

**“The Facts
in the Case”**

• • • Examined



Reply to J. H. Eaton

• • • • By Geo. H. Lofton

“THE FACTS IN THE CASE” EXAMINED.

REPLY TO J. H. EATON,

BY

GEO. A. LOFTON.

I have carefully examined the tract with the above title from Mr. J. H. Eaton. Before referring to his charges against Dr. Whitsitt, I wish to notice his animadversions upon the brethren who met in Nashville in the interest of peace and brotherhood and whom he styles a “self-appointed committee,” which declared that Dr. Whitsitt had been “greatly misrepresented,” presumably by him, and for which reason he issued the document to which I now reply. He does “all the more cheerfully” answer for himself, he says, because “*many* of the twenty members of the committee are *honorable* and *intelligent* men, who would not have sent out Dr. Whitsitt’s circular under the aegis of their reputations, if they had read it or the pamphlet to which it is an answer.” In all this he deceiveth himself. We had the so-called “Real Issue, etc.,” before us, and Dr. Whitsitt’s paper was not only written by the request of the “committee,” but was submitted to a sub-committee and sent to the members of the council for examination before publication, to all of which the most critical of that body agreed as sufficient and satisfactory, even unto this day.

The insinuation that *some* of the "twenty members of this committee" are not "honorable and intelligent men," by saying that "many of them *are*" such, comes with very bad grace from one claimed to be so young and who has played such a part in this contention. Besides this, so far as I know, none of us who have been on the defensive among this "committee," have given any provocation for this reproach upon our honor and intelligence by the author of the "Real Issue" and "The Facts in the Case"; nor have we merited the insulting stigma, at the hands of this very young man, of being "god-fathers" to Dr. Whitsitt. There are some among these "honorable and intelligent" men of sufficient age, dignity and distinction to call for consideration and reverence by one whose youth has been pleaded for his indiscretion in some of the wild and capricious utterances he has made; and it is possible that he has had several godfathers in the part he has played. He should, at least, remember that Dr. Whitsitt has friends to defend him, as well as enemies to defame him; and he should give these friends credit for honesty and the right of conviction to defend, without being called godfathers, one who, while he is abundantly able to take care of himself, has only too modestly left himself and his cause to stand upon their merits.

But I proceed now to the examination of the so-called "Facts in the Case"; and I shall notice in their order the charges and specifications preferred against Dr. Whitsitt as follows:

I—CHARGE: "UN SOUNDNESS AS A BAPTIST."

1.—Specification: "*His position that an unimmersed person may be a Baptist.*"

This specification is based upon Dr. Whitsitt's use of the word "Baptists," as applicable to the

Anabaptists who had been sprinkled, or poured upon in England prior to 1641 and who did not adopt immersion until 1641. Therefore, it is concluded as his position that "*immersion is not essential to baptism, and that baptism is not essential to church fellowship.*" In the Nashville circular Dr. Whitsitt explains: "All that I intended was to affirm that these Baptists had been Anabaptists up to the year 1641"; that "these parties were, strictly speaking, Anabaptists, but inasmuch as they shortly became Baptists, they are here spoken of as Baptists," claiming a similar use of the word "Baptists" as employed by Crosby and others in speaking of the Anabaptists before they restored immersion in England. It is urged, however, that Dr. Whitsitt's language in the *Independent*, Johnson's Cyclopaedia and the *Examiner*, during a period of sixteen years, is impossible of his explanation; therefore, he meant what he said, and is a liar, or else his explanation is at the "expense of his intellect" and he is a fool, or words to that effect!

The language of the *Independent* editorial, June 24, 1880, is quoted against him; and two particular passages are specially selected to vindicate the above specification with the further charge that he meant to argue "*in favor of sprinkling [as the true mode of baptism] based upon the claim that the Baptists themselves once sprinkled.*" The passages from the *Independent* are as follows: "The verdict of antiquity among the Baptists is in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the true mode of Baptism." Again: "The English Baptists never dreamed of the possibility of immersing *an adult person* as a religious ceremony before the year 1641." Keep in mind that Dr. Whitsitt here not only explains that by the word "Baptists," he meant Anabaptists who shortly be-

came Baptists in 1641, but that he qualifies his explanation in the second quotation by reference only to the "English Baptists," who, strictly speaking, became such in 1641.

But he says that the "verdict of antiquity among the Baptists" of England, that is, among the Anabaptists, who shortly became Baptists in 1641, "is in favor of sprinkling, or pouring, as the true mode of Baptism." Well, this is a fact so far as the *practice* of these English Anabaptists is concerned, and so of their first organized church or churches, before 1641, if sprinkling or pouring was their mode of baptism. In other words this is a question of history, and not of Dr. Whitsitt's opinion; or it is a question of historical usage as to the word "Baptists," and not of Dr. Whitsitt's orthodoxy, with regard to the mode of baptism and that to which it is essential. He limits the "verdict of antiquity" to the practice of the English Anabaptists and to the year 1641, as to sprinkling; but after this date, so far as these same Baptists were concerned, he *historically* changes the "verdict" in favor of immersion. In neither case does he say anything about the verdict of the Scriptures, or of his own opinion as to the "true mode of Baptism;" and hence he is speaking of baptism purely from a historical standpoint, and of the word "Baptists," from the standpoint of historical usage. Therefore, he never meant to argue that "sprinkling," based upon Baptist practice, was the true mode of baptism; nor did he dream of holding the position that immersion was not essential to baptism, or that baptism is not essential to church fellowship.

