of six thousand dollars from American Christians during the years of 1806 and 1807. The interest of the churches in missions to the East was also, from time to time, quickened by the arrival of missionaries from England, on their way to India, or on their return home.

Dr. Francis Wayland has given a fine summary of this period in Baptist missions. “The same spirit,” says he, “to a considerable degree, animated the Baptist churches, though their numbers were small, and their means but feeble. The Baptist Missionary Society of Massachusetts was formed in 1802. The next year, Dr. Baldwin, at the request of the society, commenced the publication of the *Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine*. This periodical had an extensive circulation throughout the Northern States. It was principally occupied by the journals of missionaries in our frontier settlements, narratives of revivals in our churches, and missionary intelligence from abroad. Dr. Baldwin was a correspondent of Dr. Carey, of Fuller, and of Ryland; and, being imbued with their spirit, he delighted to cooperate with them in spreading before his brethren the accounts which they furnished of the triumphs of the cross.

“In the year 1812, the Salem Bible Translation and Foreign Mission Society

was formed, under the fostering care of the late Dr. Bolles. This society, until the establishment of the Baptist General Convention, contributed its collections in aid of the Baptist missions in the East Indies. Nor would it be just to omit, in this place, the name of Rev. William Stoughton, D. D., pastor of the Samson Street Church, Philadelphia, and afterwards secretary of the Baptist General Convention. He had been, when in England, the friend and associate of the most efficient friends of missions there. He was in frequent correspondence with all of them and was, perhaps, the most direct channel by which their spirit was diffused among our churches. Distinguished for eloquence, varied accomplishments, and most animating views of the progress of the gospel, the triumph of the cross was always a favorite theme in his discourses. Many of our most successful ministers were his students in theology; and they imbibed in a happy degree his characteristic sentiments.

“Of course, I do not assume that the missionary spirit was at this time universal. Far from it. It is by no means universal now. Men of enlarged views, steadfast faith, and ardent piety, in various denominations, had become, to a good degree, interested in the subject of missions, and their influence was diffusing itself among the less favored brethren. The beams of the sun had only fallen upon the top of the mountains; they had not as yet rested upon the hillsides; much less had they penetrated into the valleys. But the mountain tops testified that the sun had risen.

“As yet, no general organization had been formed for carrying the gospel to the heathen. Nor is this to be wondered at. It was much less easy to form general organizations then than at present. That was not the age of steamboats, railroads, or telegraphs. Besides this, our national character has greatly changed in the course of forty or fifty years. We were then by no means conscious of our strength. There were then comparatively few things in which we had tried what we could do. This want of national confidence affected all of our public decisions, and it, of course, had its effect on our views of what was practicable in the missionary enterprise.

“In this state of public feeling, all that was wanted was the occurrence of some event which would impose the necessity of immediate action. Such an event was found in the application of the young men at Andover, to the General Association of Massachusetts, for an appointment as missionaries to the heathen” (Wayland, *Memoir of the Life and Labors of Adoniram Judson*,

I. 46-48. New York, 1860).

God was preparing in a wonderful way an opening for Baptist missions in foreign lands. The conversion of Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice to Baptist doctrines and practices was one of the most phenomenal events in all the history of missions. This foreign mission enterprise, in the United States, did not originate with the Baptists, but with the Congregationalists. How this work began in a prayer meeting of young men, how a missionary society was organized to send them out, how the money was secured for their equipment, how they were ordained, how they were called to India, and how Judson and Rice became Baptists, is one of the most thrilling stories ever told.

A part of this history has been recorded by the Congregational Board and is as follows: "The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions had its origin in a desire of several young men in the Andover Theological Seminary to preach the gospel to a heathen world. The four names appended to the memorial to the General Association of Massachusetts, which was the immediate occasion of forming the Board, were Adoniram Judson, Samuel Nott, Samuel J. Mills, and Samuel Newell. Mills is known to have come under a written pledge to engage in a mission to the heathen as early as September, 1808. He was a member of Williams College; and then and there a society was formed, through his agency, called 'The Brethren,' which had for its object 'to effect, in the person of its members, a mission or missions to the heathen.' This society was transferred, with its constitution and records, to the Seminary at Andover, in the year 1809, or early in 1810, and has continued to the present time. It is distinct from the 'Society of Inquiry respecting Missions,' though its members are of course connected with that well known and useful body. The memorialists were each from a different college; Judson being a graduate of Brown, Nott of Union, Newell of Harvard, and Mills of Williams. There is good reason for the belief that the hallowed flame in each of these brethren had not its origin in man. Mr. Nott distinctly avers that the 'starting point and early progress' of the movement in his mind, was 'without any knowledge of the existence' of those who were so soon to be his associates. He spent only one year at Andover, going thither in November, 1809. Hall, Judson, Newell, and Nott were of the class that finished its course in 1810, which was the earliest class except one in the institution. Mills was in the class of 1812. Hall was there during only a part of the last year, coming about the time of the General Association; which is

presumed to be the reason his name was not on the memorial. When Judson came to Andover in 1808, he had not attained even to a confirmed belief in Christianity; but his mind was in an inquiring state, and he soon united himself heartily with the people of God. The reading of Buchanan's 'Star of the East,' in 1809, led him to reflect upon his duty to the heathen, and in February of the next year he resolved to devote his life to a foreign mission; not then knowing that there were others in the Seminary, or even in the country, who had come to the same resolution. The memorial to the General Association was drawn up by Mr. Judson; and his standing as a scholar and great energy of character made it quite certain that he exerted a leading influence in the measures which gave occasion to the formation of the Board at this time. But the fact that the name of Mills was attached to the memorial, though he was then in the Junior class, shows that he also was acknowledged by his brethren as a leader in this movement. Such was his shrinking from the public eye, that we may believe his name was there, and third on the list, only at the earnest solicitation of all of his associates. The names of Luther Rice and James Richards were appended to the paper, but happening to stand last, 'they were struck off,' as we learn from Dr. Judson 'at the suggestion of Dr. Spring, for fear of alarming the Association with too large a number.' Rice was in the class of 1811. Richards had subscribed the pledge in Williams College as early as 1808, and was in the class of Mills both at college and at Andover. Hall was one of the ablest missionaries from the American churches. His graduation at Williams College—as was Judson's at Brown—was with the highest honors of his class. Mills was two years the junior of Hall in college; but, upon the conversion of the latter, in the third year of his course, the sagacity of that remarkable man singled him out for a foreign missionary; and so strong were Mills' convictions, that he declared Hall to be 'ordained and stamped a missionary by the sovereign hand of God.'

"In the autumn of 1809, Hall received a call to become pastor of a church in Connecticut. 'Then,' says Dr. Ebenezer Porter, who was his theological teacher in Connecticut,—'then the heart of the missionary came out.' Then was revealed the secret so long cherished between himself and his beloved brother Samuel J. Mills. These kindred spirits, associated in college, often interchanged visits afterward, mutually enkindled that holy flame which nothing but death could extinguish in their own bosoms, and which has since extended its sacred influences to so many thousands of other hearts. The

general purpose of these devoted young men was fixed. Sometimes they talked of ‘cutting a path through the moral wilderness of the West to the Pacific.’ Sometimes they thought of South America; then of Africa. Their object was the salvation of the heathen; but no specific shape was given to their plans till the formation of the American Board of Foreign Missions. Before this period the churches were asleep. Even ministers were but half-awake. To many it seemed a visionary thing in Mr. Hall, that he should decline an invitation to settle, attended by so many attractive circumstances, and so much prospect of usefulness. But I can never forget with what a glistening eye and firm accent this youthful pioneer of foreign missions, full of faith in the Holy Ghost, said, ‘No, I must not settle in any parish in Christendom. Others will be left, whose health or engagements require them to stay at home; but I can sleep on the ground; can endure hunger and hardship; God calls me to the heathen; woe to me if I preach not the gospel to the heathen.’ He went; and the day of judgment, while it tells the results of his labors, will rebuke the apathy with which others have slumbered over the miseries of dying pagans.

“The institution of the Andover Seminary, at the time the Holy Spirit was interesting the minds of graduates from different colleges in the work of foreign missions, is worthy of grateful notice. It was the only way in which they could be brought into circumstances favorable to personal acquaintance, and for associating and acting together. Nor should we omit to notice the important fact, that the missionary spirit should have been enkindled in the hearts of such men as Worcester, Spring, Evarts, and the Professors of Andover. The Seminary brought the young men where they could combine their action; and these fathers—for such they now seem, though most of them were then in the very prime of life—responded at once and cordially to their appeals. Hence the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was instituted at Bradford, by the General Association of Massachusetts, on the 29<sup>th</sup> of June, 1810. These young men and their memorial were the occasion that gave rise to the Board, but the idea and plan of it arose in other minds. The idea would seem first to have occurred to Dr. Worcester, on Wednesday morning, June 27, as he and Dr. Spring rode together in a chaise from Andover to Bradford; and the plan of it was discussed between them as they rode along. But the whole was of God, and to him be the glory.

“The Rev. Kiah Bayley, writing to the Secretaries of the Board from Vermont

in the year 1854, being then eighty-five years old, communicated the following incidents, which are worthy of preservation. He says: ‘A short time before my ordination at Newcastle, Maine, in 1797, the Rev. Alexander McLain of Bristol, had received from his friends in Scotland the sermons delivered in London by Dr. Hawies and others at the formation of the London Missionary Society. He was charmed with them, and lent them to me. I took the pamphlet to my wife, who was then at Newburyport, and she lent it to her friends, who read it with great avidity. A subscription paper was immediately issued, and a printer engaged. The work was soon in circulation. Dr. Samuel Spring and others in Newburyport caught the sacred flame. I know not that there was any other reprint of those sermons in America. Thus I have pointed out one little rill from which your society rose. There were others, no doubt, but I believe this was the leader. The sermons preached in London were sent to Scotland, and from Scotland to Maine, and from Maine to Newburyport. There the seed germinated, and the fruit will yet shake Lebanon.’”

“Messrs. Hall, Judson, Newell, and Nott completed their theological course in September, 1810, but were not able to proceed on their mission until 1812. Meanwhile, it is well known, Mr. Judson visited England to see if the London Missionary Society would arrange with the Board for a joint support of the mission; an embassy which happily failed of success. The London Directors rightly judged that two controlling powers, so widely separated, could not act with unity and decision. They also expressed the hope that as soon as the American churches became properly informed, they would furnish the means of sustaining ‘not only four, but forty missionaries.’ Those were times of non-intercourse, embargo, and commercial embarrassments in this country, and the terrible Napoleon conflicts shook the civilized world. As a passage to India seemed not likely to occur soon, Messrs. Hall and Newell went to Philadelphia, in the autumn of 1811, to pursue their medical studies. Mr. Nott has shown us two letters from Mr. Hall, setting forth the feelings of himself and associates in view of the contemplated foreign mission. The first was written on the 9<sup>th</sup> of January, 1812, and contains the following:

All hands upon deck! The Lord seems to be opening the door for us to enter speedily upon the mission. This evening I providentially fell in with Captain Cumming, of the ship *Amiable*, of this city, who told me that his vessel would be the first to sail for India, and at the middle of April at the furthest . . . It is currently reported that a

messenger has arrived in this country from England, with a proposal to rescind the Order in Council on a certain easy condition, to which it is said to be ascertained that our government will readily assent. But if this good news should not prove to be true, it is almost universally believed that, at any rate, the offending order will expire as soon as February, and the intelligent merchants here confidently believe that our commerce will be revived early in the spring. This is Mr. Ralston's opinion; he thinks we should get away in the spring. The prospect is such that no time should be lost. What will our Commissioners do? We shall immediately communicate this to Mr. Worcester and brother Judson. Let us bless the Lord and rejoice, but with trembling.

On the 13<sup>th</sup> of January he thus wrote:

I have seen Mr. Ralston today. The good man's hopes in our favor are strengthened. He has some fears. He will see the owner of the ship *Amiable*. Under present circumstances, we cannot tell when we shall return to New England. If possible, I shall remain here until the lectures are closed, which will be the last of February. We must continue here till we learn more about a voyage to India. We should not be surprised to find that the Commissioners were not able to support us, and ourselves cast on the London Society. We have too long been in suspense."

"The suspense was relieved sooner than they expected. The *Harmony*, Captain Brown, proposed sailing on short notice, from Philadelphia to Calcutta, and could take the missionaries as passengers. The narration will be continued from the statement of the Prudential Committee to the Board at its next annual meeting in September."

"In the latter part of January the resolution was taken. The ordination of the missionaries was appointed to be on the Thursday of the next week—the latest day which would leave time for them to get to Philadelphia in season. Notice was immediately given to the friends of the mission in the vicinity, and means were out in operation with all possible activity, and to as great an extent as the limited time would allow, for raising the requisite funds."

"In the meantime, Mr. Luther Rice, a licentiate preacher from the Theological Institution at Andover, whose heart had long been engaged in the

missionary cause, but who had been restrained from offering himself to the Board by particular circumstances, presented himself to the Committee with good recommendations, and with an earnest desire to join the mission. The case was a very trying one. The Committee was not invested with full powers to admit missionaries, and they still felt a very heavy embarrassment from the want of funds. In view of all the circumstances, however, they dared not to reject Mr. Rice, and they came to the conclusion to assume the responsibility, and admit him as a missionary, to be ordained with the four other brethren, and sent out with them.”

“While the preparations were making, it came to the knowledge of the Committee, that the brigantine Caravan, of Salem, was to sail to Calcutta in a few days, and could carry three or four passengers; and after attention to the subject, it was deemed advisable that two of the missionaries, with their wives, should take passage in that vessel. This lessened the great risk, and was attended with several advantages.”

“According to appointment, on the 6<sup>th</sup> of February, the missionaries were ordained at the Tabernacle in Salem. A season of more impressive solemnity has scarcely been witnessed in our country. The sight of five young men, of highly respectable talents and attainments, and who might reasonably have promised themselves very eligible situations in our churches, forsaking parents, and friends, and country, and every alluring prospect, and devoting themselves to the privations, hardships, and perils of a mission for life, to people sitting in darkness and in the region and shadow of death, in a far-distant land and unpropitious clime, could not fail deeply to affect every heart not utterly destitute of feeling. Nor less affecting were the views which the whole scene was calculated to impress of the deplorable condition of the pagan world, of the riches of divine grace displayed in the gospel, and of the obligations on all on whom this grace is conferred, to use their utmost endeavors in making the gospel universally known. God was manifestly present; a crowded and attentive assembly testified, with many tears, the deep interest which they felt in the occasion; and not a few remembered the scene with fervent gratitude, and can say, it was good to be there” (*Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, 39-44. Boston, 1862).

Such was the genesis of the foreign mission movement in the United States.

Up to this date the Baptists were not connected with the affair. But on the passage Judson availed himself of this period of leisure to investigate the scriptural authority for infant baptism. He was prompted to this course by two considerations. In the first place, he looked forward to the time when he should be surrounded by converts from heathenism. How should he treat children and servants, and did he have authority to baptize such persons? Besides this, he was going in the first instance to Serampore, to reside for a time with the Baptist missionaries. He felt the necessity of reexamining the subject, as he expected to be called upon by them to defend his belief. In this latter respect, however, he found himself singularly disappointed; for the missionaries in Serampore made no reference of the subject to their guest.

The result of the investigation was that Judson became a Baptist. Mrs. Ann Hasseltine Judson, wrote, from the Isle of France, February 14, 1813, to her parents, explaining the situation as follows:

I will now, my dear parents and sisters, give you some account of our change of sentiment, relative to the subject of baptism. Mr. Judson's doubts commenced on our passage from America. While translating the New Testament, in which he was engaged, he used frequently to say that the Baptists were right in their mode of administering the ordinance. Knowing that he should meet the Baptists in Serampore, he felt impelled to attend to it more closely, to be able to defend his sentiments. After our arrival in Serampore, his mind for two or three weeks was much taken up with missionary inquiries and our difficulties with government, as to prevent his attending to the subject of baptism. But as we were awaiting the arrival of our brethren, and having nothing in particular to attend to, he again took up the subject. I tried to have him give it up, and rest satisfied with his old sentiments, and frequently told him, if he became a Baptist, I would not. He, however, said he felt it his duty to examine closely a subject on which he had so many doubts. After we removed to Calcutta, he found in the library of our chamber many books on both sides, which he determined to read candidly and prayerfully, and to hold fast, or embrace the truth, however mortifying, however great the sacrifice. I now commenced reading on the subject, with all my prejudices on the Pedobaptist side. We had with us Dr. Worcester's, Dr. Austin's, Peter Edward's, and other

Pedobaptist writings. But after closely examining the subject for several weeks, we were constrained to acknowledge that the truth appeared to lie on the Baptists' side. It was extremely trying to reflect on the consequences of our becoming Baptists. We knew that it would wound and grieve our dear friends in America—that we should lose their approbation and esteem. We thought it probable that the commission would refuse to support us; and, what was more distressing than anything, we knew we must be separated from our missionary associates, and go alone to some heathen land. These things were very trying to us, and caused our hearts to bleed for anguish. We felt that we had no home in this world, and no friend but each other. Our friends at Serampore were extremely surprised when we wrote them a letter requesting baptism, as they had known nothing of our having had any doubts on the subject. We were baptized on the 6<sup>th</sup> of September, in the Baptist chapel in Calcutta. Mr. J. preached a sermon at Calcutta, on that subject, soon after we were baptized which, in compliance with the request of a number who heard it, he has been preparing for the press. Brother Rice was baptized several weeks after we were. It was a very great relief to our minds to have him join. Us, as we expected to be entirely alone in a mission.

Nothing remained for Judson to do but to inform the American Board of Foreign Commissioners for Foreign Missions of his change of sentiments. At the same time he addressed letters to some Baptist ministers in Boston and Salem. The following letters will explain his position:

To the Rev. Dr. Baldwin, of Boston.  
Calcutta, August 31, 1812.

Rev. and Dear Sir: I write you a line to express my grateful acknowledgments to you for the advantage I have derived from your publications on baptism; particularly from your "Series of Letters"; also to introduce the following copy of a letter which I forwarded last week to the Baptist missionaries at Serampore, and which you are at liberty to use as you think best.

I am, sir, with much affection and respect,  
Your obliged friend and servant,

Adoniram Judson, Jr.  
Calcutta, August 27, 1812.

---

To the Rev. Messrs. Carey, Marshman, and Ward:

As you have been ignorant of the late exercises of my mind on the subject of baptism, the communication which I am about to make may occasion you some surprise.

It is about four months since I took the subject into serious and prayerful consideration. My inquiries commenced during my passage from America, and after much laborious research and painful trial, which I shall not now detail, have issued in entire conviction, that the *immersion of a professing believer is the only Christian baptism*.

In these exercises I have not been alone. Mrs. Judson has been engaged in a similar examination, and has come to the same conclusion. Feeling, therefore, that we are in an unbaptized state, we wish to profess our faith in Christ by being baptized in obedience to his sacred commands.

Adoniram Judson, Jr.  
Calcutta, September 1, 1812.

---

Rev. Sir: After transmitting to the Rev. Dr. Worcester a copy of the above letter to the Baptist missionaries, I have, under date of this day, written him as follows:

Rev. and Dear Sir: My change of sentiments on the subject of baptism is considered by my missionary brethren as incompatible with my continuing their fellow laborer in the mission which they contemplate on the Island of Madagascar; and it will, I presume, be considered by the Board of Commissioners as equally incompatible with their continuing their missionary. The Board, undoubtedly, feel as unwilling to support a Baptist missionary as I feel to comply with their instructions, which particularly direct us to baptize "*credible believers with their households*."

The dissolution of my connection with the Board of Commissioners, and a separation from my dear missionary brethren, I consider most distressing consequences of my late change of sentiments, and indeed, the most distressing events which have befallen me. I have now the prospect before me of going alone to some distant island, unconnected with any society at present existing from which I might be furnished with assistant laborers or pecuniary support. Whether the Baptist churches in America will compassionate my situation, I know not. I hope. Therefore, that while my friends condemn what they deem a departure from the truth, they will at least pity me and pray for me.

With the same sentiments of affection and respect as ever,  
I am, sir, your friend and servant,  
Adoniram Judson, Jr.

---

Rev. Dr. Worcester, Corresponding Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

You will receive a letter from Dr. Marshman, accompanying this. Should there be formed, in accordance with the ideas therein suggested a Baptist society for the support of a mission in these parts, *I shall be ready to consider myself their missionary*; and remain, dear sir,

Your obliged friend and servant,  
Adoniram Judson, Jr.

---

To the Rev. Dr. Bolles, Salem, Mass.  
Calcutta, September 1, 1812.

