

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>





*Gen. Ser.*

The University of Chicago  
Libraries



GIFT OF

---



*Gen. Sel.*

The University of Chicago  
Libraries



GIFT OF

---

---





657  
BX 6276

4

DEFENSE

OF THE

# Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript

WITH A

REVIEW OF DR. JNO. T. CHRISTIAN'S  
WORK, ENTITLED: "BAPTIST  
HISTORY VINDICATED."

BY

GEO. A. LOFTON, D.D.

AUTHOR OF BIBLE THOUGHTS AND THEMES, CHARACTER SKETCHES, HARP  
OF LIFE, A REVIEW OF THE QUESTION, REVIEW OF DR. JESSE  
B. THOMAS, ENGLISH BAPTIST REFORMATION  
FROM 1609 TO 1641 A.D.

---

Appendix to English Baptist Reformation from 1609 to 1641 A.D.

---

PRICE 25 CENTS.

MARSHALL & BRUCE CO., NASHVILLE, TENN.





DEFENSE

OF THE

Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript

WITH A

REVIEW OF DR. JNO. T. CHRISTIAN'S  
WORK, ENTITLED: "BAPTIST  
HISTORY VINDICATED."

BY

GEO. A. LOFTON, D.D.

AUTHOR OF BIBLE THOUGHTS AND THEMES, CHARACTER SKETCHES, HARP  
OF LIFE, A REVIEW OF THE QUESTION, REVIEW OF DR. JESSE  
B. THOMAS, ENGLISH BAPTIST REFORMATION  
FROM 1609 TO 1641 A.D.

"gift"

---

Appendix to English Baptist Reformation from 1609 to 1641 A.D.

---

1899.

PRESS OF MARSHALL & BRUCE Co.  
NASHVILLE, TENN.

6-76  
EX-107  
TO THE  
SERRAVALLO COACHES

COPYRIGHT 1899,  
BY GEORGE AUGUSTUS LOFTON.

556334

Bx627  
L8

## PREFACE.

---

The author of this volume did not expect to appear in print again upon the subject of the 1641 controversy. Having, after a careful examination of the question in the light of the seventeenth century literature, published his last work, entitled "English Baptist Reformation," he felt, with the favorable commendation of certain expert historians and scholars, that he had done all that was necessary to establish the fact that, about 1640-41, the Anglo-Saxon Baptists revived immersion and established what they themselves called a "Reformation" of their own. The more recent work of Dr. John T. Christian, however, entitled "Baptist History Vindicated," seems to demand a critical examination; and the author of this work, having placed himself in possession of all the materials essential to such an examination, feels called upon, from a sense of duty, to expose the misleading character of Dr. Christian's work. Expert historians, or even intelligent and impartial readers, who read both sides of the contention, would not be misled; but there are thousands who read from prejudiced or partisan points of view, and who are not likely to know the truth without an effort to expose the errors of Dr. Christian. Some of the good brethren who compose this latter class—and they are in the large majority—it is hoped will be reached, directly or indirectly, sooner or later, through the publication of this volume. Whether they are ever reached or not, in this generation, the author will feel that he has done his duty; and he is conscious of the fact that future generations, in the progress and freedom and thought, will read and recognize the truth of Baptist history now claimed to be "vindicated," but, to the author's view, most grossly *perverted*.

It has not been thought necessary in this work to notice the Intro-

(iii)

146160

duction of Dr. Christian's book by Dr. T. T. Eaton, nor the favorable Review of the same by Dr. Jesse B. Thomas in the columns of the Western Recorder, since neither adds anything to Dr. Christian's arguments or conclusions. Both conservatively avoid the violent and denunciatory phraseology of Dr. Christian, and neither indulges in characterizing the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript as "forgeries" or "frauds," but simply as "unreliable;" and this is some advance in the discussion on the other side. The main point in Dr. Eaton's Introduction is this: "*Not a single instance has been cited where any Anabaptist in England practiced sprinkling or pouring, or where any Anabaptist church changed its practice.*" The conclusion of this work will demonstrate, as already shown in the author's "English Baptist Reformation," that, prior to 1640-41, the English Anabaptists not only practiced sprinkling or pouring, but that, about 1640-41, their churches changed to immersion. There may be no "single," or individual, case of Anabaptist sprinkling or pouring cited; and, on the other hand, there has not been a single or individual case of Anabaptist immersion—apart from the 1640-41 immersion revival—cited. The proposition is indubitably clear that, if the English Anabaptists, about 1640-41, restored immersion, they sprinkled or poured for baptism prior to that date, if they baptized at all.

The last chapter of the present volume contains the able and scholarly Review of Dr. Christian by Dr. Albert Henry Newman. It is rather a critical and philosophical survey of the question, as historically presented up to date, than a detailed history of the case; and had Dr. Newman had the space for a purely historical review, the author should not have attempted the present task. This Review is the most scholarly and succinct presentation of the "Whittitt Question" yet published, and it is a matter of pleasure and profit thus to give it some feeble form of permanent preservation and publication. Dr. Newman is a historical expert of large and

accurate reading, and of scientific qualification essential to a judicial presentation of the question in controversy, and the author is gratified to know that he is in substantial agreement with Dr. Newman.

The present work is based upon the author's "English Baptist Reformation," with the exception of some additional testimony from Drs. Wall, Gale, and others; and in order to a fuller understanding of the subject discussed in this volume, the reader is referred to the former volume, also to Dr. Whitsitt's Question in Baptist History, Dr. Vedder's Short History of the Baptists, and to Dr. Newman's History of Antipedobaptism. It is hoped that the reader will avail himself of all discussion upon both sides of the question, and that in the reading of this volume Dr. Christian's book will be carefully compared. The author is perfectly willing and anxious for full and fair examination by comparison, and he is more than willing to leave the conclusion to the fair-minded and impartial reader.

This work is intended to be an Appendix to the author's "English Baptist Reformation from 1609 to 1641 A.D.;" and in order to a fuller understanding of the subjects here discussed, those interested would do well to have the other volume. G. A. L.

NASHVILLE, TENN., July 22, 1899.

# CONTENTS.

---

CHAPTER .	PAGE.
I.—THE JESSEY RECORDS .....	7
II.—THE KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.....	18
III.—DOCUMENT "NUMBER 4" .....	33
IV.—AUTHORS CITED TO DISCREDIT THESE MANUSCRIPTS....	40
V.—PEDOBAPTIST IMMERSION BEFORE 1641.....	51
VI.—ANABAPTIST IMMERSION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY..	61
VII.—IMMERSION AMONG THE ANABAPTISTS OF ENGLAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PRIOR TO 1641....	72
VIII.—DR. CHRISTIAN'S SNAP SHOTS .....	84
IX.—PROOF THAT THE ENGLISH ANABAPTISTS REVIVED IMMERSION ABOUT 1640-41.....	94
X.—PROOF THAT THE ENGLISH ANABAPTISTS PRACTICED SPRINKLING OR POURING PRIOR TO 1640-41 .....	107
XI.—REVIEW OF DR. CHRISTIAN'S ARTICLES BY DR. A. H. NEWMAN, IN "THE WESTERN RECORDER".....	120



## CHAPTER I.

### THE JESSEY RECORDS.

The documents which come under the above head are found in a collection of papers entitled :

“ A Repository of Divers Historical Matters Relating to the English Antipedobaptists. Collected from Original Papers or Faithful Extracts. Anno 1712.”

The author of this collection, without giving his name, says : “ I began to make this collection in January 1710-11.”

The Jessey Church Records, including the so-called *Kiffin Manuscript*, embrace Numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this “ collection ” of some thirty-three documents as recently discovered by Dr. Geo. P. Gould, of London, but which are substantially found in Crosby’s *History of the English Baptists*, Neal’s *History of the Puritans*, and other works.

The first document of this “ collection,” entitled “ Number 1,” has the following heading :

“ The Records of an Antient Congregation of Dissenters from wch many of ye Independent & Baptist Churches of London took their first rise: ex MSS. of Mr. Henry Jessey, wch I received of Mr. Richard Adams.”

All these four documents were received by the collector from Richard Adams, who was the colleague of William Kiffin in the pastorate of the Devonshire-square Baptist Church of London from 1690 to 1701, who succeeded Kiffin at his death in 1701, and who died himself in 1718. According to Crosby and Ivimey, he was educated by Dr. John Tombes, and “ lived to a very great age.” He was evidently born before the days of 1633, and was well acquainted with Jessey and the movements of 1640-41. The “ collector ” of these documents must have been Benjamin Stinton, who purposed writing a Baptist history, and who doubtless received these documents from Adams in 1710-11. Crosby says (Vol. IV., p.



365) of Stinton: "He had been for some years collecting materials, in order to write an History of the *English Baptists*;" but he died, February, 1718, and his collection was left to Crosby, who himself wrote the History of the English Baptists in 1738-40. These Jessey Records, including the Kiffin Manuscript, are found in Crosby's history; and the inference is clear that he received them from Stinton, that it was Stinton, the collector, who received them from Richard Adams, and that Adams had gathered these papers from Jessey and Kiffin with the view of collecting and keeping Baptist records.

Some call these documents "anonymous" because of the absence of the collector's name; but the name of Jessey, the writer, and Adams, the holder of these papers, are so given as practically to rob them of any anonymous character—especially so if they are true to history. No doubt we should have had the name of Stinton, the collector, had he lived to write his history; and we do have him pretty well identified by Crosby, who declares that he had been for "some years collecting materials" for an English Baptist history, among which *these very Records are found*, and which Crosby uses as perfectly reliable testimony. Really, they are not anonymous. Their authorship and authenticity are well established by two names at least, Jessey and Adams, who were contemporary with the collector, who was also well known to Crosby in 1710-12. The very connection of Richard Adams, a very aged and respectable Baptist minister, with these documents especially deserves serious and candid consideration.

Having glanced at the authorship and authenticity of these documents from the standpoint of their *writer*, their *holder*, and their *collector*, I shall examine the intrinsic value of their evidence. That they contain some minor errors and obscurities is admitted, but I shall show that they are historically correct in every main point intended to be recorded. The object of these Records seems to have been to set forth the origin of the Calvinistic Baptist churches which sprang, with many of the independent churches, from the Jacob congregation organized in 1616. The writer does not herein touch the origin of the General Baptists, 1609-11; and these Records are simply an honest effort to reach the beginning of

one branch of the English Baptist denomination. Moreover, as Dr. Newman has well suggested, these Records are not to be regarded as exact church minutes made at the time of the events recorded, but were gathered up in after years by Mr. Jessey from recollection, eyewitnesses, or partial contemporary documents. They are simply taken from the "ex MSS." of Mr. Henry Jessey, and are more or less indefinite as to dates and unimportant details, which accounts for their fallibility, but which does not invalidate their *bona fide* character.

Under this head I shall examine document "Number 1." This is a record of personal and ecclesiastical history involving a single congregation from 1604 to 1641. The main historical points in "Number 1" are as follows, undisputed and corroborated:

1. A mention of Henry Jacob, an eminent man for learning and piety, seeking, with others, in 1604, the reformation of the English churches. (Neal, with the Oxford Historian, History of the Puritans, Vol. II., pp. 73, 126, 394.)

2. The mention of several of Jacob's books—namely, "A Humble Supplication to his Majesty (viz.) King James, &c., 1609;" "An Attestation of ye most famous and approved Authors, &c., 1610;" "The Divine Beginning & Institution of a Visible Church, &c., 1612;" "An Exposition of ye Second Commandment, &c., 1610." The Records here give substantially the titles and dates of these productions with a variation of a year or two in the publication of the date of two of them; and it is evident that the writer of these Records wrote from memory without having the books before him. Perhaps few men could recollect the long and complicated titles of seventeenth century books or their changeful dates; and the puerility of Dr. Christian's criticism on this point (Baptist History Vindicated, p. 41) is conspicuous. (Neal, Vol. II., p. 126.)

3. After much conference regarding the reformation of the English Church, Jacob went to Leyden to confer with John Robinson, where he imbibed Brownst principles; and returning to England, he ventured, with Throgmorton, Wring, Mansel, and others to establish an independent church in London in 1616. (Neal, Vol. II., pp. 126, 127; Crosby, Vol. I., p. 148.)

4. The Records say that "about eight years" Mr. Jacob re-

mained pastor of this church, when he went to Virginia, where it was supposed he died. So writes Neal, the Oxford historian, Dexter and all the rest. Dr. Christian (*Baptist History Vindicated*, p. 43) demonstrates by his valuable and enterprising investigation of the Court Records of London that Jacob returned from Virginia, perhaps in 1624, died there, and hence must have gone to Virginia earlier, perhaps in 1622; and singularly enough this fact was not historically made known at the time. Of course these Records, written as they were in after years and only indefinitely referring to Jacob's pastorate as "*about* eight years," and therefore indefinitely as to the date, 1624—a date probably put into the margin by the collector—either did not know of Jacob's return and death, or else did not regard the fact as important or essential to the history in hand. The mistake of a year or two as to the length of Jacob's pastorate is a matter of little consequence as compared with the more important fact of his pastoral connection with the church of "*about* eight years;" and the return and death of Jacob, now disconnected from the church, cuts but little figure in the history *intended* to be recorded. Alas for the absurdity of Dr. Christian's claim of "forgery" upon this point!

5. In the same year, 1616, by the advice and consent of the church, Jacob published a "Confession and Protestation" in which was shown their "consent" in and their "dissent" from the doctrines of the English Church, giving twenty-eight particular reasons of dissent, also a collection of sundry reasons why Christians should walk in the ways and ordinances of God. (Neal, Vol. II., pp. 126, 127.)

6. The Records state that after Jacob's departure the church remained "a year or two" edifying itself, and at length chose and ordained John Lathrop pastor, who served it "*about* nine years," thus stating the time indefinitely as before. Dr. Christian (*Baptist History Vindicated*, p. 45) says, according to his dates, that the church must have been pastorless more than "*three* years," if Lathrop served nine years! Nevertheless, the historical fact of Lathrop's pastorate succeeding that of Jacob's, after a short lapse of time, is stated; and it is clear that the writer of these Records did not intend to be definite as to date, since he was evidently writing

from report or his recollection of "*about* nine years." (See Neal, Vol. II., p. 399.)

7. On April 29 (Lord's day), 1632, the Records give an account of the arrest of some of the Jacob church at the house of Humphrey Barnet. (Neal, Vol. II., p. 399.) Forty-two were arrested and eighteen escaped or were not present. Barnet is represented as "no member" of the church, or "hearing abroad." Among the number taken was Mr. Lathrop. The prisoners were sent to several prisons—namely, the "New Prison," the "Clink," the "Gatehouse." The names of some of the prisoners were Mrs. Bernet, W. Parker, Mrs. Allen, Mr. Sargent, Will Ferne, Sam and Sister House, Marke Lucar, H. Dod (deceased prisoner), Mr. Barebone, Mr. Jacob, and many others. On the 12th of May following (1632), "Lord's day," about twenty-six more were committed. A fortnight after two others were seized and imprisoned "with these." For "two years," some "under bail" and some "under hold," the Lord "tryed and experienced" them, magnifying his name and refreshing their spirits, enabling them to exemplify their religion and to preach to their enemies, and giving them "favor" with their "keepers," who suffered their friends to visit and comfort them, and who allowed them to go and come upon their promise. Many were "added to the church" in prison, among whom was "Humph. Bernard." None recanted. They were allowed to receive and read the notes of Mr. Davenport's sermons, etc.

"After the space of *about* two years" the prisoners were all released upon bail except Lathrop and Grafton; but in June, 1634, Lathrop was released upon the ground that he would "depart out of the land." With thirty of the members of the church he was dismissed and went to New England (Neal, Vol. II., p. 399) in the year 1634.

These are substantially the facts in the case of these 1632 imprisonments as gathered by the Jessey Records writer in after years without attempting to be definitely accurate. Dr. Christian (Baptist History Vindicated, pp. 45-50), in the light of the Court Records, finds some discrepancies in the minor details of the report and pronounces it a "forgery!" For instance, Humphrey Barnett appears to have been arrested and brought before the court; and

yet it is possible that he was arrested from among those who escaped on April 29. Dr. Christian infers that the forty-two prisoners were all put into the "New Prison," and not into the "Clink" or the "Gatehouse," by the trial of some other "heretics" on June 14th, 1632, who were not to be sent to the New Prison, but to the Clink or the Gatehouse, because the "keeper" of the New Prison had let some of the "other companie" escape; but this does not imply that *all* of the "other companie," even if they were among those arrested April 29th, were the *whole* of the forty-two arrested. He also infers that Humphrey Bernard was a member of the church, and not converted in prison, because his name follows that of "Lathrop the minister" in the list of the arrested; but, nevertheless, he may not have been a member of the church, though caught in that company. Dr. Christian finds that Henry Dod (deceased prisoner) did not die in prison at this time—that he was out of prison November 25, 1633—and yet he may have gotten into prison again and died before 1634. He finds that "Mr. Jacob" was "Sara Jacob," that "Sister House" was "Penmina Howes—a maide," that "Mr. Sargent" was "Elizabeth Sargent," that "Mr. Wilson" was "Susan Wilson," that "Mr. Barebone" was "Sara !!!!!" Five names out of the forty-two got a little mixed in their titles; and yet this is not worse than in many other records of reliable history which has been transmitted through report or the recollection of contemporary writers or transcribers. There is no substantial difference here in the facts, names, and dates of this 1632 arraignment of the Jacob-Lathrop church, and the sole difference between the Jessey and the Court Records lies in some of the minor details—the difference largely created by the unreliable inferences of Dr. Christian. No other author of history in similar cases of record but would make two such reports a joint confirmation of a given fact. The truth is that here the Court Records establish the Jessey Records in the general facts of the arrest of April 29, 1632.

8. The Jessey Records give September 12, 1633, as the date at which a secession of some twenty persons took place from the Jacob-Lathrop church. Among the number were Henry Parker and wife, Widd Fearne, — Hatmaker, Mary Millburn, Jo Millburn, Marke Luker, Mr. Wilson, Thomas Allen, — Arnold, Rich Blunt, Theo.

Hubert, Rich Tredwell and his wife Kath., John Trimber, Mr. Jennings, Sam Eaton, and Mary Greenway.

It is assumed by Dr. Christian (Baptist History Vindicated, p. 50) that Henry Parker and wife, Widd Fearne, Mr. Wilson, Jo Millburn, and others of the above number, could not have been in the secession of 1633, for the reason that they were not released from jail until April 24, 1634—some seven months later than the secession. He refers back to the arrests of April 29 and May 12, 1632, which included Henry Parker, Will Fearne, John Milburne, Mr. Wilson, Marke Luker, Eliabeth Milburne, or Mary Milburne, whose trial the Court Records say was on the 8th of May—a discrepancy of *four* days, as against May 12, the date of the Jessey Records. Moreover, Dr. Christian shows that May 12 was not the "Lord's day," as the Jessey Records claim, but Saturday, the day before—pretty close for such records, and close enough to be identical. The point I wish to make, however, is that the persons alleged to be in prison, and whom Dr. Christian says could not have been in the secession of 1633, according to the Jessey Records themselves, could have been and were in the secession of that date. These Records, to which Dr. Christian *now* appeals as authority, distinctly state that "some" of these prisoners, during the two years from 1632 to 1634, were "under bail" and some "under hold;" and that of those under hold, they were "found so sure in their promises": that their "keepers" gave them "freedom to go home, or about their trades or business, whensoever they desired, and set their time and say they would return." Under such conditions of imprisonment the above-named persons, as the Records declare, were in the secession of 1633—whether "under bail" or "under hold," going out of or coming back to prison at their pleasure and on their promise. These facts in the case Dr. Christian was careful not to bring out or notice. Alas for the unfairness of such criticism! It was during this two years of imprisonment that many, as these Records show, were converted and "added to the church" from among the prisoners. All this Dr. Christian suppressed or did not mention.

9. The Jessey Records show that in 1638 there was another secession of some six persons from the Jacob-Lathrop church, "being of

the same judgment with Sam Eaton," who had gone out with the secession of 1633, and who, "with some others," had received "a further baptism"—that is, in 1633. The names of these six were Mr. Peter Ferrer, Hen Pen, Tho. Wilson, Wm. Batty, Mrs. Allen (died 1639), and Mrs. Norwood. These are represented as joining with Mr. Spilsbury, who had become pastor of the 1633 secession. (Crosby, Vol. I., p. 149.)

In connection with this part of the Jessey Records, Dr. Christian (Baptist History Vindicated, pp. 52-55) most grossly misrepresents the case of Sam Eaton. He says (p. 52): "It would seem from the accounts as given in these documents that Sam Eaton spent a good part of his life in joining various churches." Again, he says (p. 53): "These alleged 'genuine (?) documents' represent that on June 8, 1638, Sam Eaton received a further baptism, and that since he had been convinced that infant baptism was wrong he joined Mr. Spilsbury's church." There is not one word of truth in these statements. Sam Eaton was already a member of Spilsbury's church, and the six persons who were of his "judgment" as to "infant baptism," in 1638, joined with Spilsbury's church in order to follow Sam Eaton, whose "further baptism" was received in 1633, when, with "others," he seceded from the Jacob-Lathrop church.

But Dr. Christian claims that Eaton was arrested April 29, 1632, tried May 3 of the same year, and was in jail until April 24, 1634. As already shown by the Jessey Records, the "keepers" of these prisoners "found them so sure in their promises that they had freedom to go home, or about their trades or business, whensoever they desired, and set their time and say they would then return, it was enough without the charges of one to attend them;" and this easily accounts for the name of Eaton, as of the others already mentioned, being found in the secession of 1633. This is absolutely all that the Jessey Records or the Kiffin Manuscript claims for Eaton, and there is not the slightest hint that he joined Spilsbury or was baptized in 1638. Only those of his "judgment" with reference to "infant baptism" seceded in 1638 from the Jacob church and joined Spilsbury.

10. The Jessey Records give another instance of persecution of

the Jacob church, dated in the margin, 1637, and fixed in the "11th month (vulgarly January) ye 21st day at Queenhith (where Mr. Glover, Mr. Eaton, Mr. Eldred and others ware with us." The party was arested by the Pursevant, who, through the favor of some of their opposers, "bailed them." The next day the Pursevant got money of some of them, and so "dismissed" them, "remitting four to the Poultry Counter."

Dr. Christian (p. 54) does not seem to have hunted for this case among the Court Records, or if he did, he says nothing about it. He plants himself upon the presumption that Eaton could not have been among those arrested on this occasion (January 21, 1637), because he had been rearrested and committed to jail May 5, 1636, having been out on bond since April 24, 1634, a space of something over two years. Eaton, according to the Court Records, must, therefore, have been in jail January 21, 1637, since he continued in jail from May 5, 1636, until August 31, 1639, when he died in prison. According to the Court Records in the case of Eaton (a copy of which I have through Rev. Geo. P. Gould, of London), Eaton was permitted by his "keeper" not only to preach to his fellow-prisoners, but "*to go abroad to preach to conventicles.*" (Petition of Francis Tucker to the Court of High Commission, Calendar of State Papers, Vol. 406, date 1638.) This allows for Eaton's being at the conventicle of Queenith, January 21, 1637; and with the rest of the company he could have been bailed by the Pursevant, or dismissed for money, or remitted among the four to the Poultry Counter. There is nothing improbable in the fact of Eaton's being present with the conventicle at Queenith, 1637, since his keeper allowed him "to go abroad to preach to conventicles." The arrest and imprisonment of "heretics," at this time, seems to have been very loosely managed. This fact in Eaton's case, and in the case of the prisoners heretofore mentioned, is suppressed by Dr. Christian; and upon this point the Jessey Records and the Court Records are happily without any substantial disagreement at any point.

Under this head the Jessey Records mention another persecution of the Jacob-Lathrop people, April 21, 1640, at Tower Hill, at "Mrs. Wilson's," when Henry Jessey and others were arrested.



Also, August 21, 1641, at "Brother Golding's," and on the 22nd of the same month, 1641, at "L. Nowel's house," these people were disturbed and arrested and brought before the courts. At the latter place Mr. Jessey was again arrested, with Nowel and Ghayton, and bound to answer at the House of Commons, where the case was dropped. All these are well-attested historical facts, and undisputed, except by Dr. Christian.

11. Dr. Christian (pp. 56, 57) strains a point to find fault with the statements of the Jessey Records regarding Lathrop's release from prison and his departure to New England in 1634. There is some difference between the Jessey Records and the Court Records in the minor details regarding the release of the "saints" and Mr. Lathrop indefinitely put by the Jessey Records "after the space of *about* two years of suffering and patience." Mr. Lathrop and Mr. Grafton were excepted. At last, there being no hope of Mr. Lathrop's doing the church any good, and after the death of his wife, desiring to go to New England, the church granted permission; and upon petition that he might "depart out of the land," the Records say, *about* June, 1634, he was released from prison. There is not the slightest intimation in the Jessey Records, as Dr. Christian assumes, that Lathrop, "went to America *immediately*." Not leaving immediately, the Court Records show that his bond was ordered to be certified on June 19, 1634, and that he was attached for non-appearance; but it seems that he left for New England in August, arriving at Boston in September, 1634—the year in which the Jessey Records say that he was released on bail and the consent of the church was given him and thirty others to go to New England. There is no difference between the Jessey Records and the Court Records in the main fact that Lathrop was released and went to New England in 1634—about all that the Jessey Records, in an indefinite way, intended to record on this particular point, involving the reason for going, the consent of the church, and the action of the court. The Court Records show that he was released April 24, 1634, whereas the Jessey Records say "*about*" June, 1634; but as the word "*about*" so often indicates in these Records, the statement is simply indefinite as based upon general report or the recollection of the writer, Mr. Jessey, who subsequently gathered up

these facts. He is close enough for the truth of the matter, and substantially identical with the Court Records. He could not be expected to get every minor detail of name, date, or place accurately; and whether these saints were any or all of them released before Lathrop, or whether any at a later date refused to take the oath and remained in prison after Lathrop's release, does not affect the integrity of the Jessey Records in their substantial report of the main facts intended to be recorded. (See Neal, Vol. II., p. 399.)

The Court Records do not give all the facts in the case, so far as the action or internal operations of the Jacob-Lathrop church were concerned, in all the details recorded; and while the subsequent writer of the Jessey Records may have been ignorant of many details known to the Court Records, he accurately gives the history of the church in the main facts gathered, and in these main facts he is marvelously consistent with the Court Records. Recently more than a hundred errors have been exposed in the history of Tennessee, but these errors in no way destroy the substantial history of the State. These Records are the "ex MSS. of Mr. Henry Jessey," gathered up by him years after the occurrence of the facts recorded; and he took them from such documents, or such reports, as he could secure. The matters in these Records relating to himself and the times in which he was an actor are no doubt correct in detail as well as in the main facts, allowing for the errors that have probably been made by transmission or copying; but from beginning to end they are genuine history.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

Having followed the Jessey Records in their historical detail of the affairs of the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church from 1604 to 1641 in certain particulars, I come now to the so-called Kiffin Manuscript, which is designated by the collector as "Number 2," which is evidently only a part of the Jessey Records identical in the two paragraphs of 1633, 1638, and a continuation of these Records in the 1639, 1640, 1641 paragraphs. The Kiffin Manuscript in the 1633, 1638 paragraphs is only a repetition of the same two paragraphs found in what we distinguish as the Jessey Records; and while this document is ascribed to William Kiffin, it is evidently a transcript from the Jessey Manuscripts, and was found among Kiffin's papers by Mr. Adams, and so credited to him by Stinton and then Crosby, who constructs a substantial document, called the Kiffin Manuscript, which not only comprehends the 1633, 1638, 1639, 1640, and 1641 paragraphs of the so-called Kiffin (original) Manuscript, but combines the 1633, 1638 paragraphs of both the Jessey Records and the original so-called Kiffin Manuscript, which shows that what he calls the Kiffin Manuscript for substance was the Jessey Records. Hence, perhaps, what in one place he calls the "manuscript written by William Kiffin," he qualifies in another place by saying that it was "*said* to be written by William Kiffin." There is a single error in the 1633 paragraph of the original so-called Kiffin Manuscript which indicates that Kiffin was not the author of the document—namely, that he (Kiffin) was among the number seceding from the Jacob-Lathrop church at that date. According to Kiffin himself (Ivimey, Vol. II., p. 297; Orme's Life of Kiffin, p. 14), he joined, when twenty-two years of age—that is, 1638—an Independent congregation which was the Jessey church, and not Spilsbury's, as Crosby erroneously states in his, for substance, version of the Kiffin Manuscript. Kiffin was born in 1616, and never joined any church until 1638, when twenty-two years of age, and then he joined Jessey's church, according to his own statement.

This part of the Jessey Records is a history of two secessions from the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church which took place in 1633 and 1638, resulting in the formation of the first Particular Baptist Church, under the pastorate of John Spilsbury, at Wapping. It is also the history of another secession in 1639, which finally resulted, in 1644, in a Baptist church under the pastorate of Paul Hobson at Crutched-Friars. It is also the history of the equal division of the Jacob-Lathrop church in 1640 under the pastorates of Henry Jessey and Praisegod Barebone; of the conviction of Blunt, Lucar, Shepherd, and others of the Spilsbury church, with Jessey and others of his church, that immersion only was baptism; of the sending of Blunt to Holland for the regular administration of the ordinance; and of Blunt's return and to the dipping of fifty-three persons about the 1st and 9th of January, 1641, O. S. (1642, N. S.)—all of which facts, with the names of the persons baptized, are clearly and minutely detailed, and so recorded as history by Crosby. The causes or reasons for the foregoing secessions (1633, 1638), and the movement for immersion (1640, 1641) are distinctly stated in the so-called Kiffin Manuscript or the Jessey Records; and there is nothing in the documents themselves, or in contemporary history, to conflict with the main facts which are clearly and consistently declared. In fact, they are unquestionably confirmed by Baptist and Pedobaptist writers of the seventeenth century, followed by Crosby, who uses these Records as history without question.

Now, Dr. Christian seeks in every conceivable way to mystify or contradict these plain documents as not simply unreliable, but as a "forgery" and a "fraud." He classifies them as the Jessey Records, the Gould Kiffin Manuscript, and the Crosby Kiffin Manuscript, and seeks to show that they all contradict each other in main particulars. He tries to show that while Crosby was at first fooled by these documents, he afterwards recanted his first volume on the subject in the second volume; and he is thus guilty of the grossest perversion which can be conceived of an author. But let us examine Dr. Christian further as a critic, and we shall see the same failure to discredit the Kiffin Manuscript as in the case of the Jessey Records thus far considered. It is difficult to follow him, be-

cause he follows no regular or logical method; but I shall select for consideration the main points of his attack upon the Kiffin document.