It may be claimed that in the *Independent* editorial he was writing as a Baptist from a Pedobaptist standpoint, but, even then, he does not

assume the Pedobaptist position that Baptist practice prior to 1641 was not only the “verdict of antiquity”—that is, of history—but also of the Scriptures as to the “true mode of baptism;” and hence his statement, with his explanation, implies nothing more than historical facts and usage, without any reference to his opinion, or purpose to argue in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the true mode of baptism. Mr. J. H. Eaton ought to understand this. He wrote once from a Methodist standpoint, assuming, if I remember, that Dr. Whitsitt’s position, endorsed by the Southern Baptist Convention, and the Board of Trustees, favored Pedobaptist sprinkling or pouring, and so commended Dr. Whitsitt’s book to the favorable consideration of his Methodist brethren, in an article signed, “W. N. M(iller).” Dr. Whitsitt never went so far as W. N. M. did; but everybody knows that our very young brother Eaton never meant what he said, as a Baptist, in that Methodist article. He was simply only playing Methodist just to get a handle with which to beat Dr. Whitsitt over the head. He was a sound Baptist, even under the sin of his pseudonym.

But Dr. Whitsitt’s explanation in the Nashville circular, together with his true position, is found in his book (*A Question, &c*, p. 5) 1896. He says: “As I understand the Scriptures, *immersion is essential to Christian baptism.*” He avers that this is a “closed question” among Baptists. “The issue before us,” he says, “is far different, namely: Whether the immersion of adult believers was practiced in England before the year 1641? Whether these English people first adopted immersion for baptism in or about the year 1641?” This is his meaning in the *Independent* editorial, the Johnson Cyclopaedia and the *Examiner* article, including his explanation in the

Nashville circular; and we see that this passage includes also Dr. Whitsitt's orthodoxy upon the mode of baptism as "*immersion*." His latter statement should be accepted as an explanation of his former statement; and when this is done it becomes clear that by the "verdict of antiquity" he never meant to express an opinion that sprinkling or pouring was the true mode of baptism, nor that immersion was not essential to baptism, nor that Baptism was not essential to church fellowship.

But a word as to Dr. Whitsitt's historical usage of the word "Baptists" before their adoption of immersion in 1641. In his circular he cites Crosby, Bampfield and Robinson as so using the word; but J. H. E. takes particular care not to quote Dr. Whitsitt's citations in his tract. Worse than all, he utterly perverts Crosby in his use of the word "Baptists" whom the historian so calls long *before* they "restored" immersion in England. He prefaces his account of the restoration of the ordinance by the 'English Baptists' with the statement that "immersion had been for some time disused;" and he proceeds to show that it was restored by two distinct methods, (1) by sending to Holland for a succession administrator, and (2) by receiving it through an anti-succession administrator. Hence he says (Vol. I, p. 100): "The two other methods that I mentioned were indeed both taken by the *Baptists* at their *revival of immersion* in England, as I find it *acknowledged* and *justified* in their writings." He shows on page 103 that the "greatest number of the *English Baptists*, and the more judicious," as he calls them, restored immersion through an unbaptized administrator. The logic of it is that he calls these Anabaptists who were sprinkling or pouring for baptism prior to 1641, "Baptists," who restored

immersion in 1640-41; and Crosby and Whitsitt are exactly together in the usage.

Dr. Whitsitt also cited the caption of the Bampfield document (Review of the Question, p. 232), which was no doubt, the basis of Crosby's usage and which reads thus: "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 been so baptized to be found." Dr. Whitsitt and Bampfield are precisely together in the use of the word "Baptists."

Likewise the Baptist historian Robinson (Hist. Baptism, p. 547, 1790,) at a later date, says: "The Dutch *Baptists* reject infant baptism, and administer the ordinance only to such as profess faith and repentance; but they baptize by *pouring*."

According to early historical usage, Dr. Whitsitt is right in calling the Anabaptists "Baptists," who practiced believers' baptism whether they practiced immersion or not. The practice of believers' baptism was regarded by these early historians as the central principle and peculiarity of the Baptists; and hence the Anabaptists before they restored immersion were pointed back to as "Baptists," especially those who became Baptists, although Robinson calls the Dutch Anabaptists, "Baptists," who never adopted immersion. Such men as Crosby, Robinson and Bampfield followed this usage, however *strictly* incorrect, without the slightest idea of denying that immersion was essential to baptism, or that baptism was essential to church membership or fellowship, and with never a dream that sprinkling or pouring was ever a true mode of baptism; and what was true of such men as these is true of Dr. Whitsitt. Cathcart (Ancient British and

Irish Churches, p. 164.) speaks of Patrick as being "substantially a Baptist," but he does not call him *strictly* such. Dr. Newman says of the Continental Anabaptists of the 16th Century (Review of the Question, p. 173): "They were not *regular* Baptists, but they were thoroughly imbued with Baptist principles." Bampfield, Crosby, Robinson, Whitsitt mean no more than this.

