

KETTERING

A Newsletter of the Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies

06

From the Works of
Andrew Fuller

08

“A learned pious ministry”
Michael A.G. Haykin

13

Andrew Fuller
Annual Conference

17

Baptists as Puritans
Steve Weaver

25

Book Reviews



FEB2015 / ISSUE NO. 2



The *Andrew Fuller*
Center for Baptist Studies
at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary



Editor: Michael A.G. Haykin

Managing Editor: Dustin Bruce

Design and Layout: Dustin Bengé

Fellows of The Andrew Fuller Center

Matthew Barrett

Paul Brewster

Nathan Finn

Cody McNutt

Jeff Robinson

Jeongmo Yoo

Steve Weaver

J. Ryan West

Junior Fellows of The Andrew Fuller Center

Dustin Bengé

Dustin Bruce

Ian H. Clary

Joe Harrod

KETTERING

A Newsletter of the Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies



The *Andrew Fuller*

Center for Baptist Studies

at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary



From the Editor

MICHAEL A.G. HAYKIN

The conviction that individual lives matter in the big scheme of things is surely an aspect of a biblical worldview and biblical theology of history. Spending time, therefore, looking at the life and thought of an individual theologian like Andrew Fuller and the ongoing impact of that one life is therefore a valuable exercise. Not only does one gain information about this English Baptist, but it also helps reinforce the biblical conviction that a life lived well has ongoing impact for good. While we in this culture are having to re-learn this truth—after decades of doctrinaire and pop Marxist historiography that emphasizes economic forces and other historiographical ideologies that downplay the importance of the individual—earlier generations knew this as a given. Consider an essay on Andrew Fuller by a minor nineteenth-century biographer, James Davis Knowles (1798–1838), for instance.

Knowles had been converted under the ministry of John Gano around the age of twenty-one and subsequently became a member of First Baptist Church, Providence, RI. A gift for preaching was evident and he was encouraged to study for the ministry. After pastoring for a number of years, he was appointed Professor of Pastoral Duties and Sacred Rhetoric at the Newton Theological Institution (today part of Andover Newton Theological Seminary). Here he found time to write a memoir

of Roger Williams in 1834, having already tried his hand at a biography of Ann Judson. The same year that his memoir of Williams appeared, he also wrote an extensive study on the “Character of Andrew Fuller,”¹ which was prompted by the publication of a two-volume edition of Fuller’s works by the Boston Baptist publishers Ensign Lincoln (1779–1832) and Thomas Edmands (1781–1851).

Knowles observed that though Fuller’s “education was small,” yet “the works of Fuller are justly entitled to rank with those of Owen and Edwards” (pages 115, 113). One of the reasons for this was, as Knowles asserted, the fact that “few theological writers have equaled him in plain, direct, robust force of understanding” (page 119). Another reason, in Knowles’ estimation, was Fuller’s “originality and vivacity of mind.” Yet, he was also a man marked by “an humble submission to the authority of Scripture” (page 120). And it is the latter, Knowles rightly believed, that made “Fuller a safe and valuable guide” in Christian theology (page 123). Finally, Knowles mentioned Fuller’s piety as a reason for the value of his books: his love for God and humanity “made him a reformer, without dogmatism, and a controversialist, without asperity” (page 126). It is a shame that Knowles did not live to write a full biography of Fuller—he died of smallpox in 1838.



The Qualifications and Encouragement of a Faithful Minister¹

BY ANDREW FULLER

“He was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit, and of faith;
and much people was added to the Lord” (Acts 11:24)

Beware also, brother, of neglecting secret prayer. The fire of devotion will go out if it be not kept alive by an habitual dealing with Christ. Conversing with men and things may brighten our gifts and parts; but it is conversing with God that must brighten our graces. Whatever ardour we may feel in our public work, if this is wanting, things cannot be right, nor can they in such a train come to a good issue.

It is no breach of charity to say, that if the professors of Christianity had more of the Holy Spirit of God in their hearts, there would be a greater harmony among them respecting the great truths which he has revealed. The rejection of such doctrines as the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the total depravity of mankind, the proper Deity and atonement of Christ, justification by faith in his name, the freeness and sovereignty of grace, and the agency of the Holy Spirit, may easily be accounted for upon this principle.

My dear brother, of all things, be this your prayer, “Take not thy Holy Spirit from me!”² If once we

sink into such a way of performing our public work as not to depend on his enlightening and enlivening influences, we may go on, and probably shall go on, from one degree of evil to another.

Though religious visits may be abused, yet you know, brother, the necessity there is for them, if you would ascertain the spiritual condition of those to whom you preach. There are many faults also that you may discover in individuals which it would be unhandsome, as well as unfriendly, to expose in a pointed manner in the pulpit, which nevertheless ought not to be passed by unnoticed. Here is work for your private visits. And, in proportion as you are filled with the Holy Spirit, you will possess a spirit of love and faithfulness, which is absolutely necessary to successful reproof. It is in our private visits also that we can be free with our people and they with us. Questions may be asked and answered, difficulties solved, and the concerns of the soul discussed. Paul taught the Ephesians, not only publicly, but “from house to house.”³ Now it is being full of the Holy Spirit that will give a spiritual savour to all this conversa-

tion. It will be as the holy anointing oil on Aaron's garments, which diffused a savour on all around him.⁴

I think it may be laid down as a rule, which both Scripture and experience will confirm, that eminent spirituality in a minister is usually attended with eminent usefulness. I do not mean to say our usefulness depends upon our spirituality, as an effect depends upon its cause, nor yet that it is always in proportion to it. God is a Sovereign and frequently sees proper to convince us of it in variously bestowing his blessing on the means of grace. But yet he is not wanting in giving encouragement to what he approves wherever it is found. Our want of usefulness is often to be ascribed to our want of spirituality, much oftener than to our want of talents. God has frequently been known to succeed men of inferior abilities, when they have been eminent for holiness, while he has blasted others of much superior talents when that quality has been wanting. Hundreds of ministers, who, on account of their gifts, have promised to be shining characters, have proved the reverse; and all owing to such things as pride, unwatchfulness, carnality, and levity.

Time would fail me to speak of all the great souls, both inspired and uninspired, whom the King of kings has delighted to honour: of Paul and Peter and their companions; of Wickliff [i.e. John Wycliffe] and Luther and Calvin, and many others at the Reformation; of [John] Eliot and [Jonathan] Edwards and [David] Brainerd and [George] Whitefield and hundreds more whose names are held in deserved esteem in the church of God. These were men of God. Men who had great grace, as well as gifts, whose hearts burned in love to Christ and the souls of men. They looked upon their hearers as their Lord had done upon Jeru-

salem, and wept over them. In this manner they delivered their messages, "and much people were added to the Lord."

¹ The full title of the sermon from which this has been made is *The Qualifications and Encouragement of a Faithful minister illustrated by the character and success of Barnabas* and can be found in *The Complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller*, revised Joseph Belcher (1845 ed.; repr. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Sprinkle Publications, 1988), Works, I, 135-144. This sermon was preached at the ordination of Robert Fawcner at Thorn, Bedfordshire, on October 31, 1787.

² Psalm 51:11.

³ Acts 20:20.

⁴ See Psalm 133.