1. On page 55 he speaks of the Crosby Kiffin Manuscript as giving "twenty men and women, with divers others," in the secession of 1633 from the Jacob church, while the Gould Kiffin Manuscript gives only "five and others," and the Jessey Records only "nineteen names." Now, the Jessey Records mention only eighteen names, including Sam Eaton, "with some others" who received a "further baptism." Crosby's Kiffin says: "What number they were is uncertain, because in the numbering of the names of *about* twenty men and women, it is added *with others*." The Gould Kiffin speaks of "sundry of the church," as, "Mr. Henry Parker, Mr. Tho. Shepard, Mr. Sam Eaton, Marke Luker, and *others*, with whom joined Mr. William Kiffin"—five names "and others." Now there is no contradiction here. Crosby is indefinite in the use of the usual "*about*" with reference to the "twenty men and women," and he employs the expression "with others," found in both documents, to explain his *probable* enumeration, while both documents might imply twenty or any number in the secession. The only difference between the Jessey Records and the Gould Kiffin is that the latter does not mention all the names of the former, and gives two names—Shepard and Kiffin—not mentioned in the former. The only mistake here, as already seen, is the mention of Kiffin, who was not in the secession of 1633—an admitted error of the Gould Kiffin, but a similar error to that of the Crosby Kiffin, which puts Kiffin in the 1638 secession. The Jessey Records alone are free from this mistake of Kiffin's name in either the 1633 or 1638 secession, and it is unaccountable how Kiffin got into the list of the Gould Kiffin or the Crosby Kiffin document. This same mistake was in the original Kiffin Manuscript which Crosby had of the 1633 date, as seen in his History of the Baptists (Vol. III., p. 41); and this is evidence that what Dr. Christian calls the Gould Kiffin is the same identical document which Crosby had when he made his version of this and the Jessey Records manuscripts. It was an error which did not deter Crosby in the least from regarding the Kiffin Manuscript as a true historical statement, except the name of Kiffin, which he brackets as if correcting the mistake.

Under this head Dr. Christian says: "The lists of the names for 1638 do not correspond in the three manuscripts. Crosby's Kiffin gives two names 'and others;' Gould's Kiffin gives three names and says there were three others; and the Jessey Records give six names, and these six do not include some that are found in the Gould document." Let us look at this. The Jessey Records give "Peter Ferrer, Hen Pen, Tho. Wilson, Wm. Batty, and Mrs. Allen." The Kiffin Manuscript simply gives "Thomas Wilson, Mr. Pen, and three more," without mentioning the names of Ferrer, Allen, and Batty. Crosby's version of the two documents gives only "Mr. Thomas Wilson and others," adding the name of "William Kiffin," which he did not find in either document, 1638, and which, as already seen, was a mistake. The Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript imply precisely the same statement and are one and the same document. The only error in all these documents is in one name, William Kiffin, added by Crosby to his version of the 1638 documents and incorporated in the Kiffin document, 1633; and this is no worse than the error of Dr. Christian, who says, against well-known authority before his eyes, that Kiffin joined the Lathrop church in 1634! (P. 57.) By such methods the Bible and all other history could be discredited.

2. On page 53 Dr. Christian pronounces as an "absurd statement" the fact recorded in both the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript that the division of the Jacob church in 1633 was caused by "being dissatisfied with the Churches of English Parishes to be true churches;" but he shows lack of acquaintance with the Confession of the Jacob church, 1616, in which that body never fully withdrew from the Parish churches in what they called "the truth of the Parish churches." They still continued to hear preaching in those churches and had communion with them, which subsequently led some to have their children baptized in them, and which led others to become dissatisfied. A compromise covenant, as found in the Jessey Records, was adopted in 1630; but in spite of this measure the dissatisfaction grew and resulted in 1633 in secession in order that communion might be held with certain other churches "in order," and which did not "communicate" with the Parish

churches. (Hanbury's Memorials, Vol. I., p. 297; see also Neal, Vol. II., pp. 73, 74.)

3. On pages 59, 60, Dr. Christian gives parallel columns of the Crosby Kiffin and Gould Kiffin Manuscripts, embracing the 1633, 1638 paragraphs, with the 1639 paragraph in the Crosby Kiffin column, but left out of the Gould Kiffin Manuscript column. He then proceeds to show again the contradiction between these documents in the most important particular. He says, "The Gould document declares that this movement to send Blunt to Holland all occurred among some dissatisfied persons in the Jessey church;" and he quotes these words: "Sundry of ye church whereof Mr. Jacob and Mr. John Lathrop had been pastors;" and "the church became two by mutual consent, half being with Mr. P. Barebone, etc." "But the Kiffin document," says he, "according to Crosby, affirms that there were a number of Independents engaged in this enterprise. The words are: 'Several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregations of the *dissenters* about *London* were convinced that *believers* were the only proper subjects of *baptism*, and that it ought to be administered by immersion, etc.'" Here is a most contradictory statement, he says. "The one document declares that this was undertaken by one church, the other as positively declares that more than one church was doing this thing."

Dr. Christian connects the first sentence in the 1633 paragraph of the Gould Kiffin Manuscript, "Sundry of ye church," etc., with the first sentence of the 1640 paragraph of the same manuscript, "The church became two," etc., in order to show a one-church movement for immersion, as held by the Gould Kiffin Manuscript, among the dissatisfied members of the Jessey church. On the other hand, he quotes the Crosby Kiffin Manuscript under the 1640 date to show that this movement began with more than one church among the dissenters of London. The quotation from the 1633 paragraph of the Gould Kiffin document has nothing whatever to do with the subject and is thoroughly misleading; and the 1640 scrap from the Gould Kiffin Manuscript may or may not have anything to do with the subject. The quotation from Crosby regarding several pious persons belonging to the congregations of the dissenters who began this immersion movement in 1640 corresponds precisely with that

part of the 1640 paragraph of the Gould Kiffin Manuscript which says: "Mr. Richard Blunt, with him (Jessey), being convinced of baptism that it ought to be by dipping, etc., had *sober* conference about it in the church, and then with some of the forenamed who were so convinced." Blunt belonged to the Spilsbury church with the "forenamed," and he had conference with Jessey and some of his people about the dipping movement; and from all this Crosby drew his expression about "several *sober* and *pious persons* belonging to the congregations of the dissenters" whom he calls "English Baptists" (Vol. I., p. 97) when referring to this same immersion movement which began in 1640.

Again, Dr. Christian says, on page 61: "All the Crosby document says of 1639 is entirely omitted in the Gould document." This is incorrect. The Gould Kiffin Manuscript gives the paragraph thus: "1639. Mr. Green with Captn Spencer had begun a congregation in Crutched-Friars, to whom Paul Hobson joyned, who was now with many of that church one of ye seven;" and Crosby gives almost a literal transcript of the paragraph, thus: "In the year 1639 another congregation of Baptists was found, whose place of meeting was in Crutched-Friars; the chief promoters of which were Mr. Green, Mr. Paul Hobson, and Captain Spencer." The only difference between the two statements is the word "Baptists" which Crosby uses, and which was not true of this congregation until 1644.

4. On pages 62-74, Dr. Christian attacks the 1640, 1641 paragraphs of the Gould Kiffin Manuscript. He assails the 1641 theory with redoubled fury and intensifies his multitudinous cry of "fraud" and "forgery." He jumps upon the famous ten words, "None having then so practiced in England to professed believers"—the main sentence in the 1640 paragraph of the Kiffin Manuscript—and he proposes to demolish the entire manuscript by showing this sentence "false." He commences with the 1640 paragraph, which begins as follows: "1640, 3d Mo. The church whereof Mr. Jacob and Mr. John Lathrop had been pastors became two by mutual consent, just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and ye other halfe with Mr. Henry Jessey. Mr. Rich'd Blunt with him being convinced of Baptism, yt also it ought to be by dipping ye Body into ye Water, resembling Burial and rising again. (Col. 2: 12; Rom.



6: 4.)” Dr. Christian adds: “And then asserts that the subject baptized should be a professed believer;” but the latter words are not in this connection in this document, but in the Crosby version of it. At this point Dr. Christian undertakes to show that Blunt was convinced upon this subject neither with Barebone nor Jessey. Of course he was not convinced with Barebone, but with Jessey, whose name occurs last in its connection with the clause, “Mr. Richard Blunt with him being convinced of Baptism, that it ought to be by dipping.” But Dr. Christian denies that Mr. Jessey was convinced with Blunt that baptism ought to be by dipping; and he goes on to say that Mr. Jessey was not convinced of the necessity of dipping or believer’s baptism until the summer of 1644, and was not baptized until the summer of 1645. Therefore this manuscript is false.

Now, all the evidence goes to show that while Jessey did not accept immersion or believer’s baptism in 1640, he was convinced that dipping was scriptural from this period until he was dipped in 1645. Crosby (Vol. I., pp. 310, 311) shows that by repeated secessions from Jessey’s church to the Baptists, especially the large one in 1641, he was led to investigate the subject, and became convinced that immersion was baptism. In 1642 he says that Jessey not only proclaimed publicly his conviction that immersion was baptism, but from that time practiced it upon children. It is admitted that in the conferences of 1643-44, Jessey was finally convinced against infant baptism, and in 1645 adopted believer’s baptism and was immersed. In his “Storehouse of Provision” (p. 80), Jessey speaks of those who, after the restoration of immersion in England, had been slack toward receiving it, and he puts himself among those who had hesitated to enjoy the ordinance. He says: “Such considerations as these I had. But yet because I would do nothing rashly; I would do nothing which I would renounce again: I desired conference with some Christians differing therein in opinion from me, about what is requisite to restoring of ordinances, if lost; especially what was essential in a Baptizer? Thus I did forbear and inquired above a yeare’s space.” Back on page 12 of his book, Jessey seems to refer to the Blunt movement, to the method of which in sending to Holland he must have been opposed. He says of the

restoration of the ordinance: "Say not in thine heart, Who shall go to Heaven, or to sea, or beyond sea for it? but the word is nigh thee. (Rom. 10.) So we may not go for administrators to other countries, nor stay [wait] for them: but look to the word." Evidently Jessey was convinced with Blunt, 1640-41, that dipping was baptism, but he did not believe in sending over the sea for administrators. He was not only convinced in 1640-41, but proclaimed his conviction publicly in 1642, and practiced his conviction by dipping infants until he was convinced (1643-44) of believer's baptism and was himself immersed. All the evidences are in favor of the truthfulness of the manuscript, which shows that, with Blunt, Jessey was convinced of dipping, 1640-41, O. S., 1642, N. S.

It is not necessary to maintain, in favor of the 1640-41 movement for immersion, that the equal division of the Jessey church was created thereby. Only part of the Jessey division fell into the immersion movement; and the division between Barebone and Jessey may have originated in the danger of the church being too large. This fact is declared by Jessey's historian. The large secession from the Jessey church to the Baptists in 1641, as mentioned by Crosby, is better confirmatory of the immersion movement.

But now comes Dr. Christian to the "famous ten words:" "None having then so practiced it [immersion] in England to professed believers"—the main sentence in the Gould Kiffin Manuscript. He attacks the integrity of the passage as "radically different from the account as quoted by Crosby from *his* copy of the Manuscript—'said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin.'" He denies that this sentence is in Crosby's Kiffin Manuscript; and if so, then he holds that the Gould Kiffin Manuscript has forged the sentence, or else Crosby dishonestly left it out. "Crosby," he says, "stands above reproach;" therefore the sentence is a forgery in the Gould Kiffin Manuscript. Now I beg leave to differ; and in order to make my position to the contrary plain, I will also place the Crosby Kiffin and the Gould Kiffin Manuscripts side by side. The division of the Jessey church in 1640 is used by Crosby (Vol. III., p. 41) as a part of the Kiffin Manuscript, and so I will insert this item in its proper place on the Crosby side, just where it is found on the Gould side, and where it belongs.

## GOULD KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

"1640, 3rd Mo.: The church became two by mutuall consent halfe being with Mr. P. Barebone and ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richard Blunt with him being convinced of baptism yt also it ought to be by dipping in ye body into ye water, resembling Burial and rising again, 2 Col. 2: 12, Rom. 6: 4, had sober conference about it in ye church, and then with some of the forenamed who also ware convinced. And after prayer & conferance about their so enjoying it, none having then so practiced it in England to Professed Believers, and hearing that some in ye Netherlands had so practiced they agreed and sent over Mr. Rich. Blunt (who understood Dutch) with letters of Commendation, and who was kindly accepted there, and returned with letters from them Jo. Batte a Teacher there and from that Church to such as sent them.

"1641. They proceed therein, viz Those persons that ware persuaded Baptism should be by dipping ye body had met in two Companies, and did intend to meet after this, all then agreed to proceed alike together And then manifesting (not by formal Words a Covenant) wch word was scrupled by some of them, but by mutual desires and agreement each testified:

"Those two Companys did set apart one to Baptize the rest; so

## CROSBY KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

[1640] (Vol. III., p. 41). "For in the year 1640 this church became two by mutual consent; just half, says the manuscript, being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Henry Jessey." "This" [manuscript], says Crosby (Vol. I., p. 101), "relates, That several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregations of the dissenters about London were convinced that believers were the only proper subjects of baptism, and that it ought to be administered by immersion, or dipping the whole body in water, in remembrance of a burial and resurrection, according to 2 Coloss. ii: 12 and Rom. vi: 4. That they often met together to pray and confer about this matter, and consult what methods they should take to enjoy this ordinance in its primitive purity: That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice; because tho' some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not as they knew of revived the ancient custom of immersion: But hearing that some in the Netherlands practiced it, They agreed to send over one Mr. Richard Blount, who understood the Dutch language: That he went accordingly carrying letters of recommendation with him, and was kindly received by the church there, and Mr. John Batte their

it was solemnly performed by them.

“Mr. Blunt baptized Mr. Blacklock yt was a Teacher amongst them and Mr. Blunt being baptized, he and Mr. Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends that ware so minded, and many being added to them they increased much.”

Here follow fifty-three names of persons who were baptized on Jany. 1 and 9, 1641.

teacher: That upon his return he baptized Mr. Samuel Blacklock, a minister, and these two baptized the rest of their company, whose names appear in the manuscript to the number of fifty-three.”

Now I challenge any intelligent and impartial reader to compare these manuscripts and show that they are not identical in every particular, and not a mere “resemblance,” as Dr. Christian would imply. Let us look at the identity as particularized:

1. The 1640 division of the Jessey church is the same.
2. The conviction of Blunt and his party—the “several sober persons” of Crosby—about dipping according to Col. 2: 12; Rom. 6: 4, is the same.
3. The subsequent prayer and conference about how they might enjoy immersion are the same.
4. The fact that the ordinance was not regularly obtainable in England is the same.
5. The sending of Blunt to Holland because he could speak Dutch, his letters of commendation going and coming, his reception by the church and his baptism by Batte, his return and baptism of Blacklock and the baptism of the rest by both, are the same.
6. The fifty-three mentioned as baptized is the same.

Only the date 1641 and some unimportant details about the two companies and the covenant are omitted by Crosby; but all the facts under the 1641 date are copied by Crosby, which identify the date. But Dr. Christian denies that Crosby alludes to the “famous ten words,” and upon this he bases his chief argument in proof of the Gould Kiffin Manuscript’s fraudulency. Let us parallel both documents on this point:

## GOULD KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

"None having then so practiced it [immersion] in England to professed Believers."

## CROSBY KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

"That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice; because tho' some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, [Anabaptists] yet they had not as they knew of revived the ancient custom of immersion."

This is the fourth point of identity between these documents, and this is Crosby's version of the "famous ten words." He makes the case stronger than the ten words themselves; for, having just said (Vol. I., p. 97) that "immersion had been for some time disused" in England, he now says of the Kiffin Manuscript restorers, whom he styles as "English Baptists:" "That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to *begin* (mark the word, *begin*) this practice." What does Crosby mean? Simply what the "famous ten words" mean—namely, that immersion having "for some time been disused" in England, there was no administrator known in England to "BEGIN" it. How do we know this is Crosby's meaning? He goes on to explain: "Because though some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants (that is, Anabaptists), yet they [these Anabaptists] had not as they knew of *revived* the ancient custom of immersion." Had not done what? "REVIVED the ancient custom of immersion." What does Crosby mean now? Simply this: that the Anabaptists—those who "rejected the baptism of infants"—had not, so far as known, "revived" the "disused" practice of immersion, 1640-41, the time the Kiffin Manuscript records. What had those Anabaptists been practicing for baptism? The implication of Crosby's logic is that they were pouring or sprinkling in England down to the date of the Manuscript, and had never *begun* or *revived* immersion, the ancient practice. Crosby thus fully paraphrases the main sentence in the Kiffin Manuscript and gives the reason for its expression—more than the Manuscript does for itself.

The conclusion is clear that the Gould Kiffin Manuscript, as we now have it, was before Crosby when he copied the above 1640-41 paragraphs. No fair and candid mind can compare them and come to any other conclusion.

## THE FIFTY-THREE NAMES.

On pages 144-147, Dr. Christian takes up the fifty-three persons baptized by Blunt and Blacklock, 11 Mo. Janu. and January 9, 1641, and seeks on this basis to discredit the Gould Kiffin Manuscript. I need not give the fifty-three names here, as the reader will find them in Dr. Christian's book and in my English Baptist Reformation. These names are not signed as an attestation of the validity of this document, but their incorporation greatly confirms its authenticity. It is utterly impossible to conceive that these names, with the minute dates of their baptism, including personages of historical character, could or would have been forged. No forger would have been fool enough, if he had so desired, to have attempted such a piece of folly. Crosby found these "fifty-three names" in the document, and mentions the fact as if to signify its historical value. If the document is a forgery, as discovered by Gould, it was a forgery when Crosby saw it; for not only are the Gould Kiffin and the Crosby Kiffin Manuscripts identical in the record of these fifty-three names, but in all the matters recorded so far as we have now examined them.

1. On page 145, Dr. Christian calls attention to the date of the baptism of these fifty-three persons, which the document sets down as January, 1641. "This baptism," says Dr. Christian, "was in January, 1642." Whether he was calculating the time according to the Old Style or New Style calendar of that period, he does not say; but the document says 11 Mo. January, 1641. This would, of course, be January, 1642, according to New Style reckoning.

2. Next he calls attention to the prominent Baptists in that list of fifty-three. I care nothing for the statement of the New York *Independent*; and the question does not here arise when Kiffin, Spilsbury, Richardson, Hobson, Lamb, Barber, and Knollys were baptized, or by whom. Suffice it to say here that it cannot be shown that either one of these men was immersed before 1641. Kiffin, about whom Dr. Christian here has most to say, was not, according to his "Sober Discourse," a Baptist until 1641. He was a member of Jessey's church, as I have shown, in 1638; and according to Orme and Ivimey both, he could not have been with Spilsbury

until 1644. He was still with Jessey, though a Baptist, in 1643. (See my English Baptist Reformation, pp. 116-121, for a full discussion of this point in Kiffin's history.)

Of course, I grant that Blunt and Blacklock did not baptize all the prominent Baptists of 1641; and Dr. Christian, on page 147, properly cites Crosby to this effect. Crosby truly says (Vol. I., p. 103): "But the greatest number of English Baptists, and the more judicious, looked upon all this as needless trouble and what proceeded from the old popish doctrine of right to administer sacraments by an uninterrupted succession which neither the Church of Rome nor the Church of England, much less the modern Dissenters, could prove to be with them." But why did not Dr. Christian quote the balance of the sentence, which reads thus: "They (this greatest number of the English Baptists) affirmed, therefore, and practiced accordingly, that after a general corruption of *baptism*, an unbaptized person might warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation." This greatest body of Baptists in 1641 declared that Blunt's going to Holland was "needless trouble" and based upon the "doctrine of uninterrupted succession;" and hence they proceeded to restore baptism and begin their reformation by unbaptized administrators, such as Spilsbury, without sending over to Holland for it. In this way many of the prominent, and almost all of the Baptists of 1641 were immersed, and it was only fifty-three of any sort that we know were baptized by Blunt's succession method.

There were several prominent Baptists, however, among the fifty-three names baptized by Blunt and Blacklock, January, 1641. There was Mark Lucar for one; and among the singers of the 1644 Confession of Faith there were Thomas Shepard, Thomas Kilcop, and Thomas Munden. Besides being a signer of this Confession, Thomas Kilcop was an author. Dr. Christian objects that Thomas Shepard was a Congregational preacher at that moment in Boston; but there was no doubt more than one Thomas Shepard in the world. The same objection might have been made to Samuel Eaton as dying in prison in 1639, for at that very moment there was a Congregational preacher named Samuel Eaton in New England, who came back to England in 1640. In the Kiffin Manu-

script list of signers Thomas Shepard is mentioned, but the name is spelled "Skippard" in the publication of the Confession. The Kiffin Manuscript of the 1633 date mentions Thomas Shepard as one of the seceders. It then mentions him as immersed among the fifty-three, 1641; and then in 1644 it puts him among the signers of the Confession. It is pretty clear that the Kiffin manuscript is right, and that the name somehow got changed to "Skippard" in the publication of the Confession, or else the Manuscripts got "Shepard" for "Skippard."

3. I do not know why Blunt and Blacklock did not get among the signers of the Confession of 1644, or why their names are not found in other contemporary documents or works. Quite a number of the fifty-three, though not all of them, are left out of the list of the 1644 signers of the Confession, and out of contemporary literature, and so of hundreds of other Baptists who lived at that period which largely wanted Baptist records and publications. One possible reason why Blunt and Blacklock were left out and left unknown may have been their prominence in succession baptism, which the greatest number and the most judicious of the English Baptists abhorred. It is evident that the fifty-three baptized by them in 1641 did not subsequently hold to their view, as is shown by the writings of Thomas Kilcop, who, against Barebone, takes the independent or self-originating theory of restoring baptism. It is also possible that Blunt had organized a church upon this theory, which went to pieces before 1646, as indicated by Edwards in his *Gangraena*. All this is possible; but we had as well try to discover why thousands of men but once mentioned in history did not become more prominent. We never hear of the Hebrew children after the fiery furnace.

4. Dr. Christian charges ignorance to the Kiffin Manuscript because it assigns the date 1644 to the Confession of Faith, which he says was issued in 1643. So far as I can learn, October 16, 1644, is the date, according to Thomason, at which the Confession was published; and I doubt not that Jessey or whoever gathered up these early Records knew precisely the date of this Confession. It would be strange that such a Confession should have been made for the benefit of Baptists and for the enlightenment of their enemies in 1643, and never published until October 16, 1644. The probability is that it was published as speedily as possible upon its adoption.



What reason would the collector or compiler have for doctoring the date? And as in such records, so gathered as I have shown, it is no great wonder that he should have gotten the names of the signers out of order, or left out just *one* of them by mistake, as in the case of Samuel Richardson. I am sorry he did even that. If Dr. Christian had to be judged as he judges these Records, he would be lost, world without end, for unfairness.

5. Dr. Christian thinks it strange that John Webb and Thomas Gunn—two signers of the 1644 Confession—with six others, who were Baptists, in 1640, and who were arrested for being such and brought before the House of Lords, were not found in the fifty-three list baptized by Blunt in 1641! He quotes the Journal of the House of Lords as calling them “Anabaptists recommended to justice.” The word “Baptist” was not in use until after 1641, when the Anabaptists had adopted immersion; and the Anabaptists before about 1640 were not immersionists. It is not significant, however, that Webb and Gunn were not found in Blunt’s list. He did not baptize all the ante-1640-41 Anabaptists, but only fifty-three or more; and no doubt Webb and Gunn, like most all the rest, took immersion by the Spilsbury or the anti-succession method, adopted by the “*greatest number* of the English Baptists, and the more judicious.” Even some of those who adopted the Blunt method abandoned it, or never defended it, as Kilcop and others. It is likely that Blunt himself finally repudiated it.

## CHAPTER III.

### DOCUMENT "NUMBER 4."

This document was also received by the collector from Mr. Adams, being an old manuscript supposed to have been written by Mr. Jessey, or transcribed from his journal. Like Numbers 1, 2, 3, this document is a part of the "ex MSS. of Mr. Henry Jessey," and it has every evidence of genuineness. The document is too long here to quote, and will be found in full in my English Baptist Reformation (Appendix), and partially by Dr. Christian (p. 150), and freely used by Crosby (Vol. I., p. 311). It is an account of conferences held in Jessey's church, 1643-44, concerning the baptism of Hanserd Knollys' child, the conviction of sixteen persons against Pedobaptism, including Knollys' wife, and the final conviction of Jessey himself against Pedobaptism, and his immersion, June 4, 1645, when the greater part of his church, with him, became Baptists. This document is an elaborate account of one of the most important events in Congregational and Baptist history.

At the beginning of these conferences in 1643, both Hanserd Knollys and his wife were members of this Jessey church—Sister Knollys being a Pedobaptist, and Brother Knollys, though opposed to infant baptism and being yet unimmersed, was still a member of this Pedobaptist Church. They had an unbaptized child about this time, and it was proposed to baptize it; but Hanserd Knollys, "not being satisfied for baptizing his child," proposed a discussion of the subject of infant baptism before the church; and he and "the elder," doubtless Mr. Jessey, argued the question, with the result of convincing sixteen against the baptism of infants, among whom were Bro. Jac[kson] and S[ister] K[nollys], and B. S. "about" the middle of January (11 Mo. 1644). Other conferences were held by the church, "1644, 1 & 2 Mo."—"1644, 3, 29"—regarding the discipline of the sixteen who seceded; and Mr. Barebone, Rozer, Dr. Parker, Mr. Erburg, Mr. Cooke, Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Philip Nye, Mr. G. Sympson, Mr. Burows, Mr. Straismere,

distinguished Congregational preachers, were called in as a council to decide upon the question of discipline, and who advised clemency toward its separatists (See Crosby, Vol. I., p. 311.)

It seems that the question was now sprung about the administrator of baptism, whether or not "such disciples as are gifted to teach and evangelize may also baptize"—that is, without being baptized themselves; and the names of twenty-five brethren and sisters who first "scrupled" about an unbaptized administrator became satisfied, and some of them were baptized "before Mr. Jessey and the rest of the church were convinced against Pedobaptism"—all this presumably in 1644. Among those who scrupled about baptism at the hands of unbaptized administrators was "Sister Knollys;" and if the "2nd Row" in the first list were those who afterwards became "satisfyed" in this scruple and "ware baptized," some of them, "before Mr. Jessey and the rest of the church were convinced against Pedobaptism," then Sister Knollys was in the "2nd Row" and may have been baptized by an unbaptized administrator. It is added here in the manuscript the words: "And hence desired to enjoy it [baptism] where they might, & joynd also, some with Bro. Knollys, some with Bro. Kiffin. Thus these:

B. S. Knollys	B. Ford
B. S. Wade.	B. Potshall
B. Conver	S. Dormer
S. Jane Todderoy	S. Pickford
S. Eliza Phillips	S. Reves
	B. Darel
	B. Blunt."

B. and S. in this manuscript stand for Brother and Sister; and hence Brother and Sister Knollys are among the list who withdrew at this time from the Jessey church to "enjoy" baptism "where they might;" and the conclusion is that they were both immersed, some of the list going with Bro. Knollys and some with Bro. Kiffin—the latter of whom, with Patient, had started a church early in 1644, and the former of whom had gathered a church by 1645. Kiffin had become a Baptist in 1641, though with Jessey still in 1643; and it is possible that Kiffin in 1644 baptized Knollys,

who baptized his following, and who baptized Jessey in 1645. It is clear here that Knollys and his wife were members of Jessey's Pedobaptist Church in 1644, and withdrew in order to "enjoy" baptism then by immersion, "where they might." Although a member of Jessey's Pedobaptist Church, Knollys himself was an Antipedobaptist in sentiment, and had been so since 1640; but it was not until after the controversy of 1643-44 about the baptism of his child that he settled the question fully, withdrew with his wife from Jessey's church, was immersed, and became a full-fledged Baptist.

Now Dr. Christian says: "Every fact known in regard to Knollys goes to prove that this statement (of Knollys in Document No. 4) is not true." He quotes John Lewis, who affirmed, in his reply to Crosby, that Knollys rejected infant baptism as early as 1636. Granted, but this does not prove that he was an immersed Antipedobaptist. He says: "Crosby declares that he was a Baptist in 1636;" but Crosby calls all Antipedobaptists, "Baptists," whether immersed or not; and in his version of the "famous ten words" in the Kiffin Manuscript he so speaks of the Anabaptists, or those who "rejected the baptism of infants" in England before 1640-41, as not having begun or "*revived* the ancient custom of immersion," which, he says, "had for some time been disused." Dr. Christian quotes Cotton Mather, who numbered Hanserd Knollys as among the "godly Anabaptists" in New England; but this does not prove that he was immersed, as Crosby shows. He quotes William Kiffin, who calls Knollys an "ancient and faithful servant of God," who died at the age of ninety-three, and who had been a minister for sixty years, reaching back to 1631, at which time Dr. Christian infers that he became "a Baptist;" but history shows that he became an Antipedobaptist in sentiment in 1640. All this Dr. Christian calls indisputable authority, against Document No. 4 of the Jessey Records, in proof that Hanserd Knollys was a Baptist, presumably immersed, as far back as 1636, and probably 1631! This is precisely like all the arguments and conclusions of Dr. Christian in this discussion.

In reply to the above, I wish to cite the most excellent authority of an expert church historian, Dr. Henry S. Burrage, who, in Zion's

Advocate, April 26, 1899, in an editorial entitled "Some Recent Historical Researches," notices my recent work, English Baptist Reformation, and Dr. Christian's discussion of the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript, then going on in the Western Recorder. After some comparison of our discussion from the same documents, so at variance, Dr. Burrage instances the case of Hanserd Knollys, and says: "While, therefore, Dr. Lofton holds that Hanserd Knollys became a Baptist in 1641, Dr. Christian regards it as probable that Knollys became a Baptist in 1631, the ground of the probability being that Knollys died in 1691, and at that time, according to Kiffin, he had been a faithful minister 'about sixty years.'

"But Dr. Christian, in reaching this judgment concerning Knollys, overlooks well-known facts. He was ordained by the Bishop of Peterborough, June 29, 1629, and became vicar of Humberstone. After several years he resigned, as he had become scrupulous concerning 'the lawfulness of using the surplice, the cross in baptism, and the admission of profane characters to the Lord's Supper.' After preaching in various churches, he espoused Puritanism in 1636, and, having suffered persecution and imprisonment on account of his religious views, he left England for New England in 1638, sailing from Gravesend in Captain Goodlad's ship, April 26, 1638, and reached Boston about the 20th of July. The ministers of Massachusetts Bay were especially drawn to him. They thought he was affected with Antinomianism. While, however, he was in Boston, two persons from Dover, N. H., made his acquaintance and invited him to go to that place. He accepted the invitation, but the minister at Dover, Rev. George Burdett, who had become governor of the colony, forbade him to preach. On the removal of Burdett, however, Knollys became pastor of the Dover flock, and in December, 1638, he organized the present First Congregational Church at Dover. Thomas Larkham became Mr. Knollys' assistant in 1640, and, differences arising between them, Mr. Knollys withdrew in 1641. Rev. Hugh Peter, then visiting Dover, sent by Mr. Knollys a letter to Governor Winthrop, in which he said: 'Hee may [be] useful without doubt, hee is well gifted, you may do well to heare him in Boston,' and advised that Mr. Knollys 'and three or four more of his friends may have the liberty of sitting downe

in our Jurisdiction.' At first Mr. Knollys proposed to go to Long Island, but, at the solicitation of his aged father, he returned to England, reaching London, December 24, 1641.

"The differences that arose at Dover, as is well known, had reference to infant baptism. Knollys had scruples concerning that ordinance, but it would seem that his views were not so pronounced as to be regarded by Rev. Hugh Peter as an obstacle to his remaining in the Bay Colony. He was not a Baptist, but some Baptist principles were having a growing influence over him, so that he was accounted "an Anabaptist," as were Dunster and others, who, like him, were opposed to infant baptism. As Knollys did not become pastor of a Baptist church until 1645, we know of no facts in his life that make the statements concerning him in the 'Gould document No. 4' improbable, while Dr. Christian's endeavor to show the untrustworthiness of the 'Gould Document No. 4' is not in harmony with the well-known facts."

Only one other point under this head. On pages 72, 73, Dr. Christian refers to the name of "Blunt," found at the bottom of the last list in Document "No. 4," among those who in 1644 withdrew with Knollys and his wife from the Jessey church to "enjoy" baptism "where they might." Dr. Christian argues that this contradicts the 1640 paragraph of the Gould Kiffin document and implies that Blunt, with Jessey, was convinced of immersion in 1644, and must have gone to Holland in that year, if there was any truth in these documents at all.