Rev. Dr. J. B. Thomas says: "It is, of course, true that many of the mixed, and some of the distinct Baptist churches of to-day did spring out of Independent bodies; but it is by no means clear that all did so." (Both sides, p. 47). The expression "mixed Baptist churches," as employed in the above sentence indicates greater looseness of usage than has been laid to the charge of Dr. Whitsitt. "In a mixed Baptist church," some of the members are baptized by immersion and others by sprinkling. Those who are baptized by sprinkling must be as truly baptized as those who are baptized by immersion, for according to Dr. Thomas they are all alike Baptists. Why does not Mr. J. H. Eaton assert that Dr. Thomas holds that "an unimmersed person may be a Baptist" just as truly as an immersed person? Why does he not declare that Dr. Thomas holds that "immersion is not essential to baptism?" Why does he not also bring the same charges against the *Western Recorder*, which published the above sentence from Dr. Thomas, without a word of protest or comment?

Dr. Whitsitt is quoted as calling the Anabaptists who sprinkled before 1641, "our Baptist people." It is absurdly asked: "Did he mean our Anabaptist people." If so, then it is absurdly concluded: "If sprinklers are 'our Baptist people', then sprinkling is our baptism." All that is meant by calling the

Anabaptists before 1641 "our Baptist people" is that they were *substantially* such, because, though not "*regular Baptists*," they were "*thoroughly imbued with Baptist principles*;" and this no more claims their sprinkling than many other errors they had, worse than sprinkling, both before and after their restoration of immersion in England. Circumcision nor uncircumcision, baptism nor unbaptism, *essentially* makes a Baptist; and thousands of immersionists, to-day, are not half so close kin to us as those Anabaptists, who though they sprinkled, yet held the principle of believers' baptism—"were thoroughly imbued with Baptist principles"—and died for them. It takes more than immersion to make a Baptist—although he is not strictly such without immersion.

2.—Specification: *Dr. Whitsitt's belief that a wife should join the church of her husband, because the family comes before the church.*"

This same charge, certified to by several brethren then as now, was preferred against Dr. Whitsitt before the Board of Trustees, at Wilmington. His reply was: "It was never my intention to indicate a belief that the family outranked the Church of God. I believe that obedience to God's command is above every other human duty, and that people *in every relation of life* ought to obey God rather than man." Dr. Whitsitt firmly abides by this statement as his belief on the subject, and he affirms that whatever he may have said of the family as being the first or oldest institution of God by precedence of time, he never meant to say that as a matter of divine authority it had any claim to precedence in settling our relationship in the church. As a matter of conviction in some instances, the wife sometimes feels that it is her duty to go with

her husband, and we concede her liberty to follow her convictions; but Dr. Whitsitt maintains that no wife ought to join the church of her husband against her convictions. When she changes her views she ceases to be a Baptist, and Baptists would cease to retain her in church fellowship. On the other hand, Baptists could not receive a Pedobaptist wife wishing to join with her husband, unless she became a Baptist in principle. In either case, it is a matter of conscience between the wife and her God; and she ought to follow her conscience in matters of faith according to a fundamental Baptist principle. This is what I understand Dr. Whitsitt to teach. As a matter of indifference or expediency a Baptist wife sometimes feels it to be her duty to go with her Pedobaptist husband; and if it is a matter of conscience with her, it is still a question of *moral* obligation to be settled between herself and her God, however subject to Baptist *disciplinary* law. As a matter of religious liberty and of conscience, right or wrong in our view, she ought to follow her convictions; and I am sure Dr. Whitsitt never meant more than this.

The most absurd charge under this head is that by the expression, "Church of God," Dr. Whitsitt conceals another heresy by meaning "to include all Christian denominations, the Pedobaptists as well the Baptists, and to indicate that the Baptist denomination is but a *branch* of the 'Church of God.'" How does J. H. Eaton know this? and what right has he to dogmatically base a whole lot of absurd conclusions upon this absurd premise? What a wrong he has perpetrated upon Dr. Whitsitt! Did Paul imply the "branch church" theory when he told the Ephesian elders to "feed the Church of God," at Ephesus; or when he spoke of the "Church

of God at Corinth;" or when he said he "persecuted the Church of God?" Is not a local Baptist church the "Church of God," the "Church of Christ," as one often calls it? Dr. Whitsitt says that the denominational idea or the branch church theory never occurred to him in stating the general proposition, that he never meant "to indicate a belief that the family outranks the church of God." He spoke generically of the local church as he did of the single family, without any conception of any other organization or institution than the New Testament church of God, or local body of Christ.

Thus ends the chapter on Dr. Whitsitt's "unsoundness as a Baptist." If he is an unsound Baptist from the standpoint of the Scriptures, then the great mass of the Baptists of to-day and of the past may be set down as unsound; and I hereby affirm that he holds strenuously to the 15th Article of the Seminary Abstract of Principles which J. H. Eaton quotes as contrary to Dr. Whitsitt's views. It reads thus: "Baptism is an ordinance of the Lord Jesus, obligatory upon every believer, *wherein he is immersed in water*, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as a sign of his fellowship with the death and resurrection of Christ, of remission of sins, and of his giving himself up to God, to live and walk in newness of life. *It is prerequisite to church fellowship, and to participation in the Lord's Supper.*" Dr. Whitsitt not only endorses this article but he is and ever has been a pronounced close communion Baptist, and so pronounced by Baptists and Pedobaptists; and he has never taught by implication or otherwise that immersion is not essential to baptism, or to church relations, fellowship or communion. His historical view of the "verdict of antiquity" regarding "sprinkling or

pouring as the true mode of baptism," from the standpoint of English Baptist or Anabaptist practice before 1641, has never conflicted with his Scriptural view that "immersion is Christian baptism," as declared in his book; and his positive declaration that, whatever he may have said before and unexplained, at the time, the family does not outrank the church of God, that "obedience to God's command is above every other human duty, and that people *in every relation of life ought to obey God rather than man,*" clearly shows his real position that church relations and church fellowship depend ceremonially upon immersion which he also holds is essential to church communion. His position is that a wife convinced that she ought to join the church of her husband, should follow her conscience and her liberty as between herself and God; but this does not imply with him after so doing that she should still be retained in a Baptist church and still admitted to church fellowship and communion, although immersed. This would stultify his position as a strict communion Baptist, to which claim he holds most tenaciously; and I affirm that he never has meant to teach anything contrary to his position as a close communion Baptist.