**“We desire a learned ministry,...
we desire a pious ministry”: Remembering
the vision of Benjamin Davies (1814–1875)
for Canada Baptist College on the
200th anniversary of his birth**

BY MICHAEL A.G. HAYKIN

Deep distrust of theological education has long been endemic among Baptists. In the mid-eighteenth century, for example, the deacons of the Baptist cause in Westbury Leigh, Wiltshire, England, regarded

Human learning in a pastor with feelings of suspicion, and entertained the strongest aversion to those whom they termed “men-made” ministers. ...The Bristol Academy...presented the nearest object of mistrust to the members at Westbury Leigh. ...They could never bring themselves to regard this seat of human learning with any degree of complacency; and they scorned, as they said, “to go down to Egypt for help.”¹

A similar attitude was discernible among Ontario Baptist in the mid-nineteenth century. While

Methodists and Presbyterians in what would become Ontario recognized the importance of having a theological college early on, it would not be until 1860, nearly eighty years after Baptist had first come into Ontario that they would have a successful school for training pastors, what was known as the Canadian Literary Institute in Woodstock.

Canada Baptist College

Now, there had been an earlier attempt to fund such a school, Canada Baptist College in Montreal, but it had failed in 1849 after only eleven years of operation. This school had its origins in the earliest days of the Ottawa Association, when, in 1836, it recommended that an academy be established in either Upper or Lower Canada to train men for the Baptist ministry.² That very year John Gilmour (1792–1869), a Scottish Baptist who was the pastor of First Baptist Church, Montre-

al, sailed to England to seek to raise support for a possible seminary. His trip was not in vain, for Gilmour returned in March, 1837, with between £1500–£1600 (probably close to \$880,000 in today's currency) for an educational institution.³

A number of sites for the new college were considered. Eventually a site in Montreal was chosen, possibly because it was the centre of British banking and business interests. Thus, on September 24, 1838, Canada Baptist College opened its doors in Montreal with two students.⁴ The school curriculum was curious in some ways. For instance, along with the biblical languages, Hebrew and Greek, the students were also taught Latin, Syriac, and German, but not French, even though the school was situated in Montreal!

Its first principal was Benjamin Davies (1814–1875), a Welsh Baptist scholar, who had secured a Ph.D. from the University of Leipzig in 1838 when he was only twenty-four. The first Ph.D. in a Canadian institution of higher learning, he directed the school from 1838 to 1843.⁵ During his five years at the school roughly thirty students benefited from his teaching and counsel.⁶ In a circular letter that Davies drew up for the Ottawa Association in 1840, the Baptist educator provides a concise overview of his view of theological education. It is an overview that is still instructive—would that Ontario Baptists had always heeded its wisdom over the past 175 years!

A perspective on theological education

Davies begins by noting that there were some Ontario Baptists “who look upon it [i.e. theological education] with jealousy, if not with hostility.”⁷ Seeking to disarm this hostility, Davies pointed out first of all that the support of formal theological education in no way entailed the belief that “none can be worthy and useful ministers without education.” In fact, there were a good number

of examples to the contrary in the history of the church. The early Apostles were an eminent example in this regard. Nevertheless, Davies argued, the reason why such uneducated individuals succeed is either because they labour among “people as uncultivated as themselves” or they possess “natural powers of mind.” Illustrative of the latter was John Bunyan (1628–1688), who, though an “untutored tinker,” had a natural genius which made of him “a mighty preacher and an immortal author.” In fact, Davies was quick to point out, there were many uneducated ministers who “are often heard lamenting their deficiencies, and coveting learning as a help to them in their work.” Davies saw a good example in this regard in another English Baptist, Andrew Fuller (1754–1815), “of blessed memory, who began to preach when very unlearned, but who was so sensible of his disadvantages that he used great diligence to acquire that knowledge, without which he could never be, what he at length became, one of the most valuable men of his time, and decidedly the most useful minister in our religious community.”⁸

On the other hand, not for a moment did Davies believe that “education alone, apart from moral adaptation, can qualify for the ministry.”⁹ Responding to those who were coming to regard ministerial training in the same terms as training for any other profession, Davies vehemently asserted:

It is a notorious fact, that in all secular or state churches, young men are raised to undertake ‘the care of souls,’ without any regard to their religious feelings. We however utterly reprobate such a notion and such a custom. Much as we desire a *learned* ministry, we desire a *pious* ministry more. The first and most essential qualification, which we look for and de-

mand, is godliness, while we seek learning only as a secondary, though not unimportant preparation. It is our solemn conviction that no literary attainments, no powers of rhetoric, can give fitness for the work, if the heart be not engaged in it. This preparation of the heart in man must come from the Lord, before any other preparation, whether of erudition or of eloquence, can qualify him for the ministry.¹⁰

In training a man for pastoral ministry learning, though important, is not as vital as piety. It is the latter—the engagement of the heart, the longing for holiness, the love of human beings—which is absolutely indispensable in a pastor’s life. And this piety is itself God’s creation. In other words, unlike other professions, genuine pastoral ministry must arise from a calling from God.

The necessity of a college

In seeking to raise support for Canada Baptist College, a place of formal study, Davies had no intention of casting aspersions on other, more informal methods of education. “If the learning itself be sound and to the purpose,” he rightly noted, “we care not much whether it has been gained at home, or in the collegiate seats of liberal education, or in the halls of divinity.” Davies could point to a number of self-taught men in the transatlantic Baptist community which amply demonstrated his point:

Who does not know the history of our illustrious [William] Carey, how he became a prodigy of teaming, without having ever frequented the groves of Academus? How happy a circumstance would it be for the cause of truth, if unlettered

ministers generally were to follow the bright example of Carey, Fuller, [Abraham] Booth and others, by struggling through their difficulties and placing themselves on a level with the well instructed and enlightened!¹¹

But Davies was a realist and knew that the achievements of a William Carey or an Andrew Fuller were probably too much to expect of most men. A theological college was thus a necessity.

Among the goals of such an institution Davies noted two in particular. First, a formal theological education will “greatly assist” budding pastors “in studying and understanding the Scriptures.” Without a doubt, what the Bible has to say about “the way of salvation and the principal duties incumbent on man” is easy to understand. Yet, even the apostle Peter had to admit that in Paul’s writings there are “some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction” [2 Peter 3:16 (KJV)].

A close reading of the Scriptures reveals other areas of difficulty. As Davies noted, though, this should not be considered surprising.

A collection of writings, that are of such high antiquity, several of them being the most ancient in existence, that were composed by Orientals for the use, in the first place, of people, whose mode of living, thinking, and speaking differed widely from our own, that treat on the most sublime and abstruse subjects, and that too in languages which have long since ceased to be spoken, and therefore not easily mastered, and that have been handed down for many generations by the labor of the pen, which is a process far

less favorable to correctness than printing—surely a collection of such a character, must be expected to contain parts, exceedingly obscure to us, however clear they may have been to the first readers.¹²

Understanding the cultural, intellectual, and linguistic differences between the world in which the Bible was written and nineteenth-century British North America, as well as having some cognizance of the various difficulties posed by the transmission of the biblical text, required theological education if the text was to be faithfully proclaimed to Canadians. Nor can a preacher simply trust commentaries to relieve him of his difficulties. If he does, he is at the mercy of those who write them. “Every professed and public expounder of the lively oracles”, Davies averred, should “desire and...be able to form an enlightened and matured opinion” of the texts on which he is speaking. Davies pointed out that this would obviously entail some understanding of the original languages, a further reason for formal training.¹³

A second major reason why education was needed was to enable ministers to be more effective in their explanation of God’s Word to others. A good theological training helps those who are to be ministers to present their beliefs intelligibly, cogently, and in a winsome fashion. It enables them to order their sermons so that they do “not present a confused mass of ideas, jumbled together without connection and without design.” Davies was well aware that the age in which he lived was one in which various “learned criticisms” were being advanced against the truths of the Scriptures. How could the Bible be defended, though, without some education?¹⁴

Davies closed with a fervent appeal.