Rev. Sir: I recollect that, during a short interview I had with you in Salem, I suggested the formation of a society among the Baptists in America for the support of foreign missions, in imitation of the exertions of your English brethren. Little did I then expect to be personally concerned in such an attempt.

Within a few months, I have experienced an entire change of sentiments on the subject of baptism. My doubts concerning the

correctness of my former system of belief commenced during my passage from America to this country; and after many painful trials, which none can know but those who are taught to relinquish a system in which they had been educated, I settled down in the full persuasion that the immersion of a professing believer in Christ is the only Christian baptism.

Mrs. Judson is united with me in this persuasion. We have signified our views and wishes to the Baptist missionaries at Serampore and expect to be baptized in this city next Lord's day.

A separation from my missionary brethren, and a dissolution of my connection with the Board of Commissioners, seem to be necessary consequences. The missionaries at Serampore are exerted to the utmost of their ability in managing and supporting their extensive and complicated mission.

Under these circumstances I look to you. Alone, in this foreign heathen land, I make my appeal to those whom, with their permission, I will call *my Baptist brethren* in the United States.

With the advice of the brethren in Serampore, I am contemplating a mission in one of the eastern islands. They have lately sent their brother Chater to Ceylon, and their brother Robinson to Java. At present, Amboya seems to present the most favorable opening. Fifty thousand souls are there perishing without the means of life; and the situation of the island is such that a mission there established might, with the blessing of God, be extended to the neighboring island in those seas.

But should I go thither, it is a most painful reflection that I must go alone, and also uncertain of the means of support. But I trust in God. He has frequently enabled me to praise his divine goodness, and will never forsake those who put their trust in him. I am, dear sir,

Yours, in the Lord Jesus,  
Adoniram Judson, Jr.

The following is an extract from a letter of Dr. Marshman, of Serampore, to Dr. Baldwin, of Boston, September 1, 1812:

A note which brother Judson sent to brother Carey last Saturday has

occasioned much reflection among us. In it he declares his belief that believers' baptism alone is the doctrine of the Scriptures, and requests to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

This unexpected circumstance seems to suggest many ideas. The change in the young man's mind, respecting the ordinance of Christ, seems quite the effect of divine truth operating on the mind. It began when no Baptist was near (on board of ship), and when he, in the conscientious discharge of his duty, was examining the subject in order to maintain what he then deemed truth on his arrival in Bengal. And so carefully did he conceal the workings of his mind from us, on his arrival, that he scarcely gave us a hint respecting them before he sent the note to brother Carey. This was not indeed very difficult for him to do, as we make it a point to guard against obtruding on missionary brethren of different sentiments any conversation relative to baptism.

This change then, which I believe few who knew brother Judson will impute to whim, or to. Anything besides sincere conviction, seems to point out something relative to the duty of our Baptist brethren with you, as it relates to the cause of missions. It can scarcely be expected that the Board of Commissioners will support a Baptist missionary, who cannot, of course, comply with their instructions, and baptize *whole households* on the parents' faith; and it is certain that the young man ought not to be left to perish for want, merely because he loved the truth more than father and mother; nor be compelled to give up missionary work for want of support therein. Now, though we should certainly interfere to prevent a circumstance like this happening, particularly as we have given our Pedobaptist brother Newell, gone to the Isle of France, an order to draw upon us should he be in distress, yet, to say nothing of the missionary concerns already lying on us, and constantly enlarging. It seems to us, though Providence itself were raising up this young man, that you might at least partake of the zeal of our Congregational missionary brethren around you. I would wish, then, that you should share in the glorious work, by supporting him. Let us do whatsoever things are *becoming*, and whatsoever things are lovely, and have the reverse of these for others. After God has thus

given you a missionary of your own nation, faith, and order, without the help or knowledge of man, let me entreat you, and Dr. Messer, and brethren Bolles and Moriarty, humbly to accept the gift.

To you I am sure I need add no more than to beg you to give my cordial love to all our brethren around you.

I may probably write you again soon, and in the meantime remain yours, in the Lord.

It was in this manner that foreign missions was thrust upon the Baptists of the United States. After many leadings the mission was established under Judson in Burmah. What the celebrated Earl of Shaftesbury said of another mission was equally true of this one. "I do not believe," said he, "that in the whole history of missions, I do not believe in the history of diplomacy, or in the history of any negotiations carried on between man and man, we can find anything to equal the wisdom, the soundness, and the pure evangelical truth of the body of men who constituted the American mission. I have said it twenty times before, and I will say it again,—that they are a marvelous combination of common sense and piety . . . There they stand, tested by years, tried by their works, and exemplified by their fruits; and I believe that it will be found that those American missionaries have done more toward upholding the truth and spreading the gospel of Christ in the East than any other body of men in this or any other age."

There must be a home base, and there was a man admirably prepared to do this work. Luther Rice had already been severely attacked with disease of the liver, and his health had become quite precarious. The views of the Baptists in this country were unknown to the missionaries, and it seemed desirable that some direct intercourse might be commenced between the parties at present personally unknown to each other. It was probable, however, that the labors of Rice might be eminently useful in awakening a missionary spirit among the churches at home. With the hope of recovering his health, and at the same time accomplishing these objects, it was deemed wise for him to return to this country. He sailed March 15, 1813, for New York by the way of St. Salvador (Wayland, I.).

## **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

S. Pearce Carey, *William Carey*. New York, 1923.

*Memorial Volume of the first Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*. Boston, 1862.

Wayland, Francis, *Memoir of the Life and Labors' of Rev. Adoniram Judson*. Boston, 1853. 2 volumes.

N. M. Williams, Theodore Parker and Adoniram Judson, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXVI. 290-314.

Letters of Dr. John Ryland to Dr. Stephen West, *Bibliotheca Sacra* XXX. 178-186. Andover, 1873.

Edward Warren Capen, The Significance of the Haystack Centennial, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LIII. 703-721. Oberlin, 1906.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Luther Rice—His Character—Kingsford's Account—Note in His Journal—Before the American Board—Appeal to the Baptists—The Savannah Baptist Society—Organization of the Triennial Convention—The Number of the Baptists Small—The Messengers—The Constitution—Dr. Furman Preaches the Sermon—Judson Accepted as Missionary—Hough and Wife Sent to India—Domestic Missions—The Program—Indian Missions—Isaac McCoy—Rice Visits the Churches—A Great Crisis—A Resume of the Work.

As yet the Baptists of the United States had not organized any general meeting. There were many hindrances in the way of such a gathering. The distances were great; much of the country was sparsely settled; the roads were often impassable; the modes of travel were slow and often dangerous; and as yet there was no commanding motive for such a body. The conversion of Judson furnished the motive, and the opening of a mission in Burma the inspiration. Under these conditions the General Convention of the Baptist denomination in the United States, generally known as the Triennial Convention, was organized.

Luther Rice, who returned to America to arouse the Baptists to the support of Judson and foreign missions, was a most remarkable man. He was not without faults, he made mistakes, but his virtues and zeal outshone them all. He has been described as follows:

By nature he was endowed with many of the essential attributes of an effective speaker. His appearance was highly prepossessing, Above the ordinary height, with a robust and perfectly erect form, there was at once produced on the mind of the beholder a most favorable impression. None could fail to entertain respect, for it was demanded by a peculiar dignity of appearance and manner. Especially was this true, when he arose in the pulpit. With a full face, and comparatively small eyes, there was sometimes rather a dull and heavy cast of countenance, which immediately changed when he became animated by speaking; his voice was clear and melodious. He had but little action, which, however, was appropriate and graceful. He was, at all times, when he addressed an assembly, remarkable for self possession. Nothing seemed capable of

discomposing his mind. Perhaps few speakers have been apparently less affected by external circumstances; whatever might be the character of the congregation, whether large or small, intelligent or ignorant, whether in the city or country, he was always distinguished for the same dignity and readiness of utterance . . . The style of Mr. Rice's sermons was, in many respects, superior. A refined, critical taste, could, perhaps, have discovered, at times, a redundancy of words and phrases; but than was no more than might have been expected from discourses which were always extemporaneous, especially when it is known that the multiplicity of other duties allowed but little time for preparation . . . The moment he began to speak, attention was roused, and uniformly the interest thus awakened was kept up throughout the services. The clearness of his conceptions, the accuracy and force of his language, and the solemn dignity of his manner, all contributed to render him one of the most interesting public speakers of our land. Occasionally, his eloquence was overpowering, particularly when he advocated the more sublime doctrines of our holy religion. Indeed, in the discussion of such topics, he may be regarded as having been most felicitous. There seems to have been a coincidence between the operations of his own mind, and those truths which, in their very nature, are vast and grand. The terribleness of Jehovah's wrath, the severity of his justice, and the rectitude of all of his decisions, were themes which gave ample scope to his vigorous intellect, and is the discussion of which, he was not only instructive, but exceedingly impressive (Taylor, *Memoir of Luther Rice*, one of the First American Missionaries of the East, 271-273. Baltimore, 1841).

A most interesting account of Rice is given by Edward Kingsford, Augusta, Georgia, December 31, 1840, describing his courage and perseverance. He says:

“Nothing but absolute necessity ever prevented him from accomplishing any purpose which he had formed in his mind, or from fulfilling an engagement he had previously made. In his numerous journeys in the South, he had frequently to cross deep and rapid streams, yet he appeared never to have been disconcerted by the threatened impediment, or deterred from making the passage,

however dangerous. At one time, on approaching a stream, he perceived by the turbid state of the water, that it could not be forded without some danger, he left the horse and sulky on the bank, and plunged into the river. Just as the water reached his neck, he found himself approaching the opposite shore; he then returned and with his horse and carriage, dashed through the foaming flood. At another time, on a similar occasion, discovering that he could not keep his books, papers, and other baggage dry, if he swam his horse and sulky through the water, he disengaged his horse from the vehicle, and with portions of his books, crossed the stream thirteen times, and then, wet as he was, pursued his journey. Once, when he came to a very deep and rapid river on which stood a mill, he called to the miller to help him over. ‘Help you over?’ said the man, with astonishment, ‘you will not be able to cross that river today.’ ‘Yes, I shall,’ said Rice, ‘if you will help me.’ Immediately alighting, he commenced operations. He first took one wheel off the sulky and carried it through the mill; he took off the other, and transported it in the same way. Afterwards, by the aid of the miller, he carried the body of the sulky through. By a number of successive trips, he conveyed over the harness and the baggage, then mounting his horse he swam him through the river, and then went on his way to secure the object to which he had devoted his life. Upon another occasion, a friend sent him in a carriage to a place where he was to be met by another; but the latter failed to meet him, he pursued his journey carrying a small trunk. A part of his journey was pursued through a long and dreary swamp. Being asked by friends, sometime after, if he did not feel afraid while passing through the swamp on foot and alone; he replied, ‘I thought of nothing except the object that was before me’” (*The Baptist Banner and Pioneer*, February 16, 1841).

Such was the man American Baptists sent forth to represent their cause. While on his voyage home, March 25, he entered the following note in his journal: “This day I am thirty years old. I renewedly give myself to the Lord, renewedly devote myself to the cause of missions, and beg of God to accept me as his, and particularly as devoted to the missionary service.” After spending two months in the city of St. Salvador, where he remarks, “the Catholic superstition was entirely predominant, forming a state of heathenism

as bad as any other,” he obtained passage to New York.

On September 15, in Boston, he appeared before the American Board of Commissioners. He laid before that body a verbal and written account of his change of sentiments and the reasons for them. He was courteous and kind but received scant recognition in return.

From henceforth Rice entered into a new relation; engaged in new, important and very laborious and responsible endeavors to awaken the Baptist churches in the United States to the desirableness and practicability of combining their energies in the cause of missions.

Everywhere the movement took form and societies for the promotion of foreign missions were constituted. The appeal of the Savannah Association, Georgia, written by Dr. W. T. Brantly, Sr., is characteristic of many others, and is sufficient, in this place, to show the spirit of the Baptists:

**THE SAVANNAH BAPTIST SOCIETY  
FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS**

*To the Inhabitants of Georgia, and the adjacent parts of South Carolina:*

Friends and Brethren—As the great family of man are connected together by the same fraternal bond, it is the high duty and interest of all of its members to use the best means in their power for the benefit of the whole. Of all those means which have been employed for that great end, none have been found so effectual as the preaching of the everlasting gospel. The obligations to contribute to its extension, therefore, must be proportionately binding.

The gospel of Christ exhibiting the most important truths and furnishing the most exalted motives for action, accurately delineating the path to pure, unalloyed happiness, and deriving its authority from Jehovah himself, produces, in its diffusion, results in relation to the benefit of man, which human sages, lawgivers and kings have for ages labored in vain to effect. Alienated from his God by sin, deprived of the favor of his Creator by apostasy, man wanders in the earth a wretched object, a forsaken rebel, a child of hell. No ray of light, no gleam of hope issues from his dark abode to point out the way to restoration, happiness and glory. No human

efforts can relieve his hopeless condition. But in the gospel of Christ the sun of righteousness is seen rising with healing under his wings. His divine rays, wherever they penetrate, scatter the mists which overwhelm man in despair. These discover to him the way of deliverance and joy, and lead to the portals of bliss. On a great part of the earth, these rays have fallen with happiest effect, illuminating the extensive regions, turning their inhabitants from darkness to light, and preparing them for immortal felicity. But a far greater part of the earth remains unvisited by these beams, and consequently continues in darkness, and sees no light. But this part waits their appearance, and shall not wait in vain. The time approaches when those who have long sat in the region and shadow of death, shall have light to spring up unto them. The sun of righteousness shall diffuse among them the beams of light, and the whole earth shall be full of his glory.

Late events in divine providence prove, with convincing testimony, that this time fast approaches. Wars and rumors of wars, the overturning of nations, the rapidly increasing destruction of the Man of Sin, and the growing spread of divine truth—events predicted by the prophets, and represented by them as preclusive to the general diffusion of the gospel—clearly show that the universal triumph of Christ, the King of Zion, is not far distant. What deserves particular notice in this view, is the missionary spirit which, within a few years past, has been kindled with enthusiastic ardor in Europe, at the altar of divine love. Under its influence great things have been attempted and performed in idolatrous nations.

America, catching the same hallowed spirit, has been animated to similar exertions. Besides many societies formed for missionary efforts in this country, one, to the immortal honor of our Congregational and Presbyterian brethren, has been organized by them, of considerable extent and importance. Under their patronage, missionaries have been sent out for the purpose of effecting establishments in the East, for the diffusion of the gospel among the heathen tribes. That our brethren of these denominations should not be alone, in this great work, God, in the arrangement of infinite wisdom, has been pleased to bring some of their missionaries over

to the Baptist persuasion. These, still desirous of pursuing their generous, disinterested career, for the benefit of the heathen, now present themselves to the American Baptists for support. And shall they present themselves in vain? Friends and brethren, can the finger of divine providence, so evidently marking out the path for us, be mistaken? Can the Lord's will, so clearly made known in this dispensation, be misinterpreted? Surely not! It cannot be! If then, it be the high duty and interest of the great family of man to promote each other's happiness, and the benefit of the whole, and that it cannot be denied; and if the diffusion of the gospel of Christ be the most effectual means of securing those objects—a truth that must be admitted; then it is undoubtedly our duty and our interest to embrace the present auspicious moment, and engage in joyful haste and determined energy in the great work of evangelizing the poor heathen.

Since the secession of our dear brethren, Rice, Judson and lady, the individuals alluded to above, several missionary societies have been formed by the Baptists of America. These societies have for their object the establishment and support of foreign missions; and it is contemplated that delegates from them all will convene in some central situation in the United States for the purpose of organizing an efficient and practicable plan, on which the energies of the whole Baptist denomination, throughout America, may be elicited, combined and directed, in one sacred effort for sending the word of life to idolatrous lands. What a sublime spectacle will the convention present! A numerous body of the Lord's people, embracing in their connection from 100,000 to 200,000 souls, all rising in obedience to their Lord, and meeting by delegation, in one august assembly, solemnly to engage in one sacred effort for effectuating the great command: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

What spectacle can more solemnly interest the benevolent heart! What can be more acceptable to our heavenly Father! We invite you, dear friends, and brethren—we affectionately and cordially invite you—to embrace the privilege of uniting in so glorious a cause, so divine a work. God has put great honor upon us in giving us so

favorable an opportunity of coming up “to the help of the Lord against the mighty.” In doing so, he has conferred on us a distinguished privilege. Shall we be insensible to the honor? Shall we disregard the privilege? God forbid! Living in a country whose generous soil yields, with moderate industry, more than a sufficiency of the comforts of life, and professing, in great numbers, to be redeemed from our iniquities, our obligations to exert ourselves for the benefit of our race and the glory of God, are great indeed. O let us feel, impressively feel, the force of these obligations and act correspondingly with them! And we trust, in our attempt to act in this manner, no sectarian views, no individual prejudices, no party considerations, will have leave to operate any unfriendly influence upon a design conceived in disinterested benevolence, and having for its object the good of man and the honor of his Creator.

Connected with this address to you, friends and brethren, is the constitution on which our society is organized. According to this, you may either become members with us, or donors, or both. In either character we will cheerfully receive your aid; and, in both, we hope to have the pleasure of ranking great numbers of you.

Wishing you grace, mercy and peace, we remain affectionately, your servants in the gospel, for Christ’s sake.

William B. Johnson, *President*,

William T. Brantly, *Corresponding Secretary*.

Savannah, 17<sup>th</sup> December, 1813.

A meeting of a few leading brethren was held in Boston early in the autumn of 1813, to consult on the best course to pursue. At first, it was thought advisable to make the Boston society—formed in consequence of Judson’s change of sentiments, under the broad name of “The Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel in India and other Foreign Parts,” and which had already assumed the support of the Judsons—the parent institution, to which all others should become auxiliary (Daniel Sharp, *Sketch of the Origin and Progress of the Triennial Convention, The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record*, February, 1842. I. 33).

Rice succeeded, however, in modifying this plan to the effect that a meeting of delegates from all parts of the country should be called at some central

point as soon as practicable, to form an organization for conducting missionary operations on a more enlarged scale. With the concurrence of the brethren in the vicinity of Boston he devoted himself, during the remainder of the autumn and the ensuing winter and spring, to preparing the way for the contemplated meeting. For this purpose he visited successively New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Charleston and Savannah, together with most of the prominent towns in the southern States especially, and met with encouraging success. The brethren whom he consulted were almost unanimously desirous of a denominational movement and organization in favor of missions. His personal labors, and very extensive correspondence, resulted in the meeting of delegates from eleven States and the District of Columbia, in Philadelphia, on May 18, 1814; where, after mature deliberation, The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States was duly organized, to be regularly convened once in three years. On this account it was called the Triennial Convention (Barnas Sears, Memoir of Luther Rice, *The Christian Review*, VI. 337, 338. September, 1841).

In 1814, there were known to exist, in the United States, less than 120 Baptist associations, containing about 2,000 churches, 1,500 ministers, and 160,000 communicants. There were in 1820 a population in this country of 9,637,119.

Of this important general organization, the first among the Baptists of America, Richard Furman, of South Carolina, was chosen President, and Thomas Baldwin, of Massachusetts, Secretary. The following delegates were enrolled, the “geographical situation” being kept in view:

*State of Massachusetts —*

Rev'd Thomas Baldwin, D.D.

Revd Lucius Bolles, A.M.

*State of Rhode Island —*

Rev'd Stephen Gano, A.M.

*State of New York —*

Rev'd John Williams. Mr.

Mr. Thomas Hewett.

Mr. Edward Probyn.

Mr. Nathaniel Smith.

*State of New Jersey —*

Rev'd Burgiss Allison, D.D.  
Rev'd Richard Proudfoot.  
Rev'd Josiah Stratton.  
Rev'd William Boswell.  
Rev'd Henry Smalley, A.M.  
Mr. Matthew Randall.  
Mr. John Sisty.  
Mr. Stephen Ustick.

*State of Pennsylvania —*

Rev'd William Rogers, D.D.  
Rev'd Henry Holcombe, D.D.  
Rev'd William Stoughton, D.D.  
Rev'd Wm. White, A.M.  
Rev'd John Peckworth.  
Rev'd Horatio G. Jones, A.M.  
Rev'd Silas Hough.  
Rev'd Joseph Mathias.

*State of Delaware —*

Rev'd Daniel Dodge.

*State of Maryland —*

Rev'd Lewis Richards.  
Rev'd Thomas Brooke.

*District of Columbia —*

Rev'd Obadiah Browne (not present).  
Rev'd Wm. Gilmore (not present).  
Rev'd Luther Rice.

*State of Virginia —*

Rev'd Robert B. Semple.  
Rev'd Jacob Grigg.  
Rev'd John Bryce (not present).

*State of North Carolina —*

Rev'd James A. Ranaldson.

*State of South Carolina —*

Rev'd Richard Furman, D.D.