II.—CHARGE. "DR. WHITSITT'S UNFAIRNESS AS A HISTORIAN AND HIS HOSTILITY TOWARDS THE BAPTISTS."

1.—Specification: "*Suppression of Evidence.*"

a.—"*Suppression of Edwards' testimony.*"

J. H. Eaton confesses that his charge against Dr. Whitsitt of suppressing Edwards' testimony in his "Real Issue" was a "mistake." He says he quoted accurately from Ivimey the sentence which proved to be a mistake of five years from 1640 to 1646, with regard to some dipt Anabaptists at Bishopgate

street, in 1640; but I apprehend that J. H. Eaton first got his quotation from Dr. Thomas in his review of Dr. Whitsitt, and not from Ivimey, although he may have since consulted Ivimey and verified the extract. His supposition that Ivimey was "trustworthy" because Dr. Whitsitt endorses him, is gratuitously funny, when we consider the fact that he is trying by every conceivable crook and turn to prove Dr. Whitsitt wholly unreliable and false, not only in misquotation, but in the garbling and suppressing of testimony. He has, however, confessed his "mistake" in the use of Ivimey's statement from the *Gangraena* of Edwards; but such a mistake in Dr. Whitsitt would have been damnable falsehood! Bro. Eaton is good at confessing when caught up with, even when he writes as a Baptist from a Methodist standpoint. This was also, he said, in imitation of Dr. Whitsitt; but I protest that he quit laying his sins at Dr. Whitsitt's door, and then continue to denounce Dr. Whitsitt as either a liar or a fool.

But our young brother has sent for a copy of the *Gangraena*, verified his "mistake" and discovered another criminal suppression of Edwards' testimony by Dr. Whitsitt, on p. 138, Pt. Third, in which Edwards, after expressing his indignation at the compliments which, in 1646, some one paid to the Anabaptists as "harmless," he says:

"Which is a false epithete given to them; for what sect or sort of men since the Reformation *this hundred yeares* have been more harmful."

Edwards then goes on to tell the harm they *are doing* (not *have done*), and among other things he says again: "Who *kill* [now in 1646] tender young persons and ancient, with *dipping them all over in rivers*, in depth of winter."

Of course, Edwards, like Featley, Bailey, Baxter and the rest of their enemies of that period, identified the Baptists, in 1646 and onward, with the old Anabaptists of Germany; but because he says (in 1646) that they were then dipping does not imply that they had been dipping for a "hundred years," else we had heard of it before that, but about which documentary evidence is as silent as the grave. Now I think that it is in order for Mr. Eaton to confess up again, and say that he has made another "mistake" about Edwards. At least, on this point, he ought to let up a little on Dr. Whitsitt, and not, with the lights before him, charge him with the damnable crime of suppressing Edwards' testimony on the point suggested. Several scholarly critics have written to me on the subject of Mr. Eaton's tract; and they are all surprised especially at this point attempted to be made against Dr. Whitsitt. A more glaring piece of garbling cannot be found than this use of Edwards by J. H. Eaton.

b.—Specification: On page 103, Pt. Third, *Gangraena*, Edwards says: "A pamphlet entitled *Religion's Peace*, made by one *Leonard Busher*, and printed in 1614, wherein there is a pleading for a "toleration of Papists, Jews, any person or persons differing in religion." Therefore, Dr. Whitsitt suppressed the testimony of Edwards again when he wrote (*Question in Baptist History*, p. 115), as follows: "The annals of English literature will be searched in vain for a volume that precedes it [i.e., Barber's printed 1641] in date, and yet maintains that nothing else is true baptism but immersion." J. H. Eaton says that Busher insisted on immersion as baptism; and that his book is represented by Edwards as among a number of such books "licensed"

by Master Bachiler who "licensed unlicensed books printed before he was born." Dr. Whitsitt is not certain whether Busher's book was first printed in England or Amsterdam; but J. H. Eaton thinks Edwards implies that it was first printed in England, and therefore, Dr. Whitsitt is guilty of the crime of suppression because he did not defer to Edwards' opinion on the subject, and because he says that Barber's Treatise on Dipping is the first work of the kind ever published in English literature. Well now, this is a terrible thing. Busher never wrote a treatise on baptism, and in his Religion's Peace he uttered but one sentence on the subject of baptism in which he defines it as dipping, according to Rom. 6: 4; Col. 2:12. Dr. Whitsitt alludes to all this in his book, and all he means as to Barber is that he was the first who ever, among Baptists at least, wrote a regular treatise in defense of adult baptism as dipping. Busher's Religion's Peace was not designed as any defense or treatment of the subject of baptism by dipping, and he only incidentally refers to the ordinance which means "dipped for dead." I think if Bro. Eaton can find no better use, in his favor, of Edwards' Gangraena, he had better let that book alone. Here are three failures he has made in the use of that work to show up the crime of Dr. Whitsitt's suppression of testimony. Alas! for the man who hunts for a mote in his brother's eye when he has a beam in his own eye!

c.—Specification: "*Suppression of Featley's testimony.*" Dr. Whitsitt met this charge in his reply made in the circular issued from Nashville; but a new phase of the subject is presented here. Featley who published his "Dippers Dipt" in 1644, says of two Anabaptist errors, *then* existing:

"First, that none are rightly baptized, but those

who are dipt. Secondly, that no children ought to be baptized." (p. 36.)