Having thus, beloved brethren, laid before

you the subject of ministerial education, we cannot close without affectionately urging you to support the theological institution, [Canada Baptist College,] now established among us. Will you permit it to decline and fall, by withholding from it your prayers and contributions? Will those who have the means to provide education for pious and gifted young men, who thirst for improvement, deny them any assistance? Unfaithfulness in this matter must be positive treachery to the cause.¹⁵

By and large, though, Davies’ appeal fell on deaf ears and three years later he returned to England.

The closing of the school

Davies was replaced as principal by John Mockett Cramp (1796–1881),¹⁶ also a British Baptist, who served as principal till the College folded in 1849. Since Davies was a vocal open communionist, it has been common to attribute the demise of the school to the conflict between open and closed communionists. This is certainly one reason for the school’s failure, though other causes for its demise can be cited.

In 1849 Montreal was in the grip of a severe depression and that year there was a major cholera outbreak in the city, both of which discouraged potential students from coming to the College. The school had also been receiving support from British Baptist sources, but by 1849 this had completely dried up. Finally, there was the geographical isolation of the College from the bulk of the churches it was supposed to serve. Most of this constituency was between three to six hundred miles away to the west. It was impractical to expect ministerial students to journey that far in a day when transportation was exhausting and

costly. For example, when John Girdwood, the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Montreal, traveled from Perth to Montreal in 1842, he had to “catch a stage at four a.m., travel over bone-shaking roads for many hours, then transfer to a river-boat to reach Montreal, the total journey occupying thirty-six hours.”¹⁷ The usual travelling time for a stage-coach from Toronto to Montreal was between ninety and one hundred hours!

With the closure of Canada Baptist College, it would be a dozen years before the Ontario Baptist churches had another school of their own. The founding principal of that second school, the Canadian Literary Institute, would face similar challenges to Davies, but thankfully times were changing and the necessity of the school was increasingly recognized by Baptists in Ontario as the century wore on. Davies’ reasons for having such a school, though, would remain as valid in the late nineteenth century as they were in 1840. And this author deems them to be still wisdom as we seek both “a learned” and “a pious ministry.”

⁸ “Ministerial Education”, 194–195.

⁹ “Ministerial Education”, 195.

¹⁰ “Ministerial Education”, 195–196.

¹¹ “Ministerial Education”, 196.

¹² “Ministerial Education”, 197.

¹³ “Ministerial Education”, 197–198.

¹⁴ “Ministerial Education”, 198–199.

¹⁵ “Ministerial Education”, 200.

¹⁶ On Cramp, see Robert S. Wilson, “Cramp, John Mockett” in Lewis, ed., *Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, I, 266.

¹⁷ Theo T. Gibson, *Robert Alexander Fyfe: His Contemporaries and His Influence* (Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Co., 1998), 72.

¹ John Clark Marshman, *The Life and Times of Carey, Marshman and Ward* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1859), 1:105–106.

² A. H. Newman, “Sketch of the Baptists of Ontario and Quebec to 1851”, *The Baptist Year Book (Historical Number)* (1900), 80.³ Acts 20:20.

³ Newman, “Sketch of the Baptists”, 81–82.

⁴ For the story of the school, see George W. Campbell, “Canada Baptist College, 1838–1849. The Generation and Demise of a Pioneering Dream in Canadian Theological Education” (M.Th. thesis, Knox College, University of Toronto, 1974).

⁵ On Davies, see J. H. Y. Briggs, “Davies, Benjamin” in Donald M. Lewis, ed., *The Blackwell Dictionary of Evangelical Biography 1730–1860* (Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1995), I, 295.

⁶ *Montreal Register*, 3 (February 22, 1844), 2.

⁷ “Ministerial Education”, *The Canada Baptist Magazine*, 3, no.9 (March, 1840): 193.

Scholars celebrate Whitefield's evangelistic legacy in annual Fuller Center conference

BY S. CRAIG SANDERS

Thousands of people flocked to the Bruton Parish Church in colonial Virginia on Sunday, Dec. 16, 1739, to hear a famous young preacher they called the “heavenly comet.” Church members were joined by curious onlookers and some eager visitors who traveled a then-remarkable 14 miles to hear the powerful voice of George Whitefield proclaim the new birth.

Though he made no mention of it in his journal, the “grand itinerant” turned 25 years old that day. Despite his youth, Whitefield had already attained a level of popularity in Britain and colonial America that arguably no one has since matched. Turning to his text, Matthew 22:42, Whitefield asked the congregation a classic question: “What think ye of Christ?”

He was received with unusual warmth from the Anglican minister and faced no immediate controversy from his sermon. By the time Bruton Parish received letters from the Church of England to bar Whitefield from its pulpit, the evangelist was already on his way through the colonies for “the greatest preaching tour of any preacher since the missionary journeys of the Apostle Paul,” said Steven J. Lawson, president of OnePassion Ministries in Dallas, Texas.

Lawson, who wrote *The Evangelistic Zeal of*

George Whitefield, delivered a plenary address at the eighth annual conference for the Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary on “Whitefield and the Great Awakening,” Oct. 21-22. The two-day conference honoring the tricentennial of Whitefield’s birth featured key scholars such as Thomas S. Kidd, professor of history at Baylor University and author of the recent *George Whitefield: America’s Spiritual Founding Father*, and David Bebbington, professor of history at the University of Stirling and author of notable works on modern evangelicalism.

The reason Whitefield stirred so much anger with Anglican authorities, Lawson said, is because the evangelist used sermons like “What Think Ye of Christ?” to diagnose what he believed to be “the chief spiritual plague of the day: unconverted church members and, worse, unconverted ministers.”

“He saw the unconverted multitudes, but more than that, he saw the unconverted ministers who stood in pulpits,” Lawson said. “Whitefield saw the necessity of awakening slumbering sinners from their spiritual lethargy and from their lost condition.”

Whitefield’s preaching style was remarkable



Steven J. Lawson, president of OnePassion Ministries, delivers a plenary address, "Preaching George Whitefield," at the eighth annual conference for the Andrew Fuller Center at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Oct. 21.

because he needed no electric amplification to project his voice to thousands. His background in theater empowered his inflection in such a way contemporaries envied how he could pronounce "Mesopotamia" and deliver an exclamatory "O!" "Whitefield has been remembered as a preacher who might have graced the stage as much as the pulpit," said Bebbington. For many of his hearers, the action of his preaching was the most dominant trait, Bebbington said of Whitefield's legacy. Whitefield's content, however, was marked by rich Calvinist theology and a confrontation of sinners, both of which have carried on his legacy to the present.

"I fear many of us who are Reformed in our theology, who are Calvinistic, we never get to the 'come,'" Lawson said about Whitefield's evangelistic call in his sermons. "It's not simply stating the plan of salvation, we must go further — we must plead, we must invite, we must urge those who are without Christ to come to faith in him."

"Man is nothing," Whitefield wrote in a letter to his friend and theological opponent John Wesley, "he hath a free will to go to hell, but none to go to heaven, till God worketh in him."

His establishment of the Calvinistic Methodist Association in 1742 and decades-long theological controversy with John and Charles Wesley are evidence that Whitefield firmly rooted his evangelistic ministry and promotion of the new birth in the tenets of Calvinism.

"Whitefield's convictions about man's deep depravity melded with his belief in God's sovereignty and in God's predes-

tination of the elect to salvation to make him a principled Calvinist, in addition to being the most accomplished revival preacher of the era," Kidd said.

Whitefield's method of open-air preaching and the marketing strategy of publicizing his ministry and publishing his journals were innovative, Kidd said, but they did not detract from his traditional Calvinist teachings.