Hon. Matthias Tallmadge.

*State of Georgia —*

Rev'd W. B. Johnson.

The Constitution was discussed at great length and was finally adopted as follows:

We the delegates from Missionary Societies, and other religious Bodies of the Baptist denomination, in various parts of the United States, met in Convention, for the purpose of carrying into effect the benevolent Intentions of our Constituents, for organizing a plan for eliciting, combining and directing the Energies of the whole Denomination in one sacred effort, for sending the glad tidings of Salvation to the Heathen and to nations destitute of pure Gospel light, do agree to the following Rules of fundamental Principles, viz.:

**I.** That this body shall be styled “The General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America, for Foreign Missions.”

**II.** That a triennial Convention shall, hereafter, be held, consisting of Delegates, not exceeding two in number, from each of the several Missionary Societies, and other religious bodies of the Baptist Denomination, now existing, or which may be hereafter formed in the United States, and which shall each, regularly contribute to the general Missionary Fund, a sum, amounting to at least one hundred Dollars, per annum.

**III.** That for the necessary transaction and dispatch of business, during the recess of the said Convention, there shall be a Board of twenty-one Commissioners, who shall be members of the said Societies, Churches, or other religious bodies aforesaid, triennially appointed, by the said Convention, by ballot, to be called the

“Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States”; seven of whom shall be a quorum for the transaction of all business; and which Board shall continue in office until successors be duly appointed; and shall have power to make and adopt by-laws for the government of the said Board, and for the furtherance of the general objects of the Institution.

**IV.** That it shall be the duty of this Board, to employ Missionaries, and, if very, to take measures for the improvement of their qualifications; to fix on the ‘Field of their Labours, and the compensation to be allowed them for their services; to superintend their conduct, and dismiss them, should their services be disapproved; to publish accounts, from time to time, of the Board’s Transactions, and as annual Address to the public; to call a special meeting of the Convention on any extraordinary occasion, and, in general, to conduct the executive part of the missionary concern.

**V.** That such persons only as are in full communion with some regular Church of our Denomination, and who furnish satisfactory evidence of genuine Piety, good Talent, and fervent Zeal for the Redeemer’s Cause, are to be employed as Missionaries.

**VI.** That the Board shall choose by ballot, one President, two Vice Presidents, a Treasurer, a Corresponding, and a Recording Secretary.

**VII.** That the president, or in case of his absence or disability, the senior vice-president present, shall preside in all meetings of the Board, and when application shall be made in writing, by any two of the members, shall call a special meeting of the Board, giving’ due notice thereof.

**VIII.** That the treasurer shall receive and faithfully account for all the moneys paid into the treasury, keep a regular account of receipts and disbursements, make a report thereof to the said Convention, whenever it shall be in session, and to the Board of Missions annually, and as often as by them required. He shall also, before he enters on the duties of the office, give competent security, to be approved by the Board, for the stock and funds that may be committed to his care.

**IX.** That the corresponding secretary shall maintain intercourse by

letter with such individuals, societies, or public bodies, as the interest of the institution may require. Copies of all communications made by the particular direction of the Convention or Board, shall be by him handed to the recording secretary, for record and safe keeping.

**X.** That the recording secretary shall, ex-officio, be the Secretary of the Convention, unless some other be by them appointed in his stead. He shall attend all the meetings of the Board, and keep a faithful record of their proceedings, and of the transactions of the Convention.

**XI.** That in the case of the death, resignation, or disability of any of its officers, or members, the Board shall have power to fill such vacancy.

**XII.** That the said Convention shall have power, and in the interval of their meeting the Board of Commissioners, on the recommendation of any one of the constituent bodies belonging to the Convention, shall also have power, to elect honorary members of piety and distinguished liberality, who, on their election, shall be entitled to a seat, and take part in the debates of the Convention; but it shall be understood that the right of voting shall be confined to the delegates.

**XIII.** That in the case any of the constituent bodies shall be unable to send representatives to the said Convention, they shall be permitted to vote by proxy, which proxy shall be appointed by writing.

**XIV.** That any alterations which experience may dictate from time to time, may be made in these Articles, at the regular meeting of the Convention, by two-thirds of the members present.

Three of the delegates were from New England, twenty-one from the Middle States, seven from the Southern States, and Luther Rice from the District of Columbia. Dr. Furman preached the sermon from Matthew 28:20. A Board of twenty-one members was selected, and Dr. Baldwin became its president. Luther Rice was “appointed, under the patronage of this board, as their Missionary, to continue his itinerate services, in these United States, for a reasonable time; with a view to excite the public mind more generally, to

engage in Missionary exertions; and to assist in organizing Societies, or Institutions, for carrying the Missionary design into execution” (Minutes of the Meeting).

Joseph Mathias, a messenger to the initial meeting of the Triennial Convention, has left some interesting reminiscences. He says:

As it was my province to preach the introductory sermon at the opening of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, in October, 1813, by previous appointment, I went early to the city and called upon Dr. Holcomb, the pastor of the first Baptist church (at whose meeting house the association was to assemble), and while there, brother Luther Rice came in, an entire stranger, presented to Dr. H. some letters of introduction from brethren in Boston, New York, &c., by which he was recognized and fraternally received. He accompanied us to the meeting, was introduced to the brethren, and at a suitable time addressed the association, stating the change of his views, with respect to the ordinance of baptism, as well as those of his brother Judson and wife; his motives for returning from the East, which were particularly to elicit the patronage of the Baptists in the United States in the cause of Foreign Missions, and to take immediate measures for sustaining brother Judson, and wife in the foreign field, &c. His address was listened to with deep interest, and his pungent appeal was not made in vain. A large committee was appointed, of whom your correspondent was one, to adopt measures to facilitate the formation of a Society for Foreign Missions. That committee soon met, a society was auspiciously formed, and delegates were appointed to meet delegates from other societies in a convention, that was expected soon to be called. It is among my happy reminiscences, that I was numbered among the delegates of that Convention, which met May 18<sup>th</sup>, 1814. I saw the first movements of that body in the appointment of the President and Secretary; the selection appeared to augur favorably; that brethren from the South and North, and whose spheres of labor were near a thousand miles apart, should be unanimously called, and with one consent should sit so near together, as the united organ of that body. Assemblages of people are generally adjudged to be large or small by comparison. At that period, so many ministering and other brethren, from eleven

different states, meeting together to adopt measures and to mature plans relating to the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, was reckoned large and propitious; but convocations of a more recent date, consisting of four or five hundred, and in some instances of a thousand and upwards, from a score or more of these United States, having in view the moral and religious state of the community, gives to that meeting rather a withering appearance; but when we consider, that though it was, in its incipient state; its deliberations, resolutions, and subsequent action, awoke many from their slumbers, and has elicited the prayers, the concentrated energies and talents, as well as the liberality of thousands in the great and noble enterprise; we may therefore contemplate that Convention as the pivot upon which the great wheel has revolved, grasping within its extensive circle, both by its centripetal and centrifugal effects, an influence and sympathy that has already astonished even the most sanguine, and which, under the blessing of God, shall continue to revolve through succeeding generations, until every nation, "who see the light and feel the sun," shall be brought under the sweet and benign influence of the irradiating beams of the Son of Righteousness, through the instrumentality of the blessed gospel, "which brought life and immortality to light, and which shall be published in every land."

At the morning session of the first day, Dr. Furman was requested to preach that evening upon the occasion. He complied. His text was Matthew 28:20—"And, lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (*The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle*, 191, 192. June, 1842).

The following interesting table illustrates the progress of the Triennial Convention:

<i>Members</i>					
	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Pres</i>	<i>States Rep.</i>	<i>Convention Sermon</i>
1	Philadelphia	1814	33	11	Dr. Furman
2	Philadelphia	1817	40	13	Dr. Baldwin

3	Philadelphia	1820	53	13	O. B. Brown
4	Washington.	1823	51	10	Dr. Stoughton
5	New York.	1826	72	12	Dr. Mercer
6	Philadelphia	1829	66	11	Dr. Sharp
7	New York.	1832	122	15	Dr. Wayland
8	Richmond.	1835	119	21	Dr. S. H. Cone
9	New York.	1838	163	16	B. Stow
10	Baltimore.	1841	261	21	R. Fuller
11	Philadelphia	1844	460	21	Dr. S. W. Lynd

It was also determined that Adoniram Judson, “now in India, be considered as a Missionary, under the care and direction of this Board; of which he shall be informed without delay: That provision be made for the support of him and his family accordingly; and that one thousand dollars be transmitted to him by the first safe opportunity: That the Secretary of the Particular Baptist Society, for Missions in England, be informed of this transaction; and that this Board has assumed the pledge given by the Boston Mission Society, to pay any bills which may be drawn on them, in consequence of advances made in favor of Mr. And Mrs. Judson” (Minutes of the Meeting of the Baptist Board, 13). Burma was chosen as the field of operation and “Mr. Rough, who was twenty-eight years of age, a native of Winsor, Vt., and a member of the Baptist church at Pawtucket, R. I.,” was sent out to assist Judson in the mission (The First Annual Report of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, 28. Philadelphia, 1815) . At the time this report was made the Board had not as yet heard from Judson.

A very timely caution is given in the second annual report as follows:

An error against which it becomes the friends of missions carefully to guard, is the expectation that their plans and contributions shall *immediately* produce great and animating effects. A language, and in

some instances a very difficult one, is to be acquired, before a Missionary can begin his labors; when they are commenced, it is merely the seed time, not the harvest. A minister of Jesus introduced among the heathen, is placed in circumstances peculiarly delicate. When he observes their attachment to superstitions which have obtained sanction in the minds of idolaters by the approbation of ages, and of thousands of their populace, their priests and their philosophers; a sense of his own insufficiency, the temptations of the adversary, and the occasional assaults of unbelief, to which the best of men are subject may often originate despairing sentiments. Should he at any time express them, the sympathies of the disciples of Christ ought to be called into exercise. It were foolish and cruel to conclude a station untenable, or an adventure abortive, because existing aspects may have created temporary dismay; and still more so to censure a Missionary for having not done what God alone can accomplish. The kingdoms of this world must become the Lord's. Burma shall assuredly bow to the Messiah as shall the United States, or Europe, or Hindoostan. God, in his providence, opens channels for the diffusion of his gospel; and in ways, transcending all human calculations, levels mountainous impedimenta into plains. The Moravian Missionaries laboured long without any visible fruit. At the expiration of six years the Baptist Missionaries in Bengal were not satisfied that a solitary native had been converted to Christ (The Second Annual Report of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, 59, 60. Philadelphia, 1816).

At first the duties of this Board were confined to foreign missions; but at the Convention of 1817 the following provision was added in regard to Domestic Missions:

That the Board of Foreign Missions for the United States, have full power at their discretion to appropriate a portion of the funds to domestic missionary purposes, in such parts of the country where the seed of the Word may be advantageously cast, and which mission societies on a small scale do not effectively reach (Minutes of the Convention for 1817, 131).

As a result of this action of the Convention the following program was

inaugurated by the Board in the appointment of a number of missionaries:

Resolved, That the Board contemplates, with deep concern, the miserable condition of the various tribes of Indians on our continent; that they regard a favorable indication in Providence, the anxious solicitude which many, particularly is the neighborhood of the Indians, manifest for introducing the Gospel among them; that the Board will avail itself of the earliest opportunity, when any suitable person or persons shall offer for the service, to make a vigorous effort in relation to some of the tribes; and that, pursuant to this determination, the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to write to the Rev. Humphrey Poesy, from whom some interesting information has been already received, to learn of him still further views, particularly in relation to the Cherokees, in whose neighborhood he has resided, whether he would be willing to labour among them, and if so, what plan of operation would he suggest as most eligible, and what support would be requisite.—Also, that the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to write to the Corresponding Secretary of the Sarepta Mission Society on this subject, and to any others from whom he may judge important information may be obtained.

Application was made on the part of the Rev. Messrs. John M. Peck, and James E. Welsh, for an appointment to a Western mission, having reference ultimately to the Western Indians. This application was accompanied with a statement by their tutor, the Rev. Dr. Stoughton, much in favor of their religious character and deportment while members of his family; and of their talents and acquirements for the sacred ministry, which was highly satisfactory to the Board.

Resolved, unanimously, That the said brethren, James E. Welsh and John M. Peck, be accepted as missionaries of this Board; that they be instructed to proceed, as soon as convenient, to the westward, with a view to commence their labors at St. Louis, or the vicinity, in the Missouri Territory; that 1,000 dollars be placed in their hands, to assist them in going with their families to St. Louis, and to support them in the commencement of their missionary exertions; that they be authorized and requested to make collections of money, and of books, as opportunities offer, with a view of aiding the Western

mission, and give an account of the same to the Board; that they be instructed also to make inquiries, after arriving in the missionary field, relative to the native tribes in that quarter; and that, on the ensuing Sabbath, they be solemnly set apart to the service of the said Western mission.

Resolved, That the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to write to the Rev. Isaac McCoy, informing him of the designation of the two brethren to missionary service in St. Louis, and the surrounding country, for which station they have been for a considerable time preparing; that his application has been received by the Board with emotions of pleasure and satisfaction; and that they request him to inform them whether there is not in that quarter, and perhaps nearer to Vincennes than is St. Louis, some other station in which a missionary is equally needed, and in which he would be willing to labor.

Also, that the Corresponding Secretary be requested to write to the Rev. John Young, of Kentucky, in reply to his letters, informing him, that on applying to the committee for the Western section of our country, appointed for the examination of applicants for missionary service, should he think proper to do so, they will make such a representation of the case to the Board as their piety and prudence may dictate, and to which the Board will find pleasure in paying the earliest attention.

A letter from the Rev. James A. Ranaldson at New Orleans, in which he signifies a willingness to accept a missionary appointment in that quarter, where, it appears, an extensive field for missionary labour calls for the hand of cultivation, was taken into consideration. The case of Mr. Ranaldson was also recommended by a letter from the Rev. William B. Johnson.

Resolved, unanimously, That the Rev. Mr. Ranaldson be employed as a missionary of this Board in New Orleans and its vicinity; and that he be requested to visit such of the Indian tribes in that quarter as he has referred to in his letter, and others if he can; and inquire into the practicability of establishing schools among them; and that 500 dollars be forwarded to his assistance (Minutes of the

Convention for 1817, 140, 141).

In this manner the Convention began labor among the Indians and the whites on both sides of the Great River. The home work done by the Board was never quite satisfactory. In the Life of Spencer H. Cone, by his two sons, McCoy has been thus described: "Isaac McCoy was one of the most lovable men we ever had the happiness to be acquainted with. Living his whole life among the wild Indian tribes, and wilder frontiersmen; living a life of exposure, vicissitude and hardships scarcely to be described; always in the saddle or the camp, and every day risking life and limb to preach the gospel amongst those whom all the rest of the world seemed to conspire to destroy or forget—his mind and manners, instead of becoming rude or hard in these rough uses and associations grew, all the while, softer, holier, and more loving. Nothing could be finer than his manners. Never familiar, and carrying in his quiet eye an indescribable something which prevented anyone from ever being familiar with him, he never repelled. On the contrary, he attracted; children loved him. Men were compelled to feel, in his company, that they were near something good, kind and noble. The warm coloring of the heart tinged his words and manners, quiet as they were, in everything he did or said. If you had done anything true or good you knew he loved you for it. When he looked at you, you felt that there was no selfish thought or scheme working in his mind; but that he was thinking what he could do for your benefit or happiness, or for the benefit of some poor soul that was in need of others' help and kindness" (Walter N. Weyth, *Isaac McCoy and Early Indian Missions*, 233, 234. Philadelphia, 1895). For the poor Indians he did a monumental work.

For a whole year after the formation of the Convention Rice visited the churches, associations, and missionary anniversaries in the northern and eastern States. At the same time he carried on an active correspondence with leading brethren throughout the country. The next year, 1815-16, he spent in a similar manner in the southern and western States. From his annual report to the Board in 1817, a single sentence will show his toil: "In fifteen weeks, besides traveling more than 3,300 miles and attending the North Carolina General Meeting of Correspondence, a yearly meeting in Virginia, a meeting of the Kentucky Baptist Mission Society, and assisting the formation of a mission society in Tennessee; a kind Providence has enabled me to visit fifteen associations, spread through Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee,

Mississippi Territory, the Carolinas and Georgia, securing at each association a public collection to aid the missionary funds, and the adoption of a plan of regular intercourse and correspondence with the Board.” In ten months his collections had amounted to more than ten thousand dollars. The receipts of the Board for that year were about double their expenditures; and looking at their position with the advantage of all the light it would have been deemed best for Rice to have returned to India (*The Christian Review*, VI.).

By the year 1824 the missionary enterprise reached a crisis; and the Board was critically involved in debt. Its affairs were badly entangled with those of Colombian College. The Convention in 1826 cut loose from the college. The Board had already been removed to Boston, and avowedly determined to pursue work only among the heathen. Some of the difficulties are thus recorded in the report of the Board for 1826 to the Triennial Convention:

The Committee to whom was entrusted, since October, 1824, the care of the Foreign Missions, entered upon their duties without delay, and they trust, with a measure of prayerful dependence upon divine aid. They found, as they expected, from the state of your treasury, the spirit of Missions in the churches, very low. They forbear to go into detail of the circumstances which have contributed to this result, and will rather dwell on the measures adopted to remedy the evil. These have been limited in their application, not of choice, but of necessity. But a few of the means of which they wished to avail themselves, were in their power. They could secure but little of the aid which is derivable from discreet and active Agents. They could not at once address themselves to all those whose cooperation was desired, by means of periodical publications, for by many of them these were neither taken nor read. They were not sure of the concurrence of even their ministering brethren, for some of them yet remain to be satisfied of their duty to be workers together with Christ, in sending the gospel to the heathen, But by these considerations your Committee was not discouraged. If they could not accomplish all that was desirable, they were willing to attempt what was practicable. They were also willing to exercise patience and charity toward their brethren, who took no part in the benevolent operations of the day, believing that when more information of the actual state of things was diffused among them,

they would come up to the help of the Lord. As then they could make but limited efforts, they deemed it their duty to direct these first, to places nearest to them, and as effectually as possible, to secure the grounds passed over. They digested and caused to be printed, a plan for the information of Societies, such as they thought would prove convenient in all parts of the country. Upon this plan they have acted in their own country. Upon this plan they have acted in their own churches, and have been seconded with the best effect by many ministers and churches in Massachusetts. The same has been done and with similar success in the State of Maine, and they indulge the hope that the system may prevail through the country. By these measures, together with sums which have come into the treasury from older establishments, they have been able to meet the wants of the Missions abroad, and have ascertained to their satisfaction, that provided the moneys be discreetly and faithfully applied, the churches will be disposed to furnish all that will be necessary to a vigorous prosecution of the objects in hand (Minutes of the Convention for 1826, 8, 9).

The foreign work and liabilities of the Baptist General Convention, April 1, 1846, were as follows: Missions, 16; stations and out-stations, 143; missionaries and assistants, 99, of whom 42 are preachers; native preachers and assistants, 155; churches, 82; members of churches, 5,373, including 604 baptized the previous year; schools, 54; and pupils in attendance, 2,000. Receipts, \$100,219.94, including \$29,203.40 toward the debt. Remainder old debt, \$10,985.09. Total liabilities, \$34,835.09.

Two hundred fifty-seven missionaries had been sent into the field, 213 from the north and west, and 23 from the south; the others, not of this country. The contributions to the Triennial Convention from 1814 to 1845 were \$874,027.92.

The Memorial of August, 1846, referring to the south, used this language: "In thirty-three years of the operations of our Foreign Mission organization, the slave holding States have paid into the common treasury \$215,856.28, or less than one-fourth of what has been contributed for this object."

## **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Proceedings of the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States at their various meetings.

The Annual Reports of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions of the United States.

*The Latter Day Luminary*; by a Committee of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States. February 18, 1818, to November, 1825. 6 volumes.

Isaac McCoy, *History of Baptist Indian Missions*: embracing remarks on the former and present Condition of the Aboriginal Tribes; their Settlement within the Indian Territory, and their future Prospects. Washington, 1840.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE ANTI-EFFORT SECESSION FROM THE BAPTISTS

The Rise of the Division—The Rancor of the Discussions—The Misunderstandings—Opposition to Missions—To Education—Masonry—Drinking—“Old School Baptists”—The Opposition Widespread—Beebe in *The Signs of the Times*—Tennessee—Arkansas—Kentucky—Hill Grove Church—Otter Creek Association—Georgia—Hepzibah Association—Yellow River—Flint River—Alabama—Virginia—Reasons for the Divisions—State of Religion—John Taylor—Samuel Trott—Daniel Parker—Illinois—Peck and Parker—Indiana—Texas—Sad Results.