Now, what "Blunt" this was, found in the list of Document "Number 4," is not stated. He is not here called "Richard Blunt," as everywhere else he is so named. There might have been two Blunts as well as two Eatons or two Shepards; or, as the Court Records show with other lists, it might have been "Sister Blunt" instead of "Brother Blunt." If the case was on Dr. Christian's side, he would so insist, as there is no given name to "Blunt" here to show that "Richard Blunt" is meant. I might stop to demand that it be shown here that "Blunt" means "Richard Blunt," and rest the case; but, for the sake of argument, let us grant here that "Richard Blunt" is meant. It will be seen, under the date 1644, that after the withdrawal of sixteen members from Jessey, Docu-

ment Number 4 says: "After some time all these in ye 2nd Row were satisfied (vide in their scruple and judged supra) yt such disciples as are gifted to teach & evangelize may also Baptize, &c, &c, and ware baptized, some before H. Jessey and the rest of ye church ware convinced against Pedobaptism." The document speaks of the first list of withdrawals as those who, while they withdrew from conviction against infant baptism, also "scrupled about ye Administration of Baptisme, &c;" and the document refers to those "in ye 2nd Row" as those who scrupled about the administration of baptism—that is, baptism by unbaptized administrators—as being satisfied. If "ye 2nd Row" belongs to the last list, "Blunt" is found in it; and this would indicate, if he was "Richard," his conversion already to the anti-succession method of baptism, and that he had gone with Knollys and Kiffin, the latter of whom had only left Jessey's church in 1643, and the former of whom had remained in it till 1644.

But if this was "Richard," how came he to be in the Jessey church in 1644? If he was the "Blount" of Edwards' Gangraena, his church had gone to pieces before 1646, and he might have been back with Jessey, as Kiffin and Knollys had been. It is possible he came back to the Jessey church from Spilsbury's before 1640, and never left it after the immersion movement of 1640-41. It is hard to tell why his name, if he was Richard, is found in the Jessey list down to 1644. But if it was Richard, was he reimmersed among those who withdrew with Brother and Sister Knollys, or to Kiffin, to "enjoy" baptism "where they might?" If so, it only goes to prove that Richard had changed his "scruples," with some others, as to the administrator of baptism, and had gone over to the anti-succession theory of the larger body of Baptists. Barebone charged "R. B." with his third immersion and the probability of his fourth; and it was very common, at that time, for Baptists to be reimmersed. It is possible that many of the Blunt list of fifty-three went from the succession to the anti-succession method of baptism. In some instances the General Baptists reimmersed the Particular Baptists.

But all this is speculation. We do not know that the "Blunt" of "Number 4" is the Richard Blunt of "Number 2" document;

and if he is, we do not know how or why he was with Jessey in 1644, or why he was reimmersed, if he were. The Hanserd Knollys history settles the question, the chief point in Document "Number 4," that the Records here are correct; and what is true of Document "Number 4" is true of Number 1, Number 2, and Number 3. There are two minor errors or difficulties in all these documents inexplicable, such as Kiffin's name in the 1633, 1638 documents, and Blunt's; but in the light of all the main facts in their history, they are substantially accurate and unimpeachable. They are not generally exact church records as kept by a church clerk. Some few sections of them may be of this character, but generally they are the recollections of Jessey in after years connected with such written or reported items as he could gather. Much of these documents he recollected substantially, as of Numbers, 2, 3, and 4; but most of Number 1 he must have gathered from papers and reports. Thus I close my connected investigation of these records, in their vindication from the misrepresentations of Dr. Christian; and in subsequent chapters I shall examine the authorities and side shots by which he seeks to overthrow their integrity. I have no hesitation in saying that while these Records are not full and satisfactory as they might have been, while they are affected in minor details with some errors and obscurities, they afford a very consistent and valuable repository of facts which are the basis of well-known history, without which but little would have been known of the origin of early Congregational and Baptist history in England. They are the foundation of Baptist history in its Anglo-Saxon form; and while these Records are not palatable to certain Baptist sentiment at this time, we cannot afford to discard them for that reason. They set forth unquestionably the truth regarding Particular Baptist history in England, and they reveal the beginning of our immersion reformation in England, and are confirmed by a multitudinous host of Baptist and Pedobaptist authors from 1641 to 1700.



## CHAPTER IV.

### AUTHORS CITED TO DISCREDIT THESE MANUSCRIPTS.

I come now to notice the use Dr. Christian makes of certain authorities in order to destroy the integrity of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript; and I shall demonstrate, I think, in every instance his utter misuse and perversion of them.

1. On page 7 he speaks of Crosby as quoting the Kiffin Manuscript "with evident caution," and as not being "fully convinced that it was written by William Kiffin." He further says of Crosby: "In his first volume he appears to have felt that some of the statements contained in it were worthy to be recorded, and he may have accepted some of its theories; but it is equally certain that in the second volume, upon mature consideration, he rejected this document, at least modified his previous statements. So far from Crosby believing that the Baptists of England began in 1641, he was a believer in church succession. Nor is there a word in all his writings to indicate that he believed that the Baptists of England began to dip in 1641. He nowhere indicates that the words in regard to dipping, 'None having so practiced in England to professed believers,' were in the manuscript before him. His words on succession are plain and unmistakable;" and he here quotes from pp. i., ii. of Crosby's Preface to Vol. II. of his History of the Baptists in proof of his assumption. 'These statements are wholly unwarranted. Crosby's Preface of forty-two pages (Vol. II.) was written, upon the notice of friends, to supply a line of history which ought to have appeared in the first volume—namely, the early Christianity of England and the succession of immersion from the first British Christians, through the Romish and Episcopal Churches, to the end of the sixteenth century, when, he says, it was generally "*disused*." Crosby thinks that the British Christians for the first three hundred years were Baptists; but after that period he not only loses the succession of Baptists for centuries, but traces immersion after them through the British State churches (at first adult and infant, and finally infant) down to 1600, when the ordi-

nance even as an infant rite was lost, or supplanted by sprinkling and pouring. He not only loses immersion succession in England by 1600, but loses Baptist Church succession by the beginning of the fifth century, and never reestablishes it again, under the form of immersion, until 1640-41, the date of the Kiffin Manuscript, as shown in his first volume (pp. 95-107). Crosby, in his Preface (Vol. II.), does not hesitate to say that from John the Baptist until his time (1738-40) immersion had "*continued in the world,*" which was true somewhere and in some form; but he then proceeds to show that while in England it had continued from the early British Christians down through the churches of Rome and England to the year 1600, it practically ended about this time, even as an infant rite. I challenge any council of scholars on earth to read this Preface of the second volume and say that this is not Crosby's argument and conclusion. For a full discussion of this subject, I refer the reader to my chapter on the "Disuse of Immersion in England" (English Baptist Reformation, pp. 68-78).

In this Preface (Vol. II., pp. i.-xlii.) Crosby does not by the slightest hint indicate that he rejected the Kiffin Manuscript or made the slightest modification of it. If such had been his purpose he would have referred to the document in his Preface, and so stated. On the contrary, his Vol. I. (pp. 95-107), which discusses the restoration of immersion by the English Baptists, based upon the declaration (p. 97) that "immersion had for some time been disused" in England, is thoroughly confirmed by Vol. II. (Preface, pp. i.-xlii.), which shows how and when immersion became "disused" in England. Not only so, but Crosby nowhere ever quoted the Kiffin Manuscript with "evident caution;" and whether he was "fully convinced" or not that Kiffin was the author of it, he quotes it as perfectly valid history, and cites Hutchinson's account as contemporary confirmation of the document. I challenge any scholar to read Crosby (Vol. I., pp. 95-107) and say that he does not assume the fact that, at the date of the Kiffin Manuscript, the English Baptists, by "two" different "methods," restored immersion, or say that Crosby does not give the Kiffin document full credit for being valid history. For a full discussion of this point, I refer the reader to my chapter on the "Restoration of Immersion in En-

gland" (English Baptist Reformation, pp. 79-90.) That Crosby indicates that he found the "famous ten words"—"None having then so practiced in England," etc.—in his Kiffin Manuscript, I have already shown in my second chapter (p. 28) to be practically certain.

2. On pages 16, 17, Dr. Christian assumes that no historian "has been willing to risk his reputation by declaring that the 'Kiffin' Manuscript is authentic and authoritative. There is not one line," says he, "that any historian has been able to find concerning the chief events or the principal persons mentioned in its pages. Whoever heard of Blunt or Blacklock outside of these Kiffin Manuscripts?" He refers to Neal and Crosby as the first writers who employ these documents, and he affirms that contemporary writers knew nothing of them. I reply that Hutchinson evidently did know of the Kiffin Manuscript or of the events it detailed; and I shall show before I get through that the testimony of the seventeenth century writers from 1641 to 1700 confirms the facts set forth in this Kiffin Manuscript. After a most thorough investigation of the Kiffin Manuscript and the relation of its facts to Congregational and Baptist history from 1633 to 1641, such historians as Crosby, Ivimey, Evans, Neal, Newman, Vedder, Whitsitt, Burgence, Rauschenbusch, Barclay, Dexter, de Hoop Scheffer, and the like, do risk their reputation in declaring this document authentic; and I think these expert scholars and historians quite as capable as the brethren who have charged the Kiffin Manuscript with "fraud" or "forgery." Blunt and Blacklock are not mentioned in any other contemporary document, nor until Neal and Crosby began to write; but this is no proof that there were no such men. Noah and Abraham have no contemporary history and are known only by Bible documents. So of hundreds of names in history who are contemporarily unknown until subsequent history dragged them into notice. Neal and Crosby had no hesitation in regarding the Kiffin Manuscript as authentic, nor Blunt, Blacklock, and Batte as historical personages, and so of the other historians I have mentioned.

3. On pages 18-20, Dr. Christian adopts John Lewis, whom Crosby demolished in his Brief Reply to his Brief History of the English

Anabaptists (1740). His only claim to criticism, according to Dr. Christian's citations, like the claim of Dr. Christian himself, is based upon hypothetical inferences from imaginary facts. To him, Crosby's version of the Kiffin Manuscript was a "very *blind* account"—because, forsooth, he had not seen the names of Blunt and Blacklock elsewhere, and because the town or city in the *Netherlands* where dipping was practiced, and where Blunt received baptism, is not located, and because *John Batte*, their teacher, had never been heard of before nor since! Well, he was too microscopic and had not lived long enough to settle these atomic or molecular questions. Dr. Christian finds in him a boon companion for "sarcastic remark" regarding the "antient congregation" contemporary with the "antient MS.," as Crosby calls them; but they both forget that to Crosby they were both *old*, which, at that day, was synonymous with "antient." To Lewis, Crosby *seemed* to make two mistakes: (1) about Anabaptist admixture with the Puritans before 1633, and (2) about Anabaptist separation from them in 1633. Again, he says: "Others say it [immersion] was first brought here by one Richard Blunt; but who and what he was, I don't know." Again: "But we have no authority for this account but a manuscript said to have been written by William Kiffin."

All this is what "*seems*," or "others say so," but "I don't know," and hence is "refreshing" to Dr. Christian, who deals in the same kind of argument. If lacking historical fact, however, Lewis was not lacking in logic. His "supposition" is correct, that if the Kiffin Manuscript be true, then the Anabaptists of England of that period were in the practice of sprinkling—which he claimed not to believe, but did not disprove by any historical data. He also truly declares what was then better known, the fact that the Dutch Baptists were in the practice of sprinkling at that period; and had he read the voluminous authorities of the seventeenth century which Crosby had, and which confirm the Kiffin Manuscript, he would have known as well that the English Anabaptists, prior to the date of the Manuscript, were sprinkling or pouring, and that immersion in England, even as an infant rite, had been generally disused since 1600. He was evidently ignorant of the writings of Spilsbury, Tombes, Lawrence, Barber, R. B., King, Jessey, Cornwell, Barebone,

Edwards, Baillie, Watts, Goodwin, and others, who demonstrate that, about 1640-41, the date of the Kiffin Manuscript, the English Anabaptists restored immersion. If Lewis furnished Barclay with his theory, he did not overthrow Crosby; and so far as I can discover, Barclay perfectly agrees with Crosby. On the Dutch Anabaptist question, it would seem that Dr. Christian stops with Lewis; but if so good an author should be so good on the English Anabaptist question, why not on the Dutch Anabaptist question? The truth is that Lewis was only a dabbler in history, and, very much like Dr. Christian, indulges mostly in the criticism of ridicule, sarcasm, and exclamation points.

4. On page 20, Dr. Christian quotes Evans, the Baptist historian, regarding the statements of the Kiffin Manuscript as vague and uncertain; but the learned and scholarly Evans never repudiated these statements or declared them forgeries. As usual, Dr. Christian misrepresents Evans, who (Vol. II., pp. 78, 79) is quoting Crosby's version of the Kiffin Manuscript, regarding its "famous ten words" and the sending of Blunt to Holland for immersion, his return and baptism of Blacklock and the fifty-three whose names were in the Manuscript. Evans says: "This statement is vague." Why? "Because," says he, "we have no *date*, and cannot tell whether the *fact* refers to the *separatists* under Mr. Spilsbury or to others." Evans had not seen the original Kiffin Manuscript from which Crosby quoted, and which gave the date, and which shows that the movers for immersion were from Spilsbury's and Jessey's congregations. Evans does not doubt the facts of the document at all; and he closes the paragraph with Edwards' reference to Blount and his congregation, supposing it to be Richard; and concludes that the common practice of the Anabaptists of England at this period was Mennonite affusion. However, he ends by saying: "These 'new men' [immersionists] soon cast them [the 'old men,' or affusionists] in the shade, and their practice speedily became obsolete. Immersion, as the mode of baptism, became the rule with both sections of the Baptist community. Indeed, from this time [1646], beyond the fact already given [at Chelmsford], we know not a solitary exception." What a difference in Evans

when his language is taken in its connections, and not garbled or suppressed! All this, however, Dr. Christian suppressed.

5. On pages 21, 22, Dr. Christian cites Cathcart, Armitage, Burrage, Newman and Dexter in the interest of his thesis that the Kiffin Manuscript is a fraud, or a forgery; but not one of these authors, beyond the expression of some caution regarding the certainty of the document, repudiates the Kiffin Manuscript. Dr. Newman, after a thorough examination of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript, and after twice reviewing Dr. Christian's works, declares his perfect confidence in the genuineness and consistency of these documents; and no doubt, if these other authors named had made the same investigation, they would concur with Dr. Newman. Dr. Dexter, who reached the 1641 thesis by another process, never saw anything but Crosby's version of the Kiffin Manuscript; and while he regards this version without any date as suspicious, therefore, for its vagueness, but for Kiffin's supposed authorship, and the fact that Wilson, Calamy, Brook, and Neal knew nothing of Blunt or Blacklock outside of Crosby's version, yet he cites Edwards, Barclay, and Hutchinson, besides Ivimey and Evans, as either agreeing with Crosby or as confirming the document, even to the identification of Batte. I know of no writer, Baptist or Pedobaptist, who makes any claims to expert historical research, that calls the Jessey Records or the Kiffin Manuscript a forgery, or who has made any credible showing against their authenticity or validity. Dr. Jesse B. Thomas is too much of a scholar to pronounce these documents a "fraud" or a "forgery;" and his effort to discredit them as "unreliable" has been pronounced by competent authority as incomprehensible, to say nothing of its failure. Dr. Henry S. Burrage, as I have already shown, has demonstrated, so far as he touches the subject, that Dr. Christian has completely failed to invalidate the integrity of these documents.

6. On pages 23-28, Dr. Christian seeks to contradict the Kiffin Manuscript by Kiffin's own writings; and he not only misrepresents Kiffin, but King and others, by the most glaring specimens of garbling and suppression. In order to contradict the statement of the Kiffin Manuscript that immersion among the Baptists of England was unknown before 1641, he cites Kiffin (Brief Remonstrance,

p. 6, 1645) as follows: "It is well known to many, and especially to ourselves, that our congregations, as they now are, were erected and framed, according to the rule of Christ, before we heard of any Reformation, even in the time when Episcopacie was in the height of its vanishing glory." Dr. Christian argues that Kiffin referred here to the "Episcopal Reformation" which began in 1535! and he cites Ricraft (Ricraft) (Looking Glasse for the Anabaptists, pp. 6, 7) as admitting that Kiffin's church was in existence, "long before 1641," as "a Baptist Church organized and framed, immersion and all, 'as they now are.'" Good heavens!

A grosser perversion of facts could not well be made. Kiffin did not refer to the "Episcopal Reformation" at all, but to the Presbyterian movement, 1643-49, which was "*now* (1645) in hand" as a Presbyterian reformation of the Church of England, as shown by his retort upon Ricraft (p. 7), as follows: "You tell us of a greate Work of Reformation, wee would entreat you to show us wherein the greatnesse of it doth consist, for yet we see no greatnesse, unless it be the vast expense [by the Assembly] of Money and Time: for what great thing is it to change *Episcopacie* into Presbytery, and a Book of *Common Prayer* into a Directory, &c?" Kiffin had been charged by Ricraft with erecting "new-framed congregations, separated to the disturbance of the great Work of [Presbyterian] Reformation *now* [1645] in hand;" and Kiffin replies that before they ever heard of this reformation the Baptist congregations, as they then [1645] were, were "erected and framed according to the rule of Christ." He specifies the time as "when Episcopacie was at the *height* of its *vanishing* glory." When was that? In the latter part of the reign of Charles I., about 1640-41, when the Puritan revolution began—at the time "of ye revival of Antipedobaptism towards ye *latter end* of ye Reign of King Charles ye First," as the collector of the Jessey Records puts it in his caption of the Hutchinson Account. This was the period of the Baptist reformation, as Crosby and other Baptist writers claimed it, and synchronous with the Puritan revolution, but before the Presbyterian movement of 1643-49; and hence Kiffin retorts upon Ricraft that before this Presbyterian reformation was heard of, Baptist churches had been

erected and framed—not when Episcopacie was at the height of its glory, but of its “*vanishing* glory.”

Ricraft doubtfully grants the *possibility* that Kiffin’s own church may have been erected before the Presbyterian reformation, but not so of a great number of Baptist congregations which were then in existence. Kiffin, according to his “*Sober Discourse*,” 1681 (p. 1), never became a Baptist until 1641; and according to Ivimey’s *Life of Kiffin* (p. 17), and to Gould’s *Open Communion* (p. cxxxi.), Kiffin never became pastor of a Baptist church before the latter part of 1643 or the beginning of 1644. Hence Ricraft’s doubt about the beginning of Kiffin’s own church, and about which Kiffin says nothing in his controversy with Ricraft. The story that Kiffin joined Spilsbury in 1638, and separated from him before 1640 on account of pulpit affiliation—that about 1640, as Ivimey at first stated, he founded the Devonshire Square Baptist Church—is utterly without foundation, as Ivimey and Gould, just cited, prove. According to Orme, Kiffin remained connected with Jessey until 1643; and according to Gould, his connection with and separation from Spilsbury must have been late in 1643 or at the beginning of 1644, when, with Patient, he became pastor of a church in London, never coming into the pastorate of Devonshire Square Baptist Church until after 1653 or later, according to Ivimey and Gould.

There is nothing in the writings of Kiffin whatever that conflicts with the so-called Kiffin Manuscript, but everything to confirm it. He fully admits the separation of the Baptists from the Puritans, and that they had established a “reformation” of their own; and, like all the Baptist writers of his time, he implies that adult baptism had been lost in the apostasy and had been restored by the Baptists. He says in his “*Sober Discourse*” (p. 16): “For if it be once admitted that it [baptism] is not necessary to Church Communion, every Man of Sence will infer, That our Contention for it were frivolous, our *separation* schismatical, etc.” Again (*ibid.*, p. 58), he says: “Gospel Order settled by Apostolicall Authority & Direction, as this [ordinance of Baptism] was, hath not lost any of its native worth and efficacy, or obliging vertue, by any *Disuse* or *Discontinuance* occasioned by any, but ought to be the same *now* as it was to them in the *beginning* of such order.” In reply to Ricraft’s



querie, "By what warrant from the Word of God do you *separate* from our congregations, when the Word and sacraments are purely dispensed?" Kiffin (Briefe Remonstrance, p. 6) replies: "We (I hope) shall joyne with you in the same Congregation and Fellowship, and nothing shall *separate* us but death, but till then we shall continue our *separation* from you, according to the light we have received." In reply to the charge of disturbing the "Reformation *now* in hand," he says (*ibid*, p. 7): "I know not what you meane by this charge, unless it be to discover your prejudice against us, in *Reforming ourselves* before you"—that is, before the Presbyterian Reformation, 1643-49. In reply to Ricraft's charge that he received from their congregations "silly seduced servants, children or people," Kiffin (*ibid*, p. 10) says: "We are sure, it is well known to you, we receive *none* as members with us, but *such as have been members of your church* at least sixteen, twenty or thirty years." In reply to the charge of "schism" (*ibid*, p. 13), he says again: "When you have made satisfaction for *your* notorious schisme, and return as dutiful sonnes to their Mother, or else have cast off all your filthy Rubbish of her abominations, which are found among you, we will *return* to you, or show our just grounds to the contrary."

In all these passages, as italicized, it is clear that Kiffin admits the "disuse or Discontinuance" of "Gospel Order" and its restoration by the Baptists, as all the Baptist writers of his day held; that the Baptists were a separation and a schism from the Pedobaptists; that the Baptists had made a reformation of their own, and *before* the Presbyterian reformation; and that the Baptists, admitting their separation and schism, would "*return*" when the Pedobaptists threw off the filthy abominations of Rome. Kiffin declares, in 1645, that all the members received into Baptist churches were adult members from Pedobaptist churches; and he thus shows what was true, 1641-45, that there were no original Baptist churches, or Baptist preachers, or Baptists, apart from separation from Pedobaptist churches, in England. Every word he writes confirms the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript regarding Anabaptist separation and Reformation about 1640-41—begin-

ning in principle 1611-1633, and perfected in practice about 1640-41, by the restoration of immersion.

7. Dr. Christian seriously misuses Daniel King (pp. 25-27). King wrote a book of 238 pages, entitled "A Way to Zion," etc. (London, 1649), which is an elaborate vindication of the right of the Baptists to restore gospel order, specially gospel baptism, and the principles upon which their reformation was established. He lays down two propositions under which his book is written, as follows:

"1. That God hath had a people on earth, ever since the coming of Christ in the flesh, throughout the darkest ages of Popery, which he hath owned as Saints and his Church.

"2. That these Saints have power to reassume and take up as their right, any ordinance of Christ, which they have been deprived of by the violence and tyranny of the man of sin."

Now Dr. Christian quotes the first proposition and suppresses the second, which involves the point in controversy based upon the Kiffin Manuscript. Not only this, but he skips the whole discussion of King to the "Third Part" of his book in which (against the Quaker doctrines of Saltmarsh, who assumed that the outward ordinances of the Gospel were shadows of spiritual things and did not continue in the churches) he proves upon principle that the ordinances should continue in the churches, and that they were not *mere* shadows of spiritual things, to be essentially discontinued in their visible form. Dr. Christian thus seeks to leave the impression that King not only shows a succession of *visible* Baptist churches from the days of Christ, but that he shows that baptism had so continued—the very thing King denies and proves to the contrary. King's book, in a dedicatory epistle, was indorsed by Thomas Patient, John Spilsbury, *William Kiffin*, and John Pearson; and these five great Baptists, of 1645, took for granted by this indorsement that the visible churches of the Gospel, with baptism and the ministry, had been lost in the apostasy and restored by the Baptists, according to Matt. 28: 20, as King shows by a most able and elaborate discussion which confirms the Kiffin Manuscript.

The quotation of Thomas Grantham, Joseph Hooke, and James Culross, after King and Kiffin, on pages 27, 28, proves nothing for

the *visible* succession of Baptist churches. As a sect, or a people, no Baptist disputes their succession from the days of the apostles. King, in his first proposition, declares the succession of God's people ever since the coming of Christ and throughout the darkest ages of Popery; but it is out of this spiritual line that he argues, upon his second proposition, the right of these "saints" when the visible succession has been lost in ordinances, especially baptism, to restore them again. He assumes in his book that this visible order had been lost in the dark ages of Popery, and that Baptists—God's people—had restored it, that it then existed in the world, and that the assertion of the Seekers, Quakers and others that there were no true churches or ordinances in the world, no true ministers at that time, was false. (See English Baptist Reformation, pp. 187-191.)

8. On page 40, Dr. Christian misrepresents Barclay, and quotes his views as against the statements of the Kiffin Manuscript. Barclay, as quoted (Inner Life, etc., p. 12), says: "As we shall afterwards show, the rise of the Anabaptists took place long prior to the foundation of the Church of England, and there are also reasons for believing that on the Continent of Europe, small hidden societies, who have held *many of the opinions* of the Anabaptists, have existed from the times of the apostles. In the sense of *the direct transmission of divine truth and the very nature of spiritual religion*, it seems probable that these churches have a lineage or succession more ancient than the Roman Church;" but Dr. Christian does not continue the quotation a sentence or two further on, in which Barclay says: "But in England, although *traces* are found in our history of the existence of the *opinions* of the Anabaptists from the earliest times, it is doubtful whether any *churches* or *societies* of purely *English Baptists* had a distinct *consecutive* existence prior to 1611." So far as the visible succession of the English Baptists is concerned, he is right in line with Crosby, who traces the origin of English Baptist churches to 1611-1633; and Barclay in no way contradicts, but rather confirms, the Kiffin Manuscript, which shows that these English Baptist churches restored immersion about 1640-41, after organizing 1611-1633.

So much for these authorities cited by Dr. Christian against the Kiffin Manuscript. He cannot be relied upon in a single one of these citations.

## CHAPTER V.

### PEDOBAPTIST IMMERSION BEFORE 1641.

I shall here notice the citations and arguments of Dr. Christian against the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript, in favor of the view that the Pedobaptists of England almost universally practiced immersion down to 1641, and only introduced sprinkling after that date. The Kiffin Manuscript declares that down to 1640 none had practiced immersion in England to "professed believers," but Crosby and a host of others declare that even infant immersion by 1600 had practically or generally ceased. In his Vol. I. (p. 97), he declares that "immersion had for some time been *disused*" in England—that is, among all parties; but Dr. Christian affirms to the contrary.

1. He begins with the Episcopalians; and the first author he quotes is Dr. William Wall (p. 75), who ruins him at the start. Dr. Wall (History of Infant Baptism, p. 403) says: "And for sprinkling, properly called, it seems that it was at 1645 just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641; for Mr. Blake had never used it nor seen it used." Further down Wall says that sprinkling as baptism was first used in France in times of Popery; but now (1644-45) in England the Presbyterians had reformed the font into a basin and introduced "sprinkling, *properly called.*" Wall quotes Blake, another Episcopalian, who (1645) advocated and practiced *pouring*, and who says (Infant Baptism Freed from Antichristianism, 1645, p. 4): "Those that dip not infants, do not use to sprinkle them: There is a middle way between these two: I have seen several dipped; I never heard of any sprinkled. . . . Our way is not by aspersion, but perfusion; not sprinkling drop by drop, but pouring on at once all that the hand contains." (History of Infant Baptism, Vol. II., p. 402.) On page 401 (*ibid*), Wall says again: "In the latter times of Queen Elizabeth, and during the reigns of King James and of King Charles I., very few children were dipped in the

font." The sum of Wall's testimony is that from the time of Queen Elizabeth down to 1645 the mode of baptism among the Episcopalians, with some exceptions of dipping, was by "*pouring*;" and that "sprinkling, *properly* called," was the innovation upon pouring, and not dipping, about 1644-45, by the Presbyterians. Wall shows, back on page 401 (*ibid*), that during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, through the influence of Calvin, *pouring* had been brought into England and gradually substituted for dipping; and in spite of Queen Elizabeth and subsequent convocations and canons the custom became general in the Church of England. Wall (p. 398) quotes Walker (Doct. Baptism, p. 147, 1678), who had most carefully derived the beginning of the alteration from the general custom of dipping to sprinkling. Speaking of the period, 1550, he says: "Dipping was at this time [1550] the more usual, but sprinkling was sometimes used; which within the time of half a century (from 1550 to 1600) prevailed to be more general (as it is now [1678] almost the only) way of baptizing."

Dr. Wall is Dr. Christian's own witness; and according to him, dipping in half a century from 1550 to 1600 became disused, pouring took its place in the English Church down to 1645, and "sprinkling, properly called," was introduced in 1644, which in the case of a few began to substitute pouring in the English Church in 1645. "Very few children were dipped in the font in the latter times of queen Elizabeth and during the reigns of King James and of King Charles I." Wall says (Vol. IV., p. 172): "For two reigns [James I. and Charles I.] *pouring* water on the face of the infant was most in fashion;" and he adds this to the sentence above: "Antipedobaptism did not begin here while dipping in the ordinary baptism lasted;" and he makes the same assertion (Vol. II., p. 413) when he says: "Neither was there ever an Antipedobaptist in England, as I showed in the last chapter, till the custom of sprinkling children instead of dipping them, in the ordinary baptisms, had for some time prevailed." How Dr. Christian could have so perverted Wall seems incredible; and the funny part of it is that, from page 76 to 85, he quotes a number of authorities to *sustain* Wall, who is squarely against him! It is admitted that Queen Elizabeth tried, but in vain, to prohibit the practice of pouring—that the bishops

sought in every way to put away the "profane bason" and restore the "stone font"—that fonts, and sometimes baptisteries, are still found in the old churches of England and of the Continent; but then, as now, the children who were said to be baptized "*in* the font," as "*in* the bason," were generally affused, and "very few were dipped," as Wall declares. What Gough, Paley, Carte, the Bishops, the Prayer Book, etc., quoted by Dr. Christian in connection with Wall, imply, can in no way conflict with Wall's History of Infant Baptism, and who is the chief witness on the stand of unquestioned authority. I stand by Wall, Dr. Christian's chief witness, whose name is often repeated; and I shall further on confirm Wall's position on this subject.

From page 35 to 89, Dr. Christian arrays the English scholars from 1600 to 1641 who wrote, not against the "incoming innovation," but against the innovation which had already come. He quotes Joseph Mede, Henry Greenwood, John Mayer, Daniel Rogers, Steven Denson, Edward Elton, John Selden, Bishop Taylor, and he might have quoted on down to Dr. Wall, Sir John Floyer, Dr. Whitby and others who not only defined *baptidzo* "to dip," but who pleaded for the restoration of infant dipping in the English Church; and the very fact of their discussion and plea for immersion was based upon its acknowledged "disuse" since 1600. Not one of these English Church scholars, however, would have held that immersion was the exclusive and only form of baptism, even according to the Scriptures. They allowed sprinkling or pouring of infants in case of sickness or weakness, and would not have maintained that the New Testament use of *baptizo* always meant to dip.

On page 88, Dr. Christian refers to the Catholics and their practice of immersion in England from 1600 to 1641. In 1652 he finds one Thomas Hall, who declares that Catholics were "great dippers," and who says: "If dipping be true baptizing, then *some* amongst us that have been dipped by Popish Prelatical Priests, who are the greatest zealots for dipping, should be rightly baptized. The *Papists* and the Anabaptists like Samson's Foxes, their heads look and lie in different ways, yet they are tied together by the tail of dipping. (Tho. Collier in his Colus, p. 116.)" "Some amongst

us" is the limit of Catholic dipping in the above quotation; and it is admitted, in 1652, that "some of the Catholics and the poor Welsh" continued to dip their children, even in the winter, as shown by Barebone and Chamberlen.