"I believe the doctrine of reprobation," Whitefield wrote, "that God intends to give saving grace, through Jesus Christ, only to a certain number, and that the rest of mankind, after the fall of Adam, being justly left of God to continue in sin, will at last suffer that eternal death, which is its proper wages."

His emphasis on the new birth prompted Whitefield to expand his evangelistic activities outside of the Church of England, preaching to and inspiring Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Baptists.

Whitefield declared he saw sincere Christians in every denomination, and thus filled pulpits for Congregationalist ministers like Jonathan Edwards and Presbyterian churches like the one in which he is buried in Newburyport, Massachusetts. Shubal Stearns and Daniel Marshall, who established the Baptist movement in the South, were converted under Whitefield's revivalist preaching.

"The roots of Southern Baptists in revivalism," Bebbington said, "are evident in the altar calls that still mark their services in all types of Southern Baptist churches to this day. Ultimately, that practice is testimony to the legacy of George Whitefield."

Often considered a pioneer of ecumenical cooperation in this regard, Whitefield "drew sharp theological lines when it came to the doctrine of



Thomas S. Kidd, author of "George Whitefield: America's Spiritual Father and professor of history at Baylor University

the new birth, as well as the doctrines of grace," Kidd said. "He believed that no one could preach a full, biblical gospel while neglecting Calvinist principles."

Even though he embraced an interdenominational spirit in his ministry, Whitefield's Calvinism drew from the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles, argued Lee Gatiss, director of the Anglican Church Society. "He always remained doctrinally in line with the Anglican heritage, even when he was being more venturesome in terms of institutional order," Gatiss said.

Yet it was Whitefield's defiance of Anglican church order in a church-age society that may have contributed to the American Revolution, said Jerome Mahaffey, professor of communication studies at



David Bebbington, professor of history at the University of Stirling and author of notable works on modern evangelicalism

Northern Arizona University.

“Political power, not religious doctrine, fueled the controversy surrounding the Great Awakening. There was no separation of church and state in the colonies,” said Mahaffey, who authored *The Accidental Revolutionary: George Whitefield and the Creation of America*. “Shifts in religion held a profound impact on the evolution of political thought, and shifts of emphasis in the ministry of George Whitefield enabled democratic ideas to go viral and plow the colonies into fertile ground for the republican spirit.”

Whitefield sympathized with Americans and helped overturn the Stamp Act placed on the colonies in 1765. His expansive ministry unified the colonies and provided a moral consciousness, Bebbington countered, “but he was no simple politician.”

The legacy of Whitefield’s Calvinism extends beyond the Great Awakening to a significant theological turn in the 20th century, said Bebbington. While a distaste for Calvinism marginalized Whitefield’s legacy in the centuries after his 1770 death, “his Calvinism was an active agent in sub-

sequent history” through the efforts of Banner of Truth Trust and the ministry of D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Bebbington said.

Whitefield’s evangelistic ministry remains a model for preachers today, according to Lawson. “The need of the hour is for spirit-empowered preachers of the Word of God,” said Lawson, who called for “an army of Whitefields in this land and around the world” to proclaim the nature and necessity of the new birth.

Other topics covered in the two-day conference included Whitefield’s piety, friendship with the Wesleys, and the hymnody of the Great Awakening.

Audio and video from the Andrew Fuller Conference are available at sbts.edu/resources.

This article originally appeared on Southern News, <http://news.sbts.edu/2014/10/27/scholars-celebrate-whitefields-evangelistic-legacy-in-annual-fuller-center-conference/>.

Baptists as Puritans: How Seventeenth-Century London Particular Baptists Viewed Themselves

BY STEVE WEAVER

If this essay were sub-titled “How Seventeenth-Century London Particular Baptists Were Viewed By Others” this would be a very different essay. Instead of “Baptists as Puritans,” its title proper would be “Baptists as Münster Anabaptists” or “Baptists as Uneducated, Illiterate, Tubbers.” One example will suffice to demonstrate the disdain with which these early Baptists were viewed. In 1647 an anonymous pamphlet was published in London titled *Tub-Preachers Overturn'd*¹ which derided the uneducated and unordained lay preachers of the period in no uncertain terms. This piece, which named the names of certain “illiterate, mechanic, nonsensical cobled-fustian-tubbers,”² provides a sense of the disdain with which the early uneducated preachers were viewed by their more educated contemporaries in the seventeenth century. Among those named in this pamphlet were prominent Baptists such as: Praise-God Barebones “*Barebones a Leatherseller*,” Thomas Lamb “*Lamb a Soapboiler*,” Thomas Patient “*Patience a Taylor*,” and William Kiffin “*Kiffin a Glover*.”³ This work added insult

to injury by deriding these Baptist ministers with words such as:

Yea sir, in sober sadness, ye shall have more sense when your illiterate numbers learn to read, then they'll love to write and speak sense when they cry up human learning, and other external properties, as these unlearned rabbles account them. Till [t]hen these volumes of necessity must increase with your numbers. You shall have fewer tales and more truths, when you forget your lying mother-tongue, as well as your Latin one. For take this for truth, so long as ye pray, preach, dispute nonsense, lies, and those knaveries ye are ashamed to own; in your own dialect they shall be repeated and thrown as dung in your face.⁴

This is but one example of many that might be given to demonstrate the condescending attitude of the educated ministers of the Church of England

toward their Baptist contemporaries during the 1640s. Things would begin to change during the Cromwellian period in the 1640s and 1650s as well as in the period of the 1670s and 1680s which has been labeled by B. R. White as “the era of the great persecution.”⁵ Nevertheless, there was a significant amount of animosity toward the Baptists throughout this period.

Defining Puritanism

By labeling the seventeenth-century British Particular Baptists as Puritans, I have opened quite a can of worms. The terms “Puritan” and “Puritanism” have been notoriously difficult to define.⁶ After all, no less of a scholar than John Coffey has admitted, “Historians have agonized over its definition.”⁷ Disagreements exist among scholars over almost every conceivable question related to the definition of Puritanism. Differences range widely and include the classic interrogatives of who, what, when, why, and where. For example, *who* were the Puritans? Should this term only apply to those within the Church of England during the Elizabethan period who were seeking to purify the Church, or does it only refer to the Political party during the Commonwealth of Oliver Cromwell? *What* were they seeking to do? To purify their churches, their personal lives, society, or all of the above? *When* did the Puritan period begin: with William Tyndale, William Perkins, or even Oliver Cromwell? *When* did the period end: with the end of the Elizabethan era, or with the ejection of 1662, or the death of Richard Baxter, or in 1700, in 1705, or in 1714? *Why* did they do what they did? Were they motivated politically or theologically? *Where* were they located? Was Puritanism merely a British phenomenon, or did it also have manifestations in New England?

Thankfully this essay is not about whether modern Puritan historiographers would include

the seventeenth-century English Particular Baptists in their definitions of Puritanism. Nor is it about whether the Puritans/Separatists themselves would recognize their Baptist counterparts as belonging to their tribe.⁸ This essay explores how these “particular” Baptists viewed themselves in relation to their contemporaries.

For the purposes of this essay, I am using an admittedly rather general definition of Puritanism. I am using the term to refer to that basic Puritan characteristic or instinct to draw all their faith and practice from the Scriptures. In his definition of Puritanism in his *The Worship of the English Puritans*,⁹ Horton Davies defined a Puritan as one “who longed for further reformation in England according to the Word of God.”¹⁰ Similarly, John Brown referred to “the fundamental idea of puritanism in all its manifestations” as being “the supreme authority of Scripture brought to bear upon the conscience.”¹¹ It is to this “fundamental idea of puritanism” which sought to bring the authority of Scripture to bear upon every aspect of life that the Particular Baptists of the seventeenth century were firmly committed. They, therefore, saw themselves as fitting comfortably within the broader Reformed/Puritan/Separatist movement of their day.