Contemporaneous with the formation of the Triennial Convention there began among some Baptists an aggressive campaign against missions, education, Sunday schools, and indeed almost everything that organization fostered. The history of the Baptists of that period would be incomplete which did not give an account of the anti-effort secession variously called anti-missions and hardshellism. One can hardly, in this day, understand the rancor of speech which prevailed for years in many of the churches, and most of the early associations.

This was largely true of all parties. For example, Rockwood Giddings, who was, at one time, President of Georgetown College, said of the editor of *The Signs of the Times*, the anti-effort publication: “His examination was published in the *Signs of the Times*; a paper which is read by but few respectable people, and still fewer who are capable of *appreciating* sound arguments, when they are presented to them. Indeed, Mr. Trott, in that paper reminds me forcibly of a rather factious couplet which Mr. Wesley’s clerk is said to have read to the congregation, with the old-cast-off-wig of his master on his head—

*‘Like an owl in ivy bush,  
That fearsome thing I am’*

I have therefore no disposition to enter the ‘bush’ with him; and shall for the present dismiss him and his writings with a few remarks” (*The Baptist Banner*, January 9, 1838. IV. 2). This is rather a mild sample of things which were said.

Ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstandings were the fruitful source of many of these denominational dissensions. The following is a fair representation of many other letters written by William Hays, Weakley county, Tennessee, in

1838, and published in *The Old Baptist Banner*:

I am certainly glad of the alternative of your paper, as I think it will be of benefit to some of us Old School Baptists in the west, where the floodgates of iniquity and Arminianism are open; and the hideous roar of the lion of the tribe of serpents is heard; together with the missionary éclat which is so clearly adverse to the gospel and the church of God; and whose operations have been simultaneous since their model was set up at Mill Creek in this State. But modernism, in these days, especially in theology, has become most desirable with many, notwithstanding the opposition of such things so fully and clearly developed in the book of God, according to my understanding; as such, I am opposed to any, and all such errors, for the following reasons: Phantasm is not to be depended on in matters of indemnity, though preponderance of authority may, &c.

While there was great opposition to missions, which gradually augmented as time went on, there was, if possible, a more bitter opposition to education, and to the establishment of Baptist colleges. The expressed opposition to these benevolent enterprises, as they were designated, was a conviction that they were human institutions, inventions and schemes, and contrary to the simplicity of the instructions enunciated in the New Testament for the spread of the gospel. There were also, of course, lower considerations, such as that preachers would not receive their support if mission collections were pressed, and some dissatisfaction because some preachers failed to receive appointments which they desired. Others feared that educated men would take their places. The Holy Spirit instructed preachers what to say, and therefore human learning was unnecessary. So missions and mission societies, Sunday schools, colleges and education, paid ministers, and temperance societies were denounced as contrary to the Word of God and human liberty.

Masonry was violently denounced by the anti-mission Baptists. But this was contrary to the former position of Baptists. For example, the Charleston Association, in 1798, answered the following query:

*Query.*—Is it consistent with the principles and conduct of a Christian, for a person to join himself to a lodge of free-masons?

The following was the reply:

*Answer.*—As the essential part of the masonic constitution is secrecy, the Association find themselves greatly disqualified for giving a decided answer to the query. The universal benevolence professed by members of that body; the acts of kindness and liberality actually performed in many instances by them; and the existence of persons professing Christianity in that connection make in favor of it; but on the other hand, engagements to secrecy, before he can receive the necessary information to enable him to form a regular and conscientious judgment on the necessity a person is laid under, to bind himself by the most solemn subject, and which, should he finally disapprove of it, must prove the most embarrassing nature, appears to be so inconsistent both with reason and religion, that it would seem, at least, advisable for serious Christians to avoid the connection; especially as we are amply furnished with directions, and aided by the most powerful and sublime motives to the purest benevolence, in the scheme of our holy religion, and as the principles of all the useful branches of science are open to the freest access. Yet we think the subject so intimately connected with the rights of private judgment, that a person should be left to his own conscientious determination respecting it (Minutes of the Charleston Association for 1798).

Most of the anti-mission Baptists were opposed to Temperance Societies, and advocated the drinking of intoxicating liquors as a beverage. Joshua Lawrence, the leader of the anti-missionary forces on the East, in a sermon preached July 4, 1830, in Tarborough, North Carolina, thus defends the drinking of liquors: “Much is said about the Temperance Society—but if I am rightly informed those who join are not to drink one drop—if so, it has the wrong name, for it ought to be called the Abstaining Society. Does such a society agree with Scripture? Drink no longer water says Paul to Timothy, but use a little wine—and of deacons he said, not given to much wine—and the Saviour drank wine. And because some men make a storehouse of their belly, I must eat none—because some men have burnt up their kettles, I must not hang mine on the fire—and because some men have been killed by medicine, I must not use it prudently. What sophistry of priests!” (*The Colombian Star*, October 9, 1830).

The name by which they designated themselves was Primitive, or Old School, Baptists; and they claimed that all Baptists were originally of their contention, which certainly was not the fact. “They arrogate to themselves,” says J. M. Peck who was a contemporary, “the name of Old School Baptists because they reprobate all these measures (missions, education and Sunday schools, etc.), and declare non-fellowship with all Baptists who have anything to do with missionary work or any of those forms of active benevolence, and with all who hold correspondence with or fellowship missionary Baptists. In this charitable act they cut themselves off from at least nineteen-twentieths of all our Baptists in the United States, unless we can admit that a mere fragment of a party can exclude a vast majority” (J. M. Peck, *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, July 4, 1839).

This conflict became nation-wide but prevailed more widely in the Southern and Western States, although it extended to the Middle and New England States. It began somewhere about the year 1814 and increased in violence until 1835 to 1842, when many of the churches and associations were rent asunder. The following suggestions were made by Mr. Beebe, in *The Signs of the Times*, in 1838, and had much to do with the divisions which speedily obtained:

We believe that missionary exertions in modern days are carried on to a considerable pitch of extreme, and, therefore, cause considerable disturbance in churches and associations, which is an evil which ought to be guarded against; therefore, we will not correspond with, nor fellowship, any association or church which holds it as a principle of right.

We believe that the institution of free-masonry is a great evil, and a work of midnight darkness; we, therefore, will not either directly or indirectly, correspond with or fellowship any church or association which holds fellowship with free masons that have not withdrawn from the lodge.

As an outgrowth of this controversy there were many unpleasant, and often violent, situations produced. Churches were rent asunder, associations divided, and there were many personal alienations. A few examples of this kind out of the many which are typical are here recorded:

I. J. Roberts writes of Tennessee as follows:

The unpleasant part particularly relates to the division of the church. The Baptists are divided into four shades of difference, viz.:

1. The Regular Baptists, such as live in Georgia and S. Carolina, &c., so called by way of distinction.
2. The Separate Baptists, so-called from having separated from the Regulars on Arminian principles; they are sometimes called freewill Baptists.
3. The Campbellite Baptists; so called from having adopted the sentiments of Alexander Campbell of Virginia. None of these commune together.
4. The seed Baptists: Their preachers sometimes, by way of emphasis, are called snake preachers; because they preach that a part of the human family are the Seed of Adam, and under the law, for whom Christ died; and that a part of the Seed of the Serpent, are not under the law, for whom Christ never did die. They quote this text, with others, in proof of their doctrine: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that are under the law."

Daniel Parker of Illinois, has published a book vindicating this doctrine, and seems to be at the head of the party in the west. These still commune with the Regular Baptists. Of these four the Regular Baptists are the most numerous. Another matter of grief in the west, is the abundant ignorance which prevails among the preachers and people. None are learned except in their partyisms; and consequently far from being liberal minded. I think I am acquainted with from thirty to one hundred Baptist preachers in Tennessee, of whom very few are enlightened. I think one cause of so much neglect in the cultivation of their minds, is the entire omission of the churches to support their pastors. An unsupported and, unenlightened ministry are inseparable companions everywhere (*The Columbian Star and Christian Index*. October 9, 1830).

The condition of affairs in Arkansas was thus described:

In relation to the general condition of the denomination in Washington Association, which embraces so large a territory in this

frontier State, we have the following facts:—The brethren and the churches in the aggregate are of the High-Calvinistic cast in their doctrine. In relation to benevolent efforts which characterize our times, they have not much information, and a majority of them may, therefore, be set down as opposed. The ministers are generally good men, laborious and self-denying, but of limited attainments and moderate talents (*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, January 30, 1840).

In Kentucky there were many resolutions offered in churches and associations on the subject, some of which were passed and some rejected. The following was presented in the Hill Grove Church, Hardin county, July, 1839, and was rejected:

*Resolved* that the church has taken into consideration the corruptions of the United Baptists of Kentucky in faith and practice in the supporting of the Arminian doctrine and all those societies that money buys membership contrary to the Bible and our articles of faith answer. Resolved, that we as a church believe that the Voice of God and of truth in saying come out of her my people that ye be not partakers of her sins and receive not her plagues feel it our duty to withdraw from the United Baptists and stand on Original ground and as we were constituted a Regular Baptist church and feel it Our duty to invite all Our brethren churches and individuals to Union and correspondence with us and hope Our dear Brethren whom we love in the truth both ministers and members will visit us and preach with and pray for us (*The Baptist and Pioneer*, December 5, 1839. IV. 2).

The following extracts are from the minutes of the Licking Association, the largest anti-missionary body in the State:

The Licking Association has noticed with deep regret the various efforts which have been made to involve the memory of several valued ministers of the gospel, who lived and died members of her body, in the *modern* missionary institutions of the day. Some are curious to know why the Elkhorn Association has not introduced Peter, James and John, the Master, or some other inspired witness, to sustain her missionary operations, instead of Ambrose Dudley, Joseph Redding, John Price, and others who make no pretensions to

being inspired? A solution of the question is not difficult, when it is known that the Bible is as silent as death on that subject . . . Suppose some of our aged brethren had given countenance to missionary operations; we ask, is the church justified thereby (in absence of Bible authority), in giving her support to an institution which it is believed has done, and is doing more to corrupt her, than, perhaps, any other?"

The Circular Letter of the Panther Creek Association gives the following advice:

We further say to the churches, have nothing to do with the Bible Society, for we think it dangerous to authorize a few designing men to translate the holy Bible. Stand fast in the liberty wherein Christ has set you free, and be not entangled with the yoke of bondage.

The Otter Creek Association was organized from fragments of churches, October, 1839, in Meade county, Kentucky. The following report was given at the time of the members of this body:

The preachers of this association are remarkably illiterate, and are not too well supplied with common understanding. They are, however, as vain of their ignorance, and boast more of it, than any scholar ever did of his highest honors of the first universities in the world! But they claim to be possessed of a species of inspiration, which more than supplies the place of common sense and cultivated intellect. They were called to the ministry almost as miraculously as was Paul, and were invested of the priestly office as was Aaron. But their chief characteristic consists in their rampant opposition to all benevolent institutions of the day. This association holds in utter abomination everybody who would give the Bible to the heathen, preach the gospel to sinners, or refuse to drink drams! They are deadly hostile to all who belong to, or in anywise favor, or rather who will not disfellowship Bible, Missionary, and especially Temperance Societies (*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, February 27, 1840).

One of the first acts on record in Georgia, which may be considered hostile to benevolent institutions, is that of the Hepzibah Association, in 1817, when the Circular Letter for the year, written by Charles J. Jenkins, appointed at the

preceding session, was rejected because it took strong grounds in favor of missions. Things in the association went from bad to worse for the missionary cause, so that Jenkins wrote to Dr. Sherwood, January 2, 1823, as follows:

My situation is a lamentable one, and claims largely the commiseration and prayers of my brethren. I am in a land of darkness and cruelty, excluded from the privileges of the sanctuary, and from the society of Christians; and, indeed, I am destitute of any society at all. But, hitherto, the Lord has helped me to be resigned to his will. I sometimes have a refreshing from his presence, and then my soul doth magnify his name; but, when I am in darkness, it is distressing indeed. I beg you to remember me at a throne of grace. Pray the Lord that I may possess my vessel in patience; and that I may not be permitted to do anything which may cause a reproach on the name of the Saviour whom I have espoused.

By the year 1835 divisions in churches and associations became common. A few illustrations are given to show the spirit of the times.

The Yellow River Association, in Georgia, in 1838, adopted the following non-fellowshipping resolution:

That the institutions of the day, called benevolent, to-wit: the Convention, Bible Society, Sunday School Union, Tract Society, Temperance Society, Abolition Society, Theological Seminary, and all other institutions tributary to the missionary plan, now existing in the United States, are unscriptural, and that we, as an Association, will not correspond with any Association that has united with them; nor will we hold in our communion or fellowship any church that is connected with them.

These meetings were often violent and sometimes disgraceful. Rev. A. T. Holmes wrote that “the Flint River Association adjourned on Tuesday last, after the most stormy and unpleasant session I ever witnessed. On Monday, the body presented the most disgraceful aspect that I ever witnessed in a religious meeting. It did more harm, and I have no doubt had a worse effect on the community, than it will ever do good. Other denominations looked on with wonder and astonishment, and even regret, to see the Baptists so much divided; and even the world was pointing the finger of scorn and saying, ‘See

how these professors hate, and are trying to devour each other”” (*The Christian Index*, October 21, 1837).

In Alabama the same violence was manifested in some of the associations. The Flint River Association, in 1838, denounced missionary operations; and declared that such activities were deleterious to the peace and harmony of the churches; therefore, it was resolved “by this Association, that she declares unfellowship with the Missionary Society and all auxiliaries, together with all and every’ person who are joined with or in anywise connected with any of these institutions; and that all of those churches, ministers or otherwise, within her chartered limits who shall adhere to the principles of their constitution, in connection with the Association, will be regarded by her as members of her body, and that she will sustain and defend all those rights and privileges reckoned to them by their respective church covenants, so far as association compact is concerned.”

The estimate of the numbers of the Anti-Mission Baptists in Virginia, in 1839, according to *The Religious Herald*, was as follows:

There are in Virginia over 500 Baptist churches, and about 60,000 members. The Old School Baptists have therefore not quite one-fifth of the churches, and about one-eighth of the white members. The Old School churches are generally small, and not on the increase. Within the last year they have had but few additions; the number baptized in five churches in the Dover Association was greater than in the whole of their churches in this State. The Regular Baptist churches, on the contrary, are steadily, though slowly, increasing, and the disproportion betwixt the two bodies, in point of numbers, will every year become greater. Indeed we expect that in another generation they will have become extinct.

Many reasons may be given for these divisions. The Baptist denomination, at this time, was not consolidated or unified. The Baptists until recently had been few and scattered, the churches were often located far apart, they had preaching very seldom and no local pastor, the associations met only once a year and were frequently turned into debating societies, there were few Baptist newspapers and they only had a small circulation, and the Triennial Convention had just been organized, and was perhaps the occasion for the attack. There was as yet no common rallying point. The methods of work

were new and untried. The anti-missionary newspapers, *The Signs of the Times* and *The Primitive Baptist*, were widely circulated and from every standpoint attacked the new institutions. Many of the charges preferred were unjust but they produced the desired results.

The state of religion, in this period, the country over, was very low. It was a time of chaos and confusion, of bitter animosity and dissension, and of course religious conditions were deplorable. The Circular Letter written in 1831 by Jesse Mercer to the Georgia Convention says:

That the standard of Christian morality is deplorably low among the ministry and churches of our denomination, is too obvious to be concealed.

Are there not many professors among us whose spirit, life and conversation, filly becomes the gospel of Christ—worldly in their views and mercenary in all they do, so if they were not seen in the church meeting, or at the Lord's table, they could not be told from worldlings? And yet do they not go unreprieved?

Are there not many who, to the entire neglect of all family religion, seldom attend church meeting, and habitually live irreverently, if not immorally? And are they not suffered to go undisciplined?

And others there are, who, in the plainest sense, are drunkards, and though no drunkard hath any place in the Kingdom of God and Christ, yet do they not, by some means—by feigning repentance or empty and vain resolves—continue from youth to old age in the church, frequently, if not habitually, drunk? Are there not many such cases?

And more; is it not common that mere negative goodness is all that is requisite to constitute a member in good standing, and to recommend him, as such, to a sister church?

And, moreover, is there not evidently a want of union and concert among both ministers and churches of our denomination?

Have not instances occurred in which some churches have disciplined their members for what others have winked at, or even commended, in theirs? And have not censured, and even excluded members of some, been received and nurtured by other churches?

And have not ministers gotten into heated and hurtful controversies with one another, breathing toward each other the most cruel asperities and cruel animosities? And is it not true that one has preached what another, in and to the same congregation, has contradicted and exposed as unsound and dangerous, by which questions which engender strife have abounded? And has not all this passed off, without any effort to correct the evil or to reconcile these inconsiderate brethren?

The Anti-Mission movement had a curious beginning. Samuel J. Mills was the leading spirit in organizing the celebrated Haystack Prayer Meeting at Williams College. It was from this prayer meeting that Adoniram Judson became the missionary to India. Mr. Mills, with a companion, was on a missionary tour through Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Natchez settlement to New Orleans. While in Kentucky he went sixty miles out of his way to visit John Taylor. Taylor was a man of great influence and had seen much of service in building the early churches in that State; but he was a man of limited education and high prejudices. He speaks of his visitors as “respectable looking young men, well-informed, and zealous in the cause in which they were employed . . . I have no doubt these young men meant friendship to me and to preachers in general.”

The two missionaries were, however, unfortunate enough to arouse Mr. Taylor’s prejudices by trying to show him that for a pastor to secure missionary contributions meant to increase liberality all along the line, and *especially in regard to pastoral support*. “They became quite impatient with my indolence, assuring me that if I would only stir up the people to missions and Bible society matters, I should find a great change in money affairs in favor of the preachers; urging by questions like this: ‘Do you not know that when sponges are once opened they will always run? ‘Only,’ said they, ‘get the people in the habit of giving their money for any religious use, and they will continue to appropriate for all sacred purposes.’”

Mr. Taylor comments upon this as follows: “Surely it will not be thought uncharitable to say that I did begin strongly to smell the *New England rat*.” As a result he wrote the first of the books in the anti-mission schism.

One of the leaders in this reaction was Samuel Trott. He “was for many years,” says J. M. Peck, “in connection with the Regular Baptist denomi-

nation, first in New Jersey, and afterwards in Kentucky. Then he professed and acted with the denomination on missions, ministerial education, and other benevolent operations. He was always rather ultra in doctrine, verging toward Antinomian fatality, rather narrow in his views and tinged with a little bigotry. While in Kentucky he was connected with the Kentucky Missionary Society and, for a time, served as agent to collect funds. Whether his salary and expenses exceeded his collections; or his dogmatical-Calvinistic style of preaching dissatisfied the brethren, we never learned. They discontinued his agency. His preaching never proved very attractive, interesting, or useful anywhere. Some years since he migrated to Virginia. When the antinomian and anti-missionary party in that quarter, a few years ago, formed the Black Rock Convention, broke from the denomination, and sent forth their harmless anathemas against the whole Baptist phalanx, as missionary operators, Trott found himself amongst this little 'sect.' He had always found a peculiar itching to be a great man, and as greatness is comparative, and, doubtless, recollecting the adage, 'better be the head of the dog than the tail of the lion,' he is now nearly in the front rank" (*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, June 27, 1839. IV. 1).

It was Daniel Parker, however, who was the originator of the system. "Daniel Parker, in the west, and Joshua Lawrence in the east, are in truth and fairness, the fathers and founders of this sect" (J. M. Peck, *The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, July 4, 1839. IV. 1). "These two worthies—one in Texas and the other in North Carolina—are the two heads of the party." Parker was an enigma; and his system was a strange rehash of the old Gnostic philosophy. Peck, who knew him well, describes him in the following language:

Mr. Parker is one of those singular and extraordinary beings whom Divine Providence permits to arise as a scourge to his church, and as a stumbling block in the way of religious effort. Raised on the frontier of Georgia (by others he is spoken of as a native of Virginia) without education, uncouth in manner, slovenly in dress, diminutive in person, unprepossessing in appearance, with shriveled features and a small piercing eye, few men for a series of years have exercised a wider influence on the lower and less educated of frontier people. With a zeal and enthusiasm bordering on insanity, firmness that amounted to obstinacy, and perseverance that would have done honor to a good cause, Daniel Parker exerted himself to

the utmost to induce churches to declare non-fellowship with all Baptists who united themselves with any of the benevolent (or, as he called them, “newfangled”) societies.

His mind, we are told, was of a singular and original sort. In doctrine he was antinomian. He believed himself inspired, and so persuaded others. “Repeatedly have we heard him when his mind seemed to soar above its own powers, and he would discourse for a few moments on the divine attributes, or on some devotional subject, with such brilliancy of thought and correctness of language as would astonish men of education and talents. Then again, it would seem as if he were perfectly bewildered in a maze of abstruse subtleties” (Smith, *A History of the Baptists in the Western States East of the River*, 123, *Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle*, 198. July, 1842).