On page 80, Dr. Christian cites the practice of the Presbyterians of England prior to 1641; and he claims that, in the Westminster Assembly, 1643-49, "sprinkling was *substituted* for immersion," as if immersion had been the exclusive practice of the Presbyterians down to that time! It is a well-known fact, so held by Lightfoot and all the scholars I know, that immersion was voted upon in the Westminster Assembly as an alternate form with sprinkling, and not as exclusive of sprinkling. Down to that very date the Presbyterians were sprinkling, and immersion among them was only a tolerated alternate form of rarely exceptional practice. The Scotch Presbyterians, under Knox, adopted sprinkling, following the Genevan Calvinists; and the English Presbyterians and Congregationalists had been in the practice of it from the beginning. It is incredible that the Westminster Assembly should have suddenly, against their practice of immersion, voted to substitute sprinkling. The English Church had adopted Calvin's pouring, with an occasional exception of dipping; but by reason of their legally established form of immersion and the tenacity of the High Church scholars and clergy, dipping, as alternate with sprinkling or pouring, was never excluded from the Prayer Book and so remains, without practice, till this day. The Presbyterians, however, had never practiced immersion, though allowed as an alternate form with sprinkling; and not being tied to the practice by law or tradition, the Assembly dropped it altogether and adopted sprinkling in 1643, and established it as the law of the land in 1644. Such a radical change would have been impossible if immersion had been the practice of the Presbyterians. There was no controversy with the Congregationalists. Their Catechism, entitled "To Sion's Virgins," 1644, clearly shows that their practice had been sprinkling from the beginning; and so of all Calvinists on the Continent, or in Scotland and England.

Wall is precisely right in saying that the Presbyterians were responsible for introducing sprinkling in England, and then for

making it an exclusive law, 1644-48; but Wall was speaking of "sprinkling, *properly* called," in opposition to English Church *pouring*, and not dipping, which innovation such men as Blake (1645) resented as *rhantizing*, and had not then seen. Wall himself repudiates sprinkling and does not regard it as baptism (Vol. IV., p. 163); but while he prefers immersion, he holds with Blake and others that *pouring* is valid baptism. Hence his position that, in 1645, "*sprinkling, properly called,*" had just begun to be practiced in the English Church, and then only by "very few;" but he shows that from the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, and during the reign of James and Charles I., "*pouring*" was the "*fashion,*" and that "*very few children were dipped.*" During that period sprinkling was most the fashion among Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Some time after dipping had been displaced by sprinkling and pouring, Wall says the English Antipedobaptists appeared in England, but, at first, without "separation," afterwards separating into societies, referring, no doubt, to the 1633-38 Anabaptists; and the only confusion into which he falls in his earlier works is his supposition that the Baptists received their immersion from John Smyth, by self-baptism—an error which Collins, Crosby, and others indignantly repudiated, and an error based upon ignorance of the fact that John Smyth was never immersed at all.

I might close here with Dr. Christian's chief witness, whom he frequently mentions as settling his thesis that sprinkling never substituted dipping till after 1641 and in 1643-44; but I shall here present further testimony in harmony with Wall, who ruins Dr. Christian's case.

1. Thomas Crosby, Baptist, wrote his entire Preface to Vol. II., Baptist History, pp. i.-xliv., to show precisely what Dr. Wall claims—namely, that by 1600 immersion had gradually, within half a century (from 1550 to 1600), been substituted by sprinkling or pouring, with but little exception, in the Church of England. (See English Baptist Reformation, pp. 68-78.)

2. Sir John Floyer, Church of England (History of Cold Bathing, 1709, p. 50), says: "That *immersion* continued in the Church of England till about the year 1600;" and in the history of the sub-



ject down to 1640-41 he shows a few exceptions by dipping (pp. 14, 15, 61).

3. Jeffry Watts, Episcopalian (Scribe, Pharisee, Hypocrite, etc., 1656, p. 40), says: "The Church of England hath been now of a long time, time out of mind, mind of any man living, in firm possession of baptism, and practice of it by sprinkling, or pouring on of water upon the face and forehead, and gently washing or rubbing the same therewith and pronouncing the word of Institution, In the name, etc." According to Watts, in 1656, an old man could not remember when sprinkling or pouring was not the prevailing mode of baptism in the English Church.

4. Dr. John Gale, a learned Baptist (Reflections on Wall's History of Infant Baptism—Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Vol. III., p. 228), in speaking of immersion in England, says that it "continued till Queen Elizabeth's time." In conformity with Wall and Walker, who declare that from 1550 to 1600 the alteration from dipping to sprinkling took place, Dr. Gale (*ibid.*, p. 347) says: "In the very case of baptism *among ourselves* in England, the manner of dipping, in about one-quarter part of the time [alluding to Jewish changes two hundred years after Christ—that is, in fifty years], was *totally disused* and sprinkling substituted in its stead, etc." On page 570 (*ibid.*) he repeats the same: "For dipping was wholly laid aside, and sprinkling used instead, in less than half a century"—in England.

5. Henry Denne, Baptist (A Contention for Truth, 1658, p. 40), says: "Dipping of infants was not only commanded by the Church of England, but also generally practiced in the Church of England till the year 1600; yea, in some places it was practiced till the year 1641 until the fashion altered"—as shown by the exceptions cited by Sir John Floyer.

6. A. R. Baptist (A Treatise of the Vanity of Childish Baptisme, 1642), in his Preface to the Reader (p. 4), represents himself as sprinkled in infancy in the Church of England; and his work, Part First, is devoted to Dipping as opposed to Sprinkling. He was a recent convert to the Baptists; and he must have been born near 1600, when sprinkling or pouring must have not only been fully in practice (1642) when he wrote, but when he was born, in

the English Church. Hence Dr. Wall is right, and Dr. Christian wrong, about sprinkling, or pouring rather, being the "fashion" in England from Queen Elizabeth to the close of Charles I. Not a single Baptist author from John Smyth to John Spilsbury, before 1641, nor among them after 1641, such as Barber, A. R., R. B., Kilcop and others who wrote about 1641-42, and who combated infant baptism, ever spoke of it as infant dipping, but as "sprinkling" or "pouring;" and they explode Dr. Christian's thesis that infant dipping was in vogue till 1643-44, when the Presbyterians substituted it by sprinkling.

7. So far as adult immersion was concerned, the learned Dr. John Tombes, Baptist (An Addition to an Apology for Two Treatises, etc., 1652, pp. 10, 11), argues the right to restore immersion by unbaptized administrators, upon the ground of "universal corruption," and that "no continuance of adult baptism" could "be proved." Barebone affirms, in 1642-43, that the Anabaptists had gone, within two or three years, from sprinkling to dipping. R. B. assumed, in 1642, that until lately "there were no baptized people;" and Coruwell, in 1645, affirms that Baptists had *resumed dipping*. I might multiply witnesses who, directly or indirectly, expressly or impliedly, agree with Wall that from 1600 to 1643-44 the practice of "pouring" was "most in fashion" in the English Church, and that the practice of the Congregationalists and Presbyterians must have been almost exclusive sprinkling between those dates, while the Anabaptists were either pouring or sprinkling themselves. With but little exception there was no infant immersion; and, so far as known, there was "no continuance" of adult immersion at all. With the exception of some of the High Church party in England, perhaps all religious bodies had turned to affusion or perfusion; and, as Dr. Newman shows, the Anabaptists and Puritans would not have been affected in favor of immersion by their High Church persecutors.

On page 85, Dr. Christian cites Alexander Balfour (Antipedobaptism Unveiled, 1827, p. 240), who says: "Baptizing infants by dipping them in fonts was practiced in the Church of England (except in cases of sickness or weakness) until the Directory came out in 1644, which forbade the carrying of children to the font."

This nineteenth century writer, like Dr. Christian, has totally misread Wall, Gale, Crosby, Floyer, Watts, and a host of other authorities. William Walker, 1678 (*Doctrine of Baptisms*, p. 146), is cited as follows: "The general custom now in England is to sprinkle, so in the fore end of this centurie the general custom was to dip." Wall, as I have shown, quotes Walker to prove that in the latter half of the sixteenth century sprinkling "prevailed to be the more general (as it is now [1678] almost the only) way of baptizing." Walker contradicts himself, or else he refers to the sixteenth century. On page 100, Dr. Christian quotes Walter Craddock, in his sermon before the House of Commons, July 21, 1646, who says: "There is now among good people a great deal of strife about baptism; as for divers things, so for the point of dipping, though in some places in England they dip altogether." This was true, in 1646, among Baptists, and it was true among "some of the Catholics and the poor Welch;" but it could have been only exceptionally true among other Pedobaptists. Thomas Blake, 1645 (*Infant Baptism Freed from Antichristianisme*, p. 1), is cited by Dr. Christian as saying: "I have been an eyewitness of many infants dipped, and know it to have been the constant practice of many ministers in their places, for many years together." Wall says this quotation refers to the early life of Blake, in the first part of the seventeenth century, when there were more exceptions in favor of dipping than later. At the time of his writing in 1645 Blake had only seen "*several* dipped," but none "sprinkled," the "fashion" being to *pour*, which was his own custom. What Dr. Christian quotes from Featley's *Clavis Mystica*, 1636: "Our font is always open, or ready to be opened, and the minister attends to receive the children of the faithful, and to dip them in the sacred laver"—cannot signify more than the exception to the general custom of "pouring" which history shows prevailed in the English Church from 1600 to 1645. Featley, in 1644, was an ardent opponent of exclusive inuersion; and he went so far as to declare that it was not only not essential, but could not be proved from the Scriptures. Doubtless some Episcopalians of to-day could say: "Our font is open to any who desire to dip their children"—still allowed by the Prayer Book, but not practiced. There is an Episcopal Church in

Nashville with a baptistery. Sprinkling churches everywhere, to-day, will dip those who desire it; and there are Pedobaptist scholars who defend immersion as a scriptural mode of baptism who constantly practice affusion or aspersion.

Every Pedobaptist church I know, except the Greek Church, is a sprinkling church, and yet they make many exceptions in favor of immersion. Thousands are dipped in this country by sprinkling denominations; but the exceptions, however many, do not alter the fact that these denominations are strictly sprinkling bodies. The Church of England from 1550 to 1600 had gradually changed from dipping to pouring (often improperly called "sprinkling" and going by that designation), and this church had become technically a *sprinkling* church. While a few here and there dipped their infants, it did not alter the status of the church as having become a sprinkling (pouring) body; and from that period till this it has so remained. The exceptions soon after 1600 were greater than after, and grew less and less until very rare.

Blake and Walker are Wall's witnesses as well as Dr. Christian's; and none of these testimonies overthrow Wall, the master historian on the subject, and so amply sustained by credible and well-known authorities. Not every writer on the subject is thoroughly informed; and most writers, like Dr. Christian, are likely to make serious blunders, as in the use of Wall as an authority for his thesis, when Wall is squarely against him. The truth is that Dr. Christian is thoroughly unreliable in the use of his authorities, even as he quotes them; and then, worse than all, he only so quotes that had he quoted further he would not have quoted at all. His use of Crosby, Barclay, King, Kiffin, To Sion's Virgins, Foxe, Wall, Evans, Barber, Featley, and others—to say nothing of his perversions of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript—is thoroughly vicious in the light of criticism. It is simply astounding that he could have written so recklessly, to give the most charitable view of his performance. Who would have thought, for instance, that a writer pretending to historical information would have quoted Wall as his chief witness—and that, too, repeatedly—to prove that infant dipping prevailed in the Church of England until

1643-44, when it was substituted by sprinkling. Dr. Christian shows valuable enterprise in scrapping historical fragments, but he evidently does not read at length, or else, if he does, he garbles and suppresses, or has not the faculty of logical connection or application. I do not make this charge with any desire or purpose to offend. The fact is so palpable that Dr. Christian is either unfair, or reckless, or unqualified in his discussion of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript that it would be unjust not to show the fact to the general reader, who knows but little or nothing of the authorities cited in this work. It is a great pity, if not a crime, to mislead those who are dependent upon us for information; and I solemnly affirm that if any one will point out to me a single author I have misrepresented, or a single statement not true to the history of the case in question, I will correct my error and apologize for my ignorance. To write for the day in which we live, or to write for the popularity and applause of a following, or to write in the fear of public opinion, or to write for the vindication of a partisan pre-conception, does not become the historian; and though the whole Baptist denomination should be against my position, I affirm that what I have written is true to my authorities and true to the history of the case, according to my honest judgment; and I am perfectly willing to be contradicted by the future historian if I am wrong, although I am convinced that I shall not be reversed, unless the voluminous testimony of the seventeenth-century writers prove false. I am as thorough a Bible Baptist as ever lived, but I abhor all the honor conferred upon Baptists by false representations of Baptist history.

## CHAPTER VI.

### ANABAPTIST IMMERSION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

In this chapter I shall notice the citations and arguments of Dr. Christian in favor of immersion among Anabaptists during the sixteenth century and onward. On page 94 Dr. Christian introduces this part of the subject by an inference that the Baptists having been persecuted by the Episcopalians, notwithstanding both were immersionists, sided with the Presbyterians, who changed from immersion to sprinkling in 1643-4; then he presents what he calls the "astounding proposition" implied by the Kiffin Manuscript—namely, that Baptists, who were sprinkling down to 1641, turned against their allies, the Presbyterians, in the very hour of triumph for their affusion views. The facts are that Episcopalians were affusionists until 1645, with but little exception. The Presbyterians were sprinklers, with but little exception, down to 1643-4, when they rejected immersion as an alternate form of baptism altogether and made sprinkling a law. The Baptists were affusionists or aspersionists down to 1640-41, and, having introduced immersion about that time, gradually changed down to 1646, according to Evans (Vol. II., p. 79). The Presbyterians were no more the allies of the Baptists than the Episcopalians, and persecuted them when in power just as did the Episcopalians. In 1645 Kiffin and Ricraft were in controversy about sprinkling and infant baptism; and Kiffin declares that there was no difference between Episcopacy and Presbytery, the Prayer Book and the Directory. (Baptist Reformation, p. 107.) There was no sudden change of all the Baptists in 1640-41, when immersion was introduced; and the Baptists made the beginning of their change two or three years before the Presbyterians made sprinkling, their common usage, a law in 1643-4.

In this connection Dr. Christian (pp. 94-97) introduces the Baptist Confession of Faith of 1644, issued by the seven Particular Baptist churches of London, which had adopted immersion and who

now in the fortieth article of this Confession (published October 16, 1644) defined *baptizo* to dip—the first time in the history of English Baptists such a rendering of the word was ever put into a Confession of Faith. This was after the Presbyterians had excluded immersion as an alternate form with sprinkling by a close vote of 25 to 24; and Dr. Christian thinks the unanimity of the seven churches in the Baptist Confession of 1644 indicates that immersion was their prior practice. So it had been of those seven churches and of others since 1641-2; but already Barber, Kiffin, Kilcop, A. R., R. B., Spilsbury, and others had been in controversy with Barebone, Featley, and others; and in the controversy Barebone had charged that the “totall dipping” of the Baptists was “only two or three years” old, and Featley pronounces the fortieth article for exclusive dipping as the “*new* leaven of Anabaptisme.” More than this, the Confession is an anti-succession document, holding that where baptism is lost it may be restored by unbaptized administrators; and two of the signers, Kilcop and Spilsbury, both wrote books in which, in reply to Barebone’s charges that Baptists had introduced new baptism, they squarely assumed that the visible church of Christ, with their ministry and baptism, had been lost and restored by the Baptists, and defended their right. The Blunt method of succession baptism adopted in 1641 is repudiated by this Confession, since the “greatest number and more judicious of the English Baptists” declared, at the time, that the Holland movement was “needless” and popish, and adopted the Spilsbury method of restoring immersion by unbaptized administrators. (Crosby, Vol. I., p. 103.) Blunt and his party—or his church, if he had one—were not in the Confession for this very reason; and all this proves beyond question that the 1644 Confession itself demonstrates the recent introduction of immersion by the Baptists of England, which confirms the Kiffin Manuscript *date*, but does not adopt its *method*.

Going back now to the sixteenth century, Dr. Christian presents the following instances of what he thinks to be Baptist immersion:

1. The oft-repeated citation of Thomas Fuller with regard to the expression, “Donatists new dipt,” applied “for the main” to the Dutch Anabaptists who came to England in 1524, I have fully dis-

cussed. (Baptist Reformation, p. 23.) Fuller wrote in 1656, just 132 years after the immigration, and so far as I can find he gives no data by which to show that they were dippers. Nobody else has produced any contemporaneous testimony to this effect. Fuller evidently followed the traditional idea of Anabaptist dipping, or else he took his idea from the custom of the Anabaptists of his day (1656) as the basis of his dipping phraseology, or else, according to the usage of his day, he employed the word "dipped" in the sense of "christened," and so characterized the 1524 Anabaptists as "Donatists *new dipt*" under a new name. As Dr. Newman shows, they were evidently of the Hoffmanite type, and their practice, at that date, was sprinkling. Goodwin (1653) speaks of the first "*undipt dipper*" who "brought up the trade of dipping" in England "after the *late* [Puritan] reformation." The Anabaptists in England did not dip, so far as history shows, before 1641. The quotation from Reading, p. 98 (The Anabaptist Routed, 1655), in support of Fuller, which says, "Anabaptists not only deny believers' children baptism, as the Pelagians and the Donatists did of old, but affirm the dipping of the whole body under water is so necessary that without it none are baptized," proves nothing except that the Anabaptists of 1655 were practicing exclusive immersion, and that, like the Donatists and Pelagians of old, they denied "believers' children baptism." Reading was one of the seventeenth-century writers who charged Baptists with "*new*" or self-originated baptism. (English Baptist Reformation, p. 233.) The truth is that neither the Donatists nor the Pelagians denied infant baptism, but practiced it.

2. The quotation from William Turner (1551) I have fully discussed on pages 24-27, "Baptist Reformation." The controversy between Cooke and Turner regarding the practice of "baptysm" and the conditions upon which it was administered to the "Catechumeni" of the early Catholics on Easter and Whitsunday was altogether about the *subject* of believers as opposed to infant baptism, and not the mode. The point made by Cooke from the "Catechumeni" was that the subjects should be "*competentes*"—that baptism should be deferred, as in the Lord's Supper, until the subject was old enough to act for himself. Turner replied: "And be-



cause baptism is a *passive* sacrament, & no man can baptize himselfe, but is baptized of another: & childe may be as wel dipped into the water in ye name of Christ (which is the outward baptysm and as muche as one man can gyve another) even as olde folke: and when as they have the promise of salvation, as well as olde folke & can receive the signe of the same as wel: there is no cause why that the baptysme of childe should be differred." Turner was an English Church immersionist at that date; and here he is using his own language as to the word "dipped" and as to the subject of baptism—incidentally as to mode and polemically as to believers' baptism. He was simply urging against Anabaptist position that infant baptism should not be differentiated ("differred") from believers' baptism; that infant baptism stood precisely on the same footing as adult baptism—upon the ground that baptism was a *passive* act and could be administered to children who have the promise of salvation and could receive the sign as well as "olde folke." He uses the words "dipped" and "baptysm" alternately in the same sentence, and had no allusion to the Anabaptist mode of baptism, which was not in controversy. He was not replying to *them* as urging delay of baptism, as immersion, as in the case of the "Catechumeni;" and he spoke of dipping as a dipper himself. At the year 1551 the alteration from immersion to sprinkling in the English Church had just set in, but Turner was an infant dipper who regarded infant dipping as occupying the same ground as adult dipping, which he used as the word "baptysm."

Dr. Christian infers that Turner's expression, "Catabaptists' religion which is your religion indeede," implies that the Anabaptists were "dippers." I deny that the word "Catabaptist," in its ecclesiastical usage, ever referred to the mode of baptism. It means, as Featley, Brinsley, Bakewell, Spanhemius, Goodwin, Zwingle, Fuesli, Ottius, Newman, Whitsitt, and others have clearly shown, a "profanation" of baptism, opposition to infant baptism, an "abuse of the sacrament" by "reiteration" and the like. Sophocles' Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine period gives the true and only ecclesiastical meaning of the word: "travesty of baptism." The sole meaning of Turner in ascribing the "Catabaptists' religion" to the Anabaptists is that they were opposers of infant baptism.

3. On page 101, John Man (1578), an English Church clergyman, also an immersionist, is quoted in a fragmentary way as saying that the Anabaptists "dippe twice," after the idea of the twelve in the nineteenth of the Acts of the Apostles. So he charges that the Anabaptists and Donatists "did wrong" in "washing them again which have been once washed in the same sacrament"—rebaptism. Man does not speak of the Anabaptists here as of England. The Donatists of old and some of the Swiss and German Anabaptists dipped about 1525, and the Poland Anabaptists resumed dipping in 1574 or earlier, some years before Man wrote; and the tradition that Anabaptists dipped was common then as now; but it cannot be historically shown that the Dutch Anabaptists in England dipped—whether of the Hoffmanite or the Mennonite type—while the English Anabaptists at a later date, when they introduced immersion, were called "*undipt dippers*"—that is, those who began the practice. It is not probable that the Anabaptists of England, whether Dutch or English, from 1534 to 1640-41, ever dipped.

4. From page 102 to 106 Dr. Christian cites Foxe as testimony that the Anabaptists in England dipped about the time of King Edward VI. In his "Did They Dip?" he cited Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" as showing this in 1563; but it was demonstrated that his quotation never belonged to Foxe's original edition. Nevertheless, he found a "rare book" entitled "Reformatio Legvm, Ecclesiasticarvm, etc.," written during the time of King Edward VI., and was published by John Foxe in 1571. Dr. Christian says this book treats of the "subject of dipping among the Anabaptists of 1571 and previously;" and he presents two Latin quotations with a translation, the first of which defines baptism as dipping and the second of which is supposed to treat of the Anabaptists, who, however, are not mentioned by name in the extract which begins thus: "Afterwards the cruel ungodliness of them rushes headlong into baptism, which they are unwilling to bestow upon infants, but utterly without reason." There is here an implied opposition to infant baptism characteristic of Anabaptists, but there is no implication of their practice of immersion. The extract says, "The *cruel ungodliness* of them rushed headlong *into baptism*," but the "cruel ungodliness" which "rushed headlong into baptism" must be distin-

guished from "them," whoever they were, who are not said themselves to "rush headlong into baptism." Just what is meant is hard to say. Dr. Newman writes me on this point: "Foxe is writing, I suppose, not of the English Anabaptists of 1571, but of the early Anabaptists, having in view probably the Munsterites; and he is simply using the current phraseology in relation to baptism, which is exemplified abundantly in the writings of nearly all the pedobaptists of that time. Rushing headlong into baptism does not have reference to the mode of baptism, but to the rash, precipitate, and unauthorized way in which they introduced believers' baptism to the exclusion of infant baptism." The passage seems to express no more than the unreasonable fanaticism of some who are represented as rushing cruelly and madly into baptismal contention, or into opposition to infant baptism; but the passage in no sense proves that the Anabaptists dipped, although immersion, at that time, was generally the practice of the English Church.

The charge of "baptismal regeneration" in the extract from Foxe certainly has nothing to do with the Anabaptists. This is ascribed to "*others*" who believed that from the "external element itself the Holy Spirit emerges, and that his power, his name, and his efficacy, out of which we are renewed, and his grace, and the remaining gifts proceeding out of it, swim in the *fonts* of baptism." The Anabaptists did not believe thus of "*fonts*" for infant baptism; and this charge is preferred against the "scrupulous superstition" of those who affirmed "that no infant of Christian parents will obtain salvation who has been seized by death before he could be brought to baptism." Surely this charge of "baptismal regeneration," as Dr. Christian claims, was not applicable to Anabaptists. Well did a distinguished scholar and historian write me on this point: "Dr. Christian's Foxe quotation does not *pan out*."

5. On pages 106-108 Dr. Christian refers to Leonard Busher's definition of baptism, "dipped for dead in the water" (1614), and to Professor Masson's opinion that the practice of the "Helwisse folk" was immersion, for a full answer to which I cite the reader to my work (Baptist Reformation, Chap. IV., pp. 52, 53). The Helwisse people did not immerse; and whether Leonard Busher was ever a member of Helwisse's church or not, it is evident that his

definition is apart from any practice of immersion on his part or the Anabaptists of his period (1614). They were Anabaptists, profoundly imbued with Baptist principles; but Crosby, in his version of the "famous ten words" of the Kiffin Manuscript, says, at the date of that document, that "immersion had been for some time disused in England," and that "it was not known" if the Anabaptists " (those who opposed the practice of baptizing infants) " had *revived* the ancient custom of immersion." It is almost historically certain that the Smyth-Helwys-Morton people were affusionists, after the fashion of the Mennonites, from 1609-11 down to 1640-41; and it is highly probable, whatever the definition of baptism by Busher, that it was apart from his or the practice of the Anabaptists of his time. There is no historic evidence that he or they practiced immersion at his time, but the evidence is strongly to the contrary.

6. Dr. Christian (p. 108) cites as contemporary evidence of the fact that Busher and the Helwys people immersed, one I. H. (A Description, etc., p. 27.) He is quoted as saying: "For tell me, shall every one that is baptized in the right forme and manner (for that ye stand much on) upon the skinne be saved?" This question is said to have been put to the Helwys congregation; but how Dr. Christian gets immersion out of this "*skinne*" baptism is hard to see. Evidently the sprinkling Puritan was characterizing Anabaptist pouring, or washing (often accompanied by rubbing the flesh), and about which there was sometimes controversy between the sprinklers and pourers. This was the Mennonite fashion, in part, which the Helwys folks followed. Immersion gets the subject into the water, applies the skin to the element; but it was affusion or washing that made "*skinne*" baptism. In this connection (p. 108) Dr. Christian says that John Robinson, in his reply to John Morton, declares that he and his congregation practiced dipping. He says: "In the next place they come to baptism, in which they think themselves in their element, as filth in water. And beginning with John's baptism, etc." (Defense of the doctrine propounded by the Synod of Dort, p. 147.) Morton, in his "Description, etc." (pp. 129, 130), is represented as declaring that John baptized his disciples in Jordan, and as adding: "This indeed was the practice of the primitive

churches, it cannot be disproved." Robinson evidently intends to characterize Anabaptist contention for believers' baptism—always "beginning with John's baptism"—in which, without any allusion to their mode, he represents them "in their element" of controversy "as filth in water." He surely does not intend to represent *them*, in water, as "filth," but as such "in their element," when they come to the question of baptism—ever "beginning with John's baptism." Like Morton, Smyth, Helwys, and other Anabaptists, before 1641—yea, Mennonites and Pedobaptists—who practiced affusion, believed that John baptized in Jordan, and that the primitive churches immersed. I asked a Mennonite preacher in Rotterdam—a sprinkler—why he called John the Baptist, "John the Dooper;" and his reply was that "he dipped in the river Jordan." I then asked why the Doopsgezinden—the Dutch Baptists—sprinkled; and his reply was that "dipping would do for warm climates, but not for cold." He believed that immersion was a scriptural mode of baptism, and so of all Mennonites from the beginning, but they practiced sprinkling. Hence, in the light of these quotations, nothing can be proved as to the practice of the Helwys Anabaptists before 1641.

7. On pages 108, 109, I. G[raunt] (*Truth's Victory*, 1645, p. 19), is cited by Dr. Christian in proof that while John Morton "differed with some about free grace, he agreed with the rest on immersion." The quotation under the form of dialogue between "*Heres*" and "*Truth*" is as follows: "*Hercs*. But we have found a rule of truth in God's Word, plainly directing us to the making of the Church of Christ, none but such as are qualified by faith, are fit subjects for baptism, and then baptism of dipping admits and gives entrance unto such believers, to have communion in church fellowship with us in all holy ordinances of God, etc. *Truth*. Sir I perceive you are an Anabaptist, and therefore I shall speedily make good my late promise, and indeed, some thirty years since, Mr. Morton, a Teacher of a Church of the Anabaptists, in Newgate, then his confession comprehended all the errors of the Arminians which now of late, many that go under your name, in and about London, dissent from as it seems you do." Dr. Christian draws from the above that "Morton differed only from some of the Anabaptists of 1645

on the subject of Arminianism, yet not at all on the subject of believers' baptism and dipping;" but this conclusion is beyond the power of my conception. "*Truth*" does not say a word about Morton's belief or practice of baptism, but says only that he was guilty of *all* the errors of *Arminianism*; and all he says of "*Heres*" is that he and many of his name, about London, in 1645, dissented from Morton's *Arminian* errors (1615), without touching their agreement on baptism at all.

2. A quotation from Edmond Jessop (pp. 109, 110) is given as follows from his work (*A Discovery of the Errors of the English Anabaptists*, 1623, p. 62): "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sinnes of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptisme, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised us up from the dead. In which words (I say) he settled down expressly, that the baptisme which saveth, the baptisme whereby our hearts are purged and sanctified, and the sinnes of our flesh done away, whereby we are buried with Christ and doe rise with him, even that which is through the faith and operation of the Spirit, is one and the same, with the circumcision of the heart, etc." Dr. Christian quotes without comment; but this citation from Coloss. 2: 12, with its exegesis, if presented as an Anabaptist error, is in perfect keeping with the Anabaptist and Pedobaptist view of the time—namely, that the burial and resurrection significance of baptism, whatever the mode, was spiritually synonymous with the circumcision or washing of the heart. (See my *Baptist Reformation*, Chap. IV., pp. 49-51.)

9. Lastly under this head Dr. Christian takes Daniel Featley (*Dippers Dipt*, 1644) as a witness of Baptist immersion before 1641. He makes about the same argument, with one exception, that he did in his "*Did They Dip?*" and for a complete answer to his position I refer the reader to my Chap. XVII., pp. 202-212, *English Baptist Reformation*. The exception refers to his statement (p. 12) that "Barber was before Featley in 1639 for being a dipper." (Tanner Manuscript, 67,115 Bodleian Library, Acts High Court of Commissions, Vol. 434, fol. 81, b.) I deny that these Records say that Barber was before Featley in 1639 as a

“*dipper*,” and challenge the proof. I grant that there were Anabaptists long before 1641; that Featley knew them for many years, and dealt with some of them in the courts, such men as Barber, Lamb, Webb, Gunn, and others; but I deny that the Records ever apply the name of “*dipper*” to any Anabaptist before 1640-41; and I deny that Dr. Featley ever ascribed dipping to the English Anabaptists until about 1644. If dipping had been the offense of Edward Barber when before Featley in 1639, we should have heard of it from Featley and from the Court Records; but it was not until 1644, when, after the Baptists had restored immersion in 1641, they had been publicly dipping in the rivers and had put it into their Confession of Faith later, that Featley becomes furious and deals with the fact of Baptist dipping and pronounces the immersion article in the Confession the “*new leaven of Anabaptisme*”—the *old* leaven having always been “*rebaptism*” without regard to mod- Featley declares that he had known these Anabaptists “near the place of his residence for more than twenty years”—a vere Solifuga—“who in these *later* times *first* shewed his shining head, etc. ;” and upon this statement Dr. Christian gravely says: “Here we have the explicit testimony of Featley that the Baptists were *dippers* as far back as 1620!” By such logic I could prove that my neighbor, who began to drink in 1899, was a drunkard twenty years ago, because I was acquainted with him in 1879 and knew him ever since. Featley never makes any allusion to *English* Baptist dipping as happening until “*of late*,” since the “unhappy distractions” which began by the Puritan Revolution of 1640-41. As Dr. Newman says: “What Featley says about the practice of immersion refers definitely to the *present*, 1644.”