What evidence is there that Baptists saw themselves as Puritans?

There are at least three ways in which one might say that these Baptists saw themselves as Puritans. First, in regard to their origins. The Baptists under consideration in this essay sprang from the soil of Puritanism. Although sorting out the origins of the Particular Baptists, as Wm. Lloyd Allen once wrote, is “like trying to untangle a snarled fishing line in the dark,”¹² it appears that the mode of immersion was adopted by members of a church formed from a Separatist congregation made up

of believers previously working for reform within the Church of England. These former Puritans had left the Separatist congregation pastored by John Lathrop in 1633 to form their own Independent congregation after having become convinced that the New Testament taught the baptism of believers, although they remained unconvinced of the importance of the mode.¹³ By 1638, John Spilsbury had become the pastor of this congregation which met on Old Gravel Lane in Wapping and by January of 1641/2 the congregation had become committed to the position that the baptism of believers by immersion was the only valid New Testament baptism.¹⁴ This congregation would become the first Particular Baptist church, and is still in existence today as the oldest Baptist church in London.¹⁵

Second, these early Baptists consistently identified themselves confessionally with their Puritan counterparts in doctrine. Although there is no explicit reference to Puritan influence in the composition of the *First London Confession* in the confession itself, the framers used a Separatist confession as the main source along with other works authored by those of a Puritan mindset. James Renihan summarizes the source material utilized by these early Baptists.

The broad framework for the *Confession* is drawn from the 1596 *True Confession* of an English Separatist church which was gathered in exile in The Netherlands, and it was probably composed by Henry Ainsworth. This was supplemented by many excerpts from *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, an important theological work penned by the leading theologian of the exiles and separatists (and well-respected by non-separating puritans as well), William Ames.¹⁶

These sources seem to have been supplemented somewhat by the aforementioned John Spilsbury's personal confession of faith of ten articles appended to the end of his book *A Treatise Concerning the Lawfull Subject of Baptisme* published in 1643.

Like its predecessor, the *Second London Confession of Faith* (1677/1689) borrowed heavily from other Puritan/Separatist documents. This document was first published in 1677, but later adopted by the General Assembly of over 100 churches in 1689. This confession was largely based upon, what one historian called, "the most Puritan of documents, the Westminster Confession of Faith of 1647."¹⁷ In almost every case where the *Second London* differs from the Westminster, it follows the Savoy Declaration and Platform of Polity of 1658 crafted by Congregationalists including John Owen, whom one biographer called the "Prince of Puritans."¹⁸ Unlike the *First London Confession*, however, the framers of this confession clearly identified their sources in their introductory letter to the reader. They specifically mention the work done both by "the assembly" (i.e., Westminster) and "by those of the Congregational way."¹⁹ They also, quite helpfully provided an explanation of their rationale in using these sources. Namely, "to manifest our consent with both, in all the fundamental articles of the Christian Religion"²⁰ and to declare "our hearty agreement with them, in that wholesome Protestant Doctrine, which, with so clear evidence of Scriptures, they have asserted."²¹ By constructing their confessions from existing Puritan/Separatist documents, the London Particular Baptists self-consciously identified themselves with the wider Puritan movement.

Third, they read and quoted freely from the works of Puritans. Any reading of works written by William Kiffin, Hanserd Knollys, Benjamin Keach, or Hercules Collins reveals a vast familiarity with and general agreement with multiple

Puritan authors. In his book on studying and preaching, Hercules Collins recommends “to the consideration especially of those inclined to the ministry” a list of books that reads like a Banner of Truth catalogue.²² For example, he lists Matthew Poole’s commentaries, Joseph Caryl on Job, Stephen Charnock on the attributes of God, the works of William Perkins, Edward Leigh’s *Body of Divinity*, the works of Jeremiah Burroughs and those of Richard Sibbes, as well as the works of Edward Reynolds and those of John Preston, Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*, William Ames’ *Marrow of Divinity*, John Owen on the Trinity and numerous others.²³

The regulative principle as used by Baptists

While Baptists clearly identified themselves in the three ways listed, there is a fourth piece of evidence that settles the question altogether. It is the simple observation that whenever these Baptists differed from their Puritan counterparts, they did so based upon the fundamental Reformed/Puritan principle of the authority of Scripture over worship commonly referred to as the Regulative Principle. This principle was first articulated by the Genevan Reformer John Calvin in a treatise presented to the Imperial Diet at Speyer in 1544.²⁴ In his tract on *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*, Calvin wrote that “God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by His Word.”²⁵ Later in the same essay, Calvin drew the appropriate conclusion that “it ought to be sufficient for the rejection of any mode of worship, that it is not sanctioned by the command of God.”²⁶ By this standard, Calvin and the other Reformers rejected much of the accretions in the worship and practice of the Roman Catholic Church from the medieval period. But whatever forms of “fictitious worship” Calvin had in mind when he penned those words, it apparently did

not include infant baptism which was retained in the Reformed church of Geneva. Likewise, when the Puritan Jeremiah Burroughs offered the definitive treatment of the Regulative Principle in his posthumously-published *Gospel Worship*,²⁷ the practice of believer’s baptism by immersion seems to have been the farthest thing from his mind. The English Baptist historian Thomas Crosby, however, used this paedobaptist’s own words to argue for just that in his Preface to the first volume of his *The History of the English Baptists*.²⁸ In so doing, Crosby, who was himself the son-in-law of the prominent seventeenth-century Particular Baptist pastor Benjamin Keach, was merely following the pattern of seventeenth-century Baptists who had argued for believer’s baptism by immersion by means of this Puritan principle.

The early English Baptists argued for believer’s baptism by immersion based upon what John Spilsbury²⁹ would call “the plain testimony of Scripture.”³⁰ Spilsbury would therefore reject infant baptism, since “there is neither command, or example in all the New Testament for such practise.”³¹ Similarly, Hercules Collins³² rejected infant baptism because, as he said, “We have neither precept nor example for that practice in all the Book of God.”³³ Likewise John Norcott³⁴ would argue that sprinkling could not serve as a substitute for dipping, because “God is a jealous God, and stands upon small things in matters of Worship; ‘tis likely Nadab and Abihu thought, if they put fire in the Censer, it might serve, though it were not fire from the Altar; but God calls it strange fire, and therefore he burns them with strange fire, Leviticus 10:2–3.”³⁵ Given their understanding of the meaning of the word *baptizō*, they sought to apply the regulative principle more thoroughly than had Calvin or Burroughs and the Reformed/Puritan tradition which they represented.

Since these English Baptists were convinced

that the Greek word *baptizō* meant “to dip, wash, or to plunge one into the water;”³⁶ the mode of baptism was essential. Therefore the *First London Confession of Faith* (1644) defined “the way and manner” of baptism” as “dipping or plunging the whole body under water.”³⁷ To introduce another mode would be to disobey the clear command of Scripture since Christ had commanded that those who are taught are to be baptized and that those who believe are to be baptized. This argument was based upon the order in the Great Commission texts of Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16 respectively. Of the former text, Norcott’s interpretation was simply “when you have taught them, then baptize them.”³⁸ Of the latter text, Hercules Collins reasoned similarly: “Here is first Faith, then Baptism.”³⁹ Once again, these men argued from the plain sense of Scripture because they believed that God had the authority to order his worship.