Parker extended his labors from North Carolina through Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, and from Indiana to Texas. The extraordinary spread of anti-mission sentiment in Tennessee, and elsewhere is well explained by Dr. R. B. C. Howell. He says: “About this time the noted Daniel Parker began to attract attention. He was, as is well known, the author of the ‘Two Seed doctrine;’ as it is usually called, and then, and for sometime after, resided in Middle Tennessee; from whence he removed to Illinois, and finally to Texas, where, last autumn, he paid the debt of nature. Several circumstances combined to give him and his doctrine extraordinary influence. Our Methodist brethren had, from the first settlement of the country, been very numerous and strong. Here the Cumberland denomination arose, and swept over the land like a whirlwind. Both those classes of Christians were ultra-arminian, and they and the Baptists were perpetually at war. It is not surprising that, in these circumstances, the Baptists became insensibly ultra-predestinarian. Of this doctrine Parker was the champion, and therefore, the general favorite. In his person, dress, and manners, he was plain, approximating to vulgarity. This also added to his popularity, And, withal, he was a man of astonishing ability and untiring industry. It may be supposed that the repugnance of his system would have destroyed his influence, but this was not the case. So ingeniously did he interweave it with Baptist doctrines, as then understood and preached, which was a kind of antinomianism, that it required much discrimination to separate them, and

make them appear in contrast, with satisfactory distinctness. His views met with a spirited resistance from a few men, such as McConico, Whitsitt, and Wiseman; but the prevailing feeling was, that if he erred, it was on the safe side—in favor of the divine sovereignty, and in opposition to Arminianism.

“Mr. Parker set in motion the means that overthrew missions in Tennessee, and to which he was induced by the following considerations.—He was ambitious to be a writer, and sought, as the medium of his communications with the public, the columns of the *Columbian Star*, then published in Washington City. His essays, setting forth his peculiar opinions, were rejected by that paper, and his doctrines ridiculed as equally immodest and preposterous. This was too much for a man of his unbounded pride and self-confidence tamely to endure. The offense given him was unpardonable. The conductors of the *Star* he knew to be associated in the conduct of the missionary enterprise, and of ministerial education. From that hour he conceived the most implacable hatred against the men and all their pursuits. Seldom did he preach a sermon in which he did not give them a thorough dressing. He also commenced the publication of a series of pamphlets, which he continued for a year or two, giving expressions of his doctrine. In these, as well as his sermons, he appeals successfully to the sympathies of his Tennessee brethren. His own, with other pamphlets and books, such as those by Joshua Lawrence, of N. Carolina, and James Osborne, of Baltimore, were constantly carried and sold by him and his associates until the land was deluged by them in all its length and breadth. Religious newspapers, tracts, and books (except their own) were denounced as unscriptural, and designed to supersede the Bible; ministerial education was reviled as consisting of the manufacture of graceless and lazy young men into preachers, and therefore supremely abominable; and missions were worse than all, since they were nothing less than a combination of their pretended managers, not to preach the gospel to the heathen, which they could not do, because they did not themselves know the gospel, but to get the people’s money, with which they were represented as purchasing immense estates, and living like princes. All of this was believed by a surprising number of people. Why should they not believe it? They knew human nature to be very depraved; they possessed little general information, and they were assured of its truth by ministers, in whose veracity they had the fullest confidence.

“Meanwhile, no agent, or other friend of missions, visited the state, who

might have corrected these false impressions, and set all these matters, and missions particularly, in the proper light. No Baptist paper existed in the South, and none was taken, except, perhaps, by one in a thousand of our brethren. Moreover, some of the prime friends of missions became converts to Mr. Alexander Campbell's system and joined him. Thus missions became beyond measure odious. The current of prejudice had. Gradually swollen, until now no one dared to resist it. Not a man ventured to open his mouth in favor of any benevolent enterprise or action. The missionary societies were dissolved, and the associations rescinded all of their resolutions, by which they were in any way connected with these measures, and, in this respect the stillness of death rested upon the whole people! Subsequently, and until the present time, this state of things has been kept up wherever it was possible., by the same means, and by industriously circulating in addition such papers as *The Old Baptist Banner*, of Tennessee, and *The Primitive Baptist* of North Carolina, and *Signs of the Times*, of New York" (R. B. C. Howell, Missions and Anti-Missions in Tennessee, *The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record*, 306, 307. November, 1845).

Peck speaks of his work in Illinois as follows: "In 1820, Daniel Parker, then a resident of Crawford county, and connected with the Wabash District Association, published his book against the 'Principles and practice of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions,' which was circulated petty extensively among western Baptists. We wrote a pamphlet to correct Parker's misrepresentations, but suppressed it after it was in the hands of the printer, for fear that it might give Parker's book more notoriety and influence than- it otherwise possessed. Parker was indefatigable in introducing a query into as many Associations as he could through the West, that would produce an answer condemnatory to missionary operations, and he really deserves the credit, not only of that monstrous abortion of purblind theology, *The Two Seeds*, but as the most active and persevering opposer of missionary and other benevolent societies in the West. Most. Of his argument and objections are founded upon misrepresentation, or whimsical sophisms, but there is one objection more plausible and formidable than our brethren who are not well acquainted with western Baptists imagine. It may be stated in the following form:

"That missionary societies, not being formed and sustained by the authority of the churches of Jesus Christ, not under their control, but based upon the

principle of the payment of a definite sum of money by individuals, acting independent of the churches, and who, by appointing the managing committee, exercise entire control, and thus take the appropriate work of the churches out of their hands. That in assuming to appoint missionaries, and designate the fields of their labor, without any direct responsibility to the churches, they usurp another of the church's prerogatives, in controlling a portion of the ministry."

J. M. Peck twice met Daniel Parker in debate in Indiana. The first was in June, 1822, in Gibson county, at a special session of the Wabash District Association. The contest lasted the entire day and was decided by vote of thirty-five to five in favor of missions. In 1825, the second debate occurred before the White River Association in which the association unanimously voted against Parker. In 1824 the Sangamon Association was formed, and it was charged that missionary work was rejected through clandestine methods by a vote of a majority of one. The following article was adopted: "It shall be the duty of the Association to bar from a seat any United Baptist who is a member of a missionary society" (*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, December 26, 1839). This action was the occasion of much strife among the churches, litigations, remonstrances and confusion. The remonstrances were in vain, though at one time nine churches called for a change in this rule, and it was only changed in 1826 by a convention called to remodel the constitution.

Dr. Peck records the following terrible results of this agitation in this association:

We need not inform our readers that these movements, hostile to missions, were an effectual barrier to religious efforts of every kind in the churches connected with these Associations—that the spirit of God fled from such scenes of strife and confusion—that revivals of religion were withheld from such churches—that a majority of the churches then have ceased to exist—that an unusual number of the preachers have turned out to be drunkards and profligates—and that so far as religion is concerned other churches and Associations cover this field. God has spoken in his Providence, in terms too plain and fearful to be misunderstood—"O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself."

Referring to these events Dr. De Blois, the biographer of John M. Peck, describes these scenes as follows: Peck “visited various churches and associations, and met the famous (or infamous) Daniel Parker, politician, theologian, reactionary and propagandist. This shrewd and able man embodied the whole devilish spirit of the anti-mission crusade, and had a smooth tongue, considerably eloquent, and a genius for a persistent proselytism.

“In the light of present-day world-wide ideas it is hardly possible to understand the bitter opposition to all of the higher forms of Christian service which characterized the people of the smaller churches in the New West one hundred years ago. At the Association in New Princeton, Indiana, Mr. Peck was refused a seat in the body and treated as an outcast, because of his zeal in missionary enterprises. Mr. Parker, on the other hand, was welcomed joyously, and applauded at his rabid opposition to every form of missionary activity. Mr. Peck, great hearted and noble, says in his diary: ‘In my interview with Brother Parker, I alluded to his address about missions, and told him I could cheerfully give him my hand, as a conscientious and well-meaning though greatly mistaken brother.’

“Describing the latter sessions of the Association he says: ‘The subject of missions came up. This was occasioned by one church having charged another with having supported missions.’ This constituted a serious grievance. Mr. Parker arose and delivered a fiery address, denouncing all missionary effort in lurid and forceful terms. Mr. Peck obtained leave to speak and defended the missionary enterprises of the denomination with great fervor. It was a memorable occasion. Two of the most noteworthy leaders of religious thought and feeling that the 19<sup>th</sup> century produced were present, face to face, at the meeting of a few humble and insignificant churches. They spoke mightily, the discussion lasted for five hours. Mr. Peck must have appreciated the vigor of his antagonist for he says: ‘I never before met with so determined opposer to missions in every aspect.’ But the virile and eloquent Parker, State Senator, splendid man of affairs, religious leader, founder of a sect and stalwart reactionary in all that concerned the kingdom of Christ, received a startling rebuff; for the very Association which had declined to recognize the missionary and had refused him a seat three days before, voted heartily to sustain the cause of missions, and resolved, by formal vote, to support the church which had raised a contribution for the

great cause” (De Blois, 48, 49).

Thus did the terrible conflict rage for nearly thirty years. A large number of members withdrew and formed new churches and associations; the morale of the denomination was weakened; the minds of the people were turned from missionary endeavor and directed to contentions; and altogether the results were most discouraging. This contention was accompanied by another schism in which more people were probably alienated from the churches than in this one.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

B. H. Carroll, Jr., *The Genesis of American Anti-Missionism*.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE SCHISM OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

THE Rise of the “Current Reformation”—Calvinism—Arminianism—Alexander Campbell—In Pennsylvania—A Presbyterian—Unites with the Baptists—Described by Archbishop Purcell—Debate with John Walker—Barton W. Stone and the Reformation—Campbell and Stone Unite Their Forces—The Ten Articles—The Debate with McCalla—Immense Crowds—Peculiar Views—A Great Sensation—Prominent Ministers—His Great Talent in Debate—His Views Slowly Introduced—Baptism for the Remission of Sins—Call to the Ministry—Paid Ministry—Poorly Prepared Ministers—The Separation—Action of the Associations—The Account of Dr. W. C. Buck—The Increase of the Baptists.

Practically simultaneous with the rise and progress of the Anti-Mission movement, already described, came the tremendous shock to the Baptists occasioned by the Rev. Alexander Campbell, known as “The Current Reformation.” The center of this conflict was Kentucky, though it had large following in Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania, and it affected largely many other states. The Baptists were fortunate in having three commanding men to oppose these doctrines, in the persons of Jeremiah Bell Jeter, of Virginia, Silas M. Noel, of Kentucky, and A. P. Williams, of Missouri.

The advent of Campbell into Kentucky Baptist affairs was under the most favorable conditions possible for the promulgation of his peculiar views. There was no general organization among the Baptists in the states, and consequently no room for counsel and united action. They had but few schools and colleges, and, consequently, few trained ministers. In a technical sense there were none. There were a few struggling Baptist newspapers, but none of commanding influence. The strenuous preaching of hyper-Calvinism had produced, in many quarters, a reaction toward Arminianism and in some sections there was even a favorable consideration of Arianism. The denomination from the first had been divided upon the subject of creeds. Some perhaps had stoutly accentuated their importance, and others had magnified their evil tendencies. The agitations against missions, Bible societies and theological schools had just begun. Indeed, there was a tendency to looseness of views which was a portend of danger. The Presbyterians were aggressive, and possibly sometimes arrogant, and it was felt that a Baptist champion who could combat them would be welcome. All things worked together for the coming of Mr. Campbell.

Of all of the men of that day none was more conspicuous than Alexander Campbell. Born in Ireland, descended through his mother from the French Huguenots who fled to Scotland on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, educated in the University of Glasgow and an American from choice, he was in every way a unique character. He had been associated in Scotland with the reform movement of Robert and James Haldane. Educated, fearless in his investigations, encyclopedic in his learning, with great natural ability and a comprehensive command of English, he was a debater of unusual power.

He landed in the United States in September, 1809, and settled in Washington, Pennsylvania. He gave a brief account of himself subsequently as follows:

I arrived in this country with credentials in my pocket from a sect of Presbyterians known by the name of Seceders. These credentials certified that I had been, both in Ireland, in the Presbytery of Market Hill, and in Scotland, in the Presbytery of Glasgow, a member of the Secession Church, in good standing. My faith in creeds and confessions of human device was considerably shaken while in Scotland, and I commenced my career in this country, under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be made an article of faith, a rule of practice, or a term of communion among Christians (*The Christian Baptist*, II).

He continued to preach among the Presbyterians till June, 1812, when he was baptized by Mathias Luce, in the presence of Elder Henry Spears, and as a result the Brush Run Church was organized. "I had no idea of uniting with the Baptists," says Mr. Campbell, "more than with the Moravians or the mere Independents." He continues:

I had unfortunately formed a very unfavorable opinion of the Baptist preachers as then introduced to my acquaintance, as narrow, contracted, illiberal, and uneducated men. This indeed, I am sorry to say, is still my opinion of the ministry of that Association at that day; and whether they are yet much improved, I am without satisfactory evidence.

The people, however, called Baptists, were much more highly appreciated by me than their ministry. Indeed, the ministry of some sects is generally in the aggregate the worst portion of them. It was

certainly so in the Redstone Association thirty years ago. They were little men in a big office. The office did not fit them. They had a wrong idea, too, of what was wanting. They seemed to think that a change of apparel—a black coat instead of a drab—broad rim on their hat instead of a narrow one—a prolongation of the face, and a fictitious gravity—a longer and more emphatic pronunciation of certain words, rather than scriptural knowledge, humility, spirituality, zeal, and Christian affection, with great devotion and great philanthropy were the grand desiderata . . .

I confess, however, that I was better pleased with the Baptist people than with any other community. They read the Bible, and seemed to care but little for anything else in religion than “*conversion*” and “*Bible doctrine*.” . . . They pressed me from every quarter to visit their churches, and, though not a member, to preach for them. I consented through much importunity, and during the year I often spoke to the Baptist congregations for sixty miles around. They all pressed us to join the Redstone Association.

We laid the matter before our church in the fall of 1813. We discussed the propriety of the measure. After much discussion and earnest desire to be directed by the wisdom which cometh from above, we finally concluded to make an overture to that effect, and to write out a full view of our sentiments, wishes, and determination on that subject. We did so. Some eight or ten pages of large dimensions, exhibiting our remonstrance against all human creeds as bonds of union or communion among Christian churches, and expressed a willingness, on certain conditions, to cooperate or unite with that Association; provided only, and always, that we should be allowed to preach and teach whatever we learned from the Holy Scriptures, regardless of any creed or formula in Christendom. A copy of this document, we regret to say, was not preserved; and when solicited from the Clerk of the Association, was refused.

The proposition was discussed at the Association; and, after much debate, was decided by a considerable majority in favor of our being received. Thus was union formed. But the party opposed, though small, began early to work, and continued with a perseverance

worthy of a better cause (*The Millennial Harbinger*, V. No. 1, Third Series; 345-347. Bethany, Va., 1848).

In this manner Mr. Campbell was received into a Baptist association. He soon removed to Buffalo, now Bethany, West Virginia, and farmed, taught school and preached.

Archbishop Purcell, who afterwards debated with Mr. Campbell, gives an account of his journeys. He says:

It was his habit occasionally to pass through the southern portions of Ohio and Indiana and Illinois, and through the fine blue grass region of Kentucky and the rich farming sections of the Missouri River, where the farmers are and always have been exceedingly intelligent and hospitable. Perhaps there is not a finer set of people on the face of the globe. These interesting pilgrimages began somewhere about 1824, or perhaps a little earlier than 1820—that era, and lasted perhaps a quarter of a century with some intervals. His discourses attracted vast crowds of people, who came from distant points and who listened to every word that fell from his lips and felt in their heart of hearts all the burning zeal of Peter the Hermit. At that time the religious propensities of the people were very strong, and there were but few churches in the country and no places of amusement. People would ride fifty miles to attend a large baptizing, a camp meeting or a religious debate. Mr. Campbell was regarded as a kind of religious Goliath, and was met at every cross road and every toll gate by well intentioned, half informed preachers of the different denominations and challenged to produce his credentials, to enter into a discussion in defense of his original and peculiar views. Our hero was nothing loth to do so. Such opportunities were precisely what he desired. A vast audience would gather together to hear what to them was vastly more attractive than a great battle to the death between two celebrated gladiators.

These debates were brief and decisive. Campbell floored his opponents in a few moments. Their arguments fell to pieces as if they had no more strength than a potter's vessel. So quickly was all this accomplished that they could hardly realize their discomfiture. The people saw all of this and it made Campbell thousands of

proselytes; and their children and their children's children have to this day stuck to his church like grim death, and they will stick for generations to come.

It was upon one of these excursions that he met John Walker, a Presbyterian minister of the Seceder Church, at Mt. Pleasant, Jefferson county, Ohio. The debate occurred on June 19 and 20, 1820. It was practically a one-sided affair. This gave Campbell much reputation.

As yet he had preached nothing heretical. Most of his views, as announced later, were not new in Kentucky. As an organized system they dated back to the days of the Great Revival. This system originated, in the most part, with Barton W. Stone, who was the leader of the revival in Upper Kentucky. He broke off from the Presbyterian Church and preached practically all of the doctrines later advocated by Campbell. He and his associates were suspended from the Presbyterian Synod on September 16, 1803, and the next day they informed the Synod that they had organized another Presbytery. "Yet from this period," says Stone, "I date the commencement of that reformation, which has progressed to this day" (Rogers, *The Biography of Barton W. Stone*).

John A. Gano, in preaching the funeral sermon of Stone, said:

The first churches planted and organized since the great apostasy, with *the Bible* as the only creed or church book, and *the name Christian* as the only family name, was organized in Kentucky in the year 1804 (Rogers).

After the adoption of his singular ideas Mr. Stone was much pleased at the coming of Campbell to Kentucky. He says:

When he came into Kentucky, I heard him often in public and in private. I was pleased with his manner and matter. I saw no distinctive feature between the doctrine he preached and that which we had preached for many years, except on baptism for the remission of sins. Even this I had once received and taught, as before stated, but had strangely let it go from my mind, till Brother Campbell revived it afresh. I thought then he was not sufficiently explicit on the influences of the Spirit, which led many honest Christians to think he denied them. Had he been as explicit then, as since, many honest souls would have been still with us, and would

have greatly aided the good cause. In a few things I dissented from him, but was agreed to disagree (Rogers).

The ultimate union of the two parties became a foregone conclusion. After the union Stone thus expresses himself

Their aid gave a new impetus to the Reformation which was in progress, especially among the Baptists of Kentucky; and the doctrine spread and greatly increased in the West. The only distinguishing doctrine between us and them was, that they preached baptism for the remission of sins to believing penitents. This doctrine had not generally obtained among us, though some few had received it, and practiced accordingly. They insisted also upon weekly communion, which we had neglected. It was believed by many, and feared by us, that they were not sufficiently explicit on the influences of the Spirit. Many unguarded things were spoken and written by them on this subject, calculated to excite the suspicions and fears of the people, that no other influence was needed than in the written word; therefore to pray to God for help was vain. The same thing had been objected to us long before; for we also had been unguarded in our expressions. In private conversation with these brethren our fears were removed, for our views were one (Rogers).

After stating ten articles which were held by Campbell, John Rogers, the biographer of Stone, remarks:

Such were the capital positions of A. Campbell and those with him. It is scarcely necessary to say, what is so palpably, from the extracts already presented, and others that might be made, that father Stone and those with him occupied substantially the same ground.

Of course, therefore, a union might be expected.

Now then, let us call before us the local positions of the parties, as well as their religious relations.

In the year 1828 there were great religious excitements among the various denominations in Kentucky, but especially among the Baptist Churches. Hundreds and thousands were immersed among them, in the north of Kentucky, principally by those preachers who

were very much under the influence of A. Campbell. Their converts, of course, were under the same influence. In and about the year '29 or '30, the Baptists, in this part of Kentucky, took a very decided stand against A. Campbell, and those who stood with him. The consequence was, many were separated from them and forced to set up for themselves.

Here, then, were the parties in the field, living in the same neighborhoods and villages, and occupying, religiously, very similar grounds.

We were mutually teaching the same great truths,—telling the world that Christians ought to be one—that human creeds were among the great causes of division—that to believe with all the heart, that Jesus is the Christ, and to put ourselves under his government, were the only requisites to church membership; that subsequently to speak of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit, and all other matters of useless controversy, in the language of Scripture, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world, are the only requisites of the continued enjoyment of church fellowship here, and place in the church triumphant hereafter.