Nothing is clearer than that Featley speaks of Baptist dipping as that which, in 1644, was their “*now practice*,” as he calls it, and to which he never alludes before—or as before—1641.

Featley, like Baillie, Edwards, and others, refers to the disputations in Zurich (1525-30) and to the decree of the Senate drowning Anabaptists for rebaptism. He no doubt believed that the Swiss Anabaptists were immersionists, as those at St. Gall were; and while, like Edwards, he wished for a similar decree to punish immersion now, in 1644, as the same sin which affected the Swiss

in their rebaptization (1525), he does not connect the English Anabaptists with the Swiss Anabaptists by *successional* dipping, but only *similar* dipping. Like Edwards and Baillie, he knew that, in 1644-46, the Continental Anabaptists were sprinkling, and that down to 1641 the English Anabaptists were sprinkling, as Baillie and Edwards both imply; and hence all that Featley says of the Anabaptists of Zurich, or during the reigns of Henry VIII., Elizabeth, or James I., does not in the slightest way imply that the English Anabaptists, whom he had known for more than twenty years, had any immersion connection with prior Anabaptists, or that they began immersion before the "unhappy distractions of late," which succeeded 1640-41. Dr. Christian does not make so good an argument here as in his "Did They Dip?" and as I have not space here to reproduce my full reply, as in my English Baptist Reformation, I can only refer the reader to that discussion. It is absolutely certain that Featley treats of Baptist dipping as "of late" origin in England, a thing of 1641-44; and he squarely, in contradistinction to the old, pronounces the immersion article of the 1644 Confession the "NEW LEAVEN OF ANABAPTISM"—and that, too, after two or three years of discussion, in which the Baptists had admitted the fact and defended the right to restore immersion.



## CHAPTER VII.

### IMMERSION AMONG THE ANABAPTISTS OF ENGLAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY PRIOR TO 1641.

In this chapter I shall notice the citations and arguments of Dr. Christian in favor of immersion among the Anabaptists of England in the seventeenth century, just prior to 1641, in proof that the Kiffin Manuscript is a forgery.

1. He cites (p. 116) the name of Rev. John Canne, and admits, according to the Broadmead Records and the reckoning of Rev. Charles Stovel, that he was at Bristol, April 25, 1641, as a baptized man. In his "Did They Dip?" (p. 211) he placed Canne as a Baptist in 1640 at Bristol, and emphasized the fact that he had here discovered a Baptist who was immersed "*before 1641!*" He has made a new discovery, however, that "11 Mo. Janu., 1641," old style, the date of Blunt's baptism, is "January, 1642," new style, and charges Dr. Whitsitt with ignorance of a fact that he himself had not discovered when he wrote "Did They Dip?" His assumption is that April 25, 1641, the time that Canne appeared at Bristol as "a baptized man," is eight months in advance of 11 Mo. Janu., 1642, new style; and therefore Canne was a Baptist eight months before Blunt introduced his Holland baptism. Dr. Christian gives up the "Anno 1640" date of his "Did They Dip?" and until now is guilty of the very ignorance of which he charges Dr. Whitsitt regarding Janu. 11 Mo. 1641, old style, as Janu. 11 Mo., 1642, new style. The Kiffin Manuscript, however, has Janu. 11 Mo., 1641, old style; and since old style and new style would be the same for April (the difference only applying to January, February, and March), Dr. Christian's criticism amounts to nothing. Canne appears as a "baptized man" nearly five months after Blunt introduced baptism by immersion; and if he had so appeared eight months before, in 1641, he would come under the head of the immersion revival by the independent method of Spilsbury.

2. On pp. 119-128 Dr. Christian takes up the case of Edward Barber. I shall not controvert the statement of the Dictionary of

Biography cited on page 122 that "Edward Barber, a Baptist minister, was originally a clergyman of the Established Church, but long before the beginning of the civil wars he adopted the principles of the Baptists"—a modern statement. He was a General Baptist in principle before 1641; and he was imprisoned from June, 1639, to June, 1640, for his utterances on the subject of "infant baptism," but without a single hint anywhere that during his imprisonment or before his Treatise written in 1641-2 he was an immersionist. As Crosby, in his version of the "famous ten words," and as the history of the General or Helwys Baptists demonstrates, the Anti-pedobaptists down to the date of the Kiffin Manuscript (1640-41) had not "*revived* the ancient custom of immersion." They were likely practicing the affusion of the Mennonites; and though Edward Barber was imprisoned for his utterances against infant baptism, he was not yet an immersionist, not before 1641. The citation (p. 125) of Peter Chamberlin in his reply to Bakewell's Sea of Absurdities, etc., in 1650, as calling "sprinkling" a "new invented way," corresponding exactly with Wall that "sprinkling did not begin to prevail till 1644," is a repetition of Dr. Christian's blunder in misunderstanding Wall, who spoke of "sprinkling, *properly* called," and new as taking the place of *pouring* in the English Church in 1645, and not immersion. Edward Barber's letter to Chamberlin (pp. 125, 226), relating that Dr. Gouge when sent unto him "2 several times" (1639-1640), acknowledged that "(not only sprinkling) but the baptizing of infants was a tradition of the church," using the acknowledgment as one argument (upon Barber) to take the oath, and that this is evidence that Barber was a dipper, is the most far-fetched and absurd inference imaginable. The argument might do as to infant baptism, the thing for which Barber was imprisoned; but "sprinkling," according to Dr. Christian, was not introduced in England until after 1641, and infant dipping, with little exception, was universally in vogue until that time and after. Nevertheless, I hold, with Dr. Wall, to the contrary, and that while sprinkling, "properly called," was not introduced until 1644-5, the English Church was practicing affusion, and not immersion. "For two reigns," says Wall, "pouring was most in fashion." (History Infant Baptism, Vol. IV., p. 172.)

He referred to the reigns of James and Charles I.; and when Barber was in prison (1639-40) for his utterances against infant baptism, the mode of baptism was not in question. He was himself an affusionist; and whatever incidentally passed between him and Gouge about "sprinkling," if he had been an immersionist then, as in 1641-2, we should have heard of the controversy in 1639-40 as in 1641-2. But not so. Barber is as silent as the grave on immersion in 1639-40, when in prison for his opposition to infant baptism—and that, too, when Wall says that "*pouring*" was the English Church "fashion."

On pp. 126-128 Dr. Christian cites us to Barber's Treatise on Baptism (1641-2)—the first polemical defense ever written by a Baptist in favor of immersion—as evidence that Barber was a dipper before 1640-41, and that dipping was the practice of the Anabaptists before that date. Barber, after his release from prison, had evidently, as a General Baptist, adopted the Spilsbury method of dipping; and already the subject of exclusive dipping had suddenly sprung up with its introduction, or, as Crosby shows (Vol. I., p. 96), upon its agitation when the Baptists "*were for* reviving the ancient practice of immersion. Praisegod Barebone had preceded Barber in the controversy, who was charging already that the Baptists had gone from sprinkling to dipping; and whatever allusions Barber makes to dipping as a past practice does not reach beyond the recent introduction of immersion which was already under the fire of such men as Barebone. In the latter part of his Treatise, Barber replies to Barebone's work (1642), showing that Barber's tract was finished and published later in 1642 than Barebone's.

The very first utterance of Barber in the Preface of his Treatise has all the appearance of a fresh conviction regarding "Dipping" as the ordinance of Christ, and seems to imply its recent introduction, since he declares, in 1641-42, the general ignorance—especially among the ministry—of dipping, which, he says, had for a "long time unviolably" been kept "in the planting of the *first* churches;" and that *now* the Lord had raised *him* up, a "poore Tradesman," to "*devalge* this glorious Truth to the *World's* censuring." His further statement in the Preface: "In like manner *lately*, those that profess and practice the dipping of Jesus Christ are called and re-

proached with the name of Anabaptists, although our *practice* be no other than what was instituted by Christ himself." The word "*lately*" implies something *new* in the persecution of the Anabaptists, who had always been reproached, and so called for their practice of rebaptism by any mode; but now their practice of exclusive immersion—"lately"—adds a fresh or additional reason for persecution, which Crosby shows to be the case from the very beginning of the immersion agitation.

But, whatever is true of these expressions, there can be no doubt that Barber, in the latter part of his Treatise, in reply to Barebone's charge to that effect, held that immersion had been "lost" under the defection of Antichrist; that the Baptists, having "Christ, the Spirit and the Word," had the commission of the Scriptures to restore it; and that they had so restored it. Hence he does not deny, but tacitly admits, the charge of Barebone that the Baptists had "very lately" changed from sprinkling to dipping. Barebone, in his reply (1643) to R. B. and E. B., affirms that Barber "acknowledgeth" that "Baptism *was* lost;" and that "believers having Christ, the Word and the Spirit," may "raise it againe"—the thing Baptists claimed to have done, as Barebone frequently asserts. All this Dr. Christian fails to notice. He denies that Barber said that baptism was "destroyed and raced out" in *England*. Dr. Christian urges that he is simply answering P. B.'s argument that Roman Catholics' baptism was valid, "despite the defection of Antichrist," because the Roman Catholics had destroyed and raced out baptism, both as to matter and form, the matter being a believer and the form dipping, etc. Exactly so, but upon this very fact Barber based his argument from the Scriptures that *being* "destroyed and raced out," baptism could be recovered, not by another John the Baptist, but by "believers having Christ, the Word and the Spirit," citing Matt. 28: 19, 20 and other scriptures as his authority for restoring lost baptism. Barber's claim is that not simply in England, but the world, Antichrist had destroyed and raced out believers' dipping; and, as already said, he yields to the charge and defends it that Baptists had the right to do so and had restored the subject and form of baptism as "*lost*," according to the Scriptures. Nothing could possibly be plainer than Barber's argument and ad-

mission of this fact in answer to Barebone. For a full discussion of "Barber and Barebone," see my English Baptist Reformation, pp. 163-174.

3. Dr. Christian, on pages 129-136, assumes that "Thomas Lamb became a Baptist long before 1641, and was an ardent supporter of immersion." He is represented as in prison from February 6 to June 25, 1640, and was released under orders "not to preach, baptize, or frequent any conventicle." Dr. Christian says he was scarcely out of prison till he was sent for to go into Gloucestershire. An Episcopal rector (1642) writes a letter describing an Anabaptist movement near his house, which resulted in sending to London for Lamb, who, shortly after the movement, came to Lanham, in the absence of the rector in London, and rebaptized at night, in "an *extream* cold and *frosty* time," divers men and women in the river Severn, in the city of Gloucestershire. Dr. Christian says this baptism "took place in the winter or late in the fall of 1640"—certainly in the *winter*, I should say, whether 1640 or some other date, as it was "*extremely* cold;" and he gets at the date by a letter from one Wynell (who was challenged, I suppose, for debate) to these Baptists, who mentions a letter from Lamb, their founder, expounding some question of doctrine to them, dated "Feby 11. Anno 1641." The events occurred between the time that Lamb baptized in Gloucester and wrote the letter, February 11, 1641—after his return to London, 114 miles distant. When the rector had returned from, Lamb had returned to, London; and the rector's sermon and controversy might have all occurred in three or four days. The letter to Lamb and his reply would not take ten days by post, and so Lamb's baptism at Gloucester may have taken place in the "extreme cold" weather of January, 1641. Drew (English Baptist Reformation, p. 229) hints at Lamb's baptism by the "first person baptized in England"—possibly Blunt; but he may have been an "unbaptized administrator," or have followed Spilsbury in 1640 by the anti-succession method. At all events, his baptism at Gloucester is about 1641, and belongs to the immersion revival period. Dr. Christian says: "If February 11, 1641, is old style, then this immersion took place in 1639." According to the reckoning with "11 Mo. Janu., 1641," O. S., it would be February 11, 1642,

N. S.! The inference that the Court order to Lamb when released from prison "not to baptize," instead of not to rebaptize, implies that he was immersed, does not follow, since the rector charges that he did "rebaptize" in the Severn. The word "baptize" in 1640 Court Records did not imply immersion.

On page 134 Dr. Christian misrepresents the reply of William Allen to John Goodwin regarding the expression "new baptism." Allen does not use the expression: "Dipping is not new, but is the old baptism." His reply to Goodwin is as follows: "Though it should be granted, that many if not the generality of these that have entered into the way of the *new baptism* (as the Querist calls it, it being the *old way* of baptism), etc." Allen simply says what all Baptists of the time said—namely, that while it was indeed a "new *found* truth," or "new *found* way," as Spilsbury puts it, yet it was, nevertheless, the "old way;" for Allen distinctly held to the disuse and discontinuance of apostolical baptism and its reformation or restoration by the Baptists. (Baptist Reformation, p. 138.) Dr. Christian says that Lamb (this was the other Thomas Lamb) was indignant at Goodwin for this attack on Allen, and resented it; but in his reply to Goodwin on this point he does not deny the charge of "new baptisme." This is Lamb's reply to Goodwin on this point: "You have no need of baptism after repentance and faith (which you call *new baptisme*) because your *old* sprinkling is effectual to all ends, etc." (Baptist Reformation, p. 200.) Instead of denying the charge of "*new baptisme*," he impliedly admits it by contrasting it with Goodwin's "*old* sprinkling." In his "Truth Prevailing, etc." (1655), in reply to Goodwin's "Water Dipping, etc.," Lamb, like all the rest of the Baptist writers of the time, had no hesitation in admitting and defending the right of Baptists to recover immersion lost under the "fatal apostacie;" and he most squarely of all admits and defends the fact that Baptists had separated and reformed from the Puritans, as the Puritans had from the Presbyterians, as the Presbyterians had from the Episcopalians, as the Episcopalians had from the Catholics, the great difference being that Baptists had gone back wholly to the Scriptures, and the rest, not even the Congregationalists, who had gone farther than the rest, had not. (Baptist Reformation, p. 199.)

Dr. Christian (p. 135) also misrepresents Goodwin himself when he implies that Goodwin organically or ceremonially connects the English Baptists of 1655 with the German Anabaptists of 1521 by "*dipping*." Goodwin regarded Stork (1521) as the author of self-originated baptism after that "exotique mode" in England, which he claims had been *lately* adopted, and therefore "new," and not indigenous to the soil of England. Goodwin speaks of the "first unhallowed and *undipt* dipper" who "*set up* the Dipping Trade in *this* nation;" and he thus denies any succession of dipping in England from abroad, the man who began it being unbaptized himself, an "*undipt* dipper." Goodwin also affirms that the "very first original spring" of the Baptists was "since the *late* [Puritan] Reformation" and their "mode exotique"—copied, as he thought, from the 1521 Anabaptists. He speaks of knowing the "most ancient" minister whom he knew "walking in that way," and who preferred the "term," "New Baptisme," to Anabaptism. Goodwin is emphatic that dipping in England was a *late* introduction by the Baptists, and that "when their *new baptisme* was *first* administered in this nation," there were "no others" than "persons baptized in infancy," just as Wall affirms. It is hard to see how Dr. Christian could pervert Goodwin. (See Baptist Reformation, pp. 231, 232.)

4. On pages 136-139 Dr. Christian presents the case of R. B., supposed by Dr. Whitsitt to have been Richard Blunt, but who, Dr. Christian says, was R. Barrow, author of a Short Treatise (1642), in reply to Barebone's book of the same year written to "Prove Baptisme in or under the defection of Antichrist to be the Ordinance of Jesus Christ, etc." Dr. Christian glories in his discovery as another blow to the Blunt-Holland episode; but he does not disprove the allegations of Barebone that R. B. denied any continuance or succession of baptism, and only held to what he called a "perpetual interrupted succession." More than this, he held, as Barber and the rest did, that baptism lost could be obtained or restored, without any special commission as John had, by an unbaptized administrator. Not only so, but Barebone charges R. B. with holding in 1642 "that at sometime lately there were no baptized persons [immersionists] in the world: And yet Baptisme might be raised again

well enough." I have tried repeatedly to see Dr. Christian's copy of R. B[arrow] in order to verify Barebone's representations of R. B., but up to date I have been refused or deferred; and I have concluded if Dr. Christian has such a copy, there is something in it he does not wish me to see. "R. B." may not be Richard Blunt; but if Barebone's quotations from him are correct, he confirms the Kiffin Manuscript by showing, in 1642, that until "lately" there were no "baptized persons" in England. He says nothing about Blunt or his going to Holland, but he is a fine witness in Blunt's favor.

5. Dr. Christian refers on page 139 to the report of an Anabaptist sermon in a pamphlet entitled (The Arraignment, Tryall, Conviction and Confession of Francis Deane, etc., London, 1643). The title speaks of this sermon as "preached at the Rebaptizing of a Brother at the *new* holy Jordan, as they call it neare Bow, or Hackney River; Together with the manner how they use to perform their Anabaptisticall Ceremonies." Dr. Christian says that the expression, "The manner how they use to perform their Anabaptisticall Ceremonies," describes a past event and implies that this baptism was at some considerable time before 1643. Of course the event was past in April, 1643; but how long does not appear. The added sentence, "Together with the manner how they *use* to perform their Anabaptisticall Ceremonies," implies here nothing more by the word "use" than the custom at the time of the baptism mentioned. The word *used*, in the past tense, is not employed; and there is not the slightest reason here to infer that this baptism was at any considerable time before 1643. In fact, the language in the title and in the sermon implies a recent date. The expressions, "The *new* holy Jordan;" the "*old* Foord neare Bow, and now the *new* Jordan or place of happinesse;" "*new* doctrine" as the preacher called the subject of his sermon (Wash and be Cleane), all imply a *late* introduction of the old custom of immersion among the Baptists, or "Dippers," as they were now called.

6. On page 140 he points out the book entitled "The Booke of Common Prayer, etc." (1641), which discovers "a base sect of people called Rebaptists *lately* found out in Hackney Marsh neare London," and which describes the scene of a multitude rebaptizing



one another at the river, where "one christened his own childe, and another tooke upon him to church his owne wife." This, Dr. Christian says, precedes the Blunt baptism in 1641, January 1, which date he has changed to 1642, according to the old and new style thesis; but upon this accommodating thesis which he employs both ways to suit his purpose, why may not the date of "The Booke of Common Prayer, etc.," be 1642? and the date of this baptism still later than January 1, 1642, the date of Blunt's baptism? Dr. Christian says he preached in a church "near Hackney Swamp which was organized before 1641," but he gives us no historical data of the fact. He says that Spilsbury's church was located near the Hackney River, and had existed from probably before 1633; but he gives us no historical data for this assertion. The truth is that this episode, 1641 (or 1642), in Hackney Marsh is so irregular and mixed in its nature that it is hard to tell whether or not it was Anabaptist. It was not of the Blunt regular or succession character; and was evidently, if it was Anabaptist, of the irregular and independent character which sprung up about 1640 under the Spilsbury theory of baptism by unbaptized administrators, and which for its irregular and often disorderly character we find a description in the Bampfield Document. It is now evident that under the agitation of the Blunt movement, 1640, and perhaps before, this irregular and sometimes disorderly method of immersion began; but it is, nevertheless, a confirmation of the Blunt movement according to the Kiffin Manuscript. It was about 1640-41, the period of the immersion movement, and not apart from it.

7. On pages 141-143 Dr. Christian seeks to infer that the Jacob-Lathrop church was agitated by the immersion question of 1633, but there is no data upon earth for his inference. Lathrop left for America in 1634 with thirty members of his church; but not a word is heard among them about immersion in England before leaving; and Dean's statement that on the secession of 1633, which resulted in the formation of the first Baptist (Calvinistic) church in England at that date, "the *mode* of baptism had been agitated," is contrary to all the facts known to that secession. The reason of their separation is distinctly given; and although "Eaton with some others received a further baptism," the mode is not in question.

Those that came over to America, according to Dean, seem not all to have been settled upon the mode of baptism; and they found others in Scituate, he says, ready to sympathize with them. The probability is that the question of mode in the Scituate church originated with those whom Lathrop found in Scituate. In 1639, Dean says, after Lathrop went to Barnstable, "a majority believed in immersion," and some in "adult immersion exclusively;" but there was no such practice among them. Of course it is well known that Dr. Chauncy, who succeeded Lathrop at Scituate, practiced infant immersion, and had agitated it in New England all along before 1639-1642; but there is no evidence given to show that the immersion sentiment in New England, whether in Scituate or elsewhere, came from the Jessey church.

8. Again, Dr. Christian cites us to the tract, "To Sion's Virgins" (1644), as another direct proof of immersion in the Jessey church before 1641. He says that "there was an earlier edition, because the title-page tells us that this Catechism 'is in use in these times.'" The title-page reads thus, "To Sion's Virgins, or A Short Forme of Catechisme of the Doctrine of Baptisme, In use in these times that are so full of questions;" and there is not the slightest inference to be drawn from the expression, "In use in these times that are so full of questions," that the Catechism ever had an earlier edition. The tract was evidently written in 1644 to meet the "questions" of the time; and Dr. Christian's perversion of the phrase "is in use" is misleading. He locates the earlier date after "Sept 18: 1634," because the tract declares that "Mr. John Lathrop" was "now pastor in America," and "that was the date," says Dr. Christian, "of Mr. Lathrop's arrival in America." Mr. Lathrop was pastor at Barnstable, after leaving Scituate, where he remained till his death, November 3, 1654 (Felt. Ecc. Hist. of N. England, Vol. II., p. 115); and hence when the Catechism was written in 1644 it rightly said of Mr. Lathrop that he was "now pastor in America." The writer of this Catechism declares that he was "an antient member" of the Lathrop church; and of course could have written the tract in 1644—just twenty-eight years after the Jacob-Lathrop church was organized in 1616—another man using the word "ancient" to describe twenty-eight years of membership, and not nec-

essarily an old man. Dr. Christian quotes the author as saying that we should avoid "those that make divisions," and then continues: "I desire to manifest in defense of the baptisme and forme we have received [sprinkling], not being easily moved, but as Christ will more manifest himself, which I cannot conceive to bee in dipping the head, the creature going in and out of the water, the forme of baptisme doth more or less hold forth Christ. And it is a sad thing that the Citizens of Zion should have their children born foreigners, not to be baptized, etc." "Now," says Dr. Christian, "here is a direct statement of immersion as believers' baptism long before 1641!" He quotes the author again as warning Anabaptists in dipping not to take the name of the Lord, "especially such as have received baptisme in infancy;" and then Dr. Christian calls this "antient" author as an appropriate witness against the Kiffin Manuscript! This "antient" author is defending, in 1644, sprinkling as the old and invariable custom of the Lathrop church from the beginning, against believers' dipping, which was not in vogue till 1640-44, and warning against the baptismal divisions which were especially distracting the Jessey church in 1643-44, and which ended in Jessey and the church turning Baptist in 1645; and Dr. Christian, without the slightest warrant, applies all this to the Lathrop church after 1634 and before 1637, when there was no division or mention of immersion whatever. There was a small division in 1638; an equal division in 1640, when the first immersion agitation began; a large secession to the Baptists in 1641; and in 1643-4-5, about the date of this tract, "To Sion's Virgins," there were other and more disastrous agitations and divisions upon baptismal "questions;" but history gives no hint of such divisions or questions among the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey people before these dates, and all the facts go to show that the Tract was written in 1644, in view of the baptismal divisions and questions which agitated these people about this time and which began with the Jessey division in 1640.

So much for Dr. Christian's proofs of immersion among Anabaptists before 1641—that is, within the seventeenth century. Not a single case has he shown, by the slightest inference, apart from the 1640-41 movement, for the restoration of immersion. All his

cases circle about 1640-41. He has taken Canne, Barber, and Lamb; but they are within the limit of 1640-41. He has used Allen, Goodwin, Barrow, the Anabaptist Sermon, the Hackney Marsh episode, "To Sion's Virgins;" but they all circle him about 1640-41, and there is no historical data for the suggestions of Dean that immersion originated in the secession of 1633, which created the first Particular Calvinistic Church. If such had been true, the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript would have shown that the *mode* as well as the *subject* of baptism was in controversy, 1633-1638, at the separations which took place from that strictly *sprinkling* church. Those Records do mention the division and immersion agitation, 1640-41; and it is impossible to suppose that the separations of 1633-38, based upon specific reasons assigned in these documents, could have involved immersion without their notice. "Infant baptism," 1638, is recorded as one ground of separation at that time, and probably was the ground of some in the separation of 1633; and if these separatists had been immersionists, and the mode of baptism a ground of division with a sprinkling church, 1633-38, these Records would have chronicled the fact, as they did later—in 1640-41.

Every instance cited in this chapter from Dr. Christian—and these are all the instances of English Anabaptist immersion he has ever found before 1640-41—hold him practically to the date of the Kiffin Manuscript. Even if he could show the agitation of the immersion question as far back as the 1633 secession, according to Dean, it brings him into harmony with Barclay and others who think 1633 was the date at which the English Anabaptists introduced immersion; and Dr. Newman, who has no doubt of such introduction in the light of seventeenth century writers, is inclined to the possibility that the immersion agitation may have begun about that date.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### DR. CHRISTIAN'S SNAP SHOTS.

I have scarcely thought it necessary to notice the many snap shots which Dr. Christian, in his irregular and disjointed discussion, has taken at the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript; but it may not be amiss here to expose his misconceptions and misrepresentations from his microscopic points of view. He frequently charges the Collector with concealing his identity and with the deliberate purpose of fraud or forgery; and yet while he characterizes his extreme awkwardness and ignorance, he ascribes to him acumen and shrewdness in following history to construct his records, in which, though minor details are sometimes wrong, yet, in the main facts, right in every instance! Nevertheless, upon the basis of these minor faults Dr. Christian constantly exclaims, "Fraud!" and flourishes his exclamation points, as if, in the absence of something better, to force an impression upon the reader. I have never read after a historical critic of such partisan enthusiasm and fervor in the manifest effort to find fault with the object of his investigation, or one who dealt so often in expletive sarcasm, exclamation, and denunciation against the subject under discussion.

It is thus he deals (p. 10) with the Collector's statement: "I began to make this Collection in Jan. 1710-11." He grants that the Collector had given the date, "1710-11," that he had given "Mr. Adams," from whom he received these Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript; but he asks: "Who is me? Who was Mr. Adams?" Well, Dr. Christian knows that the Collector had given the name, "Richard Adams," and he knows, or ought to know, that Richard Adams was a very aged and respectable Baptist minister, who was co-pastor with Kiffin, and who succeeded Kiffin upon his death to the pastorate of the Devonshire Square Baptist Church, in London. The "I" and the "me" which pronominalized the Collector was probably Benjamin Stinton, who, by his association here with Richard Adams, and who, after his death, having intended to write a Baptist history, left these very Records to Crosby, is pretty well

identified and sufficiently authenticated. Had Stinton lived and written the history of the Baptists instead of Crosby, who used his materials, I have no doubt we should have had the Collector's name.

Dr. Christian goes on to say that the Gould Kiffin Manuscript, in its present form, is not a seventeenth-century document, for the reason that, if copied in 1712, the copyist did not follow the original in form and spelling, but introduced the form and spelling of his own time. Moreover, he assumes that the entire compilation of the Gould Manuscripts, by reason of certain quotations from Wall's Infant Baptism (1705) and Strype's Memorials [of Cranmer] (1678), stamp the entire work as of late date. These works quoted, however, are within the Collector's dates, 1710-12; and if he copied the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript in the form and spelling of his own time, history shows that he did not alter the *substance* of these documents, nor make them eighteenth-century papers. On page 11 he cites as another proof that the Kiffin Manuscript is not authentic, the fact that document No. 17 of the compilation is an article written by the Collector himself, which portrays the form and style of the Kiffin Manuscript and the Jessey Records in the construction of sentences, in spelling, and in all the peculiarities of language. These thirty articles, whatever may have been their basis, are all from one man, and have been so changed in their compilation that "no dependence can be put in them." If all *this* were true, it does not prove that the *substance* of the Kiffin Manuscript and the rest of these documents had been changed or could not be depended upon. Two of the documents, Hutchinson's and Bampfield's, which I have verified by the original documents, are in the form and style of the Collector's spelling and capitalization, but they are literally correct otherwise. The caption of the Hutchinson Account, as of the Jessey Records, Kiffin Manuscript, and the Bampfield Document, is, of course, the Collector's, and very much in the literal form of these documents; and as I find the Hutchinson and the Bampfield Documents correct in all except the mere spelling, capitalization, and the use of some of the abbreviations, I conclude the same of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript. If the Collector was as honest with them as with Hutchinson and Bampfield, we have not only the substance, but the form, of these

Records, with perhaps the rare exception of a single word. So far as the use of the "&," "wch," "yt," "Mr.," are concerned, I do not remember where in the seventeenth century they were not used, especially in manuscript writings; and even down into the eighteenth century "Mr." and the "&" were employed by Wall and others.

On page 12 Dr. Christian says that the Collector wrote into the Kiffin Manuscript and the Jessey Records his own "peculiar doctrines and words"—"views"—since "the collator and these documents hold precisely the same views, expressed in the same style and language, and spelled in the same way." This he tries to show by the use of the words "Antipædobaptist" and "Antipædobaptism" found in the captions of the Hutchinson Account and document No. 4, which were of later usage than the dates of the Records; but if the words "Antipædobaptist" and "Antipædobaptism" properly define or describe the documents, as they unquestionably do, then they express his views only by consequence, and not by interpolation. The criticism of the Collector for the advanced usage of terms and expressions such as "ye Revival of Antipædobaptism" in the caption of the Hutchinson Account, the word "Baptist," the "Account, (Bampfield Document, No. 18) of ye Methods taken by ye Baptists to obtain a proper Administrator of Baptism by immersion, when that practice had been so long disused yt there was no one who had been so baptized to be found," shows that Dr. Christian, instead of the Collector, is writing his views into these documents by a most illogical interpretation. He argues that because of the similarity of the Bampfield caption and the "famous ten words" in the Kiffin Manuscript, this is proof that the Collector added these ten words to the Kiffin Document as well as forged them in the caption of the Bampfield Document. He demonstrates this by the erroneous assumption that Crosby does not mention the "famous ten words" in his version of the Kiffin Manuscript, and that there is nothing in Bampfield's language following the Collector's caption which gives excuse for his statement. In the first place, Crosby elaborately paraphrases the "famous ten words" in the Kiffin Manuscript, with an added reason for their utterance; and, in the second place, Bampfield in his book expressly declares, after conviction, about 1676, that baptism was immersion, while in London, he

made search either for a "First or After Administrator of this ordinance," from "printed Records or credible Witnesses;" and after an unsatisfactory examination of a number of irregular methods of restoring immersion, he seems to have gone to Salisbury and dipped himself in the river there, under the theory of divine guidance in order to "perfect baptism," and thus restore it properly to the world—not having been, as he conceived, rightly restored by any of the former methods. The Collector properly inserted in his introduction: "since ye revival of yt practice in these latter times," in connection with Bampfield's inquiry. Crosby clearly used the Bampfield Document and employs the very language of the paper when he says, "Immersion had for some time been *disused*;" and when he speaks of the "*methods taken* by the *Baptists*, at their *revival of immersion* in England." So he speaks again of "true baptism, and the manner of *reviving* it in these *later times*." (Vol. I., pp. 97, 100, 105.) He paraphrases the famous ten words of the Kiffin Manuscript, and uses the caption and introduction of the Bampfield Document almost literally.

The Collector's use of the words "Antipædobaptism," "Baptist," "revival of immersion," and the like, were perfectly legitimate in his captions at a later date; and if he copied these documents about 1710-11, and inadvertently or otherwise had gotten some of these words in the body of the documents, history goes to show that he in no way ever altered the substance of these documents. Evidently Kiffin, Adams, Stinton, and Crosby had them just as we find them, whoever the Collector was; and when such men as these transmitted and used them as reliable history, at the time they did, we may trust their validity—especially so when they are perfectly consistent with the history of the dates and events they chronicle. The Collector neither "wrote" nor "doctored" the Jessey Records, the Kiffin Manuscript, nor the Bampfield Document. They are genuine as certainly as that Baptist history is true.