This statement in no way conflicts with Dr. Whitsitt's declaration that Featley implies, in 1644, that immersion among the English Anabaptists was a "splinter new practice." Featley calls immersion the "*new leaven*" of the 40th Article of the Baptist Confession of 1644; and he corresponds with Barebone and others at the time who declared that immersion among English Anabaptists was a "very new way"—"not more than two or three years old" in 1642-43. Featley, like other Pedobaptist controversialists of that time, constantly identified the Baptists with the old Anabaptists of 1525, and onward, in the doctrine of believers' baptism as opposed to infant baptism; but none of them ever organically or baptistically related them as immersionists. Not a single writer, whether Baptist or Pedobaptist at that time, ever pointed out Baptist immersion or called it "new" in England before 1641. Featley never mentions the Baptists as dipping in England until after the controversy which began in 1642, that is, when he wrote his "Dippers Dipt" in 1644, at which time he said they were flocking in great multitudes to the rivers and were dipping hundreds over head and ears.

2.—Specification: "*Garbling testimony*"—also "*fabrication and flagrant misuse of evidence.*"

a.—"*Garbling and fabrication of the 'Jessey Church Records' and the so-called 'Kiffin Manuscript.'*"

There are two points attempted to be made under the charge of garbling and fabrication of the Jessey Church Records and the Kiffin Manuscript.

(1.)—It is charged that Dr. Whitsitt fabricated the "Jessey Church Records" as found (Question,

etc., pp. 81-83) in the first of the parallel columns containing these manuscripts, by putting together the 1633, 1638 paragraphs of the Jessey Records and the 1640, 1641 paragraphs of the original Kiffin Manuscript and calling the collocation the "Jessey Church Records." (See Appendix A.) Dr. Whitsitt did not call this combination of the two documents the "Jessey Records," but the "Jessey *Church* Records," and in this he was exactly right, since the 1640, 1641 paragraphs, as we shall see, are a continuation of the history of the Jessey Church by Kiffin and probably extracted from the Jessey Records. It is agreed that Dr. Whitsitt erred in claiming the 1640, 1641 paragraphs of the Kiffin Manuscript as a part of the Jessey Records; but at the time he thought Gould, from whose book he copied the document, sustained him in the classification and so defended himself in the *Western Recorder*. Subsequently, however, a copy of the Jessey Records and the original Kiffin Manuscript was sent to Dr. Whitsitt, by Geo. Gould, of London, and the mistake was apparent as the two documents are distinct, though substantially the same in the 1633, 1638 paragraphs of each,—the Kiffin Manuscript in the 1640, 1641 paragraphs being simply a continuation of the "Jessey Church Records" as rightly claimed by Dr. Whitsitt. (See Appendix B.) The error of Dr. Whitsitt in the classification is only technical and not material and in no way affects the argument in confirmation of his thesis that the Baptists revived immersion in England, 1641; but this technical error is the horrible crime of fabrication to which J. H. E. points with triumphant delight. Such scholars as Drs. Newman and Vedder only regard the error as a technical mistake in misconceiving Gould, but they had not discov-

ered that Dr. Whitsitt had made a damnable fabrication with the view of foisting a falsehood upon history and of deceiving the scholarship of the world! My young brother Eaton would have done himself more credit by denominating Dr. Whitsitt simply a fool instead of a falsifying fabricator.

(2.)—The same charge of fabrication is made of Dr. Whitsitt's collocation of the several paragraphs, in the second of his parallel columns, of what he also erroneously names the "so-called Kiffin Manuscript," but which is really Crosby's version of the Kiffin Manuscript in all its paragraphs, 1633, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, including the 1633, 1638 paragraphs of the Jessey Records. (See second column Appendix A.) Bro. Eaton grants, however, that the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs quoted by Crosby (Vol. I, pp. 148, 149), and collocated as by Dr. Whitsitt in his second column, is the genuine Manuscript of William Kiffin because Crosby says so, and puts the paragraphs in "quotation marks;" but Crosby even in these paragraphs is only quoting in substance with little exception, the original Kiffin Manuscript and the Jessey Records, making corrections and additions as he saw fit, and as will be seen upon a comparative examination of the original documents and Crosby's version which itself errs in some particulars, as the MSS. err in others. (Compare both Appendices A and B.) Dr. Whitsitt is not charged with any garbling or fabrication, however, in collocating the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs of Crosby's quotation—except in calling them a part of the "so-called Kiffin Manuscript," an error he would not have made after receiving the original Kiffin Manuscript from Gould.