We could not then keep asunder but by unsaying all that we had said, and undoing all we had done. Father Stone and John T. Johnson are to be regarded as the prime movers of this good work. Speaking in reference to it, B. W. Stone says: “Among other Baptists who received and advocated the teaching of A. Campbell, was J. T. Johnson, than whom there is not a better man. We lived together in Georgetown, and labored and worshiped together. We plainly saw that we were on the same foundation, in the same spirit, and preached the same gospel. We agreed to unite our energies to effect a union between our different societies. This was easily effected in Kentucky; and in order to confirm this union, we became co-editors of *The Messenger*. This union, irrespective of reproach, I view as the noblest act of my life (Rogers).

Mr. McCalla, a Presbyterian for some years, had been preaching in Kentucky on baptism and kindred subjects. He repeatedly challenged the Baptists for a debate. The Baptists accepted the challenge and the debate between him and

Campbell was duly arranged. It was held in the town of Washington, a few miles back of Maysville, in the old Baptist meeting house. It was the first discussion of any prominence that had ever taken place in Kentucky between a Baptist and a Pedobaptist. Thousands of interested and excited visitors, from almost every portion of northern Kentucky, witnessed the battle, and were cheered or dismayed by its results. Baptists and Baptist preachers felt profoundly thankful that the advocacy of their cause was committed to the hands of a giant. His victory over McCalla was complete. In grateful pride, the Baptists of Kentucky hailed, with unanimous voice, his triumph (*The Christian Repository*, January, 1858, p. 36).

In this debate Mr. Campbell said little or nothing which differed from the ordinary views of the Baptists on the design of baptism. Of the Baptism of Paul he said:

The blood of Christ, then, *really* cleanses us who believe from all sin. Behold the goodness of God in giving us a *formal* proof and token of it, by ordaining a baptism expressly “*for the remission of sins.*” The water of baptism, then, *formally* washes away our sins. The blood of Christ *really* washes away our sins. Paul’s sins were *really pardoned* when he believed, yet he had no formal *pledge* of the fact, no *formal* acquittal, no *formal* purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in the waters of baptism (Campbell and McCalla Debate).

In little or nothing did this differ from the view of the Baptists. It was very different from the later statement where he said “that sins are actually forgiven in the act of immersion” (*The Christian Baptist*).

Mr. Campbell was surrounded by a great company of Baptists. Jeremiah Vardeman, the successful, the eloquent, was his moderator, and he was easily the most influential Baptist in the State. A man of warm and enthusiastic temperament, he became the devoted friend and to some extent the follower of Campbell. Jacob Creath was there. He was the associate of Vardeman; and they traveled and preached together, and in their mode of operation and general views were alike. He had an earnest sweeping eloquence and was superior in management, in shrewdness, in tact. He was already at the head of a powerful faction and he became one of the first disciples of the new order of things. Walter Warder, the pastor, was there. He was the most beloved

Baptist in the State. He had been the agent under God of winning thousands of souls to Christ in Mason, Fleming, Bracken and Bourbon counties. He had longed for more union, more intelligence, and more piety among the ministers, and more seal and liberality in the membership. It seemed to him that God had raised up Alexander Campbell for such a time as this.

The debate being concluded Campbell passed through all of the principal towns of Northern Kentucky preaching everywhere he went to vast multitudes. Never in the history of Kentucky had a religious teacher created such a sensation or attracted such attention. To the city of Lexington came Baptist preachers to hear the new champion. The previous night, as they gathered in the city, they “held a candle light prayer meeting.” They met at sunrise for the same object, after which they went early to the meeting house, “to meet and receive the new brother.” The ministers sat in the pulpit, awaiting with anxiety his arrival; and when he entered the house, crowded as it was to overflowing, they “invited him to the pulpit, and welcomed him to the services of the day.” For full three hours he spoke on the great commission.

Among those who listened to that discourse, and met, after the service, beneath the hospitable roof of Dr. James Fishback, were John Taylor, Silas M. Noel, Jeremiah Vardeman and the elder, Jacob Creath. Here the startling and dogmatic views of Campbell were questioned, modified, or freely discussed. The leading preachers of the State were grouped around the preacher. On his influence over the minds of these strong and fearless men depended the triumph or defeat of his plans and hopes. Enlisted under his standard, battling beneath the guidance of his eye, success was certain. United in their opposition, his Reformation must have perished at its birth (*The Christian Repository*, February, 1858, p. 86). Out of this company Campbell won outright Jacob Creath; Jeremiah Vardeman apparently acquiesced; and Fishback was neutral. There were two men in the company who were never shaken. They were Silas M. Noel and John Taylor. The former in mental power was the equal of Mr. Campbell; in learning not much his inferior, and in clearness of mental vision and logical acumen his superior. John Taylor was not an educated man, but he did have a thorough knowledge of the Bible, strong common sense and an integrity incorruptible.

“The night after preaching,” says Taylor, “we sat up very late, and had much

conversation, as also next morning. Noel and myself slept together that night—we exchanged thoughts about the new preacher—we strongly suspected he was deeply tinctured with Unitarianism, in which we became more confirmed by the friendship between him and Stone, and all of Stone's followers. I heard a number of things from Campbell which made me stare; in some of which I withstood him. Elder Chilton was speaking of a good work going on—sinners weeping and crying for mercy. I saw Mr. Campbell raise his hand, and with a loud crack of his finger, and a scornful look at Chilton, say: 'I would not give that for it; if a sinner weeps when I preach, I know that in some way I have deceived him.'"

If Campbell had won Creath he had lost the equally influential Taylor. Noel accompanied Campbell to Shelbyville and Louisville. From the latter appointment Noel returned home sad but determined. Campbell had failed to convince the two most forceful leaders, Taylor and Noel. He carried with him a faction but not the Baptists of Kentucky. He returned to Virginia apparently well satisfied. Stone, J. T. Johnson and Creath had enlisted in his cause; Vardeman, the Warders, Joseph and William, and Silas M. Noel were presumed to be neutral; John Taylor, with George and Edmund Walter, had shown signs of opposition.

There were many things which contributed to the spread of the peculiar views of Mr. Campbell among the Baptists of Kentucky. His personal popularity in the overthrow of the Pedobaptists has been mentioned. In this debate he displayed more talent and learning than had ever been known in this State. The manner in which he performed the part not only pleased the Baptists, but gave them triumphant satisfaction. Many of them considered Campbell as the greatest living man. Thus the McCalla debate opened the way for the dissemination of his religious views among the Baptists. Never did a Reformer commence his work under more flattering auspices. The publication of *The Christian Baptist* was begun in 1823, and the little "Monthly" soon secured a large circulation. This paper greatly assisted his cause (J. M. Pendleton, *Campbellism Examined*, in *The Southern Baptist Review*, February and March, 1855, p. 85).

Another reason for his success was that his system was slowly developed, and his views gradually expressed. In process of time he came to the position that the Christian church was buried under rubbish for ages, and that it was

his mission to dig it out. He says:

If the Christians were, and may be the happiest people that ever lived under the most gracious institution ever bestowed on men. The meaning of this institution has been buried under the rubbish of human traditions for hundreds of years. It was lost in the dark ages, and has never been, till recently, disinterred. Various efforts have been made, and considerable progress attended them; but since the Grand Apostasy was completed, till the present generation, the Gospel of Jesus Christ has not been laid open to mankind in its original plainness, simplicity and majesty. A veil in reading the New Institution has been on the hearts of Christians (Campbell, *The Christian System*).

A man could hold any opinion he chose but it must be regarded as private property. The belief of one fact—that Jesus Christ was the Messiah—and the submission to one institution—baptism, was all that was required (Ibid). The consequences were, says Mr. Campbell:

We have had a very large portion of this unhappy and mischievous influence to contend with. Every sort of doctrine has been proclaimed, by almost all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners and with the supposed sanction of the begun Reformation (*The Millennial Harbinger*, VI).

He wrote in terms of ridicule of what is designated as a call “to the ministry,” and made the impression that it was as much the duty and privilege of one Christian brother as another to preach the gospel. This was peculiarly grateful to the feelings of those who wished to preach and were destitute of the qualifications considered requisite to the gospel ministry. Such men saw that they could not be preachers as long as preachers constituted a small and select class. The only hope for them consisted in enlarging the class by lowering the grade of qualifications in those who might wish to enter it.

He was also understood to advocate the management of church affairs so as to supersede the necessity of pecuniary contributions. The salary of “the clergy” had called forth some of his most satirical effusions. The inference was promptly drawn, that it was wrong to compensate ministerial labor. The idea of a “cheap gospel” was especially palatable to the lovers of money. It was also understood that he was opposed to Bible, Missionary and Tract

Societies, Sunday schools and other institutions of this kind. The conclusion, therefore, was that no applications would be made for money to promote the objects of these organizations. For this reason many of the covetous were favorably disposed to the views of the Reformer. Knowing the blessings of salvation “without money and without price,” they tried to persuade themselves that there should be no expenditures for religious purposes.

The Baptists on the other hand were illy prepared to meet error. They had no general body, save the Triennial Convention, which was new and met only every three years, upon which they could consolidate their interests, or even meet for counsel. They had only a few weak and uninfluential newspapers. There were only a few Baptist preachers who had read through the New Testament in Greek or were capable of making a Greek criticism. They were not accustomed to polemical discussions. Their preaching was confined principally to experimental and practical topics while controversy was repudiated.

Those who followed the lead of Mr. Campbell became exceedingly aggressive. In northern Kentucky thousands of people were immersed for the forgiveness of sins. In the meantime he had discontinued *The Christian Baptist* and founded *The Millennial Harbinger*. *The Harbinger* Extra on “Remission of Sins” was published July 5, 1830, and this appears to have been the signal for a separation between the Baptists and the Reformers. When the Extra declared unequivocally that “immersion is the converting act”—that “immersion and regeneration are two Bible names for the same act”—the Baptists thought the time had come for them to protest against such teaching. They protested not only verbally but practically.

The method of procedure between the parties was very different. The Baptists, whether in the majority or the minority, were in favor of a separation. The followers of Mr. Campbell, unless in the majority, were generally opposed to separation.

As a specimen of the procedure of other bodies the action of the Dover Association, of Virginia, is here recorded. This was, at the time, the largest association of Baptists in the world. In the autumn of 1832, this body convened at Four Mile Creek meeting house, in Henrico county, Virginia, not far from the city of Richmond. The Reformation excitement had reached its height. Several of the churches belonging to the body had been split asunder,

and others were in a distracted and unhappy condition. All eyes were turned to the Association for advice in this time of trial. The subject was referred to a select committee, consisting of Revs. John Kerr, James B. Taylor, Peter Ainslie, J. B. Jeter, and Philip Montague. The committee in due time made the following report:

The select committee appointed to consider and report “what ought to be done in reference to the new doctrines and practices which have disturbed the peace and harmony of some of the churches composing this association,” met at the house of Elder Miles Turpin, and having invited and obtained the aid and counsel of Elders Andrew Broaddus, Eli Ball, John Micou, William Hill, Miles Turpin, and brother Erastus T. Montague, after due deliberation, respectfully report the following preamble and resolution for the consideration and adoption of the association.

This association having been from its origin, blessed with uninterrupted harmony, and a high degree of religious prosperity, has seen with unspeakable regret, within a few years past, the spirit of speculation, controversy and strife, growing up among some of the ministers and churches within its bounds. This unhappy state of things has evidently been produced by the preaching, and writings of Alexander Campbell, and his adherents. After having deliberately and prayerfully examined the doctrines held, and propagated by them, and waited long to witness their practical influence on the churches, and upon society in general, we are thoroughly convinced that they are doctrines not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ—disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency; and, therefore, ought to be disavowed and resisted, by all the lovers of truth and sound piety.

It is needless to specify, and refute the errors held and taught by them; this has been often done, and as often have the doctrines, quoted from their writings, been denied, with the declaration that they have been misrepresented or misunderstood. If after more than seven years’ investigation, the most pious and intelligent men in the land are unable to understand what they speak and write, it surely is an evidence of some radical defect in the things taught, or in the

mode of teaching them. Their views of sin, faith, repentance, regeneration, baptism, the agency of the Holy Spirit, church government, the Christian ministry, and the whole scheme of Christian benevolence, are, we believe, contrary to the plain letter of the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour.

By their practical influence, churches long blessed with peace and prosperity, have been thrown into wrangling and discord—principles long held sacred by the best and most enlightened men that ever lived or died, are vilified and ridiculed as “school divinity,” “sectarian dogmas,” &c. Ministers, who have counted all things but lose, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, are reprobated, and denounced as “visionary dreamers,” “mystifiers,” “blind leaders of the blind,” “hireling priests,” &c., &c. The church in which many of them live, and from which they call it persecution to be separated, is held up to public scorn as “Babylon the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth.” The most opprobrious epithets are unsparingly applied to principles which we think clearly taught in the Word of God, and which we hold dear to our hearts. While they arrogate to themselves the title of “Reformers,” it is lamentably evident, that no sect in Christendom needs reformation more than they do.

While they boast of superior light and knowledge, we cannot but lament, in their life and conversation, the absence of that “wisdom that is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.” In fine, the writings of Alexander Campbell, and the spirit and manner of those who profess to admire his writings and sentiments, appear to us remarkably destitute of “the mind that was in Christ Jesus,” of that divine love “which suffereth long, and is kind, envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil.” Whenever these writings and sentiments have to any extent, been introduced into our churches, the spirit of hypercriticism, “vain janglings and strife about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers,” have chilled the spirit of true devotion, and put an end to Christian benevolence and harmony.

If the opprobrious epithets, and bitter denunciations, so liberally heaped upon us by Mr. Campbell and his followers, are deserved, they, as pious and honorable men, cannot desire to live in communion with us; and if they are undeserved, and designedly slanderous, this of itself would forbid our holding them in Christian fellowship. If, indeed, they have found the long lost key of knowledge, and are the only persons, since the days of the apostles, who have entered and explored the divine arcanum, it is due to themselves—to purblind Christendom—to the world—to truth—to God, that they should, in obedience to the divine command, clothed in the shining garments of truth and righteousness, walk out of “Babylon,” and concentrating their light, exhibit a true sample of the “ancient order of things”; and diffuse around them a blare of “love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” Until they do this, grave and thinking men, whose hearts are sickened with the depravity of the times, and who mourn a sad and general departure from truth and holiness, would voluntarily come out from “the present corrupt order of things,” and holding sweet communion with one another, and with their God, let their light so shine that others seeing their good works, might be induced to glorify their Father in heaven; but, alas! they appear to be a strange anti-sectarian, dogmatical sect, who live only in the fire of strife and controversy, and seek to remain in connection with the existing churches, that they may with the greater facility obtain materials for feeding the disastrous flame.

In every aspect of the case then, a separation is indispensably necessary. The cause of truth and righteousness requires it—the best interests of all the parties concerned demand it.

We, therefore, the assembled ministers, and delegates of the Dover Association, after much prayerful deliberation, do hereby affectionately recommend to the churches in our connection, to separate from their communion all such persons as are promoting controversy and discord, under the specious name of “Reformers” That the line of distinction may be clearly drawn, we feel it our duty to declare, that whereas Peter Ainslie, John Du Val, Matthew W. Webber, Thomas M. Henley, John Richards and Dudley Atkinson,

ministers within the bounds of this Association, have voluntarily assumed the name of “Reformers,” in party application, by attending a meeting publicly advertised for that party, and by communing with, and otherwise promoting the views of the members of that party, who have been separated from the fellowship and communion of Regular Baptist churches—therefore

*Resolved,* That this Association cannot consistently, and conscientiously receive them, nor any other ministers maintaining their views, as members of their body; nor can they in future act in concert with any church, or churches that may encourage or countenance their ministrations.

The report was adopted by the Association without discussion and with but few dissenting votes.

Dr. W. C. Buck, gives the following history of the situation and the reasons for the rise and progress of this schism among the Baptists of Kentucky:

In order that we may be able to see things as they now are, let us look back to the state of things as they were in 1832, when the friends of effort began to agitate the plan of a Baptist State Convention, as the only expedient which then appeared practicable, to save the denomination from utter anarchy and ruin; and what do we see? Previous to that tremendous shock which the Campbellistical heresy inflicted upon the denomination in the west, and by which one-half of the churches in this State were rived asunder, and a large proportion of the ministry subverted, the denomination in Kentucky numbered somewhere about 400 churches, contained between 25 and 30,000 members, who were nerved by about 250 to 300 preachers. This we suppose to be about the statistical condition of the denomination, in 1828 and ‘30, when Campbellism broke out in our churches; and had they been united, properly instructed and disciplined, that schism never would have occurred; but they were deficient in all these respects. They were generally descendants from Virginia Baptists, and had been cradled and schooled in settled aversion to clerical distinction and clerical support, by legal enactment, as it was in the State before the Revolution; but they had suffered these correct opinions to

degenerate into an entire, practical neglect of the ministry, and with a large proportion this degeneracy had become sentimental; so that they did not only deny the right of earthly potentates and national hierarchies to control their consciences, and gather tax by law to the support of the Episcopal clergy, whom they did not acknowledge as the ministers of Christ; but they proceeded farther to deny the authority of Christ, to demand a support for those whom they acknowledged to be chosen and sent by him, as his ambassadors. They averred that they were under no obligation to support the gospel, and regarded their contributions to the ministry (if they ever made any), as mere acts of charity. And so prevalent was this sentiment, that it was selected as a popular topic for the pulpit by the ministry, and many have rode into popular favor upon this hobby. No preacher, therefore, who wished to keep his credentials, dared to oppose the popular current and tell the churches their duty. The consequence was, the preachers had to engage in secular employments, for support, deprive themselves of study, and preach when they could; so that there was not, even five years ago, one settled pastor in Kentucky, nor one minister supported, and not one that performed pastoral labor, except in the Louisville church. A very few churches had preaching twice a month; once a month was thought to be the rule of perfection, and beyond this few aspired, while a large proportion were entirely destitute; and yet if you would attend one of those monthly Sabbath meetings, you would see from one to half a dozen ordained and licensed preachers, assembled to avail themselves of the stated preacher's popularity, in calling out an assembly, in order to show their talent in preaching; and often have the most patient assemblies imaginable, been drilled half to death by this system of ministerial polygamy, when all the country for miles around was left in perfect destitution. We will venture to assert that not more than a third of the ministry were employed, taking one Sabbath with another, the year around. And yet, if this miserable state of things had been all, the trouble would not have been half so great; but, alas! the fever of faction raged in all the violence of embittered personal strife. The controversy between Elkhorn and Licking Associations, had been insinuating its poison into the vitals

of society for years, and when the cause of personal pique was worn threadbare, the original pugilists forced it into a doctrinal difference, and the whole denomination was kept in agitation and turmoil upon the subject. Nothing was heard from the pulpit but the extremes of these opposite sentiments; nothing was *Gospel* to the different parties, but what favored their side of the question in the most ultra forms; and nothing *error* but what opposed it; so, that one wide and deep line divided the denomination and every church in it; giving all on one aide to *Calvinism*, and all on the other aide to *Arminianism*; neither party as such deserved the appellation bestowed upon it by the other, but still as perfectly separated upon these lines, as are the antipodes; and the spirit of war was rife among them, as when their fathers and the red man battled on the *Bloody Ground*. All the ties of Christian fellowship were sundered, the order of society broken up, and little else was talked about in social or religious circles but these matters of party strife and feud; and thus were the materials prepared for the convulsion which ensued. A volcanic fire burned to the very center of the denomination; which finally burst out in one widespread and ruinous disruption, by which the extremes of those parties were thrown off at opposite poles; the ultras on one side to Campbellism, and those on the other to antinomian-particularism. Few churches in the State escaped unscathed by this avalanche of error, and not one wholly untainted with the spirit of jealousy, captiousness, and discord which it engendered, and from which the denomination has not yet recovered; and hence the suspiciousness and jealousy manifested toward those who are engaged in efforts to do good. The spirit of antinomian-particularism, has not yet fairly worked off, and is still throwing up its murky fires, and threatening some of our churches with anarchy and disunion: Not so with Campbellism; it rode upon the passion of its votaries with the speed of a dromedary, and did its work of destruction in a hurry, by which the denomination in Kentucky was reduced to something like 20,000, with perhaps near 200 preachers, while the number of churches remained undiminished. We appeal to the candor of every one, whether friend or foe, who has any personal acquaintance of those times, for the truth of the statements here made, and also for

the gentleness which we have evinced in coloring the drapery (*The Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer*, April 30, 1840).