The criticism (pp. 18-32) of the word "antient" as applied to these Records and elsewhere applied to the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church, in the light of the usage of the times, is extremely absurd. In fact, the Collector in 1710 speaks quite properly of the church at that time as "antient," and so of Crosby, who calls the Kiffin



Manuscript "antient" in 1738-40. Crosby so speaks of a number of the seventeenth-century Baptist Churches; and in the seventeenth century and onward the word "antient" was used to express the word "old." One man speaks of his "antient friend," his "antient love" for another, and old men were frequently called "antient," as, for instance, the author of the Catechism entitled, "To Sion's Virgins," styles himself in 1644 as an "antient member" of the Jacob church, then only twenty-eight years old, and he not necessarily an old man.

On page 33 Dr. Christian charges both the Kiffin Manuscript and the Jessey Records as false with regard to the "first rise" of Baptist Churches in London. He says: "The Kiffin Manuscript makes the distinct statement that the first Baptist Churches of London originated in the Jessey church;" but the Manuscript reads: "An Old MSS, giving *some* Acco<sup>t</sup> [not a full account] of *those* Baptists who first formed themselves into distinct Congregations or Churches in London." This refers to the Particular Baptists, and not the General Baptists whose first church under Helwys originated in Amsterdam; and the intention of the Manuscript is not to say, "The first Baptists who organized churches in London," but "those Baptists," as here described, "who first formed themselves," etc. The Jessey Records make practically the same statement when it says: "An Antient Congregation of Dissenters from wch *many* of ye Independent & Baptist Churches in London took their first rise"—meaning the same class of Baptists of which the Kiffin Manuscript speaks, and not meaning to say that any other class of Baptists did not originate their churches in London. Dr. Christian denies that "many" or "all" Baptist Churches of London came out of the Jessey church, or that "*any*" Baptist Church came out of it. I think it is clear that the secession of 1633 became a Baptist Church, with Mr. Spilsbury as its pastor, in 1638, of which Sam Eaton was a member; and in 1638 another secession being of Sam Eaton's judgment, joined Spilsbury, and thus followed Sam Eaton, who was evidently with Spilsbury. In 1639 there was another secession from this church which became Baptist, in 1644, with Paul Hobson as pastor; and in 1641 Crosby says there was another large secession from Jessey's church to the Baptists, which possibly or-

ganized under Blunt. In 1645 the whole church, with Jessey as pastor, became Baptist; and the statement of the Jessey Records that "many" thus originating out of and multiplying therefrom the Jessey church, seems to be clearly true. Dr. Christian also denies the statement that the Baptist Churches of London, or of England, in 1638, first formed themselves into distinct congregations. Nobody has ever said they did in 1638, although it is said by Crosby that the Baptists, of the Particular sort at least, began in 1633; and so of all other historians I have read since Crosby. The General Baptist churches began with the Helwys Church, which was organized 1609 in Amsterdam and transplanted to London in 1611; and by 1631 we learn that there were five churches of this class in and around London, with others at Lincoln, Sarum, Coventry, and Tiverton, with possibly a few others. Dr. Angus (English Baptist Reformation, p. 36) says of these: "The earliest General Baptists of which any *history* is known were founded about 1611-14 by Thomas Helwisse in London, Tiverton, Coventry, etc.; and the earliest Particular Baptist Church by John Spilsbury, at Wapping in 1633. There are *traditions* of other churches," he says; but these are the "*earliest*" known to history; and Dr. Angus is of infallible authority with Dr. Christian. All this is perfectly agreeable to the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript, which are in no wise in conflict with the prior origin of the General Baptists.

On page 35 Dr. Angus gives a number of churches which claim organization prior to 1611-1633—such as Braintree, 1522; Crowle and Epworth, 1597; Bridgewater, Oxford, and Sadmore, 1600; but the origin and continuance of these churches are traditional, and there is no history of them as Baptist Churches practicing immersion before 1641. It is possible that there were societies or conventicles having a continuance from the Lollards and Dutch Anabaptists, here and there, down to the seventeenth century; but if so, they did not practice immersion before 1633-41, when they fell in with the Particular and General Baptists "at their revival of immersion," as Crosby puts it, about that time. There is no history of such Baptist organizations of such long continuance in England, which would be strange indeed if they had such continuance, in the light of the voluminous history of younger Baptist Churches. The

Baptist writers of the seventeenth century, who deal so largely with the controverted questions of Baptist origin, know nothing of any Baptist Churches in England which came down to 1640-41 as immersion bodies. The testimony of Herbert Skeats, Robinson Claude, and Dr. Some, in the light of the 1640-41 "revival of immersion" by the English Baptists, does not prove the existence of any immersion bodies among the Anabaptists in England in the sixteenth century nor down into the seventeenth century. Neal's allusion to the Baptist Confession of 1644 as an immersion document—or to the number of Baptist Churches in 1644—is nothing to the point. The testimony of Knollys (p. 37) in reply to Dr. Bastwick, in 1645, and his expression "*baptized with water*" in the practice of churches in London before 1645 proves nothing unless he meant his association with Baptist Churches between 1641 and 1645; for he was an English Churchman until 1638, when he separated upon Puritan principles and fled to America in the same year. He was a Congregationalist in New England, with Anabaptist sentiments, until 1641, when he returned to England; was in Jessey's church until 1644, when evidently he became a Baptist and entered the Baptist pastorate in 1645, the year he replied to Bastwick. Document No. 4 and Dr. Henry S. Banage agree in this conclusion; and Knollys could have had no relation or experience with Baptist Churches in London until after 1641, when they became immersionists. Hansered Knollys and the Kiffin Manuscript, or the Jessey Records, are close friends.

The allusion of Dr. Christian on pages 39, 40 to the Court Records, charging Anabaptists in 1635-6 with refusing to come to the Parish churches, or charging Francis James with being a "schismatic recusant" and an "Anabaptist," is nothing to the point. No Court Record mentions a "dipper" before 1640-41; and Dr. Christian has not discovered a "dipper" by name or practice, among Anabaptists, before about that date. Not one single case of adult immersion has been pointed out before the immersion agitation which began before 1640 among the Blunt people and resulted in the first dippings mentioned at the hands of Blunt and Spilsbury—the respective advocates of the succession and anti-succession methods of restoring immersion.

On page 33 Dr. Christian says: "Both these documents call these congregations 'Baptist Churches.' The word 'Baptist' was not in use at that time to designate our people, and the phrase 'Baptist Churches' was not in use in England till long afterwards. These documents [the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript] are a false record and cannot be depended on." Of course these expressions, "Baptist" and "Baptist Churches," are the language of the colator in his captions, and not the documents; but he is in perfect line with Crosby, Evans, Robinson, and other historians of that and subsequent periods, who called all Antipedobaptists, "Baptists," without regard to the mode of baptism. Robinson (*Hist. Baptism*, p. 284) says of the "Dutch *Baptists*" that while they require repentance and faith, they "baptize by *pouring*." It is surprising to see, too, how often Dr. Christian calls these Anabaptists before 1641, "Baptists," "Dippers," "Immersionists," when, in fact, he has not shown a single "Baptist" or "Baptist Church," as immersionist or dipper, before about 1640-41, and not one apart from the immersion "revival" movement of that date.

I shall agree with Dr. Christian (p. 29) that before and after 1641 Antipedobaptists were called Anabaptists, and that Baptists were so called long after 1641, down through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and perhaps by some until this day. An Anabaptist was so called because he was said to rebaptize, whether by immersion, pouring, or sprinkling; and when after 1641 the Baptists had become immersionists, the stigma of Anabaptism continued for the same reason in the mind of the Pedobaptists as before 1641. The Anabaptists of England always repudiated the name both before and after 1641, because, whether they poured or immersed, they claimed that they did not rebaptize, since those baptized in infancy, and whom they baptized upon a profession of faith, were never baptized at all—just as we Baptists hold to-day. The Anabaptists in 1612, when they addressed King James, declared themselves "Anabaptists falsely so called;" and in their Confession of 1644 they declared themselves "Anabaptists falsely so called."

The word "Baptist," however, was never applied to the Anabaptists of England until 1644, when they had become immersionists and had begun to classify themselves against the Pedobaptists as

“baptized people,” “baptized churches”—“Baptists”—in contradistinction to those who sprinkled; and these designations, “baptized people,” “baptized churches,” “Baptists,” were never applied to the Anabaptists of England *before* 1641. The only stigma of the Anabaptists before 1641 as to *mode*, or *method*, was that of se-baptism derived from their founder, John Smith, without any mention of the form; but after 1641 the stigma had a double significance, which not only involved the principle of rebaptism by any mode, but also as to mode, or form, which the Pedobaptists called the “new way” of “dipping”—and that, too, at the hands of “undipt dippers,” “unbaptized administrators.” More than this, since before 1641, the Anabaptists and Pedobaptists were both practicing sprinkling, or affusion, the distinguishing designation of “baptized people” would not arise, because there was no difference as to mode; but the moment the mode changed from sprinkling to dipping among the Baptists the distinction came. The citation by Dr. Christian (p. 30) of Thomas Collie is inexplicably impertinent, and proves nothing to the point that Anabaptists were called “baptized Christians” before 1641. Collie is claimed by Dr. Christian as a “Baptist” in 1635—long before the name of “Baptist” was used. He represents him as writing a book ten years after 1641—that is, in 1651—and the phrase, “baptized Christians,” which he applied to the Baptists of 1651, without the slightest indication of the author, Dr. Christian applies to the Anabaptists before 1641. Collie indignantly repudiates the stigma of Anabaptism, since Baptists in 1651 were baptizing according to the Scriptures, while Pedobaptists were the ones who had “learnt the new way” of “sprinkling in the font, instead of baptizing in a River,” as Baptists were then doing. Collie has no sort of allusion to any such thing before 1641; and Dr. Christian himself urges that the Pedobaptists were dipping, and not sprinkling, “*in* the font” before 1641. There is no instance, so far as shown, of a single expression which conveys the idea that Anabaptists, before 1641, were ever called “baptized people,” or “Baptists,” in England.

Well, so much for Dr. Christian’s snap shots at the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript. I forgot to touch upon his apostrophic “’s,” but Williston Walker (Creeds and Platforms of Congrega-

tionalism, pp. 90, 155, etc., New York, 1893) gives instances of its use in 1617, 1647, and in several other places of early date. But let that pass as a very microscopical criticism—and yet sometimes the microscope is as good as the telescope. The difficulty is that Dr. Christian has never applied the critical telescope to these Records, except as he had it reversed. These Records are not perfect. They have some minor errors and obscurities, but in the main or substantial facts of history they are genuine and invulnerable. It is evident, as Dr. Newman suggests, that these documents “were probably compiled from twenty to fifty years after the events from partial contemporary records and the memories of eyewitnesses, which allows for the fallibility of the documents without impeaching their *bona fide* character;” and, so far as we know, Richard Adams, who probably received these documents from Jessey and Kiffin, who lived beyond the seventeenth century himself, and who gave them to the Collector, had much to do with their captions, their form, and phraseology. I lay great stress upon Adams’ connection with these documents. He was a venerable and honorable Baptist preacher, and the fact that he had gathered these documents for the purpose of Baptist history and had transmitted them to the future historian, should lead us to regard them with respect and to look for their authenticity before seeking for any purpose to discredit them.

## CHAPTER IX.

### PROOF THAT THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS REVIVED IMMERSION ABOUT 1640-41.

In this and the following chapter I shall close with the affirmative and negative testimony in defense of the Jessey Records and the so-called Kiffin Manuscript under two propositions:

1. The English Anabaptists revived immersion about 1640-41.
2. Therefore the English Anabaptists practiced sprinkling or pouring in England before 1640-41.

These two propositions are the correlative of each other. If the one is true, the other is true; but I shall separately demonstrate both, as if the negative was not implied by the affirmative in this case. I shall not assume that there was no exception in favor of adult immersion before 1640-41 among the English Anabaptists; but it is certain that no exception has been historically shown up to date. There were exceptions in favor of infant dipping from 1600 to 1641 and onward in the English Church, but no such exceptions have been shown among the English Anabaptists, after a diligent search by Dr. Christian through the literature and Court Records of the seventeenth and preceding century. The nearest Dr. Christian gets to it is in the case of Sam Eaton, who died in prison August, 1639; and he would not have discovered that but for my presentation of Taylor's poem (*A Swarme of Sectaries*, 1641), in which it seems that "of late" Spilsbury "rose up" to "rebaptize" Sam Eaton in "Anabaptist fashion"—both of the "new-found Separation." It would appear that Spilsbury immersed Eaton and put him to immersing, since it is said that Eaton baptized an "impure dame" at the "bank side," which would seem to imply a river, though nothing is said about baptizing in the river. Without further light to the contrary, the terms of this revelation allow the implication of immersion; and, without intending or expecting the discovery, Dr. Christian and myself are jointly responsible for the discovery—he by the Court Record, showing Eaton's death in August, 1639, and I by the Taylor poem (1641), which shows that probably Spilsbury immersed Eaton "*of late.*"

How late it was that Spilbury baptized Eaton before 1641 does not appear. In Dr. Christian's first account of Eaton in the Court Records he suppressed the fact altogether that Eaton was an Anabaptist or that he was buried as such by about 200 Brownists and Anabaptists. In fact, he sought to imply that Eaton was not an Anabaptist at all, and never belonged to the secession of 1633, nor to Spilbury in 1638; and it was not until he saw Taylor's poem in my book that he reveals the fact that he knew that Eaton was an Anabaptist. Why? Because he discovered that if Eaton died in 1639, according to the Court Records, his baptism antedated 1640-41, as appeared by my citation of Taylor's poem. Even then he suppressed the further fact that these same Court Records show that Eaton's keeper allowed him to go out of prison to visit and preach to conventicles, which further fact would allow of his immersion by Spilbury in 1639 before his death in August, and which would accord with Taylor's expression "*of late.*" In order that the reader may see how Dr. Christian suppressed these facts wholly in his first account and partially in his Appendix, after seeing my citation of Taylor's poem, I will here quote that part of the Court Records so treated under the head of Francis Tucker's petition to the Court of High Commission:

"Samuel Eaton, prisoner in Newgate, committed by you for a schismatical and dangerous fellow, has held conventicles in the goal, some to the number of 70 persons, and is permitted openly to preach. . . . The keeper has been present in a conventicle of 60 persons when Eaton was preaching. He said there was a very fair and godly company, and stayed there some season. Contrary to the charge of the High Commission, he permits Eaton to go abroad to preach to conventicles." (State Papers, Vol. CCCCVI., 1638.) In Vol. CCCXXVII., fol. 107, 1639, a note is made of the death and burial of Sam Eaton and the fact that he was buried by at least 200 Brownists and Anabaptists, in Bunhill Fields, August 25, 1639. Dr. Christian cannot be relied upon in his use of the Court Records.

The Taylor poem and the death of Eaton (August, 1639) has led Dr. Newman to admit the possibility that the immersion agitation may have begun about 1633, and that Eaton may have been immersed when he received a "further baptism," though among those



who received a "third baptism." I differ here with Dr. Newman upon the testimony of Praisegod Barebone, who, in 1643, declares that the "totall dipping" of the Baptists was only "*two or three years old, or some such short time.*" Besides this, Barebone asserts that they had received a "*third baptism,*" and this seems impossible for Eaton as far back as 1633. He was evidently immersed by Spilsbury, if immersed at all, in the neighborhood of 1640—"of late," as Taylor says, in 1641. The agitation of a "proper administrator" probably began about 1633, but it was not until about 1640 that the agitation of the proper *mode* seems to have been settled; and it now seems clear that Spilsbury, in opposition to the succession method, antedated its introduction by the "unbaptized administrator method" shortly before 1640, as the "two or three years, or some such short time," declared by Barebone, would indicate.

Between Dr. Christian and myself this, however, is the best that can be done for Baptist dipping before 1640-41; and Eaton's case belongs to the 1640-41 movement for the revival of immersion according to the Kiffin Manuscript. The Court Records show no case of Baptist immersion before 1640-41; and Spilsbury's immersion of Eaton was very likely not known until 1641, as indicated by Taylor's poem. Eaton was secretly slipping out from prison to visit conventicles, and so getting back; and it is likely that his baptism by Spilsbury and his own baptism of the impure dame were very private, whether "*of late*" performed in 1639 or when the High Commission Court was still in power. Of the many Anabaptists arrested and brought before the Court, however—and among whom were Barber, Lamb, Gunn, and others (1639-40)—there is no case of a "dipper;" and the nearest case to it is that of Lamb, who, when released in 1640, was commanded not to "baptize." It is not impossible, though there is nothing to prove it, that Lamb had fallen into line with Spilsbury as another "unbaptized administrator" of immersion in 1640, and in the winter of 1640-41 introduced the baptizing at Gloucestershire. Granting the possibility of all this, I now come to the discussion of my two propositions:

I. The English Anabaptists revived immersion about 1640-41, according to the Kiffin Manuscript and concurrent testimony.

Around or about the date (1640-41) the Baptist movement for the restoration of immersion, according to the Kiffin Document and contemporary evidence, took place, in proof of which I cite the following authorities:

1. Praisegod Barebone and Edward Barber (1641-2-3). In 1642 Barebone (A Discourse Tending to Prove the Baptisme in or under the Defection of Antichrist to be the Ordinance of Jesus Christ, etc., London, 1642, pp. 3, 5, 12, 13, 15) was moved by this Baptist revival of immersion to attack the Baptist position. In his discussion he first (pp. 3-5) states the Baptist argument—namely, that baptism was lost and the church ceased, and that they had the right and had gone about raising or erecting again the order of the gospel—Barebone claiming that, if lost, it could not be restored, save by a new commission or a new John the Baptist. On pages 12, 13, he expressly declares that “*very lately*” the Baptists had “found out” a “new defect” in their baptism as to mode or “*manner*,” formerly as to “*subject*;” and that according to their “new discovery” they had gone from two baptisms to a “*third*,” which was “*totall dipping*.” Now, according to Barebone, all this, in 1642, was “*very lately*;” and in his reply to R. B. in 1643 he declares that this “*totall dipping*” of the Baptists was “*only two or three years old, or some such short time, in this kingdom*.” Barebone was an honest, capable man, and an unimpeachable authority on this subject, if not finally a Baptist.

Now, Edward Barber, in the latter part of his tract (A Small Treatise of Baptisme, or Dipping, 1641-2) replying to Barebone, admits and defends the Baptist argument—namely, that the ordinance of baptism, which he defines as immersion, had been “raced out and destroyed,” both as to subject and form, but that “being lost, believers having Christ, the Word and Spirit, have this”—namely, the commission (Matt. 18: 19, 20) of Christ to “raise it.” In his “Short Reply” to Barber (1643), Barebone charges Barber that he “acknowledgeth” his former indictments; and it is clear that Barber admits and defends the Baptist position as stated by Barebone, and does not deny the charge of the recent introduction of immersion “*very lately*” begun by the Baptists as positively and emphatically affirmed by Barebone. This is direct and unequivocal

confirmation of the fact, at the hands of both a Pedobaptist and a Baptist, in 1642, in the same controversy, that the Baptists had "very lately," within "two or three years" (1643), begun immersion in England; and this is impliedly a square confirmation of the Kiffin Manuscript. (See full discussion in "English Baptist Reformation," pp. 163-174.)

2. In 1643 Barebone (A Reply to the Frivolous and Impertinent Answer of R. B. [1642]) represents R. B. (a Baptist) as affirming "that at sometime *lately* there were no baptized people in the world: and yet Baptisme might be raised well enough;" and Barebone (p. 30) states himself, again, that only "within these two or three years, or some such short time," "two or three" churches had "bin totally dipped for Baptisme, by persons at the beginning unbaptized themselves." Here is another testimony by a Pedobaptist and a Baptist in the same controversy (1642-43), affirming the recent introduction of immersion by the Baptists within dates which clearly confirm the Kiffin Manuscript. "Two or three years, or some such short time," in 1643, is not very definite; but it means *about* 1640-41, and it might reach to Sam Eaton. Barebone affirms that R. B. had already been baptized thrice, and he charges R. B.'s zeal in the matter of dipping to its being "*new*," and "the man is mightily taken with it."

3. Again, in 1642-44, there was a tilt between Spilsbury and Barebone. Spilsbury wrote a Treatise concerning the Lawful Subjects of Baptisme, etc., dated 1652, but which must be 1642, as Barebone replies verbatim to his statements in his work (A Defense of the Lawfulness of Baptizing Infants, etc., London, 1644). Possibly 1652 marks the date of another edition of Spilsbury's work, the substance of which was well known in 1642. In this work Spilsbury discussed six points in which (4) he shows how wanting church or ordinance are to be recovered, (6) "no succession under the New Testament, but such as is spiritually by faith in the Word of God." In proof of the restoration of immersion by the "last method" adopted by "the greatest number of the English Baptists," Crosby cites Spilsbury's Treatise (p. 63), where he says: "Where there is a *beginning* [of baptism], some must be *first* [to recover]." Spilsbury proceeds to show the right of recovery by unbaptized adminis-

trators, and meets all the objections raised by Seekers, Pedobaptists, and Quakers; and he declares that the succession of the *visible* church has been repeatedly broken and restored, though the *invisible* never. On pages 2, 3, he defines baptism to be immersion, and calls it the "good old way" as shown to be restored. "Some please," he says, "to mock and deride, by calling it a *new-found way*, and what they please. Indeed it *is* a *new-found truth*, in opposition to an *old-grown error*; and so it is a *new thing* to such as the Apostles' Doctrine was to the Athenians, Act. 17. 19." The admission of Spilsbury is that as to Baptists the "good old way" was "indeed a *new-found truth*, in opposition to an *old-grown error*" by recovery; but to the Pedobaptists and others it was a "new thing" altogether. Barebone, in his reply (p. 18) to Spilsbury, asserts that his position which overthrew "outward Christianity," etc., was "of much concernment every way, with men: *and that of all persons in the world, only these few; so of late baptized by totall dipping.*"

Thus another Baptist and Pedobaptist, Spilsbury and Barebone, like Barebone and Barber, Barebone and R. B., in the same identical controversy (1642-44) conclude the same thing—namely, the late introduction of immersion by the English Baptists in confirmation of the Kiffin Manuscript. These great Baptist writers in 1642 are in agreement with a great Pedobaptist writer, that immersion had been lost under the defection of Antichrist; that the Baptists claimed the right according to Matt. 28: 19, 20 to restore it; that they had restored it "very lately," within "two or three years" past; and that immersion was "indeed a new-found truth," recovered through the "good old way." Not one of these writers ever denies anything Barebone says, except his position against the "*right*" to recover lost baptism and his claim of visible succession.

4. In 1642 Thomas Kilcop (A Short Treatise of Baptism, etc., London) antagonizes Barebone along the same line, and by the same arguments of Barber, R. B., and Spilsbury answers his charge with regard to baptism, "the use of it being lost." He admits that it was lost and recovered, and he nowhere denies Barebone's charges about the *recent* recovery of it within the "two or three years" past; and if such a charge had been false, it would have been too grave and infamous not to have been denied, denounced, and exe-

crated. No Baptist in the seventeenth century ever disputed it or evaded it.

5. In 1644 Daniel Featley (Dippers Dipt), who was well acquainted with this controversy between Barebone and the Baptists and with the 1644 Confession of Faith, declares that the immersion Article (XL.), with its definition of *baptizo* as dipping, was the "new leaven of Anabaptisme," as already noticed heretofore; and in the same year (1644) William Cooke called the Baptists, "*New Dippers.*" (A Learned and Full Answer to a Treatise entitled The Vanity of Childish Baptism [by A. R.], p. 21.)

6. In 1645 Francis Cornwell, Baptist (New Testament Ratified, etc., London, p. 19), says: "When Christ was *discovered* to be our King, and that we were but as Rebels, untill we did obey his Command, when he by his Spirit *discovered* what his commandment was, namely, that we which believe in Jesus Christ, must repent and be dipped in the name of Jesus Christ, the love of Christ our King constrained us to *arise* and be *dipped* in the name of Jesus Christ." Who is Cornwell speaking of? Baptists? When was it that the Spirit discovered to them the duty of dipping? I answer: About 1640. When did they arise and be dipped? I answer: About 1641. How do I know? The Kiffin Manuscript says so; and Praisegod Barebone says, in 1643, that Baptist dippers were only "two or three years, or some such short time," old. In the same year (1645) Henry Denne (Antichrist Unmasked, London, pp. 1-3) declares that this Baptist movement to restore the "Doctrine of the Baptism of Water" was a "NEWBORN BABE!" In the same year (1645) Christopher Blackwood (Apostolicall Baptisme, p. 2) speaks of the "doctrine of dipping" as a matter of "Novelism." Cornwell, Denne, and Blackwood were Baptists; but in the same year (1645) Ephraim Pagitt (Heresiography) called "dipping" a "new crotchett come into the heads" of the Anabaptists; the author of the Loyall Convert (The New Distemper, 1645) calls Anabaptism especially "The New Distemper;" John Eachard (The Axe Against Sin and Error, etc., 1645) speaks of Anabaptist baptism and church as "*new baptism*" and a "*new church way.*" These Pedobaptists in 1645 agree with the Baptists of that date that they had resumed dipping some time lately, and that their dipping was

“new”—a “new crotchett”—and that their church was a “new thing.” So Josiah Ricraft and Nathanael Homes in the same year insist that the Baptists had “erected” their churches “anew,” and had in some instances, by whole churches, first added believers’ sprinkling and then immersion. (See English Baptist Reformation, pp. 218-220.)

7. In 1646 Steven Marshall (Defense of Infant Baptism, London, 1646, p. 74) speaks of the English Anabaptists as “*our new Anabaptists.*” Robert Baillie in the same year, 1646, (Anabaptism the True Fountaine of Independency, p. 163, London) says that “dipping” is but a “*yesterday conceit of the English Anabaptists*”—a “*new invention of the late Anabaptists*”—“taken up only the *other year* by the Anabaptists in England.” In the same year B. Ryves (Mercurius Rusticus, London, 1646, p. 21) declares that, “since the late Reformation,” there were in Chelmsford two sorts of Anabaptists; “the one they call the Old men, or *Aspersi*, because they were sprinkled; the other they call the New men, or *Immersi*, because they were overwhelmed in their Rebaptization”—showing that immersion since 1640-41 was a new thing, and that immersing Anabaptists were called “*new men*” in contradistinction to the sprinkling Anabaptists, who were called “*old men*,” who antedated 1641. In this same year Thomas Edwards (Gangraena, London, 1646, p. 36, Pt. I.), after enumerating 176 errors of the Sectaries, adds the “dipping” of the Baptists among the errors which have been preached and printed within these “*four last years in England.*” Here are four distinguished Pedobaptist writers, within four or five years of the event, who confirm the Kiffin Manuscript and Barebone in the recent introduction of immersion by the English Baptists, here claimed by Baillie as “*only the other year*” and by Edwards as within “*four years past.*” They do not speak definitely, but approximately, of the date (1640-41), as did Barebone.

8. In 1649 Daniel King, a leading Baptist, in his great book (A Way to Sion, etc.), affirms (p. 82) that baptism had been “lost,” the church “corrupted,” and her “succession lost;” and after variously discussing the scriptural method for restoration, he says again (p. 85): “And this is the way to *reforme* what is amiss; yea and the people of God [Baptists] have reformed, and taken up or-

dinances upon this consideration; as of Israel's taking up circumcision in the land of Canaan, Josh. 5: 2." In the same year John Drew, an Episcopalian (A Serious Address to Samuel Oates [Baptist], 1649), attacked Oates' book (A New Baptisme and Ministry); and supposing Oates to have been baptized by Lambe and Lamb by some "rebaptized minister of a foreign church" (possibly meaning Blunt), he asks Oates this question: "How came he to be your minister? by what authority did he baptize that *first* person in *England* who baptized Mr. Lamb?" Here King, the Baptist, takes the recent introduction of immersion, or reformation of baptism, by the English Baptists for granted; and Drew, the Episcopalian, questions the Baptist Oates' theory of "New Baptisme and Ministry" upon the ground that his first administrator of baptism in England who may have baptized Lambe had no authority. All this points back to 1640-41.

9. In 1650 Henry Jessey, in his able work (Storehouse of Provision, etc.), fully discusses (pp. 13-15) the Baptist theory and right according to "the Word" of restoring lost baptism; objects (p. 16) to sending "over sea" or to "foreign countries" for an administrator, as if referring to Blunt; affirms the fact that the Baptists had restored the ordinance (pp. 111, 187); and declares (p. 80) that he himself had, after cautious delay, received it as restored—that is, in 1645. (See English Baptist Reformation, pp. 191-195.) In the same year Nathanael Stephens (A Precept for the Baptisme of Infants, etc., London, 1650) charges (p. 2) the Baptist view with setting up a "*new church*," erecting a "*new Ministry*," casting all in a "*new mould*" by beginning with a "*new baptisme*." Jessey, the Baptist, and Stephens, the Pedobaptist, take for granted 1640-41, and confirm the Kiffin Manuscript.

10. In 1652 John Tombes, Baptist (An Addition to an Apology, etc., London), in reply to Baillie's charge that he maintained the right of unbaptized persons to baptize others, says (pp. 10, 11): "*If no continuance of adult baptism can be proved* and baptism by such persons is wanting, yet I conceive what many protestant writers do yield, when they are pressed by the Papists to shew the calling of their *first reformers*; that after an *universal corruption*, the necessity of the thing doth justify the persons that *reforme*, though

wanting an ordinary regular calling, will justify in such a case both the lawfulness of a Minister's baptizing, that hath not been rightly baptized himself, and the sufficiency of that baptism to the person so baptized." Tombes is Crosby's leading witness to the restoration of immersion by the "last method," about 1640-41.

11. In 1653 William Kaye (Baptist), in his work (Baptism Without Bason, etc., London), on page 6, propounds this question: "How comes it to pass that this doctrine of baptism hath not been before *revealed*?" According to Kaye, its revelation had to wait until the perversions and corruptions of Antichrist should be so revealed and overcome as to "procure the free course of the Gospel," as in "the light of the reformation that *now* shineth." In the same year John Goodwin, Pedobaptist (Water-Dipping, etc., London, 1653), calls Baptist baptism the "new mode of dipping." On page 36 he calls the original administrator of this "new mode" of baptism in England, "Our *first* unhallowed and *undipt* dipper in this Nation;" and he declares of the Baptists that the "very first original spring of them" was "*since* the *late Reformation*"—that is, the Puritan Reformation, which began in 1640. Goodwin called "water-dipping" "*new baptism*." The Baptist Kaye and the Congregational Goodwin agree, and both point to 1640-41—the period of the English Baptist reformation of baptism by the revival of dipping. In 1653 William Allen, Baptist (An Answer to Mr. J. G[oodwin], etc., London), clearly expresses (pp. 34, 107) the Baptist reformation of baptism through the restoration of church order, at the hands of unbaptized administrators, after the "*disuse* and *discontinuance*" of the ordinance under "Papall defection."

12. Thomas Lamb, Baptist (Truth Prevailing, etc., London), in 1655, admits Baptist separation from the Puritans and reformation upon a higher plane of scriptural truth (p. 44). In the same year John Reading, Pedobaptist (Anabaptism Routed, etc., London, 1655), calls (pp. 100, 171) dipping as the Baptists "*now* hold," "new baptism."