Our young critic, however, finds Dr. Whitsitt's glaring fabrication in adding the 1640, 1641 para-

graphs to the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs of the "so-called Kiffin Manuscript," as found in different places in Crosby's history, although they describe related events connected with the Jessey Church Records, and substantially tally with the 1633, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641 paragraphs as a whole, and as found in the original Kiffin Manuscript. For instance he denies that the 1640 paragraph given by Crosby (Vol. III, p. 41,) is quoted from the Kiffin Manuscript, and which reads as follows: "For in the year 1640 this church [Jessey's] became two by mutual consent; just half, says the *manuscript*, being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Henry Jessey." What "manuscript" did Crosby refer to? Turn to the original Kiffin Manuscript which reads as follows: "1640, 3rd Mo: The Church [Jessey's] became two by mutual consent just half being with Mr. P. Barbone, & ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey," and we discover that Crosby did not only refer to the Kiffin Manuscript but quoted it almost *verbatim*. So Dr. Whitsitt is exactly right in his classification of the 1640 paragraph with the "so-called Kiffin Manuscript" by putting it just where he did, only here, (Vol. III, p. 41,) Crosby does not give the original document in substance, but quotes from it literally, as he had it before him and sent it thus, with all its original parts, to Neal. So far then Dr. Whitsitt has made no mistake in reconstructing the Kiffin document from Crosby. With the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs we have now got a part of the 1640 paragraph literally established by Crosby, beyond the shadow of a doubt, in its proper place.

But our young critic finds another fabrication in the reconstruction of the "Jessey Church Records" by Dr. Whitsitt, who adds on to this 1640 quotation

from the Kiffin Manuscript that part of the original document which Crosby quotes without "quotation marks," somewhat literally and somewhat substantially (Vol. I, pp. 101, 102), and which includes a part of the 1640 and the whole of the 1641 paragraphs of the original Kiffin Manuscript. In this part Crosby details the movement which led to the sending of Blunt to Holland for a proper administrator of immersion, just as the original Kiffin Manuscript describes it in its 1640, 1641 paragraphs down to the 53 members who were immersed by Blunt and Blacklock; and such is the identity between the original Manuscript and Crosby's version that it is clear that Crosby had the original document before him, just as on pages 148, 149, Vol. I. The only material difference between the original and the version is that Crosby, while he quotes the date 1640, leaves out the date 1641; but he goes on to detail all the facts of that 1641 date, which followed 1640, so as to identify the date 1641 whether he mentions it or not. Crosby relies upon this part of the Kiffin Manuscript just as implicitly for history as he does any other part of it; and although he neglected to use the date 1641, he substantially, and in some respects literally, details the facts of the document just as minutely and confidently as he does of the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs of the Manuscript. To be sure, he speaks of this part of the original Manuscript as "said to be written by William Kiffin;" but it is the "same manuscript," as a whole, and in all its parts which he says (Vol. I, p. 148) was written by William Kiffin, and which we find in its entirety as copied by Gould. Not only so, but he quotes from this *very* "manuscript" as such, and as he calls it, (Vol. III, pp. 41, 42,) when he mentions the 1640 paragraph in connection with

Neal's statement that Jessey "laid the foundation of the first Baptist congregation that he had met with in England." Crosby also literally quotes from its 1633 paragraph at the bottom of page 41, when he refers to the bracketed phrase ["with whom joined William Kiffin,"]—found in this *very* "*manuscript*." Over on page 42 he goes on to refer to the 1638 and then to the 1639 paragraph of this "*same manuscript*"—quoted in Vol. I, p. 149, as from William Kiffin; and thus Crosby, beyond all question, identifies the 1640 and thus the 1641 paragraph of the original Kiffin Manuscript with the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs of the "*same*" document.

How does he identify them? (1) By connecting the 1640 paragraph, which belongs to the 1641 paragraph of the original Kiffin Manuscript, with the 1633, 1638, 1639 paragraphs, of what he calls the "*same manuscript*," on pages 41, 42, Vol. III. (2) Before quoting in substance the 1640-41 paragraphs of this "*ancient manuscript*" said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin" (Vol. I, pp. 102, 103) he emphasizes its authority by saying that he (Kiffin) "lived in *those times* [1640-41, the date of this part of the MS.] and was a leader among those of that persuasion [the Blunt or succession persuasion]" as set forth in the MS.; and thus Crosby identifies this 1640-41 paragraph as "an account given of the [Blunt] matter *in an ancient manuscript*"—not a manuscript of itself—the authorship of which he presumed to belong to Kiffin, which he here emphasizes by indentifying Kiffin with its date and event, and which he had quoted before as the "*same manuscript*" in which he had pointed out part of the 1640 paragraph and the 1633, 1638 and 1639 paragraphs (Vol. III, pp. 41, 42)—also on pp. 148, 149, Vol. I.—as shown above.

J. H. Eaton affirms that this 1640 quotation (Crosby, Vol. III, p. 41) is not quoted from Kiffin; and not only does he make an utter failure at proof, but he misrepresents Ivimey (Vol. I, p. 156) and Evans (Vol. II, p. 110) who say nothing about this 1640 paragraph as belonging to the Hubbard Church Manuscript which, with the Kiffin Manuscript, Crosby also lent Neal, and both of which he charges Neal with misunderstanding. Our young critic also falsely represents Crosby as referring to this 1640 church when he says: "Who their pastor was the manuscript does not say." (Vol. III, p. 41.) Crosby refers to the secession of 1633, Sept. 12th, when he says: "Who their pastor was, etc;" and he expressly says of this 1640 division [Eaton's bracket 4] that one-half of the church was with Barebone, the other half was with Jessey, just as found in the original Kiffin Manuscript, from which Crosby literally quoted.