This schism together with that of the Anti-Mission separation brought untold disaster to the Baptists. “This was by far the greatest schism,” says Allen, “that ever occurred in the church; but still the Baptists retained their usual ratio to the population of the State, which was about one to twenty of the inhabitants. In 1832 when the storm of the schism had spent its fury, they had thirty-three associations in Kentucky, four hundred and eighty-four churches, two hundred and thirty-six ordained ministers, and thirty-four thousand one hundred and twenty-four members. The increase since then has been unprecedented; in the succeeding ten years they had doubled their numbers” (Allen, *A History of Kentucky*, 179, Louisville, 1872).

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

B. B. Tyler, *A History of the Disciples of Christ*. New York, 1900.

Richardson, Robert, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*. Philadelphia, 1888-70. 2 volumes.

Rogers, John, *Biography of Barton Warren Stone*. Cincinnati, 1847.

R. L. Dabney, An Examination of the Leading Points of the System of Alexander Campbell, *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, XXXI. 371-413. Columbia, S. C., 1880.

## CHAPTER IX

### A NUMBER OF BAPTIST ACTIVITIES

Alien Immersions—J. L. Reynolds—Crosby—Philadelphia Association—The Case of James Hutchinson—Jesse Mercer—The Christian Review—Benedict—Education—Colombian College—The Triennial Convention on Education—An Address—The Effect of the Revolutionary War—The Charleston Association—Baptist Education Society in the Middle States—The Massachusetts Education Society—A School of Theological Instruction in Philadelphia—Washington, D. C.—The Progress of the Colombian College—President Monroe—The Resignation of Rice—Newton Theological Institution—Hamilton College—The Education Society in South Carolina and Georgia—Mercer College—Other Colleges—State Conventions—The General Convention of Western Baptists—Home Missions in the West—Sunday Schools—Baptist Publication Society—Newspapers and Periodicals—Conclusion.

In all this period of strife and schism the Baptists were slowly groping their way into a place of purpose and action. These troubles had a unifying effect. The controversies in a measure proved a blessing. There were great and unnecessary losses but these were not without compensations.

The subjects of alien immersions and the proper administrator of baptism often arose among the Baptists of this period. This was especially accentuated by the defection of the anti-mission forces and the followers of Alexander Campbell. After the American Civil War it sometimes became acute. There have always been differences of opinion on this subject; but among early American Baptists, perhaps, the vast majority rejected such baptisms and accounted them as invalid. Only a few instances and expressions can here be quoted, but they are sufficient and authoritative enough to indicate the general trend of the thinking of the denomination.

Professor J. L. Reynolds, D. D., Professor in Columbia College, South Carolina, formerly President of Georgetown College, Kentucky, and once Professor in the Theological Department of Mercer University, Georgia, says of rebaptism:

In Africa the question attracted attention at an early period and received a prompt decision . . . The ground on which the validity of heretical baptism was denied, that there could be no real baptism out of the true church.

He further says:

The Novatians, dissatisfied with the lax discipline of the Church of Rome, seceded from it, A. D. 251, and organized themselves on the most rigid principles. Claiming to be the true church they baptized, without distinction, all who were admitted to their communion. Applicants from other churches, were of course, rebaptized. They were the first Puritans—Cathari—and there is little doubt that they were opposed to infant baptism . . . The ground assumed by those separatists, as well as those who succeeded them, was that the Catholic Church (so-called) was become corrupt and anti-christian.

Again:

In all cases of rebaptism to which I have referred, the principle of action was the same—out of the true church there was no baptism. This was a point on which all, whether heretics, or Catholics, seem to have agreed.

He further says:

The Mennonites (so called from Menno, who died 1571) rebaptized all who were admitted into their communion. This is the statement of Neudecker, *Lebrd. Dogmende*, 621.

Once more:

The vast body of the Mennonites adhered to the ancient practice which they had received from the earlier Anabaptists (*The Christian Index*, May 26 and June 16, 1843).

Thomas Crosby, speaking of the Baptists in London, in 1615, says:

They rejected the baptism of infants as being a practice which had no foundation in Scripture; and all baptisms received either in the Church of Rome or England, they looked upon to be invalid, because received in a false church, and from anti-christian ministers (Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists*, I. 273. London, 1738).

The Philadelphia Association, the oldest among the Baptists of America, in the year 1788, decided against the validity of baptism administered by persons who had not been lawfully baptized and ordained. They assigned four reasons for the decision. The fourth is as follows:

Because such an administrator has no commission to baptize, for the words of the commission were addressed to the apostles and their successors in the ministry, to the end of the world, and these are such whom the church of Christ appoint for the whole work of the ministry.

Reference may also be made to similar decisions of this Association in 1729, 1732, 1744, 1749 and 1758.

The Richmond Association, in 1809, decided:

Three things are required to make gospel baptism, viz.: a gospel mode, a gospel subject and administrator (Benedict, *A General History of the Baptist Denomination in America*, II. 472. Boston, 1813).

In 1791 a case was brought before the Kettocton Association which produced considerable agitation. James Hutchinson, who was born in New Jersey, but raised in Loudon county, Virginia, had gone to Georgia, and there first became a Methodist, and then a Baptist preacher. Previous to his joining the Baptists, he had been baptized by a Methodist. When he offered to join the Baptists of Georgia, it was made a question whether his baptism, being performed by an unbaptized person, was valid! The Georgia Baptists decided that it was valid.

In the year above mentioned Mr. Hutchinson came to Virginia to see his relations in Loudon county. While he was there, his preaching became effectual to the conversion of many. Mr. Hutchinson baptized them. These things stirred up the question in Kettocton Association, whether the baptism of Hutchinson and his disciples was valid. The decision here was just the reverse of the decision in Georgia. They determined not to receive him or those baptized by him, unless they should submit to be rebaptized. After some time they consented, and the ordinance was readministered (Semple, *History of Virginia Baptists*).

Jesse Mercer, in a Circular Letter adopted and published by the Georgia Association, in 1811, assigns "the reasons, briefly, which lead us to deem Pedobaptist administrations, though in the proper mode, invalid." The first reason assigned is:

The apostolic church, continued through all ages to the end of the

world, is the only true gospel church.

After laying down several propositions he proceeds:

From these propositions, thus established, we draw the following references, as clear and certainly true; That all churches and ministers, and not successively to them, are not in gospel order; therefore, cannot be acknowledged as such.

Again he says in the same Circular:

Our reasons for rejecting baptism by immersion when administered by Pedobaptist ministers are

- I. That they are connected with churches clearly out of the apostolic succession, and therefore clearly out of the apostolic commission.
- II. That they have derived their authority, by ordination, from the Bishops of Rome, or from individuals who have taken it on themselves to give it.
- III. That they hold a higher rank in the churches than the apostles did, are not accountable to it, and consequently not triable by the church; but are amenable to or among themselves.

Further on he remarks:

The Pedobaptists by their own histories, admit that they are not of it (the true line of the succession of the churches). But we do not; and shall think ourselves entitled to the claim until the reverse is shown clearly. And should any man think that authority derived from the Mother of Harlots sufficient to qualify to administer a gospel ordinance, they will be so charitable as not to condemn us from preferring that derived from Christ . . . If any think the administration will suffice which has no pattern in the Gospel, they will suffer us to act according to the Divine order with impunity.

*The Christian Review*, Boston, 1846, in a long article on Rebaptism, says:

We next consider the case of those who, though adults, baptized in the proper mode and form, yet at that time held grossly heretical doctrines; of adherence to which their baptism was a profession to the world: such as Unitarians, who deny the faith of the Trinity;—Universalists, who deny all future punishment; Campbellites, whose

acknowledgement that Jesus is the Son of God implies neither a belief in the divinity nor vicarious sufferings of Christ, nor a profession of a change of heart. Even the Mormons, it is said, baptize in the name of Jesus. When persons who may have been baptized in a profession in any of these forms of error, are afterwards brought to the truth as it is in Jesus, is it their duty to be rebaptized? In such cases, the first baptism, is surely to be regarded rather as a profession of disbelief, than of belief in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It should therefore be esteemed quite invalid, and be repeated by those who embrace orthodox doctrines. Nor can their subsequent faith make good their former baptism (*The Christian Review*, July, 1846. XI. 198, 199).

David Benedict, the historian, probably held a more extensive correspondence with the Baptists of America in his day than any other man. He was doubtless correct when he summed up the situation as follows: "I have ascertained by my extensive correspondence, that by far the greatest part of our denomination both rebaptize and reordain all who join them, from whatever churches they come" (Benedict).

Much attention was turned to educational matters. The origin of the Columbian College was one of the general results of the Triennial Convention. The necessity of well-educated missionaries and the need of an enlightened ministry at home were keenly felt. There was at that time no institution in this country connected with the Baptists for the education of young ministers in theological learning. Individuals, like Dr. Stoughton and others, had given private instruction with ability and zeal. The time had arrived when more enlarged and systematic measures were necessary. The Convention justly concluded that one of the urgent needs was the training of young ministers. In the Constitution of the Convention it is stated that it is the duty of the Board to "employ missionaries, and, if necessary, to take measures for the improvement of their qualifications" (Art. IV.).

A Committee consisting of Drs. Furman, Baldwin and Stoughton, was appointed "to prepare an address on the subject of Foreign Missions, and the general interest of the Baptist denomination." After a fervent appeal to the churches for the support of foreign missions, the following is added:

The efforts of the present Convention have been directed chiefly to

the establishment of a foreign mission; but it is expected that when the general concert of their brethren and sufficient contributions to a common fund shall furnish them with proper instruction and adequate means, the promotion of the interests of the churches at home will enter into the deliberations of future meetings.

It is deeply to be regretted that no more attention is paid to the improvement of the minds of pious youth, who are called to the gospel ministry. While this is neglected, the cause of God must suffer. Within the last fifty years, by the diffusion of knowledge and attention to liberal science, the state of society has become considerably elevated. It is certainly desirable, the information of the minister of the sanctuary should increase in an equal proportion. Other denominations are directing their attention, with signal ardor, to the instruction of their youth for this purpose. They are assisting them to peruse the sacred writings in their original languages, and supplying other aids for pulpit services, which, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, may become eminently sanctified for the general good. While we avow our belief, that a refined or liberal education is not an indispensable qualification for ministerial service, let us never lose sight of its real importance, but labor to help our young men, by our contributions, by the organization of education societies, and if possible, by a general theological seminary, where some, at least, may claim all the advantage which learning and mature studies can afford, to qualify for acting the part of men who are set for the defense of the gospel. Improvement of this nature will contribute to roll away from the churches the reproach of neglecting to support the ministry of the word. They will be unwilling to receive for nothing that which cost their ministers much (Minutes of the Convention, 42, 43).

The Revolutionary War came nigh destroying all educational work among the Baptists. They had entered into the struggle for independence with ardor. Their most useful ministers were chaplains; and most of the male members bore arms in defense of the country. The result was a universal dispersion, which practically broke up the local habitation of the denomination. For example, the First Church, New York, which at the beginning of the war had over two hundred members, had been reduced to thirty-seven at the close of

the struggle. The tendency was to destroy all of those institutions formed and sustained by combinations—such were the institutions of learning and plans for the education of the ministry. The compensation came with the universal dissemination of the truth. These faithful men went everywhere preaching the Word throughout the United States, and thus the Baptists were exceedingly multiplied.

Comparatively little was effected in behalf of education in the denomination for nearly a half century after the commencement of the Revolution. In addition to their dispersion through the wilderness of an almost illimitable extent, a taste had been acquired and habits formed, which were totally adverse to these pursuits. Many, during this period, through necessity, entered the ministry without any literary preparation, the tendency of which was to diminish, in all, a sense of its importance. The circumstances, added to the depressed condition of the country, arising from the long continuance and severity of the war, and, subsequently, from a depreciation of the currency, rendered a recommencement of these efforts for the education of the ministry exceedingly difficult.

The Charleston Association had, in 1789, put in operation a plan to establish a permanent fund for the education of ministers, and in 1792 the committee was incorporated by the legislature of South Carolina. So that by the year 1810 the committee had approximately received for this fund ten thousand dollars; and had educated thirteen young men for the ministry. Among this number were Jesse Mercer and W. T. Brantly. The Warren Association followed the Charleston Association in making, in 1791, similar plans. Three years later the society was incorporated by the legislature of Massachusetts.

The Baptist Education Society, of the Middle States, was formed in 1812, at Philadelphia: Its object is thus expressed:

Its avowed and explicit object is, with a divine blessing, the assisting of pious young men in obtaining such literary and theological aid as shall enable them, with greater ease to themselves, to fulfill the public duties of the Christian ministry (*The Christian Review*, June, 1837. II. 269) .

At the next Convention, May, 1817, Dr. Furman “placed before the body, in a speech of considerable length and great interest, the very serious and religious importance of a well informed ministry.” The following article was

added to the Constitution:

That when competent and distinct funds shall have been received for the purpose, the board, from these, without resorting at all to mission funds, shall proceed to institute a classical and theological seminary, for the purpose of aiding pious young men, who, in the judgment of the churches of which they are members, and of the board, possess gifts and graces suited to the gospel ministry (Art. XIV. Minutes of the Convention for 1817, p. 139).

Through an arrangement with the Education Society of Philadelphia a school of theological instruction was opened in that city in a private house, and a number of young men were received as pupils. W. S. Stoughton was principal and Irah Chase one of the professors. So that by the meeting of the Convention, in 1820, “a General Education Plan,” was adopted (*The Latter Day Luminary*, II). The Constitution was again amended as follows:

When the Convention shall have located an institution for education purposes, it shall be the duty of the board, under the direction of this body, and exclusively from education funds, to erect or procure suitable buildings, for the accommodation of the students, and to pursue such measures as may be found most conducive to the progress and prosperity of the institution. They shall also judge of the qualifications of persons approved by the churches as possessing suitable gifts, and called of God to the work of the gospel ministry, who shall apply for admission as beneficiaries of the board. They shall have power to appoint suitable instructors in the different departments of education, and determine on the compensation to be allowed them for their services, and superintend, generally, the affairs of the institution.

The question of the proper site for the institution was one of great importance, and had for sometime occupied much attention. Philadelphia had strong attractions, but a location further south was deemed advisable. A location had been provided at Washington by Rice and others. April 26, 1820, he had written as follows:

It has afforded me no small pleasure to find it convenient, incidentally to other matters in hand, to bestow some attention to the object of providing at Washington a site for the institution to

promote the education of the ministry, and ultimately for the foundation of a college, under the direction of the general Convention.

These premises were offered to the Convention, consisting of forty-six and one-half acres, together with a building erected for the purpose. The following resolutions came before the Convention:

1. *Resolved.* That the institution for the education of gospel ministers be located in the city of Washington, or in its vicinity, in the District of Columbia; and that the board be directed to cause its removal thither, whenever suitable preparations shall be made for its reception in that place, and when, in their opinion, such a removal shall be expedient.

2. *Resolved.* That this Convention accept of the premises tendered to them for the site of an institution for the education of gospel ministers, and for a college, adjoining the city of Washington; and that the board be directed to take measures, as soon as convenient, for obtaining a legal title to the same; and that the board be further directed to keep the institution, already in a state of progress, first in view, and not to incur expenses beyond the amount of funds which may be obtained for the establishment of the institution (*The Latter Day Luminary*, II. 128).

These resolutions were adopted. For a period the college prospered greatly. President James Monroe warmly commended the enterprise as follows:

Its commencement will be under circumstances very favorable to its success. Its position north of the city, is remarkably healthy. The act of incorporation is well digested, looks to the proper objects and grants the powers well adapted to their attainment. The establishment of the institution within the federal district, in the presence of Congress, and of all of the departments of government, will secure to the young men who may be educated in it many important advantages; among which the opportunity which it will afford them of hearing the debates in Congress, and in the Supreme Court, on important subjects, must be obvious to all (*The Latter Day Luminary*, II).

But debt occurred and the board loaned the college ten thousand dollars of

mission funds (*Ibid*, II. 363). At length things went from bad to worse. In 1826 the Convention passed the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That no charge against Luther Rice as to immoral conduct has been substantiated.

*Resolved*. That many imprudences are properly attributed to him, for which, however, the urgent embarrassments of the College furnish at least a partial apology.

*Resolved*, That from the various developments it appears that Mr. Rice is a very loose accountant, and that he has very imperfect talents for the distribution of money (Minutes of the Convention for 1826, 18).

In April, 1827, the entire faculty resigned, and the students were dispersed. For a year there was no school. Rice was compelled to resign as agent and treasurer though he never ceased to labor for the college during his life. At a later period when he was led candidly to consider the affairs of the institution he said:

Four unfortunate errors produced, in the first instance, the embarrassment of the institution, viz.: going in debt,—too much cost and parade of faculty,—incautiously crediting students, and supporting beneficiaries without means,—and by remaining so much of my time at the college to assist in managing its affairs, instead of being constantly out collecting funds. This erroneous course was fallen into more readily, because, at the time, funds were circulating freely through the community, and subscriptions and collections were easily obtained. But when debts were contracted, an over proportion of faculty employed, students largely indulged on credit, with beneficiaries on hand, a great change took place in the financial condition of the whole country; still, hoping the state of things would prove only temporary, the correction was not immediately applied, as it ought to have been, and serious embarrassment, at length, began to be felt.

However deplorable was the situation “the most searching investigations of his conduct, in connection with the embarrassment of the college leave not the shadow of suspicion on his integrity. In his whole history as agent, he sought not his own; and for years actually toiled without fee or reward

beyond his personal expenses.” He fell on sleep September 25, 1836, in Edgefield District, South Carolina. A large marble slab with a full inscription was placed over his grave by the Baptist State Convention of South Carolina. His only earthly possessions were an old horse, a worn out buggy, and a spotless reputation which he dedicated to Columbian College (Knowles, *History of Columbian College*, *The Christian Review*, III. 115. Also VI. 321. Sears, *Memoir of Luther Rice*). Unfortunately the college had a troubled history from its inception.

The Newton Theological Institution was founded by the Massachusetts Education Society, at Newton Centre. A beautiful and elevated site of seventy acres was secured for the institution. Under the direction of Ira Chase the school was opened November 28, 1825. There were present three students.

The Society made the preliminary arrangements, in 1825, for the founding of the Institution. The incipient measures are thus recorded:

May 26, 1825. Thursday morning, met at Dr. Baldwin’s, according to adjournment. The Board took into consideration the establishment of a theological seminary in the vicinity of Boston; when the following preamble and resolutions, proposed by brother Sharp, were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, it appears to be the earnest desire of influential brethren in our denomination, that there should be a theological institution in the vicinity of Boston, therefore,

1. Resolved, That it is highly expedient, that the Board take immediate measures to accomplish this important object.
2. Resolved, That Rev. Dr. Baldwin, Rev. Mr. Sharp, and Rev. Mr. Wayland, be a committee to draw up a plan for a theological institution, and recommend such place or places for its location, as they deem proper.
3. Resolved, That Rev. Dr. Bolles, Deacon Heman Lincoln, Rev. Mr. Going, Rev. Mr. Sharp, Mr. N. R. Cobb, and Deacon Levi Farwell, be a committee to solicit subscriptions to aid in the establishment of the institution aforementioned.

The first meeting of the New York Education Society met in Hamilton, May, 1817; and as a result the Hamilton Institution, now Colgate University, was

founded in 1819. “It appears that in 1817,” says Joseph Belcher, “when three flourishing colleges were sustained within the State, there were but three Baptist ministers in all the State west of the Hudson, who had enjoyed the advantages of a collegiate education. A general diminution of influence was the inevitable consequence, and the attention of sagacious brethren began to be drawn to the subject. In May, 1817, (at the very time the venerable Dr. Baldwin, of Boston, was urging the claims of ministerial education before the general convention assembled at Philadelphia) five or six individuals (not knowing of the meeting at Philadelphia) met at the house of deacon Samuel Payne, in Hamilton, to converse and pray over the same subject. Thirteen brethren, after mature and prayerful deliberation, proceeded to organize the *Baptist Education Society of the State of New York*, subscribing one dollar each” (Joseph Belcher, Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution, *The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Record*, 153. May, 1844).

Many of the ministers of Maine were conscious of their poor equipment for their work. In a Circular Letter prepared in 1807, for the Bowdoinham Association, Rev. Sylvanus Boardman characterized the ministry of the district as it was very largely at that time, when in a plea for the support of those whom the churches had called to preach, he spoke of “their want of education, not understanding their mother tongue, compelled to devote their time to study, even to obtain a knowledge of the English language sufficient to qualify them to acquire knowledge of logic, mathematics or philosophy.” Three years later the association organized a plan of an institution to promote literary and theological knowledge. Colby College was finally located at Waterville, and a charter obtained February 27, 1813.

The Cincinnati Domestic Missionary Society was formed in 1824 and one of its objects was: “To promote the cause of gospel missions, and the education of ministers, called, chosen and faithful.” From this movement the Granville College, now Benison University, was organized, at Granville, Ohio, December 13, 1831, with thirty-seven students, the oldest among them being thirty-seven years of age, the youngest eight. Twenty-seven of them were from Granville, and all but two, William Whitney and Giles Peabody, were from Ohio. There were five preachers among them.