13. Jeffry Watts, in 1656, Episcopalian (Scribe, Pharisee, Hypocrite, etc., London), repeatedly pronounces Baptist dipping a "Novelty," a "New Business," an "inglorious New Thing," and the like; and on page 63 of the "Dipper Sprinkled" he speaks of the



first Baptists in England as dippers—"your *elder* brothers, who about 13 or 14 years ago, ran about the country"—corresponding with 1640-41.

14. In 1676 Edward Hutchinson, Baptist (*Treatise Concerning the Covenant, etc.*), speaks (pp. 2-4) of the "manner of reviving this costly truth"—referring to immersion as restored by the Baptists; and in the following paragraph, after describing the Baptist movement for restoring baptism, he says: "The great objection was the want of an administrator; which, as I have heard, was removed by sending certain messengers to Holland, whence they were supplied." Hutchinson unquestionably refers to the Blunt agitation (1640-41). In the same year (1676) Francis Bampfield, as shown in his "*Shem Acher*" (1681), went to London, and was convinced that immersion was baptism; and after search for a "first or after administrator" among the records of the various methods by which immersion had been restored, and not being satisfied, he baptized himself. The caption of the Bampfield Document reads as follows: "An Account of ye Methods taken by ye Baptists to obtain a proper administrator of Baptism by immersion, when that practice had been so long disused, yt there was no one who had so been baptized to be found;" and the introduction of the Bampfield Document adds that Bampfield's search for a "first or after administrator" of immersion was "*since ye revival of yt practice in these latter times.*" Both Hutchinson and Bampfield fully confirm the Kiffin Manuscript and imply its date, about 1640-41.

15. Hercules Collins, Baptist (*Believers' Baptism from Heaven, etc.*, London, 1691), on page 115, speaking of baptism, asks: "Could not this ordinance of Christ, which was lost in the Apostacy, be revived?" and he not only indignantly repudiates its restoration through the se-baptism of John Smythe, but implies that it was restored otherwise by the English Baptists and as "being well known by some yet alive"—that is, in 1691, which points back to about 1640-41.

16. In 1692 Thomas Wall, Episcopalian (*Infant Baptism from Heaven, etc.*, London), charges (p. 22) the Anabaptists that "by *their own grant the way they came by their baptism* is Will-worship and Idolatrous until they prove it lawful for a man to Baptize him-

self, or that an unbaptized Person should Baptize another;" and this points back to their *conceded* introduction of immersion by the independent method about 1640-41.

17. In 1705 Dr. Wall (History Infant Baptism, Vol. II.) charges Baptists with schism and separation, and he says (pp. 557-58): "Any very ancient man may remember when there was no Englishman, or at least no society or church of them, of that persuasion. They at first held their opinion without separating for it. Their eldest separate churches are not the age of a man, viz., seventy years. I mean the ancient men, or men of reading among them, know this; the young and vulgar, who will talk right or wrong for a side, do not own it; but others own it, and they *justify* it by pleading their opinion is the *truest*." On page 413 (*ibid.*) he says again: "Neither was there ever an Antipedobaptist in England, as I shewed in the last chapter, till the custom of sprinkling children instead of dipping them in their ordinary baptism had for some time prevailed." On page 172 (Vol. IV.) he says again: "Antipedobaptism did not begin here while dipping in the ordinary baptisms lasted. Then for two reigns [James I. and Charles I.] pouring water on the face of the infant was most in fashion, and some few people turned Antipedobaptists, but did not make a separation for it. They never had any considerable numbers here till the Presbyterian reign began." Dr. Wall is Dr. Christian's chief witness on sprinkling; but he here confirms the Kiffin Manuscript and its date, 1640-41; if not on the question of restoring baptism, yet on the related question of Baptist beginning in England.

18. Dr. John Gale, a very learned Baptist (Reflections on Wall's History Infant Baptism, Vol. III. of Wall's History Infant Baptism, London, 1706), admits (p. 61) Wall's charge of Baptist separation; and he agrees with Wall and all others (p. 228) that immersion in England "continued till about Queen Elizabeth's time," when, in the English Church, it was generally substituted by "*pouring*," and finally by "*sprinkling*" in 1645. On page 346 Dr. Gale says: "In the very case of baptism *among ourselves* in England, the manner of dipping, in about one-quarter part of that time [i. e., in fifty years], was totally disused, and sprinkling substituted in its stead." Again, on pages 554, 555, he repeats this fact when he says

of "dipping" that it was "wholly laid aside—nay, counted unlawful, too, and all within the space of half a century here in England." On page 570 he says, again, that in England it was "wholly laid aside and sprinkling used in its stead in *less* than half a century." Gale does not controvert Wall upon this point, but admits it; and he excludes the idea that during this period of "disuse" the Baptists practiced adult immersion. He says that "baptism *among ourselves* in England"—Antipedobaptists and Pedobaptists—was in total disuse. Gale makes no claim of Baptist succession in England, organically or baptismally, but admits separation; and his testimony powerfully confirms the Kiffin Manuscript.

19. Finally, in 1738-40, Thomas Crosby, the first Baptist historian, with the Kiffin Manuscript and all these foregoing authorities in his hands (Vol. I., pp. 95-107), not only uses the Kiffin Manuscript with Hutchinson's confirmation, but employs Spilsbury, Tombes, Laurence, and other Baptist authors to set up the fact that by two different methods, at a given time, the English Baptists revived immersion, declaring (p. 97) that "immersion [in England] had for some time been *disused*;" and in the Preface to his Vol. II. (pp. i.-xlii.), he demonstrates how and when it became "disused" by the year 1600.

20. Dr. B. Evans (another learned Baptist historian), in 1860, confirms Crosby in the use of the Kiffin Manuscript, and so of Ivimey (1820); and both show the fact, without knowing the date, that immersion was restored by the Baptists of England.

I consider that I have established my first proposition that, about 1640-41, the Baptists of England revived or restored immersion.

## CHAPTER X.

### PROOF THAT THE ENGLISH ANABAPTISTS PRACTICED SPRINKLING OR POURING PRIOR TO 1640-41.

Having established my affirmative proposition that the Baptists of England about 1640-41 restored immersion, I come now to affirm the correlative proposition :

II. Therefore the English Anabaptists prior to 1640-41 practiced sprinkling or pouring for baptism.

Though not one single case of adult immersion among English Anabaptists, apart from the revival movement, about 1640-41, has been pointed out, I shall not affirm that there were no exceptions; but I do affirm that such exceptions are not historically known, and are not probable in view of the fact that the English Anabaptists, in order to immersion, had to restore the practice. They were not in the practice of immersion; and if they were baptizing at all, and not in the practice of immersion, then they were sprinkling or pouring. As in the last chapter I cited the authorities to prove directly or inferentially that, according to the Jessey Records and Kiffin Manuscript, the English Baptists restored immersion about 1640-41, so I shall observe the same method in proof of my second proposition; and if these proofs are not so numerous as in the first proposition, they are quite as conclusive, and are thoroughly sustained by all the proofs for the first proposition which essentially imply the truth of the second proposition. If the first proposition is true, the second is true by consequence; and although it is thus logically established, I shall, nevertheless, demonstrate it in the light of sufficient testimony.

1. It is conceded by modern scholarship that John Smyth, the founder of the General Baptists, was not only self-baptized, but that, after the fashion of the Mennonites and perhaps in contradistinction to the sprinkling of the Puritans, he most likely baptized himself by *affusion*. Though not certain of this fact, Dr. Armitage (History of the Baptists, p. 439) concedes that it was "affusion." Ashton, Muller, de Hoop-Scheffer, Evans, Barclay, Whit-

sitt, Vedder, Newman, Ranschenbush, all concede that John Smyth was not only self-baptized, but that he baptized himself by affusion. Smyth himself (*Character of the Beast*, 1609, pp. 58, 59) fully admits his se-baptism; and not only do Smyth and his faction admit "that they undertook to baptize themselves" (Evans, Vol. I., 209), but Lubbert Gerrits, in his letter to the church at Leeuwarden, asking advice about receiving Smyth's faction into the Waterland church, at Amsterdam, distinguishes their baptism as an act of their minister (John Smyth), "by which *he baptized himself.*" (Evans, Vol. I., p. 213.) This was in 1610; and it cannot be disputed that, with Smyth's own testimony and the testimony of the Dutch Church to which he and his faction applied for membership, he baptized himself. In all his writings and confessions, although cognizant of the symbolism of immersion, he never defines baptism as dipping, but as a "washing with water," after the manner of the sprinkling Puritans and the pouring Mennonites; and in his "Character of the Beast" (pp. 3, 4) he defines baptism as sprinkling (Heb. 10: 22), of which he says: "The *baptism* which is inward is called the *sprinkling* of the heart from an evil conscience." On page 84 (*ibid.*) he calls the "*water* of washing" the "*instrument* of baptism." No Baptist who believed in exclusive immersion, in which the subject is applied to the element, and not the element to the subject, would define water as the "instrument of baptism;" and no exclusive immersionist would define baptism, whether inward or outward, by the word "*sprinkling.*" The inference is highly probable, if not absolutely clear, that Smyth was not an immersionist, although, like the Pedobaptists and the Mennonites of that day, he regarded immersion as a mode of baptism, and used its symbolism of burial and resurrection by the "washing of water" by whatever mode.

2. It is also conceded by scholars that not only Smyth, but his followers, practiced affusion, and not immersion. Helwys, Morton, and the rest of the Smyth church were baptized by Smyth, who had affused himself—that is, by the same mode he practiced on himself. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that when Smyth's faction applied for membership in the sprinkling Waterland church they were examined as to their doctrine of salvation and their mode of bap-

tism, and no difference was found between them and the Waterlanders, who never practiced immersion; and when the faction was received, the unbaptized portion of it was sprinkled, according to Dr. Muller. (Evans, Vol. I., pp. 208, 209, 223.) Dr. Evans, Baptist, takes up the matter and says (Vol. II., pp. 51, 52): "Again and again has it been asserted that at this period immersion was not the mode adopted by these heroic confessors." He cites again Ashton and repeats his expression (Robinson's Works, Vol. III., p. 461, Appendix): "Nothing [referring to Smyth and Helwys] appears in their controversial writings to warrant the supposition that they regarded immersion as the proper and only mode of administering that ordinance;" and who concludes that Smyth affused himself, in which "opinion," Dr. Evans says, "Dr. Muller fully concurs."

"But," asks Evans, "was it so?" He does not pronounce positively; "but," says he, "we are bound to confess that the probabilities are greatly in its favor. The harmony of opinion, and the anxiety for agreement, which their Dutch brethren manifested in the documents laid before our readers, *would more than warrant this conclusion*. Add to this the fact, already stated by Ivimey, that, on the formation of the first Particular Baptist Church in England, an individual was sent over to Holland to be immersed. Now, this could not arise from there being no Baptists in the country. We have seen that the very opposite was the fact. Other churches, too, as will be seen presently, existed in the country. Only from one or two causes could this condition arise: dislike to Arminian doctrines or dissatisfaction with the *mode* of baptism. Which of these operated it is difficult to say. Probably *both* had an influence in determining this course." In all this it is clear that Evans inclined to the opinion—to the conclusion more than warranted—that Smyth, Helwys, and their followers were affusionists.

In substantiation of this opinion, Evans (Vol. II., p. 79) cites the case of the "two sorts of Anabaptists" at Chelmsford (Mercurius Rusticus, 1646), distinguished as "*Old men, or Aspersi*" (sprinklers), and "*New men, or Immersi*" (dippers); and he concludes: "Most will now see that the practice of the Mennonite brethren was common in this country. These New men soon cast

them into the shade, and this practice speedily became obsolete. Immersion as the mode of baptism became the rule with both sections of the Baptist community. Indeed from this time [1646], beyond the fact already given [at Chelmsford], we know not of a solitary exception." Barclay (Inner Life, pp. 69, 70), speaking of Smyth, Helwys, and their followers and the period of their origin and early continuance, says: "The question of the *manner* of baptism does not come up, and there can hardly be a doubt that the practice of immersion had not then arisen, and was not deemed important." Thus conclude Muller, Evans, Ashton, and Barclay.

3. I cite here the testimony of Crosby (Vol. I., p. 102) in his version of the "ten famous words" of the Kiffin Manuscript, which at the date of the Manuscript (1640-41) says: "None having then so practiced [immersion] in England to professed believers." In his paraphrase of this sentence Crosby says: "That they could not be satisfied about *any* administrator in *England* to *begin* this practice; because tho' some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not as they knew of, *revived* the antient custom of immersion." Crosby has just said (p. 97) that "immersion had for some time been *disused*" in England; and now he says, although there were Anabaptists in England (those who rejected infant baptism), it was not known if they had "*revived*" this "*disused*" custom of immersion. "They could not be satisfied of any administrator [of it] in England to *begin* this practice." It was not a question of *continuance* or *succession* of immersion with Crosby, but of introduction, beginning, revival, because it was not known if the "*disused*" ordinance had ever been *started* by the Anabaptists of England prior to 1640-41; and the logic of Crosby's paraphrase of the "famous ten words" of the Kiffin Manuscript is that they *had not*. The implication, therefore, is that the Anabaptists between 1611 and 1640-41, in England, practiced sprinkling or pouring—according to Crosby.

Crosby, in his continued version of the Manuscript, says that for this reason they sent Blunt to Holland to get the ordinance regularly; and in speaking of those who sought to secure immersion by this method (p. 97) he says: "Others were for sending to those foreign Protestants that *had used immersion for some time*, that so

they might receive it from them"—implying that the Dutch to whom Blunt was sent had restored the ordinance themselves, which was the case with the Collegiants, to whom Blunt went, and who had restored immersion in 1620, as the English Baptists did about 1640-41. In England "immersion had been *disused* for some time;" in Holland the Collegiants "had *used* immersion for some time." Those among whom it had been "*disused*" got it from those among whom it had been "*used*"—"for some time" in both cases. Crosby here shows his perfect confidence in the Kiffin Manuscript by his prior historical statement of the facts set forth in the document; and he clearly implies the practice of sprinkling or pouring both among the Dutch and English Anabaptists prior to their respective revival of immersion.

4. The next witness I shall introduce in proof that the Anabaptists were sprinkling or pouring for baptism prior to their revival of immersion, about 1640-41, is Praisegod Barebone, who is an able and unimpeachable witness, and is highly spoken of by Dr. Christian—not in his "Did They Dip?" but in his "Baptist History Vindicated." In his "Discourse Tending to Prove the Baptisme in or under the Defection of Antichrist, etc." (pp. 3, 12, 13), he properly charges, in 1642, Baptist position with the following claims:

(1) The church, ministry, and baptism had utterly ceased when Antichrist prevailed.

(2) Baptists had the right, according to the Scriptures, to recover, without a new commission, "gospel order" by restoring the visible church, baptism, and ministry.

(3) Baptists had restored this visible order.

All this the Baptists claimed from John Smyth down to 1640-41 upon the principle of believers' baptism, without regard to *mode*, the *subject* of baptism being the only question in controversy; and hence from John Smyth down they were called a "new sect," with a "new church," "new ministry," and a "new baptism." Now on pages 12, 13 Barebone affirms that "*very lately*" the Baptists had "found out a *new defect* in their baptisme"—that is, in the "*manner*" or *mode* of their baptism; and that "as *before* in regard to the *subject*" they had changed from infant to believers' sprinkling, so



now "in regard to so great a default in *manner*," or mode, they had changed from sprinkling to dipping. This is Barebone's meaning when he calls their recent change "their *new* discovery"—something *newer* than "before." Hence he says they had addressed themselves "to be baptized a *third time*, after the true *way* and *manner* they had found out"—"very lately." In other words, Baptists had (1) been sprinkled in infancy; (2) had been sprinkled when, by a *former* discovery of the "defect" as to "subject" in their baptism, they had adopted believers' baptism; and (3) now, under a "new [or newer] discovery" of the "defect" as to mode in their baptism, they had further changed from sprinkling to dipping. *New before*, it was *newer now*. "As for sprinkling or pouring water on the face," Barebone adds, "it is nothing at all as they account, and so measuring themselves by their *new* thoughts as *unbaptized*, they address themselves to take it up after the manner of *Dipping*;" and he argues that not only is exclusive dipping as *now* practiced by the Baptists not essential, but that they lacked, if their claim was right, an original "Dipper" with authority as had John the Baptist—having received their new dipping at the hands of "undipt dippers," as Goodwin would put it, or unbaptized administrators.

Here, then, is a direct witness, in 1642, to the fact that, until the Anabaptists had "*very lately*" adopted dipping, they practiced believers' sprinkling, their second baptism, having first been sprinkled in infancy. If any man in England knew what he was talking about, it was Barebone; and neither Barber, Spilsbury, A. R., Kilcop, nor R. B. in 1642 pretended to deny his charge, but, on the contrary, defended what he charged. Again, if any witness in England was an honest and unimpeachable witness, it was Praisegod Barebone.

5. In 1643 Praisegod Barebone (A Reply to the Frivolous and Impertinent Answer of R. B. [1642], etc.) represents R. B., a Baptist, as follows: "But it appeareth to be true that R. B. indeed holdeth so, that at some time *lately* there were no baptized [immersed] persons in the world: And yet Baptisme might be raised again well enough." Barebone, who declares that "very lately" the Baptists had changed from sprinkling to immersion, is confirmed, in the

same year (1642), by a Baptist who held that until lately there were no *immersed* persons in the world—certainly none in England. According to Barebone (1643), the change had been made within the past “two or three years, or some such short time.”

6. In 1643, S. C., in reply to A. R. (A Plea for Infants' Baptisme, etc.), says of the Anabaptists (p. 4): “And yet they grant that baptisme may be where there is no church; and so (*casting away the baptism which they formerly received*) they are driven (*in taking up their new baptism*) to affirm that an unbaptized person or persons may and must baptize themselves, and after that baptize others, else true baptisme can never be had.” Immersion being the new baptisme, after 1641, the former baptism cast away was sprinkling.

7. In 1644 I. E. (Anabaptist Groundwork, etc.) asks T. L. the following question: “I ask T. L. and the rest of those Baptists or Dippers that will not be called Anabaptists (*though they baptize some that have been twice baptized before*) what rule they have by word or example in Scripture for going men and women together unto the water for their manner of dipping?” I. E. is in accord with Barebone with regard to Baptist dipping lately taken up, in which former Anabaptists were baptized three times: (1) sprinkled in infancy, (2) sprinkled again when they became Anabaptists, and (3) dipped when they became full-fledged Baptists and baptized those who had been “*twice baptized before*.”

8. In 1645 Nathanael Homes (A Vindication of Baptizing Believers' Infants), on page 2 (Epistle to the Reader), speaks of some of the Anabaptist difficulties in their transition from sprinkling to immersion, when he says: “One congregation at first adding to their Infant baptisme, the adult baptisme of sprinkling; then not resting therein, endeavored to adde to that, a dipping, even to the breaking to pieces of their congregation.” This is another confirmation of Barebone's testimony as to the late change of the Baptists from sprinkling to dipping.

9. Robert Baillie, 1646 (Anabaptisme the True Fountaine of Independency), on page 163, says: “Among the old Anabaptists, or those over sea, to this day, so far as I can learn, by their writs or any relation that has yet come to my ears, the question of dipping

and sprinkling never came upon the Table. As I take it they dip none, but all whom they baptize they sprinkle in the same manner as is our custome"—all of which, with the exception of the Rhynsburg Mennonites, was true at the time Baillie wrote, and had, with some exception, been true from the beginning in 1521. In view of this fact, Baillie declares that dipping among the English Anabaptists was a "yesterday conceit," a "new invention," "taken up (as Barebone shows) *onely the other year*;" and on page 153, after stating the Baptist argument for dipping as against sprinkling, he says: "However we deny both parts of the proof. Sprinkling and dipping are two forms of Baptisme, but accidentally, circumstantially, or modally, so to speak, and *till very late* the Aanabaptists themselves did not speak otherwise." Baillie not only declares the practice of Anabaptist sprinkling on the Continent down to his time, but he says that "*until very late*" the English Anabaptists held that sprinkling and dipping were both forms of baptism. They did not practice "*until of late*" exclusive immersion; and upon this point Crosby agrees with Baillie, who agrees precisely with Barebone, who, in 1642, declares that until "very lately" the Baptists were sprinkling before their change to immersion.

10. B. Ryves, in 1646 (*Mercurius Rusticus*), as already quoted, shows that at Chelmsford there were "two sorts of Anabaptists; the one they call the Old men, or *Aspersi*, because they were but sprinkled; the other they call the New men, or the *Immersi*, because they were overwhelmed in their Rebaptization." Nothing could be plainer than what Barebone shows—namely, that the Anabaptists before 1640-41 were sprinklers—now, in 1646, called the "Old men," as some of them still remained. The immersionists were called "New men," because they had changed from the *old* Anabaptist sprinkling to the *new* Baptist immersion, which, as Spilsbury says, was "the good old way," but a *truth*, or a *way*, "*new found*," in practice, in opposition to sprinkling, "*an old-grown error*."

11. In 1653 William Kaye, Baptist (Baptism Without Bason), in expressing the former darkness under which the Anabaptists rested, as now the Pedobaptists continued to rest, uses the following illustration (p. 37) to show how Baptists had come to the light: "We knew, or may know, that *believers themselves* which were really

and fully *baptized* (Acts 19: 1, 2, 3, 4) because they were ignorant at that time of the Holy Ghost, were upon *that account* (all the *fundamentals* being *revealed* without which baptism cannot be warrantable) *rebaptized: when WE* were SPRINKLED great darkness, in comparison of the light of the Gospel reformation that *now* shineth, was *then* as a cloud overvailing the Word." Kaye clearly refers back to the period of Anabaptist *believers'* sprinkling prior to the Baptist immersion "*reformation;*" and comparing the darkness of the Anabaptists under the cloud of sprinkling, though baptized believers, with the darkness of the twelve under the cloud of ignorance as to the Holy Ghost, though baptized believers, yet both came to the light by rebaptization—the twelve under the light of the Holy Ghost and the Anabaptists under the light of the immersion revival or reformation. His point is that "believers themselves," though baptized, were under a cloud, until the light shined—the one under the cloud of ignorance as to the Holy Spirit, the other under the cloud of ignorance as to the proper mode of baptism; and as the Holy Ghost became light to the one, immersion brought light to the other. Nothing seems clearer than that Kaye means that prior to the immersion reformation, "WE," the Anabaptists, "were SPRINKLED"—as believers baptized.

12. As a final confirmation of this fact, I conclude with the testimony already quoted in part of Francis Cornwell, a learned Baptist (*The New Testament Ratified with the Blood of the Lord Jesus, etc., London, 1645*). In his controversy with Whittle (p. 19) he says: "Hence it is that we poor despised believers in Jesus Christ dipt [Baptists] owne Jesus the Christ to be our eternal high Priest, that manifested his love to us in the Covenant of free Grace. . . . This love *discovered*, caused us to hearken to the voyce of Jesus our Anoynted Prophet; for his voice is lovely: And when he *revealed* to us, by his word and good Spirit, that none was the subject of baptism; but such as believe in the Lord Jesus the Christ and repent of their *dead works*. When this truth was *revealed*, we hearkened to the voice of Christ onely as his sheep ought to doe, John. 10. and regarded *no more* the voyce of a stranger, the *Pope*, the *Bishop*, the *Priest*. Nay when Christ was *discovered* to be our *King*, and that we were but as Rebels, untill we did obey his Command, when he

by his good Spirit *discovered* what his Commandment was, namely, that we which believe in Jesus Christ, must repent and be *dipped* in the name of Jesus Christ, the love of Christ our King constrained us to *arise* and be *dipped* in the name of Jesus Christ." On page 22, in the addenda to Whittle's Answer, Cornwell says: "The Nationall churches have trodden the holy cite of believers in Jesus Christ dipt under foot *neere* 42 moenths; which reckoning a day for a year, may amount to neer 1260 years, Rev. 11. 2."

This is the clearest Baptist testimony, which may be thus analyzed:

(1) Cornwell held the usual Baptist theory of his time that the spiritual church which he here calls "dipt," or Baptist, had been trodden under the foot of Antichrist for 1,260 years; had continued spiritually by unbroken succession down to his time; and that, *visibly*, it had been lost in Rome, or Pedobaptist Protestantism which sprang out of Rome—all the "nationall churches."

(2) He affirms that when the *discovery* of believers' baptism and finally immersion had been made to this spiritual line, they ceased to hearken to the voice of priest, bishop, or pope—constrained by the love of Christ—arose and were "*dipped*" in the name of Christ, and so came out from under the shadow of Antichrist. In other words, the people whom he called "dipt," or Baptists, at a given time, as expressed by the adverb "*when*," *resumed* dipping. He is in perfect line with Kaye, who refers to the time "*when*" they were "*sprinkled*." That time, according to a multitude of testimony, was, as to Kaye, before 1640-41, and, as to Cornwell, about 1640-41. It is clear that if the Anabaptists at any time *resumed* dipping, they, before that time, were in the practice of *sprinkling*. Cornwell simply implies that English Baptists were separatists from the Pedobaptists, and that at a given time restored immersion. All this is in perfect accord with the Kiffin Manuscript, which at the date 1640-41 says: "None having then so practiced [immersion] in England to professed believers;" and with the Bampffield Document, which, without giving the date, gives "An Account of the Methods taken by the Baptists to obtain a proper Administrator of Baptism by Immersion, when that practice had been so long disused, that there was no one who had been so baptized to be found."

The date was the same and the inference clear that if at that period they restored immersion, before that period they must have been sprinkling or pouring. This is the inexorable and unanswerable logic of the situation.

It has been urged that not a single or individual instance of sprinkling has been cited among Anabaptists before 1641. Kaye says he was "sprinkled;" and by the plural, "WE," he says that the Anabaptists were "sprinkled" as "baptized believers." Barebone says that they were sprinkled; that they went from sprinkling to dipping, having had three baptisms. Baillie says that the Continental Anabaptists sprinkled; and that, until very lately, the English Anabaptists had held dipping and sprinkling as indifferent, and had not until very recently adopted their "new invention" of dipping; and it is useless to charge Baillie with ignorance of the Anabaptists or with prejudice toward them, when he is in perfect agreement with Barebone and the Baptists themselves. R. B., a Baptist, declares, in 1642, that until lately there were no immersionists in England; and Cornwell, in 1645, affirms that the Baptists had *resumed* dipping. So of Barber, Kaye, King, Kiffin, Spilsbury, Patient, Pearson, Jessey, Kilcop, Collins, Denne, Lamb, Allen, Blackwood, Tombes, Lawrence, Hutchinson, and others. Here, in all this, is not only an instance of individual sprinkling, but the fact that the Anabaptists as a body had gone from sprinkling to dipping; and with all the search through the seventeenth-century history of the Anabaptists not one single instance of dipping among them, apart from the 1640-41 period of restoring the ordinance, is found prior to about that date. By both positive and circumstantial evidence I have demonstrated my propositions: About 1640-41 the English Anabaptists revived immersion, and before that period they practiced sprinkling or pouring.

## CONCLUSION.

It is not essential to notice Dr. Christian's array of Pedobaptist testimony (Appendix, pp. 1-33) in favor of immersion as the scriptural form of baptism. It may serve as a gloss upon his absurd criticism of the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript, but it is nothing to the purpose as to the real issue. Classically, the scholarly world agrees that *baptizo* means to dip, and nothing else; and yet, outside of the Greek Catholic Church, I know of no Pedobaptist scholar who denies the validity of sprinkling or pouring as a *scriptural* rite. The Roman Catholic claims to have changed the ordinance upon the principle of disciplinary authority and upon the ground that immersion is not essential to the "substance of baptism;" but he admits that *baptizo* means only to dip in the New Testament as in the classics. Protestant Pedobaptists who are scholars admit the universal classic usage of *baptizo* in the sense of immerse; but many of them deny dip as the New Testament usage, while many who admit that *baptizo* means to dip in the New Testament also insist upon the definition "wash," and therefore three modes of baptism—immersion, pouring, or sprinkling. We must know what a Pedobaptist means by his admissions before we "crow" much over his concessions.

Neither have I thought it essential to notice his discussion of John Batte and his relation to Blunt (Appendix, pp. 156-163). I concede, with Dr. Newman, that the Dutch and other writers who identify him with the Blunt baptism probably get their history from Crosby, who takes it from the Kiffin Manuscript. This does not concede, however, that Batte was a mythical character, since he is known to have been a Collegiant teacher at Leyden, "1630 and onward," and that he was an immersionist and still living in 1640; and since the Kiffin Manuscript, which has been demonstrated to be a valid document, does not say that Blunt received his baptism from Batte in Amsterdam, it is clearly probable that he received it from Batte in Leyden—very close to Amsterdam. There was a "John Batte," in the "Netherlands," who was a dipper down to 1630 and onward; and all the facts of his existence, location, and

connection very largely confirm the Kiffin Manuscript in its claim for the Blunt baptism.

Again, it is not essential to the thesis that, about 1640-41, the English Baptists revived immersion, to prove that the Kiffin Manuscript is a valid document. Grant that it is a forgery and that Blunt, Blacklock, and Batte are mythical characters, and yet the testimony of Barber, Barebone, Spilsbury, A. R., R. B., Kilcop, King, Jessey, Kiffin, Edwards, Baillie, Kaye, Goodwin, Watts, and a host of others, show conclusively that the "greatest number and the more judicious of the English Baptists" restored immersion by the "method" of the "undipt dipper." To be sure, these writers barely hint of the Blunt method of successional baptism, because that method was abhorrent to the great mass of "both sorts" of Baptists; but these writers are prolific in the discussion of the "last method," and Crosby shows that at the very time of the Blunt movement the large body of Baptists protested against the Blunt method as "needless trouble" and of popish origin—another demonstration that Crosby not only gave credence to the Kiffin Manuscript, but identified it by the opposition of the general body of Baptists to its method, at the very time it was introduced.

Finally, it is not essential in this discussion to notice what Dr. Christian says (pp. 163-166) about the baptism of the Dutch and German Anabaptists. I could answer at much length; but I will simply refer the reader to the great work of Dr. A. H. Newman, entitled "History of Antipedobaptism," and also to the testimonies adduced by Dr. William H. Whitsitt in his work, "A Question in Baptist History" (pp. 34-48). There are historical scraps of Dutch, German, Swiss, and other Continental Anabaptist immersion, in the sixteenth century, as Dr. Christian gathers; but it is evident, according to the conservative showing of Dr. Newman, that the Continental Anabaptists generally practiced sprinkling, and that the mode among them was a matter of indifference, the subject being the great matter at issue. More than this, it is certain that there was no baptismal or organic connection between the Continental and the Anglo-Saxon Anabaptists in the seventeenth century. The English Anabaptists clearly originated from the Puritans, with perhaps an elemental base in the Lollards and Dutch Anabaptists of the sixteenth century.



## A REVIEW OF DR. CHRISTIAN'S ARTICLES.

BY PROF. ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.