Dr. Whitsitt built better than he knew—not having at the time the original Kiffin Manuscript before him by which more certainly to construct its paragraphs in their order and connection from Crosby. He "hit the nail on the head," dates 1640, 1641 and all; and although he left off a word or two in the beginning of one of his quotations, he made no material mistake whatever. He committed a diabolical crime in following Barclay by adding an "n" to John Batte (making him Batten); but Batte or Batten, he was the man who baptized Blunt, 1640, and first sent immersion to the Anabaptists of England, 1641. Dr. Whitsitt also committed the deadly crime of bracketing the sentence including the fifty-three names baptized by Blunt and Blacklock, which Crosby literally copied from the Kiffin Manuscript; but the motive ascribed to Dr. Whitsitt for this dia-

bolical "trick" is simply out of sight. How profoundly our young critic sees into the depths of Dr. Whitsitt's desperately wicked and deceitful heart!

b.—"*Garbling A. R.'s testimony.*"

Dr. Whitsitt commits another crime in quoting, upon Dexter's authority, from the "Second Part" of A. R.'s *Vanity and Childishness of Infant Baptism*, when it should have been "Part First;" and his following the bracketed clause of Dexter is insultingly turned over to Dr. Whitsitt's "god-fathers" as a "*nameless performance!*" Nevertheless, A. R.'s testimony is along the line of Spilsbury, Tombes, Laurence, Barber, King, Collins and others of the time who held that true baptism had been "swallowed up in grosse popery" and who held that believers having Christ, the Word and the Spirit had the right to restore it according to the Scriptures—which the Baptists of 1641 did. Dr. Whitsitt has freely admitted his error in following too implicitly some of his quotations from Dexter; but his explanation and apologies are all at the expense of his intellect, or else of his veracity, according to our young brother.

c.—"*Garbling of Muller's testimony.*"

Muller says, according to Evans (Vol. I, p. 208), that when Smyth and his faction presented themselves to the Mennonite Church in Amsterdam for membership they were "questioned about their doctrine of salvation and the ground and the form (mode) of their baptism;" and the statement is made: "No difference was found between them and us." Muller says of the Mennonite Church to which they applied for membership that its "mode of baptism was by sprinkling or affusion"—that "the members of this community were not immersionists;" and the conclusion is, that, if there was no

difference between them and Smyth or his followers, as to the "mode of baptism," then Smyth and his followers were sprinklers or affusionists. After Smyth's death his faction was received by this Mennonite Church, and those of them who had not been baptized, according to Muller (Evans, Vol. I, p. 223), were received by "sprinkling." "This mode of baptizing," says Muller, "was, from the days of Menno, the only usual mode amongst them [the Mennonites], and is still amongst us. The Waterlanders, nor any of the Netherland Doopsgezinden, practiced at any time baptism by immersion. Had they made any exception, in that use, on behalf of the English, who in their country had not yet received baptism, it is more than probable that the memorial would have mentioned the alteration. *But they cared only for the very nature of the baptism, and were therefore willing to admit even those who were baptized by a mode differing from theirs, just as we are wonted to do now-a-days.*"

(This italicized sentence is the sentence claimed as suppressed by Dr. Whitsitt.)

Now, in the first place, no difference between Smyth's party and the Mennonite sprinklers had been found as to the "mode" of baptism; and therefore there is no implication in the above italicized quotation that those received who had already been baptized, had been immersed, but the contrary. It is also certain that those who were received by baptism were sprinkled without exception, and that this was the only mode of baptism in the church in which they sought membership—what no body of *immersionists* would have submitted to. 2. The above italicized sentence: "But they cared only for the *very nature* of baptism, etc.," is only an expression of liberality which implies that the Mennonites

would have received those of the English already baptized, even if they had been baptized by any other mode than sprinkling, without reference to mode—just as they do now. 3. It is clear that if Smyth's party had believed in immersion, and those already baptized had been immersed, then those who were received by baptism would have demanded immersion which would have been granted and so recorded in the "memorial." There would have been no division as to baptism among a body of immersionists; but such a body would never have sought membership, or baptism, in a body of sprinklers. As Muller says, there was "no difference" between Smyth's party and the Mennonites, either as to the nature or form, the design or mode of baptism; and as the English united with the sprinklers, it is clear that they were all sprinklers themselves.

In the light of history, Dr. Whitsitt had no motive, even if he had been so disposed, to suppress this sentence which cannot controvert the natural implication that the English already baptized had been sprinkled or affused. Moreover, Evans (Vol. I, p. 203) quotes Ashton (the editor of Robinson's Works) showing that Smyth baptized himself by "affusion"—a statement with which Muller, he says, "fully agrees;" and if Smyth practiced affusion upon himself, he practiced it upon his followers—and so his faction was admitted into the Mennonite Church, both the baptized and unbaptized. The only difference in mode which could have existed between the English and the Waterlanders would have been between sprinkling and pouring, about which there was sometimes considerable controversy.

d.—"*Garbling of Stanford's and Benedict's testimony.*"