Another type of biblical text used by the early Baptists in their defense of believer’s baptism was the examples of baptisms performed in the New Testament. These examples supplemented their understanding of the definition of *baptizō*. They include both the baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist and the numerous examples of baptisms of new believers in the book of Acts. John Norcott begins his treatise on baptism in the very first chapter with an account of the baptism of Christ in the river of Jordan. Norcott uses the baptism of Jesus to demonstrate that baptism is dipping. The fact that Matthew 3:4 says that Jesus came “up out of the water” proved that Jesus was immersed beneath the water. Else, “had he not been down, ‘twould not have bin said he went up.”⁴⁰ “We never say,” Norcott continued, “one goes out of the house when he never was in. So Christ could not be said to come out of the water, had he not been in.”⁴¹ Likewise, Hercules Collins cites John 3:23 which states, “John the Baptist baptized in Enon, because

there was much water there.” Collins responded to this verse by quipping, “if Sprinkling would have done, there had been no need of much Water nor Rivers.”⁴² Given these convictions, it should not be thought unusual that the *Second London Confession of Faith* (1689), of which Collins was a principal signer, stated so bluntly regarding baptism that: “Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of this ordinance.”⁴³

Collins’ commitment to the regulative principle is perhaps most clearly seen in the “Preface” to his catechism where, in the midst of an appeal for Christian unity based on a common commitment to the “fundamental principles and articles of the Christian faith,” he explains his “differing in some things about Church-constitution.” He expresses his hope that his zeal for “the true form of God’s house” will not be misunderstood. So he explains:

That God whom we serve is very jealous of his worship; and forasmuch as by his providence the law of his house hath been preserved and continued to us, we look upon it as our duty in our generation to be searching out the mind of God in his holy oracle, as Ezra and Nehemiah did the Feast of Tabernacles, and to reform what is amiss; As Hezekiah, who took a great deal of pains to cleanse the House of God, and set all things in order, that were out of order, particularly caused the people to keep the Passover according to the Institution: for it had not, saith the text, been of a long time kept in such sort as it was written; and albeit the pure institutions of Christ were not for some hundreds of years practiced according to the due order, or very little, through the innovations of antichrist; and as circum-

cision for about forty years was unpracticed in the wilderness, yet as Joshua puts this duty in practice as soon as God signified his mind in that particular, so we having our judgments informed about the true way of worship, do not dare to stifle the light God hath given us.⁴⁴

Though baptism may have been largely lost for centuries, it had now been recovered as a direct result of the renewed emphasis on the authority and sufficiency of the Word of God in the Protestant Reformation. Collins' zeal for worship regulated by God's Word drove him to reject the human innovation of infant baptism. In so doing, he was never more true to the spirit of Puritanism.

Conclusion

For seventeenth-century Baptists, both the mode and the recipients of baptism were vitally important. Their defense of the practice of believer's baptism by immersion was driven by their commitment to the Regulative Principle of Worship. Ironically, it is in this important area of difference from mainstream Puritan thought that the Baptist solidarity with Puritanism is most clearly seen. Infant baptism simply could not be found in Scripture, and therefore must be rejected at any cost. Believer's baptism by immersion, however, was "the plain testimony of Scripture" and was therefore to be defended at any cost.

The commitment to the authority of Scripture by these early Baptists has been noted by other interested observers. In 1871, the Anglican George Herbert Curteis delivered the Bampton Lectures at the University of Oxford.⁴⁵ These lectures were published the next year under the title *Dissent, in its Relation to the Church of England*.⁴⁶ In one of his eight lectures, he addressed the Baptists. As an Anglican in the latter part of the nineteenth cen-

ture, he rejected the validity of both Puritanism in general and its Baptist manifestation in particular. In the lecture, Curteis expressed his own ardent desire that the separation between the Baptists and the National Church would be temporary.⁴⁷ Significantly though, while discussing the principles which led to the Baptists independence from the Church of England, he opined about the essence of Baptist identity:

Now all these three principles are closely connected together; and indeed they are all, fundamentally, one. And that one fundamental principle is—Puritanism. Yes; the Baptists are essentially and *kat' evxoch.n* 'Puritans;' and—I think it must be honestly confessed—they, and they only, are really consistent and logically unassailable Puritans. If Puritanism is true, the Baptist system is right. If Puritanism is a grand mistake, and the most singularly unchristian of all the (so to say) 'orthodox' misapprehensions of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, then the Baptist system falls to the ground of itself.⁴⁸

The argument of this essay has been that this assessment is not just a nineteenth-century Anglican view of the relationship between Baptists and Puritanism; it also reflects the way the Baptists of the period under consideration viewed themselves.

¹ Anonymous, *Tub-preachers overturn'd or Independency to be abandon'd and abhor'd as destructive to the majestacy and ministry, of the church and common-wealth of England* (London: George Lindsey, 1647).

² *Tub-preachers overturn'd*, 14.

³ *Tub-preachers overturn'd*, 15. Only the last names are given;

as the anonymous author indicates on the title page, “Reader, I cannot inform thee of their christen [*sic*] names because ‘tis questionable whether they have any.”

⁴ *Tub-preachers overturn’d*, 13.

⁵ For a survey of this period, see B.R. White, *The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century* (Didcot, Oxfordshire: The Baptist Historical Society, 1996), 95–133.

⁶ For example, see Brian H. Cosby, “Toward a Definition of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Puritanism’: A Study in Puritan Historiography,” *Churchman* 122:4 (2008), 297–314; and Ian Hugh Clary, “Hot Protestants: A Taxonomy of English Puritanism,” *Puritan Reformed Journal* 2:1 (2010), 41–66.

⁷ John Coffey, “Puritanism, evangelicalism and the evangelical protestant tradition,” in Michael A. G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds., *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities* (Nashville, TN: BH Academic, 2008), 255.

⁸ R. Scott Clark has recently raised this issue in a recent blog post “Six reasons I can’t agree with Carl on the definition of Reformed.” He wrote in the 28 June 2012 post that “when the Particular Baptist movement developed in the 17th century, the Reformed churches did not embrace them as Reformed.” See <http://pilgrimagetogeneva.com/2012/06/28/six-reasons-i-cant-agree-with-carl-on-the-definition-of-reformed-dr-r-scott-clark/>. I am not convinced Clark is correct on this point. Further research is needed, but John Coffey’s essay: “From Marginal to Mainstream: How ‘Anabaptists’ became ‘Baptists’” (Presented at ICOBS VI, July 2012) seems to have sufficiently refuted this viewpoint.

⁹ Horton Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans* (Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1997).

¹⁰ Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans*, 11.

¹¹ John Brown, *The English Puritans: The Rise and Fall of the Puritan Movement* (Fearn, Tain, Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 1998), 17.

¹² Wm. Lloyd Allen, “Baptist Baptism and the Turn toward Believer’s Baptism by Immersion: 1642” in *Turning Points in Baptist History: A Festschrift in Honor of Harry Leon McBeth*, eds. Michael E. Williams, Sr. and Walter B. Shurden (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2008), 37.

¹³ James Edward McGoldrick, *Baptist Successionism: A Crucial Question in Baptist History* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2000), 130.

¹⁴ McGoldrick, *Baptist Successionism*, 131–132.

¹⁵ For the history of the church, see Ernest F. Kevan, *London’s Oldest Baptist Church: Wapping 1633—Walthamstow 1933* (London: Kingsgate Press, 1933).

¹⁶ James M. Renihan, *True Confessions: Baptist Documents in the Reformed Family* (Palmdale, CA: Reformed Baptist Academic Press, 2004), 3. See also Jay Travis Collier, “The Sources Behind the First London Confession,” *American Baptist Quarterly*, 31:2

(June 2002): 197–214.

¹⁷ James M. Renihan, *Edification and Beauty: The Practical Ecclesiology of the English Particular Baptists, 1675-1705* (Colorado Springs, CO: Paternoster, 2008), 18.