John M. Peck founded the Rock Springs Academy in Illinois. Several years later he gives the following account of the enterprise:

In 1826, when not a single academy or boarding school of any kind (except the Catholic seminaries) existed in Illinois or Missouri, I went to the Atlantic States, “on my own hook” (to use a western figure), to obtain aid in the establishment of a seminary. Next year, 1827, the building and institution known as Rock Spring Seminary was started . . . During that season (1826) I visited every prominent institution, college, high school, etc., in my range of travel, to learn all I could of their system of management.

The following interesting incident is recorded:

One day a young Presbyterian minister, Rev. John M. Ellis, a graduate of Andover Theological Seminary, and who had then recently come to Illinois, was riding on horseback through “the Sangamon Country,” as the region here in question was called. As he was making his way over the lonely prairies, interspersed here and there with patches of timber, he came to a small clearing in the midst of hazels and black-jacks, and was arrested in his progress by the sound of an axe. Observing the woodsman more nearly, he called to him with the question, “What are you doing here, stranger?” “I am building a theological seminary.” “What, in these barrens?” “Yes, I am planting the seed.” This was Dr. J. M. Peck, founder of the Seminary at Rock Springs. Mr. Ellis was afterwards active in originating the Illinois University at Jacksonville.

This led to the organization and ultimately to the founding of Shurtleff College, at Upper Alton, Illinois (*Baptist Memorial and Christian Chronicle*, 204. July, 1842).

An education society was organized in Indiana, in 1834, and in 1835, there appeared in *The Cross and Journal*, in Cincinnati, a number of articles on such subjects as the following: “What influence ought the Baptist denomination to exert upon the religious and literary world?” “What influence do we exert upon the religious and literary world?” “The importance of religious education in the formation of the character of youth?” There were discussed many more subjects of like character.

The result of the agitation was that a Manual Labor Institute was opened in Franklin, in 1837, and became Franklin College, in 1844.

The Kalamazoo Literary Institute, Michigan, was chartered March 21, 1837.

It was at first conducted as a branch of the State University, at Ann Arbor, and was partly supported by appropriations from the treasury of that institution. This anomalous state of affairs terminated at about the close of 1846, when the branches were all given up, and the resources and energies of the university were concentrated at Ann Arbor.

The Baptists of Kentucky selected Georgetown as the site of their college, and a charter was obtained for the institution January 15, 1829. William Stoughton was selected as President of the new institution, but died en route to Georgetown to take up his duties. Joel S. Bacon was elected president June 11, 1830. He struggled manfully with the embarrassment occasioned by the lack of funds, by suits and injunctions, and controversies over the management of the property.

There was formed in 1817 “the Baptist Society in South Carolina and Georgia, for the education of pious young men, designed for the ministry.” The following extract is taken from an address sent forth on the occasion:

By our constitution, you will be informed of the designs which we entertain, of the principles which are to guide our operations, and of the methods which will define our proceedings. To the formation of this union, we have been induced by several considerations. The increasing demand in several parts of our country for Baptist ministers with suitable qualifications; the progress of general literature in all classes of society, requiring a proportionate improvement in those who exercise the sacred office; the frequent instances which bring to our view young men of piety and promise, destitute of the requisite means for improving their talents, and a sincere hope, that with the Divine blessing, our cooperation in the proposed measure might contribute to the increase and extension of genuine piety are some of the motives which have excited us to the course into which we now affectionately invite your benevolent activity. Such motives are so true in fact, and so obvious to common inspection, that they must necessarily disturb the repose of the indolent, and assail the observation of the inconsiderate. In the field, brethren, which we propose to cultivate, there is an impressive call to united zeal and diligence.

So far are we from wishing to arrogate to ourselves the merit of

originality in this scheme, that we take pleasure in alleging the example of brethren in other places, as an additional incentive to ardor, in a pursuit where they have led the way. In different parts of the United States are societies united for the accomplishment of designs, in all respects like those for which we solicit your favorable regard. Such examples inspire us with the greatest confidence. But admitting that no other association resembling that which we have contemplated had been formed, is there any want of evidence in favor of its claims? Do not the circumstances of many young brethren, eager to break through opposing difficulties, and stand forth as the ambassadors of Christ, make an affecting appeal to our piety and exertion. Do not Christians of all denominations, combining their energies in order to give greater prevalence to the Word of Life, invite our endeavors to something that may accord with the spirit and animation of the present times? Does not that extensive union for missions, which promises to embody the strength of our denomination in this country, demonstrate the expediency of such methods as might augment the number of laborers for a field of action so widely diffused?

Reverend Silas Mercer, in 1793, employed a teacher to, open a classical school in his residence. Jesse Mercer attended this school. It could not be called a theological seminary, but was designed to furnish instruction to such ministers as cared to avail themselves of its advantages. This school continued three years.

A conference of ministers and others was held at Powelton, in May, 1801, and in 1803 the "General committee of Georgia Baptists" was formed. Itinerant preaching and a school in the Creek nation were the leading objects. It was determined the next year, at Kiokee, that measures be taken to establish "the Baptist College of Georgia." An attempt was made to obtain a charter from the legislature, but this was refused because it was alleged that it would injure the State University. An academy was opened at Mount Enon, near Augusta, in 1807, which flourished for a period and then declined.

Mr. Pennfield, of Savannah, in 1829, bequeathed twenty-five hundred dollars for educational purposes on the condition that the Convention raise a like amount, which was quickly done. In January, 1833, a manual labor school

was opened, seven miles north of Greensborough, with thirty pupils, a few of whom were licentiates. In the first and second year a powerful revival was experienced, and a large number professed conversion. The village was called Pennfield and the school was named Mercer Institute, in honor of Jesse Mercer, who has been called “the most influential minister of the denomination ever reared in the State” (*The Christian Index*, July 21, 1832).

Out of this general movement grew Furman University of South Carolina. The formation of a school in the State had long been agitated. Consequently, in 1826, the Furman academy was established in Edgefield Court House. It was not of long life, but the theological department was preserved. After many struggles in 1851 Furman University was organized.

The Wake Forest College, North Carolina, was established in 1834. At first the institution was to be a manual labor school. So a large farm of 600 acres in Wake Forest county, near Raleigh was purchased and Dr. Wait became president. The school passed through a long period of debt and perplexities before it reached its present large usefulness (*The Christian Index*, September 8, 1832).

The beginnings of the Virginia Baptist Seminary are recorded in an appeal that the Virginia Education Society, through a committee composed of Eli Ball and William Sands, made to the Baptist churches of that State. The methods pursued accurately describe conditions of other similar institutions of learning of those times. The committee says:

This Society has now been formed about two years; its object is to aid pious young men, recommended by their respective churches, in improving themselves for the ministry. None are received except members of a Baptist church, of good report, blameless deportment, and who give evidence of an aptitude to teach. The great object of the Society is, to enable those who have determined to consecrate themselves to this most responsible office, to become qualified by a course of study and mental discipline, for discharging with faithfulness and ability their duties.

Eleven young brethren are now under the care of the Society; the greater portion of them under the care of bro. Edward Baptist, and three of them are with bro. Ball. Others are waiting to place themselves under the patronage of the Society, as soon as the

institution shall be ready to receive them.

The Society has hitherto encountered much difficulty and labored to great disadvantage for want of a building where the students could be collected together, and placed under the superintendence of a teacher whose whole time could be devoted to the work of instruction. This difficulty has been removed by the purchase of a farm well adapted to the purpose the Society had in view.

The farm contains over 200 acres of land, the improvements are sufficiently commodious, with a little expense, to accommodate 30 or 40 students. The situation is pleasant and perfectly healthy. It is situated in a Northern direction from Richmond, about four and a half miles distant, and about one-half mile West of the Brooke Turnpike.

It has already been intimated that it is the intention of the Society to connect manual labor with the instruction of the students. They have two objects in view in this course;—to lessen the expense and to improve the health of the students. The greatest economy will be introduced into every department of the Institution; the Society having solely in view the important object of effecting the greatest possible good with the smallest possible expense. They know and feel sensibly the great destitution of our churches, and the necessity of supplying that destitution as speedily as possible, and this knowledge will govern them in all their expenditures. A majority of the board are practical business men, who have been taught by long experience to expend nothing uselessly.

The property has been secured to a body of trustees; men well known and esteemed in their churches. Every precaution has been taken to guard the Institution from falling into the hands of individuals not members of a regular Baptist church. In case of a departure from the principles of those churches, they are bound to surrender their trust.

A teacher, possessing the confidence of the brethren, Elder Robert Ryland, has been appointed and daily expected. As possession of the farm will be given on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, the school will then be ready to receive additional students, and will go into immediate operation. It

is not intended to have a summer vacation.

The purchase of the farm, with the growing crop, has cost the Society \$4,500. One-third of this sum will be wanted immediately, as the first installment will be due on the first of next month. This payment will be met by some of the brethren in this city, but we trust that our brethren in the country will not suffer them to bear this burden long.

It is very desirable, that at least ten thousand dollars should be obtained this year. The whole of the purchased money should be paid without delay; and a very considerable expense must be incurred in the purchase of a library, &c.—furniture and provisions for the family;—altering and repairing the buildings;—providing stock for the farm, implements of husbandry, mechanical tools, &c.—as well as the salary of the Principal. Our friends who have funds on hand, or who can furnish them in a short time, are requested to forward them without delay (*The Christian Index*, July 7, 1832).

A charter was obtained in 1842 and it became Richmond College.

Approximating the close of the period now under survey several other important schools were founded. In this list is included Mississippi College; the Judson in 1838 and the Howard, in Alabama; the Union, 1842, in Tennessee. In all of these states where these schools are located there were many preliminary efforts leading to their formation. The Colombian College delayed some of these organizations; and after they were formed they weakened the influence of that institution. American policies have run largely on state lines.

It was apparent to all Baptists who had studied the situation that something was lacking in their organization. The association had been the unit of their counsel and missionary operations. The Triennial Convention was made up of missionary societies and such other bodies as cared to cooperate. To remedy this manifest defect State Conventions, or General Associations, were formed in various states. These gave a medium of communication, a rallying place for all of the interests in the bounds of the state, and a method of coordinating the work of the several states. These conventions brought compactness and unity of purpose to the churches of the denomination.

By the year 1832 there were fourteen state organizations as follows: New

York and South Carolina, 1821; Virginia and Georgia, 1822; Connecticut and Alabama, 1823; Massachusetts, Vermont and Maine, 1824; New Hampshire and Rhode Island, 1825; and New Jersey and North Carolina, 1830.

The Triennial Convention was constituted preeminently in the interests of foreign missions; and while it had given some attention to home missions, many persons felt that this was only a secondary consideration. This feeling was especially true in the vast territory of the new states of the West. A numerously attended General Meeting of the Western Baptists in Cincinnati, was held November 6, 1833. As a result of this preliminary gathering the Convention of Western Baptists, assembled in the same city, November 5, 1834. It was declared that "the business of this Convention shall be to encourage and promote, by all lawful means the following objects, to-wit:

Missions, both domestic and foreign; ministerial education, for such as have first been licensed by the churches; Sunday schools, including Bible classes; religious periodicals; tract and temperance societies, as well as all others warranted by Christ in the gospel.

The following statements were made in regard to domestic missions:

In the Report upon Home Missions presented to this body last year, we had a general exhibition of the disorganized and inefficient condition of the Baptist denomination in years gone by, particularly in the western states, together with some of the natural causes of so deplorable a state of things; also, a brief outline of our home missionary operations in the different states, and the abundant success with which God has crowned these efforts. Your committee deem it unnecessary, at so early a period, to survey the same ground again. According to the report above named, regularly organized associations for missionary purposes were in successful operation in four of the western states, viz.: Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky and Tennessee. In Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, and some of the states further South, the work was going on through the agency of the Baptist Home Mission Society with increasing success, and local societies were forming for the carrying on of the good work in a more systematic and efficient manner. To these statements we need only add, that the Illinois Baptist convention has been organized, and in Missouri the brethren have taken measures for a similar

organization (Proceedings of the first Anniversary of the General Convention of Western Baptists, at Cincinnati, 7. Cincinnati, 1835).

Sunday schools had made no great progress; and those who favored such schools were usually on the defensive. There was much opposition manifested from many sources. While they had not attained the efficiency and popularity of later times, they had begun to fill a large place in Christian instruction.

“There are many individuals of our denomination in the West,” says J. M. Peck, “and sometimes whole churches, who are opposed to Sunday schools. The cause is from misunderstanding the design and plan of such institutions among Baptists. They imagine that Sunday-school teaching by others is to instill into the minds of children sentiments, and form habits, not in accordance with their views of divine truth; or else to teach children head religion merely, and leave the heart unaffected; and that their tendency will be eventually to exclude the Spirit of God in conversion. If these brethren could be convinced that this is not the design, nor the tendency of these institutions, they would not only approve, but cordially cooperate in sustaining them. We pretend not but some unwise persons may have spoken of Sunday-school instruction in an unguarded manner, and produced the impression of this tendency. But let our brethren look at this subject without prejudice, make themselves acquainted with the facts pertaining to it, distinguish properly between the good, the imperfect, and the wrong modes of instruction, and they will perceive that their fears, distrust and jealousies are without foundation.

“The committee pretend not to advocate, or even approve all schools taught on the Lord’s day, and which may be denominated Sunday schools, or of all things that may be taught in such institutions. They wish their brethren, as they do themselves, to make due discrimination. They advocate Sunday schools and Bible class instruction on the same broad principles as they do public preaching, and instruction from house to house. No one approves all kinds of preaching, nor all that is preached even by good men; no one approves all kinds of Sunday schools, nor of all that may be taught therein. And it would be just as unwise and unfair to oppose all preaching, as to oppose all kinds of Sunday-school instruction” (*Report on Sunday Schools and Bible Classes*, November 7, 1834. Proceedings of the First Anniversary

of the General Convention of Western Baptists, 19. Cincinnati, 1835). Such was the spirit and temper of the times in regard to Sunday schools, and these opinions prevailed not only in the West but in many other sections of the country.

The American and Foreign Bible Society was formed by the cession of members of the Baptist denomination from the American Bible Society, in 1836, because the Board declined to render aid in printing the Bengalee Scriptures translated on the principle adopted by the American Baptist missionaries in Burmah, involving the translation of the word *baptizo*. The seceding parties organized the American and Foreign Bible Society May 12, 1836. Its efforts were expended chiefly in foreign fields, in the missions of the Baptist denomination (Baird, *The Christian Retrospect and Register*).

The first local Baptist Publication Society was formed in New England in 1811, under the name of the Evangelical Tract Society. It was “not, however, strongly denominational, never became vigorous, and has long since ceased to exist except in name. The necessity of some means for the publication of Baptist tracts was very generally felt in different sections of the country. John S. Meehan and the students for the ministry under the care of Dr. Stoughton, in Philadelphia, as early as 1820, discussed the question of organizing a society for this purpose. But Mr. Meehan’s sudden removal to Washington, D. C., prevented the consummation of their plan. Rev. Samuel Cornelius, of Virginia, and others seriously contemplated a movement in this direction. It was reserved in the providence of God for Rev. Noah Davis, a young minister ordained at Saulsbury, Maryland, December 21, 1823, to take the first effectual steps toward the organization of a tract society. Very soon after his ordination he wrote a letter on the subject to Mr. J. D. Knowles, his former class mate, a student at Colombian College, Washington, D. C., and editor of *The Colombian Star*. The letter was the occasion of much conversation, and led to a meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> of February, 1824, at the house of Mr. George Wood, in Washington, for the purpose of organization. It was originated “as a national society, a center round which the Baptists of every section of the country might rally, a fountain from which should go out streams of blessing to every corner of the land. Its support, however, for the first few years came almost exclusively from southern Baptists.” Of the \$1,010.33 received the first two years, all but \$133.73 came from the southern States.

“About six weeks after the Society’s organization a few tracts were printed, and the first Depository was opened April 2, 1824, in the office of *The Colombian Star*, Washington, D. C. At first it was under the care of Mr. John S. Meehan, afterwards in charge of Mr. Baron Stow, then a student in Colombian College. On November 14, 1826, a special meeting of the Society was held in Washington, at which it was resolved to transfer the headquarters of the Society to Philadelphia. This was done that better facilities for shipping to southern cities and elsewhere might be secured. A committee of brethren residing in Philadelphia was appointed to act in behalf of the Board, and on the 25<sup>th</sup> of December of the same year that committee convened in the house of Dr. J. L. Dagg. The first meeting of the Society in that city was held January 7, 1827, Dr. Dagg acted as chairman and Dr. Howard Malcolm as secretary” (*Fiftieth Annual Report of the American Baptist Publication Society*, 7-12).

The first religious periodical published by the Baptists in this country was *The American Baptist Magazine*, established in 1814. *The Western New York Baptist Magazine* was edited and published by the Hamilton Baptist Missionary Society. *The Latter Day Luminary* was commenced by a committee of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, in Philadelphia, 1818. For the first four years it was published every three months, in 1822 it was removed to Washington and appeared monthly. *The Christian Watchman*, a weekly paper, was established in Boston, in the beginning of the year 1820. *The Religious Intelligencer*, a weekly paper, was published in Providence, Rhode Island, in May 1820. *The Colombian Star*, began in February, 1822. On the same day *The Christian Secretary* began in Hartford, Connecticut. About the same time *The Waterville Intelligencer* was printed in Waterville, Maine.

In the year 1836 the following Baptist newspapers were published in the United States: *Zion’s Advocate*, Maine, Adam Wilson, Editor; *The Eastern Baptist*, Maine; *The New Hampshire Baptist Register*, Edmund Worth, Editor; *The Vermont Telegraph*, Orson S. Murray, Editor; *The Sabbath School Treasury*, Boston, J. H. Purkitt, Editor; *The Christian Review*, James D. Knowles, Editor; *The Baptist Register*, Utica, New York, Alex. M. Beebe, Editor; *The American Baptist*, Jonathan Going, Editor; *The Mothers Journal*, Utica, New York, Mrs. M. Kingsfort, Editor; *The Perennial Register*, Philadelphia, I. M. Allen, Editor; *The Monthly Tracts*, Philadelphia; *The*

*Monthly Paper*, I. M. Allen, Editor; *The Witness*, Pittsburgh, Samuel Williams, Editor; *The Religious Herald*, Richmond, William Sands, Editor; *The Biblical Recorder*, Newbern, North Carolina, Thomas Meredith, Editor; *The Southern Baptist*, Charleston; *The Christian Index*, Washington, Georgia, Mercer and Stokes, Editors; *The Jacksonville Register*, Alabama, William Wood, Editor; *The Baptist*, Nashville, R. B. C. Howell, Editor; *The Baptist Banner*, Shelbyville, Kentucky, John L. Walter, Editor; *The Cross and Baptist Journal*, Cincinnati, J. Stevens, Editor; *The Baptist Advocate*, Cincinnati, J. Stevens, Editor; *The Pioneer*, Upper Alton, Illinois, J. M. Peck, Editor; *The Baptist Memorial*, New York, was established January, 1842, Rufus Babcock and J. C. Choules, Editors. The oldest Journal West of the Alleghany Mountains was *The Gospel Herald*, 1813, published at Frankfort, Kentucky, by Silas M. Noel (Henry C. Vedder, *Journalism in the Baptist Church in the United States*, *The Chautauquan*, August, 1895. XXI. 602).

There were many other institutions established among the Baptists which were to attain mighty proportions. Such were Sunday schools, temperance societies, and others of like character, but they were either just beginning or had not as yet attained prominence.

### **BOOKS FOR FURTHER REFERENCE:**

Henry M. King, Education among the Baptists of this Country during the last One Hundred Years, *The Baptist Quarterly*, X. 445-466. Philadelphia, 1876.

Alvah Hovey, Progress of a Century, *The Baptist Quarterly*, X. 467-489.

E. Thresher, An Address prepared for the Semi-Centennial of Denison University, *The Baptist Review*, III. 572-592. Cincinnati, 1881.

James D. Knowles, History of the Columbian College, District of Columbia, *The Christian Review*, II. 115-136. Boston, 1837.

Ministerial Education in Georgia, *The Christian Review*, II. 579-584.

Philip Schaff, Progress of Christianity in the United States, *The Princeton Review*, LX. 209-252. New York, 1879.

James David Butler, American Pre-Revolutionary Bibliography, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, XXXVI. 72-104. Andover, 1879.

Daniel C. Stevens, The American Baptist Publication Society. One Hundred years of Service and Growth, *The Review and Expositor*, XXI. 397-407.

Louisville, 1924.