It seems to the writer that the question as to the date of the introduction of proper believers' baptism among the English Antipedobaptists of the seventeenth century is occupying the attention of the Southern Baptists to an extent wholly disproportionate to its importance. I do not see that those who feel the necessity of insisting on an unbroken succession of churches practicing believers' baptism (immersion), whether such can be established by known historical facts or not, would greatly strengthen their position by disproving the 1640-42 documents and the proceedings that they record, or even by proving that the Smyth-Helwys party practiced immersion in 1609. On the other hand, it is difficult to conceive that any Baptist should be disposed, without evidence of the most irresistible kind, to attribute to any body of Antipedobaptists a grave deviation from the apostolic standard that they professed to follow. For my own part, if the Anabaptists that appeared in England from time to time during the sixteenth century combined with their protest against infant baptism the practice of proper believers' baptism (immersion), I want to know it, and I promise the readers of the Western Recorder that within two days after my discovery of any conclusive evidence, or even highly probable evidence, of the fact by me, an article shall be on the way to Louisville setting forth the discovery in the strongest form that the facts shall warrant. If John Smyth immersed Helwys, and if Leonard Busher was himself immersed or immersed anybody, I want to know this also, and I promise duly to exploit any such discovery as soon as it comes within my knowledge. I would say the same with respect to Spilsbury's practice in 1633, etc. But even if immersion, as the regular or exclusive practice of all these parties, should be established, there seems to be no direct historical connection between Smyth's baptism and that of the early Anabaptists, or between Spilsbury's and Smyth's. With the facts at present before me, I should look for Baptist continuity far more hopefully in the direction indicated by

the "Kiffin Manuscript," passing backward from the Rhynsburgers to the Unitarian Baptists of Poland, and from these to the Paulicians of the East, than in English evangelical circles.

But the issue regarding the events and documents of 1633-42 has been raised, and the British Museum and other European collections have been exploited on behalf of both sides of the controversy. The facts, we may suppose, are now before us with reasonable fullness, and those who are interested in the matter should decide the question for themselves after reading carefully the latest and fullest presentation of the matter from both points of view. For years it has been a maxim by which I have guided my own historical studies, and sought to guide those of others, to read what both sides in every controversy have to say. It is astonishing to what an extent the personality of a controversial writer, apart from any conscious and deliberate perversion of facts, colors the representation. It would not do to judge of Jovinian and Vigilantius by the passionate denunciations of Jerome, nor of Carlstadt by Luther's ravings; and while the temper of modern controversialists is in general superior to that of earlier ages, the calm, judicial spirit of investigation, whose sole concern is the ascertainment of truth, is not yet completely regnant.

It is not the wish of the editor that I should criticise in detail Dr. Christian's articles. To do so would probably require as much space as the articles themselves have filled; for there are few paragraphs, or even sentences, in the series that would not tempt the critic to some sort of remark, commendatory or otherwise. I suppose that the interests of my readers will be best subserved by (1) a frank, clear, succinct statement of my own views on the matters in dispute, and (2) an examination of Dr. Christian's discussions and conclusions.

In controversies of this kind a large number of people make up their minds at an early stage as to the merits of the case, and are ready to accept what favors the position adopted and to reject what opposes it, without much regard to the intrinsic weight of the arguments; but I believe there are many readers of this paper who wish to know the facts, however much they may be opposed to their own wishes or preconceived opinions, and who are so much in love with

the truth that they can take pleasure only in the most candid and straightforward handling of the historical materials.

Nearly twenty years ago, in the regular course of my studies as an instructor in church history, I became convinced that immersion was introduced anew among a body of English Antipedobaptists that in several companies had from 1633 onward seceded from the Puritan congregations of which Jacob, Lathrop, and Jessey were successively pastors; that about 1640 the question of immersion as the only allowable form of baptism was mooted; that those who thought it important to receive baptism at the hands of one who had himself been baptized sent one of their number to Holland to be immersed by a Collegiant (Rhynsburger) minister, who, on his return, baptized many others; and that such as felt no need of succession in baptism introduced immersion shortly before or shortly after this introduction of baptism from Holland in an independent way.

The facts related in a somewhat general and inaccurate way by Crosby seemed to me to be supplemented and confirmed by the extracts from certain old manuscripts quoted in an apparently accurate form by Rev. George Gould, in his "Open Communion and the Baptists of Ncrwich" (1860), a copy of which came into my hands early in my investigations. The statement of Crosby that the sending of Blount to the Netherlands was due to the fact that, "though some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not, as they knew of, revived the ancient custom of immersion," has always seemed to me a somewhat guarded paraphrase of the statement contained in the so-called "Kiffin Manuscript," "none having then so practiced it in England to professed believers."

It did not occur to me that the ascertainment of these facts regarding the rise of the English Particular Baptist movement was in any sense a new discovery on my part, and I should, no doubt, have been greatly surprised to hear that any one who had given much attention to Baptist history was ignorant of these facts or had any different view of the matter.

The Independent articles, if I read them, did not, I suppose, impress me as containing much that was new; and when Dr. Dexter's work on "John Smythe, the Se-Baptist," etc., appeared (1881), in

which, by a great array of notices from contemporary literature, and without the use of the extracts from the "Kiffin Manuscript," etc., as quoted by Gould, he reached the date of 1641 as the time when immersion was introduced among the Calvinistic Antipedobaptists of London, I wrote for the Examiner a somewhat extended review of this work, in which, while disapproving of the spirit of the book, I stated that the author had, by an elaborate process, reached precisely the same date as that given in the "Kiffin Manuscript," as quoted by Gould, which he had strangely overlooked. I have a letter from Dr. Dexter, written soon after the appearance of my review, in which he seeks to account for his failure to consult Gould's book, a copy of which was in his library, and in which he expresses the opinion that the document and his researches remarkably confirm each other, and promises in a future edition, if one should be called for, to give me full credit for pointing out the dated extracts from the "Kiffin Manuscript" in Gould's work. It is worth while to observe that Dexter's failure to use Gould's extracts was due not to his doubt as to their authenticity, but to his failure to find them.

If in those halcyon days any prophet of evil had foretold that the setting forth of these simple facts would be the occasion of a year's long controversy, that should shake to its foundations the life of the great Southern Baptist brotherhood, I should have been utterly incredulous. Of course I am fully aware of the fact that this historical question has become greatly complicated with other issues, but recent publications on both sides show that much importance is still attached to the maintenance and the overthrow of the proposition that somewhere about 1640-42 immersion was first introduced among the Puritan Antipedobaptists, who, from 1633 onward, separated themselves from the Jacob church.

After reading what has been written on both sides and endeavoring to give due weight to every consideration adduced, I find myself with some additional information regarding details, but with views unchanged regarding the main issue. I will state in a series of propositions my present understanding of the situation:

1. I am convinced that the body of documents used by George Gould in 1860 is a faithful copy of that used by Neal and Crosby, and received by the latter from Benjamin Stinton, his brother-in-

law (died February, 1718), who had for some years been engaged in gathering materials for an elaborate history of the Baptists.

2. I regard it as practically certain that Benjamin Stinton was the collector of 1710-12, who prepared the headings of the documents, and who stated that he received those that are especially important in the present controversy, and that are attributed to Kiffin and Jessey as writers or custodians, from Richard Adams, who was educated by Tombes, who almost certainly was acquainted with Jessey (1655-63), who was associated with Kiffin as assistant pastor (1690-1701), who succeeded the latter as chief pastor of the Devonshire-square church at the latter date, and who died in 1718, having retired from active service some years earlier (about 1710, when he intrusted his collection of documents to the collector, presumably Benjamin Stinton).

3. It seems certain to me that the Gould collection of documents, including the extracts from printed books, is identical with that used by Crosby. The comparison made by Professor Vedder furnishes proof that, to me at least, is conclusive.

4. I find no contradictions between the Gould manuscripts and Crosby's citations. Crosby did not appreciate the importance of the *verbatim* reproduction of his documents, and sometimes paraphrased or gave in his own language what he took to be the purport of a document; but he does not depart very far in any case from the facts contained in the document.

5. I can discover no motive whatever for the forgery of such a body of documents either before the time of Crosby or in the present century. That no forgery occurred in the present century is proved by the identity, as regards all important matters, of the Gould documents with those used by Crosby. The high character of George Gould would, I think, preclude the possibility of the fabrication of the papers by him. A forger would hardly have taken the trouble to copy out the great body of extracts from printed books contained in the collection. The collector of 1710-12 (almost certainly Benjamin Stinton) was a man of high character, and could have had no motive, as far as I can see, in propagating a false account of the beginnings of his denomination. Richard Adams was so closely associated with the chief actors in the early proceedings

that he could hardly have been deceived by forgeries, and he must have known the sources of the documents that he attributed to Kiffin and Jessey. It is altogether likely that the Jessey documents had come into the hands of Kiffin, and that Adams received them from the latter. Not only does no motive for the forgery of such a collection of documents appear to me, but the documents themselves awaken in my mind no suspicion of spuriousness. I feel in reading them that they are precisely what they profess to be. I must admit the possibility, of course, that others may be differently impressed. I simply record the impression made upon my own mind.

6. The various documents contained in the collection (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) are not to be regarded as throughout of the nature of accurate minutes made on the spot. They consist apparently of such information as could be gathered from partial contemporary records, supplemented by the memories of survivors, a good many years after the events recorded. Some portions bear evidence, by their indefiniteness, of having been compiled at a much later date than the events recorded. The manner in which the length of Jacob's ministry and the date of his departure and death are spoken of would indicate that strictly accurate data were either inaccessible at the time or were not considered important.

If any one should attempt, forty or fifty years after its rise, to gather materials for the earliest history of a small, irregularly-constituted body of Christians out of which had grown a host of churches of different denominations, in the absence of formal minutes, he would find it impossible to secure complete and self-consistent information. The New Testament Gospels, written in their present form from contemporary memoranda and from oral traditions, though their authors were evidently divinely directed in their selection of materials and graciously preserved from error, differ greatly as to the events selected for treatment, as to the order of events, as to the aspect of the same event presented, as to the words spoken by the Savior on a given occasion, etc. It is impossible to determine with complete accuracy the year of our Lord's birth or death, the length of his ministry, or the exact date of almost any other important New Testament event. Even the Imperial rec-

ords fail, in most cases, to give us definite dates for New Testament events that synchronize with political.

It seems probable to me that late in life Jessey (who died in 1663) gathered what material he could in the form of contemporary records and oral traditions, and that still later Kiffin attempted to complete the records, or at least added such documentary materials as he could. The inaugurators of an ecclesiastical movement do not usually realize the importance of keeping full and accurate records. It is only when the importance of the movement has become manifest by results that individuals become impressed with the value of historical data.

I could illustrate my view of these records admirably from the history of the Baptist Churches of Toronto. There is still living a man who was present almost from the beginning, and who, possessing a particularly retentive and accurate memory, has been able to put on record much that would otherwise have been irretrievably lost; but for many years after the first meetings began to be held no contemporary records are extant, and there is much uncertainty regarding many things.

The "Kiffin Manuscript" and the "Jessey Church Records" are certainly not free from error; it would be surprising if they were; but this does not prove that they are frauds. The statement of the 1640 document, to the effect that none had then practiced immersion in England to professed believers, may or may not have been a part of a strictly contemporary record. If it was, it would be valuable only to the extent of the knowledge of those concerned. If it be a later effort to account for the sending of Blount to Holland, based upon tradition, its value would depend, of course, on the accuracy of the tradition, and it would be perfectly legitimate to test it by contemporary literary documents. I think, at any rate, we may be reasonably certain that this clause represents Kiffin's idea as to the reason for sending to Holland for immersion.

7. If there be sufficient evidence that some time before May, 1640, immersion had been introduced by some of the seceders from the Jacob-Lathrop church, I am not sure that this would contradict the spirit of the statement in the 1640 record. If immersion had been introduced anew by Spilsbury even as early as 1633, this

would not have met the views of Blount and his friends regarding a properly authorized administration. The clause might fairly be taken to mean only that outside of this circle of Puritans, some of whom had become Antipedobaptists, none were known of who were practicing believers' immersion. Spilsbury's baptism, if he were already practicing immersion, would be no better than they could independently introduce; but the evidence of the practice of immersion by Spilsbury and others before 1640 will be considered hereafter.

8. Apart from these documents, the evidence that the Baptists and their opponents (1642 onward) regarded the practice of believers' immersion as of recent introduction in England seems to me to be irresistible.

It will be manifest to all, I think, that Dr. Christian's criticism of the so-called Kiffin Manuscript and Jessey Church Records does not apply to my view of these documents. Dr. Christian would discredit the Gould collection because the original manuscripts have not come to light; but we should have little left in the way of authentic historical material if we should insist in every case on the production of the originals. I do not think that even from his own point of view his attempt to discredit the documents by means of literary criticism is a success. I suppose there are few men in the world who are such adepts in literary criticism that they would undertake to determine within twenty or thirty years the date of a document by the orthography, the use of abbreviations, capitals, punctuation, etc. The use of the abbreviation that looks like *ye* for *the* was not limited to a few years. The *y* is a perpetuation of the Anglo-Saxon character for *th*, and, so far as I know, does not occur in early printed works. The use of "&" was common long before 1640, and has continued to the present. The use of *wch* for *which* is, no doubt, still common. The use of the apostrophe in the possessive is by no means so late in its origin as Dr. Christian supposes. I find it in Edwards' "Gangræna" (1646), and earlier instances could doubtless be found. Dr. Christian finds fault with the copy of the extract from Hutchinson in the Gould Manuscripts, and, by putting it alongside of what he considers a correct copy of the passage, wishes to impress the reader with the carelessness and unre-



liability of the collection. He will doubtless be surprised to learn that his own copy of the passage contains thirty-nine variations from the original, and that it contains the only material error found in either copy (the substitution of "superstitions, ceremonies" for "superstitious ceremonies"). Most of the variations referred to are slight and insignificant (orthography, capitalization, Italization, punctuation, etc.), and such as any one is liable to make who does not strive to be microscopically exact; but these variations show how perilous it is to criticise a document on such grounds.

I do not think that the meagerness of our information respecting the careers of Blount and Blacklock after the event of January, 1641, O. S., 1642, N. S., has any decisive bearing on the matter in dispute. It is recognized on all hands that this Blount-Blacklock movement involved only a small minority of the English Antipedobaptists of the time, and it is highly probable that many of those who joined in it came afterward to prefer the independent method of introducing proper baptism. There is no reason to think that either of these baptizers was a man of great ability; and as what they stood for did not prevail, their lack of prominence in the later history is by no means remarkable.

Dr. Christian is right in insisting that no evidence has been discovered among the records of the Rhynsburgers of the baptism of Blount. Upeij states that Jan Batte was at that time pastor of a congregation in Amsterdam, and that the English Baptist, Richard Blount, was sent to him there to receive baptism; but he probably relied upon Crosby's quotation from the Kiffin Manuscript for this statement. The latest and best historian of the Rhynsburgers (Van Slee, "De Rijnsburger Collegianten," 1895) has been able to find no further proof of the existence of Batten's Amsterdam congregation. But the Kiffin Manuscript does not state that Blount's baptism occurred in Amsterdam, and it may have occurred in Leyden, where Batte(n) is known to have labored (1630 onward). That Batte was an immersionist and was still living in 1640-41 is not questioned.

I was much interested by the materials that Dr. Christian was enterprising enough to discover in the Court Records of 1632-40. That the so-called Jessey Church Records show important varia-

tions from these official records seems indisputable. The mistakes as to the sex of individuals might easily have resulted from the carelessness of an early copyist or from difficulty in deciphering obscurely-written manuscript, but it may be that these public records are themselves incomplete. I should like very much to see a complete copy of the Court Records, and am not in a position, with the materials at present before me, to give a final opinion regarding their bearing on the present controversy. It is evident, on the face of the Jessey Church Records of this time, that they are not strictly contemporaneous. The length of Jacob's pastorate, "about eight years," indicates that the writer did not know the exact date. The time that intervened between Jacob's and Lathrop's pastorates, "a year or two," shows the same lack of exact information. I think it very possible that the dates in the margin were added at a later time (possibly by Stinton) on the basis of the information contained in the text. The definite facts about Jacob's departure for America and his death constitute an important addition to our information, but do not materially affect my view of the situation. Nothing depends on the exact dates in this case, and the writer of this part of the records either did not have the exact facts or he was not concerned to give them. There are other seeming discrepancies that would probably disappear under the hands of a harmonizing critic with both sets of documents before him in complete form.

The case of Eaton seems to me the most important of all in its bearing on this controversy. If, as Dr. Christian claims the Court Records show, Eaton died in prison in 1639, after having been confined there continuously since 1636, and if Taylor's verses correctly represent Spilsbury as immersing Eaton, and Eaton himself as practicing immersion, and if this Eaton be the same as the one who died in 1639, then immersion must, as Dr. Christian claims, have been practiced as early as 1636 by Spilsbury. The reference by Taylor to the "Bankside" is favorable to the supposition that the writer had immersion in mind, and it seems highly probable that the Eaton referred to is identical with the Sam Eaton mentioned in the Jessey Church Records under 1633. Of course there is the possibility that Eaton's imprisonment may not have been close and continuous during the three years preceding his death. If he was

at liberty for awhile shortly before his death, the baptizing may have occurred in the same year; but, in any case, it must have preceded the Blount-Blacklock immersions of 1641-42. Some time ago, it will be remembered, I expressed the opinion that the Spilsbury party, being hindered by no scruples as to the "baptizednesse" of the administrator, may have begun to immerse shortly after May, 1640, when the first record of the agitation of the question as to the mode of baptism appears. It may be that, with a knowledge of the fact that Spilsbury had already introduced immersion independently, the author of this record made the statement that none had then so practiced in England to professed believers regarding the recent independent introduction of immersion by Spilsbury as having no relevance to the situation; for Blount and his friends could have introduced immersion among themselves with just as good a right.

Some months ago I took occasion to show in the columns of this paper the utter inadmissibility of attempting to connect Thomas Sheppard, the Puritan preacher and author, who never labored in London, and who left for New England in 1635, with the Baptist movement in England (1642-44). Certainly no forger would ever have thought of introducing the name of such a man into such a connection, when he was known to have been at the time supposed one of the most prominent pastors in Massachusetts and completely free from any suspicion of leanings toward Baptist doctrine and practice. It is probable that the Thomas Sheppard of the Manuscript is a copyist's mistake for Thomas Skippard, of the Confession of Faith of 1644; or, if this be a misprint for Sheppard, then this Sheppard would be a different man from the Massachusetts preacher.

It does not at all accord with my understanding of the facts to say that the "1641 theory rests upon the casual presence of ten words in an unauthenticated and remote copy of an anonymous manuscript." I consider that the fresh introduction of immersion among the Antipedobaptists who from time to time withdrew from the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey church (1633 onward) is abundantly established by a host of Baptist and Pedobaptist writers. The statement was made in effect repeatedly by friends and foes, and no one, so far as I am aware, showed any disposition to call it in question.

I do not see that Dr. Christian's criticism has in any way weakened the force of the evidence in favor of this view. Of course I cannot here cite the authorities, but they have been brought forward again and again, and are within the reach of all who are interested in them.

Dr. Christian has added many fresh items to the great body of notices previously published by him in favor of the contention that immersion was still, during the first half of the seventeenth century, recognized as normal baptism by Church of England writers. I could add greatly to the list of testimonies from writers of all names and creeds regarding apostolic baptism. Almost every important writer—Lutheran, Calvinist, Socinian, Arminian, Anabaptist, Anglican—that touches upon the matter at all uses freely the symbolism of burial and resurrection in connection with baptism; and yet this usage had absolutely no influence on their practice. Even those Church of England writers that argued so strongly in favor of the apostolic mode did not carry their contention so far as to deny the validity of sprinkling or pouring. It was the extreme High Churchmen, I believe, that were most anxious to conform to the practice prescribed in the Prayer Book. English Antipedobaptists would have been repelled from rigorous insistence on immersion rather than attracted toward it by such advocacy.

It must be said, on the other hand, that the occasional practice of immersion in the Anglican Church during the seventeenth century and until the present time can be established. There never was a time when any one—Antipedobaptist or Pedobaptist—need have been ignorant as to the form of apostolic baptism. The trouble was that all parties had reached the conviction that the mode of applying water in baptism was a matter of indifference.

If the Protestant leaders of the sixteenth century had argued against immersion, it is altogether likely that the Anabaptists would have championed the apostolic practice thus attacked; but as the Reformers freely acknowledged that immersion was the apostolic form of baptism, and in some cases expressed a preference for it, and yet countenanced the use of forms regarded as simpler and more convenient, the Anabaptists were content to concentrate their protest on infant baptism, and, for the most part, regarded the

mode of baptism as a matter of indifference. Even in the few cases on record in which immersion was employed we have no evidence that those who practiced it insisted upon its exclusive validity or refused to have fellowship with those practicing pouring or sprinkling. It is altogether likely that if immersion was ever practiced among Antipedobaptists in England before 1633-42 it was by way of expressing individual preference rather than by way of insisting on the exclusive validity of a definite mode. But, as a matter of fact, we know of no cases whatever. This does not prove, however, that there were none; but the close connection of all the Antipedobaptists that we meet with in England during the sixteenth century with the Dutch Anabaptists would lead us to expect that their practice would conform to that of their Continental brethren.

It is not at all likely that there were many Anabaptists in England under James I. and Charles I. The rigorous persecuting measures of Elizabeth and her successors tended to drive all Non-conformists (Antipedobaptists and other) out of the country. The success that crowned the struggle of the Protestants of the Netherlands against Spanish tyranny and the toleration in religion freely accorded there to all, together with the almost unexampled commercial prosperity of the Netherlands at this time, no doubt attracted such Anabaptists of Dutch origin as were in England to this land of liberty and plenty. It is inconceivable that under the circumstances many should have secretly remained in England; but even if there were small groups of Anabaptists worshiping here and there in different parts of England during the first forty years of the seventeenth century, and even if it could be ascertained that such practiced immersion either occasionally or exclusively, there would be no evidence of any historical connection between such and the Puritans that became Antipedobaptists in London (1633 onward); and these latter would have been utterly unwilling to form or to claim a connection with them if they had been known to be present and to be immersionists. The bad reputation of the Anabaptists and their unacceptable views on oaths, magistracy, warfare, the person of Christ, etc., would have made any such connection out of the question.

In conclusion, I seriously think that this 1641 business has been

sufficiently exploited on both sides. There are whole centuries of Christian history awaiting our attention. I am of the opinion that a thorough study of general church history is a necessary preparation for the effective handling of Baptist history, and that Baptist history can be rightly understood only when studied as a part of the great evangelical movement of the early centuries and of the middle ages. Baptists have done far less than their share of historical research. The present controversy, that has been productive of so much harm, has been of incidental benefit in stimulating an interest in Baptist history, but interest stimulated by partisan considerations is not the kind of interest that leads to trustworthy results. The true church historian must rise superior, as far as possible, to partisan or even to denominational interests. Baptists want to know and to hold to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. We may be sure that no real interest of Christ's cause will suffer from the ascertainment and the publication of all the facts of history.—*Western Recorder*.



# ENGLISH BAPTIST REFORMATION.

(From 1609 to 1641, A.D.)

By Rev. George A. Lofton, D.D.

Published by Chas. T. Dearing, Louisville, Ky. Price, \$1; ministers, 75 cents. Sold also by Hunter & Welburn and by J. R. Florida & Co., Nashville, Tenn.

## SOME TESTIMONIALS.

Rev. A. H. Newman, D.D., LL.D.,

Professor Church History, McMaster University, Toronto, in a letter to Dr. Lofton, says: "While you have given abundance of incontrovertible evidence on the *main point* under discussion, I think you weaken your position by Italicizing the expression *new baptism* in many of the proofs quoted." He also disagrees with Dr. Lofton in dogmatizing with reference to 1641 as the *exact* date at which some of the English Antipedobaptists restored immersion, but says again: "You have brought together a large amount of interesting material, and you have handled it in an able and judicious manner. There are some points, as I have pointed out before, in which you somewhat overstrain the use of words of passages in the interest of your thesis; but in general you have held the balance well. . . . I certainly regard your work as by far the fullest and best that has appeared in connection with the controversy." With other qualifications of his indorsement of the work in some personal points involved in the discussion, Dr. Newman speaks again of Dr. Lofton's book as "the successful accomplishment of a very laborious task" and a "highly creditable performance." Dr. Newman further says in the Baptist and Reflector of later date: "Dr. Lofton's 'English Baptist Reformation' (from 1609 to 1641, A.D.) is one of the most scholarly and complete of all the works that have grown out of the Whitsitt controversy. . . . The present work has evidently cost a vast amount of painstaking effort, and future writers of English Baptist history must take account of Dr. Lofton's labors. Within the limits that the author has prescribed for himself the work is almost exhaustive, and even those who are not prepared to accept his conclusions will be glad to find, ready to their hand, nearly all the important available materials in a reasonably accurate form. . . . In his general view of the rise and early history of the English Antipedobaptists, Dr. Lofton is substantially in accord with my own views that have been repeatedly set forth in public. He is right in regarding the so-called 'Kiffin Manuscript' and 'Jessey Church Records' as genuine records of the movements that occurred in the Jacob-Lathrop-Jessey Puritan congregation, out of which (1633 onward) sprang a number of Calvinistic Antipedobaptist congregations that ultimately became regular Calvinistic Baptists. . . . The work before us is by far the best and most complete statement of the side of the controversy represented by the author. Unless new material should come to light, another such work will hardly be required. . . . Dr. Lofton's book is worthy of high praise."



Rev. William H. Whitsitt, D.D., LL.D.

"The work of Rev. George A. Lofton, D.D., entitled 'English Baptist Reformation' (from 1609 to 1641), is the most valuable contribution that has yet been made to the discussion of the restoration of immersion in England in 1641. This point has been demonstrated by him beyond all possibility of successful contradiction. The industry, learning, and critical skill of Dr. Lofton render him the foremost authority in this department of history. Nobody has won so many laurels as he, and in all future times his name will receive the most prominent and honorable mention when the story of the current controversy shall be written."

Prof. A. T. Robertson, D.D.

"Your book is a superb piece of work—so open-minded, so thorough, so exhaustive, so conclusive. How anybody can resist the evidence you present is a mystery to me. You have done the truth a lasting service."

Baptist Argus.

"This volume by Dr. Lofton is by all odds the most thorough and important that has yet appeared. It towers above all others in the extent and thoroughness of its research. It ought to close the discussion. His proofs are so well ordered, so abundant, and so convincing that not an inch of standing room has been left for those who oppose the thesis that immersion was restored by the Baptists of England in 1641. The author has won enduring fame by his earnest and capable labors in the department of Baptist history."

Christian Index.

"Dr. Lofton has attained no little prominence in the historical discussion regarding the date 1641 and its events, so far as it pertains to the Baptists. It is only just to say that his previous books have been the best on the disputed subject. Among those who accept the fact of the revival of immersion in England in 1641 he has shown the firmest grasp upon all historical data, and more clearly massed his material for the comprehension of the people. Last summer he visited England and made further researches. This has enabled him to present a most valuable contribution to the purely historical question."

Rev. J. B. Hawthorne, D.D. (Baptist and Reflector).

"In this work Dr. Lofton puts himself in line with such distinguished specialists and experts as Drs. Newman, Vedder, Rauschenbusch, and Dexter, and all the best scholarship of the world, in supporting the thesis which has made Dr. Whitsitt a martyr. His book is the product of years of careful, conscientious, patient investigation. The most learned and distinguished living writers upon the formative period of Baptist history acknowledge their indebtedness to Dr. Lofton, and recognize his work as preëminently able and accurate. By all intelligent

and unbiased minds this work will be regarded as one of the most valuable contributions ever made to Baptist literature."

---

**Religious Herald.**

"In this little book of nearly 300 pages Dr. Lofton presents to his brethren what should prove to be the grand finale of the historical aspects of the Whitsitt controversy. Two years ago, taking Dr. Whitsitt's view, he wrote a pamphlet on the subject, which was nothing less than an historical demonstration. His present book is an expansion of the pamphlet, in which new evidence is accumulated, and the demonstration is much more irresistible. His book is a real contribution to history. It is written in the historic spirit and in the interest of no individual."

---

**Baptist Courier.**

"Dr. George A. Lofton, the author of several good books, has recently given the world another valuable work, 'English Baptist Reformation' (from 1609 to 1641). Dr. Lofton has been a laborious and painstaking student of church history for many years, and he has made the period covered in this volume a specialty, and recent studies in the best libraries in Europe the better qualify him to write on the subject."

---

**Zion's Advocate.**

"Dr. Henry S. Burrage, Baptist historian, instancing the case of Hanserd Knollys, agrees with Dr. Lofton in the trustworthiness of 'Document No. 4' of the Jessey Records against the criticism of Dr. Christian from the Hanserd Knollys' standpoint. He says: 'Dr. Christian's statements concerning Knollys, in his endeavor to show the untrustworthiness of the "Gould Document, No. 4," are not in harmony with well-known facts.'"

---

**Louisville Commercial.**

"Rev. Lofton's work sustains Dr. Whitsitt's position at every point. He brings forward fifty-two witnesses to prove that immersion was restored in 1641 in practically the same form that had been used in apostolic times. Twenty-eight of these witnesses are Baptists and twenty-four belong to other religious denominations. All these were eyewitnesses to the change from sprinkling to immersion. Apparently the weight of this evidence is so great that it is impossible to resist it."

---

**Louisville Courier-Journal.**

"Dr. Lofton is considered an authority in the department of Baptist history that embraces what is known as the 'Whitsitt Question.' No other investigator has pursued the topic with so much industry and ability."

**The Messenger (General Baptist).**

"Doubtless his 'Landmark' brethren will dispute, strenuously, the arguments and conclusions of Dr. Lofton, but he has certainly made a strong presentation of his side of the argument. The author personally visited the British Museum and other famous libraries of England in search for material, and more than half a hundred authors are quoted. Those who are interested in the discussion of this question should read and study this work."

**Seminary Magazine (Louisville, Ky.).**

"If any man should be an authority on the history in question, it is Dr. Lofton, for he has from the very first given the controversy his closest attention, studying diligently every proof offered by either side. . . . Aside from matters controversial, of which this volume bids fair to be the decisive and final note, the book commends itself to all fair-minded students of history as a capable and honest effort to present the facts of the period it covers. It is a valuable contribution to the treasury of our traditions."

**Rev. S. M. Province, D.D. (Florida Baptist Witness).**

"Dr. Lofton is a painstaking investigator, and he went to his task in the British Museum and other great libraries with a skill in handling his materials acquired by years of patient study and assiduous toil. His work is marked with earnestness and courage, and displays a true historical instinct. He reaches the same conclusions concerning the period of which he writes that Whitsitt, Newman, Vedder, Rauschenbush, and other investigators have reached. There can be no reasonable doubt that Dr. Lofton's work closes the question as to the restoration of immersion in England in 1641. Dr. Whitsitt is abundantly vindicated. The claim upon which his fame will chiefly rest is that he led the way to a revision of current historical opinion among Baptists and to the establishment of the truth concerning their connection with English Anabaptists. Dr. Lofton modestly claims to have added nothing to President Whitsitt's thesis, but he has certainly shown more fully the ground of that thesis."

**Christian Observer (Presbyterian), Louisville, Ky.**

"We have found this book not mainly an expression of the conclusions of Dr. Lofton, but an *aggregation of the evidence* from which these conclusions are drawn, accompanied, in a very happy way, with references to the original documents, volume and page. It is thus an historical treasure-house, and will take its place as one of the standards of church history. . . . We may not here follow the details of Dr. Lofton's argument. Suffice it that it has left upon our minds the impress of capacity and sincerity. The Baptist Church has nothing to lose by following the lead of such a writer. Dr. Lofton, of course, bases his belief in immersion upon the Scripture itself. If the Scripture teaches it, then baptismal succession is unnecessary; if the Scripture does not teach it, baptismal succession is no good ground for it. The 'Landmarkers,' therefore, are contending for that which, if proved, would be of no value to them. Their own true course is to 'search the Scripture' and follow its teaching."









2- 12789

BX 6276 .L8	Lofton Defense of the Jersey records + Kiffin manuscript.
	556334
	E. S. Larson Desk 29
	2- 12789

NOV 4 '42  
DEC 15 1942

BX6276  
.L8

556334

2- 12789