¹⁸ Andrew Thomson, *John Owen: Prince of Puritans* (Fearn, Tain, Ross-shire: Christian Focus Publications, 2004).

¹⁹ “To the Judicious and Impartial Reader” in *The Baptist Confession of Faith The Baptist Catechism* (Birmingham, AL: Solid Ground Christian Books/Carlisle, PA: Reformed Baptist Publications, 2010), xii.

²⁰ “To the Judicious and Impartial Reader”, xiii.

²¹ “To the Judicious and Impartial Reader”, xiii.

²² Hercules Collins, *The Temple Repair’d: Or, An Essay to revive the long-neglected Ordinances, of exercising the spiritual Gift of Prophecy for the Edification of the Churches; and of ordaining Ministers duly qualified* (London: William and Joseph Marshal, 1702), 49.

²³ Collins, *Temple Repair’d*, 49–50.

²⁴ For the historical context of Calvin’s writing of the tract, see Bruce Gordon, *Calvin* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 163–164.

²⁵ John Calvin, “The Necessity of Reforming the Church” in *Tracts Related to the Reformation*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Edinburgh: The Calvin Translation Society, 1844), 1:128.

²⁶ *Tracts Related to the Reformation*, trans. Beveridge, 1:133.

²⁷ Jeremiah Burroughs, *Gospel Worship* (Repr. Morgan, PA: Soli Deo Gloria Publications, 1990).

²⁸ Thomas Crosby, *The History of the English Baptists* (London, 1738), I, xi–xiii.

²⁹ John Spilsbury (sometimes spelt Spilsbery) was the first pastor of London’s oldest Baptist church. According to B.R. White, John Spilsbury was the first of the Particular Baptists to “preach and practice believer’s baptism” and his *A Treatise Concerning the Lawfull Subject of Baptisme* (1643) was “the first known publication on the subject by a Calvinist” (*The English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century* [London: The Baptist Historical Society, 1996], 72). For a biographical and theological sketch of Spilsbury, see James M. Renihan, “John Spilsbury (1593–c.1662/1668),” in Michael A.G. Haykin, ed., *The British Particular Baptists: 1638–1910* (Springfield, MO: Particular Baptist Press, 1998), 1:21–37.

³⁰ John Spilsbery, *A Treatise Concerning the Lawfull Subject of Baptism* (2nd ed.; London: Henry Hills, 1652), unnumbered page 3 of “The Epistle to the Reader.”

³¹ Spilsbury, *Lawfull Subject of Baptism*, unnumbered page 3 of “The Epistle to the Reader.”

³² Hercules Collins served as the third pastor of London’s oldest Baptist church. For details on the life of Hercules Collins, see Michael A.G. Haykin “The Piety of Hercules Collins (1646/7–1702)” in *Devoted to the Service of the Temple: Piety*,

Persecution, and Ministry in the Writings of Hercules Collins, eds. Michael A.G. Haykin and Steve Weaver (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2007), 1–30.

³³ Hercules Collins, *An Orthodox Catechism* (London, 1680), 26–27.

³⁴ John Norcott was the second pastor of the Wapping congregation, following John Spilsbury upon his death in either 1662 or 1668.

³⁵ John Norcott, *Baptism Discovered Plainly Faithfully, According to the Word of God* (London, 1672), 19.

³⁶ Spilsbury, *A Treatise Concerning the Lawfull Subject of Baptism*, unnumbered page 3 of “The Epistle to the Reader”.

³⁷ William L. Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1969), 6.

³⁸ Norcott, *Baptism Discovered Plainly Faithfully*, 10.

³⁹ Hercules Collins, *Believers-Baptism from Heaven, and of Divine Institution. Infants-Baptism from Earth, and Human Invention* (London, 1691), 8.

⁴⁰ Norcott, *Baptism Discovered Plainly and Faithfully*, 5.

⁴¹ Norcott, *Baptism Discovered Plainly and Faithfully*, 5.

⁴² Collins, *Believer's Baptism from Heaven*, 16.

⁴³ Lumpkin, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, 291.

⁴⁴ Collins, *An Orthodox Catechism*, Preface.

⁴⁵ Special thanks to Joachim Rieck of Namibia, Africa, who alerted me to these lectures through our mutual friend Richard Barcellos.

⁴⁶ George Herbert Curteis, *Dissent, in its Relation to the Church of England* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1872).

⁴⁷ Curteis, *Dissent*, 211.

⁴⁸ Curteis, *Dissent*, 212–213.



BOOK REVIEWS

Adam Embry, *Keeper of the Great Seal of Heaven: Sealing of the Spirit in the Life and Thought of John Flavel* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011).

In this slim volume, Adam Embry achieves something quite remarkable. The author offers the reader a contextually sensitive biographical introduction to the life, labors, and writings of John Flavel, while also outlining the major contours of Flavel's doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He especially presents Flavel's view of the sealing of the Spirit as it develops in his writings, and contrasts it with other English Puritans. And he discusses Flavel's influence on later evangelical leaders such as Jonathan Edwards, Archibald Alexander, and Martyn Lloyd-Jones. And he accomplishes all this in one hundred and six pages! Those who want to know more about John Flavel in general, and his doctrine of the sealing of the Spirit in particular, will surely enjoy and benefit from Embry's work.

Bennett Rogers, PhD student,
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Thomas Schirrmacher, *Be keen to get going: William Carey's Theology*, trans. Cambron Teupe (Hamburg: Reformatorischer Verl. Beese, 2001).

A full-blown study of Carey's theology is long overdue. This small study—twenty-four pages or of text with twenty pages of footnotes—is not that study, but a great taster. Schirrmacher, a widely published missiologist and historian of missions, particularly focuses on Carey's eschatology (p.9–24)—a key foundational element of his missiology—and then briefly discusses Carey's Calvinism and social vision (p.25–31). While the former section is very helpful, the latter is somewhat inadequate. Much more is needed to outline Carey's commitment to the doctrines of grace. It would have been particularly helpful, for example, to have looked at his doctrine of the cross. From what I have seen, references to the doctrine of particular redemption are especially scarce in Carey's writings. That he believed in such, I do not doubt. He was, after all, sent out to India by the "Particular Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Among the Heathen." But how exactly did

he express his views on this issue? Nevertheless, this is an excellent entry-point for what is greatly needed: a study of Carey's Calvinism.

Michael A.G. Haykin
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Regina D Sullivan, *Lottie Moon: A Southern Baptist Missionary to China in History and Legend*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.

Charlotte Digges “Lottie” Moon (1840–1912) is arguably the most well-known Southern Baptist missionary. Generations of Baptists have told and re-told her story: born in the antebellum South into the Virginia planter society, Moon was precocious, mischievous, and independent. She was converted in her late teenage years, earned two academic degrees, and taught at schools in Kentucky and Georgia before being appointed a missionary to China in 1873. Lottie ministered in China for the better part of four decades despite significant difficulties of culture, language, war, disease, and famine. She died emaciated and penniless on a boat in the Kobe harbor just after her seventy-second birthday, having sacrificed herself for the starving Chinese nationals whom she loved dearly. These facts are well-known, inspiring, and, according to historian Regina Sullivan, long misinterpreted or almost totally wrong. One of Sullivan’s intentions in *Lottie Moon* is “to strip away the layers of misinformation that have built up since [Moon’s] death in 1912” (p.2). Another of Sullivan’s objectives is to “bring what was hidden into the open” concerning the founding of the Woman’s Missionary Union (WMU) and Moon’s role in its establishment (p.3). At some points Sul-

livan accomplishes these goals, but at others she adds fresh layers that obscure this remarkable woman.

Lottie Moon is an updated version of Sullivan’s doctoral dissertation from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (2002). In five meticulously-documented chapters, Sullivan builds her case that Lottie Moon was strongly influenced by “woman’s rights ideology” and a proponent of a woman’s right to serve God in any way she deemed best, to organize with other women to accomplish ministerial goals (p.10), to challenge the gender norms of the pre-war south (p.22), to serve as a “female activist” within a male denominational hegemony (p.160), essentially “to create her own life” (p.31). Sullivan challenges nearly every aspect of the “Lottie Moon story,” her term for the narrative offered by earlier biographers, the WMU, and denominational leaders, whom Sullivan contends have shaped Moon’s biography for their own purposes. Perhaps Sullivan’s most insightful contribution is to dispel the legend of Moon starving herself to help the Chinese nationals suffering famine. Sullivan has given ample evidence to the contrary, demonstrating that Moon’s failing health and the onset of a dementia was likely the cause of her starvation and that her missionary colleagues disputed the hunger strike story for years (p.150–159). Sullivan’s presentation of the founding of the WMU is utterly fascinating in its detail and insight. Her understanding of regional and global politics and of the variety of failed approaches employed by some western missionaries is very helpful. Sullivan notes that some leaders within the Southern Baptist Convention have cast Lottie Moon as a “female Christ-figure,” a comparison that Lottie would have surely rejected. Sullivan is right to assert that Lottie Moon’s

legacy has been used by denominational leaders, but she fails to note the same tendency in her own work.

Without disclosing her method, Regina Sullivan has reinterpreted Lottie Moon's life through a gender-centric hermeneutic. One sees this emphasis throughout the book in a sustained refrain of negative masculine portrayals (p.4, 27, 31, 54, 59, 101, 113, 163, 167–168, etc.) and unsustainable assertions about the inner motivations of men like Henry Tupper (p.34), and the nameless “many Southern Baptist men” who supposedly feared losing their authority should women be allowed to organize into religious societies (p.59). Although Sullivan states at the outset that the book contains a “critical study” of Moon's religious ideology and use of woman's rights language (p.1), her analysis is hardly balanced. In her conclusion, Sullivan states that Moon's “religious conviction” led her to the mission field, yet throughout the book she rarely explores the content and contours of Moon's theology, apparently assuming that Moon's views were similar to her own (p.4). Missing is substantive discussion of the Christian tradition to which Moon subscribed and articulated and which sustained her through the dangers and difficulty of her self-sacrificing work in China, and, contrary to Sullivan's uncertainty (p.56), led to her breaking her engagement with C.H. Toy. Absent is any mention of the influence of John Broaddus and other men on Moon's early Christian formation. Ignored are those pieces of evidence that show that Moon largely submitted herself to denominational authority. While Sullivan has done an admirable job of returning to the primary sources over earlier hagiographies, the key weakness is that she does not allow Moon's own theological convictions to shape her story, which would look

very different than the version she has constructed.

While Lottie Moon may not have starved herself to death, she certainly served herself to death by foregoing many of the benefits afforded her. The critical question that Sullivan fails to answer is, “Why?” What motivated Lottie Moon's zeal for taking the Christian gospel to China? Why would she sacrifice so much for what appeared to be little return? To reduce Lottie's gospel-centered missionary activism to a desire to flaunt male authority (p.113) while pursuing her own “professional goals” (p.171) seems to cheapen the sacrifice of this remarkable woman.

Joe Harrod

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

John Piper, *Andrew Fuller: I Will Go Down If You Will Hold the Rope!* (Minneapolis, MN: Desiring God Foundation, 2012). Available at <http://www.desiringgod.org/resource-library/books/andrew-fuller>.

Over the past twenty-four years John Piper has annually given a lecture on a figure from church history. A number of them have already been published in *The Swans Are Not Silent* series. Now, Piper's desiringGod ministry is making some of those not published in this series available for free as a PDF file, an EPUB file for readers like the Nook, Sony Reader, and Apple iBooks (iPad, iPhone, iPod) or a MOBI file for Kindle applications. I chose to read this mini-biography of Andrew Fuller as a PDF file that I printed off and made into a small booklet.

This biography was originally given by Piper in February, 2007, as “Holy Faith, Worthy Gospel, World Vision: Andrew Fuller’s Broad-sides Against Sandemanianism, Hyper-Calvinism, and Global Unbelief” (still available at <http://www.desiringgod.org/resource-library/biographies/holy-faith-worthy-gospel-world-vision>; accessed August 6, 2012). In the newly-published version of the 2007 lecture, little has been changed (two references, notes 10 and 13, which refer the reader to an online source that is no longer available, should have been changed). And a typographical error from the original lecture—a misspelling of Samuel Pearce’s surname as Pierce (p.4)—should also have been corrected. The opening paragraph of the original lecture has been omitted from the newly-published version, which causes some problems since Piper refers to it later (see p.2, final paragraph). What is new is a portrait of Fuller drawn for this booklet (opposite p.1).

Piper considers Fuller to be “an unusually brilliant theologian,” whose writings may have a greater impact on future generations than they have already had on past generations (p.2). The latter impact has been quite considerable, for in a very real sense his thought—wrought in a context of personal suffering (p.3, 7) and close engagement with Scripture—lay at the foundation of the modern missionary movement in the late eighteenth century. Piper identifies two areas of Fuller’s thought that are particularly important for the rise of modern missions: his controversy with Hyper-Calvinism that helped remove theological impediments to mission in the lives of far too many of his Baptist contemporaries (p.11–18) and his debate with Sandemanianism (p.18–23) that sharpened Fuller’s understanding of the faith that justifies. Piper concludes that Fuller teaches us, among other

things, that getting core doctrines right actually helps advance world missions (p.24). *In fine*, “holy faith plus worthy gospel yields world vision” (p.26). Finally, the irony of Fuller’s ministry has to be the fact that his day, the “cool and rational eighteenth century,” gave birth to the “greatest missionary movement in world history” (p.2).

Although there is a lot more that can be said about Fuller—it should occasion no surprise that Piper does not miss Fuller’s profound Edwardsean-ism (p.10–11)—this is a very helpful introduction to some key issues in Fuller’s life and thought as well as his importance in the history of Christianity.

Michael A.G. Haykin

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

PS This booklet has been published by The Andrew Fuller Center for Baptist Studies since the writing of this review and is available from the Center.

Phillip L. Simpson, *A Life of Gospel Peace: A Biography of Jeremiah Burroughs* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011).

A Life of Gospel Peace by Phil Simpson is the first full-length biography of the Puritan, Jeremiah Burroughs. In this work Burroughs’ ministry from his first charge at Stisted in Essex (a little known fact) is documented with many references to Burroughs’ own works. The work is highly commended as the reading of it will fill a number of gaps in Burroughs’ life (e.g., his relationship there with Calamy while at Bury St Edmunds). The early chapters prepare us for chapters 7 and 8, which highlight Burroughs as a first-rate preacher. The

remaining chapters give helpful insights to other aspects of Burroughs' life (e.g., his views on Independence). I have, however, a few queries; for example: Why is southern Essex placed in East Anglia (p.1)? And why did it take a least 18 months for him to be baptised (p. 2)? There are a few other queries, but they are all like the above, minor ones and do not detract from a very fine piece of work.

Jim Davison, Part-Time Lecturer in Church History in the Institute of Theology,
Queen's University Belfast, N. Ireland.



The *Andrew Fuller*

Center for Baptist Studies

at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Michael A.G. Haykin, Director
2825 Lexington Rd, Louisville, KY 40206