Dr. Whitsitt overlooked the statement of Benedict, drawn from Stanford, that Roger Williams and party "were convinced of the nature and design of believers' baptism by immersion." (Benedict Hist. Baptists, Vol. I, p. 475, 1813.) Upon reference, however, to my consolidated edition of Benedict (p. 450, 1848), I find an altered statement of the fact in which there is no mention of the word "immersion"—but only the word "baptized;" and the indication is that Benedict here conforms to Dr. Whitsitt's thesis under the progressive revision of his own work in 1848. Benedict now reads: "As the whole company, in their own estimation, *were unbaptized*, and they knew of *no administrator* in any of the infant settlements to whom they could apply, they with much propriety hit on the following expedient: Ezekiel Holliman, a man of gifts and piety, by the suffrages of the company was appointed to *baptize* Mr. Williams, who in return, baptized Holliman and the other ten." Benedict says again: "Any company of Christians may commence a church in gospel order, by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all power to appoint any one of their number, whether minister or layman, to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions." This is old-fashioned John Smyth-Spilsbury-Baptist teaching; and it looks as if Williams and his party commenced as the English Baptists did, church organization, baptism and all. Dr. Whitsitt must have been led by Benedict's latter instead of his former statement. Both editions of Benedict are referred to on the same page of Dr. Whitsitt's Question in Baptist History, page 163.

e.—"*Garbling of Hagne's testimony.*"

Here again Dr. Whitsitt concedes that he over-

looked Dr. Hague's allusion with reference to Roger Williams' baptism as implying immersion. He protests, however, that he had no intention to do so; and as an evidence of the fact, in his book, he concedes that Knowles understood the word baptize in Roger Williams' case to mean immerse. More than this, he cites Drs. Newman and Armitage both as boldly affirming that Roger Williams was immersed; and hence he could not have intended to garble, suppress or deceive. He says that in preparing his book he was much pressed with other duties and hurried up by the every day demand for its appearance at the time; and that in his haste he overlooked Hague's sentence, as also Benedict's transcript from Stanford, 1813. In this connection he quoted some fourteen authors including Stanford, Benedict, Hubbard, Backus, Callender, Knowles, Hague, Cramp, Dexter, Vedder, Straus, Burrage, Armitage and Newman; and with the exception of two or three of them he quoted correctly, *pro* and *con*, and could not have intended to quote any of them amiss. He could have no motive for deception, and it would have been madness to have thought of escaping detection at the hands of the scholarship of the world, even if he had been the literary villain that our young brother pictures him to be. It would be bad enough to call Dr. Whitsitt a fool—which such scholars as Drs. Thomas, Newman, Vedder and others have never thought of doing; but it is infinitely worse to stigmatize him as a literary liar or thief—which some Christian scholars and gentlemen, knowing him and his reputation as a scholar and gentleman himself, would scorn to do.

“IN CONCLUSION.”

Our young brother, in concluding sums up his case as a cold-blooded lawyer, and pronounces the

verdict that Dr. Whitsitt is guilty of the charges preferred; and he sends out his thesis to the jury of the people who can hear only his side of the case. He is both judge and counsel, full of prejudice and rancor, and a swift witness in his own case, before his jury; and he decides his own case under the professed claim of being fair and impartial and as never having misrepresented Dr. Whitsitt. As I have shown he has done but little else than misrepresent Dr. Whitsitt; and worse than all, like the partisan demagogue before the jury of the public, he has abused, stigmatized and calumniated the prisoner at the bar and employed all the arts of sophistry to carry his point and win his case. Not in a single sentence has he shown the spirit of Christian charity to Dr. Whitsitt; and in the color of his own eye he has sought with microscopic severity to pluck the mote out of his brother's eye. He has the semblance of one seeking for blood; and instead of the spirit of the lamb toward one of the old sheep of God's pasture he seems to display the nature of the hunter on the track of his victim. He shows none of that spirit which would lift men up, rather than drag down angels.

I am glad to turn away from an attorney like this to the candor and integrity of our people whose sense of justice mingled with mercy can be trusted; and it is before this jury I lay my case.

This young brother complains that Dr. Whitsitt declined to allow a trustee to the books of the Seminary, and therefore lords it over the appointed "guardians" of the institution. Let it be remembered that that trustee is the relentless foe of Dr. Whitsitt—one who has pursued him in his paper for these two years with merciless severity—and then let us judge of the motive of that trustee in the prem-

ises, and no fair-minded man on earth will ever condemn Dr. Whitsitt for his course. The Executive Board of the Trustees in Louisville had the right to call for the books and papers of the Seminary, if anything had been going wrong, at any time; but there is nothing in the chartered law of the Seminary which authorized an individual trustee, with or without cause, to demand the books and papers of the institution from the President—especially an individual whose personal motives the President had a right to suspect in making such a demand. Let it be borne in mind too that that individual trustee, in all he has had to say about the matter has never up to date explained to the public what he wanted with the information he desired.

I send out this tract as a defense of my honored friend and brother, Dr. Whitsitt. I do this not simply as an act of justice, but above all as a tribute of love to him and as a contribution to the cause of brotherhood and peace. I feel no malice toward any of my brethren, whatever reasons for grievance I may have had from some; and all I say in this document is only said because demanded of one of the Nashville Council by the fiction called "Facts in the Case" based upon a false and not a "Real Issue"—which, upon the whole, is a gross misrepresentation of Dr. Whitsitt's position, and which, at best, is a microscopic enlargement of a few mole-hills into mountains. I stand ready, in defense of Dr. Whitsitt and his contention, to meet every adverse criticism or argument, historical or otherwise, in the case; and I affirm that Dr. Whitsitt is historically right, that his errors or mistakes are immaterial to the issue, and that the crimes of "garbling," "fabrication," "lying," etc., etc., etc., are falsely charged.

APPENDIX A.

J. H. EATON'S BRACKETED PARALLEL.

JESSEY CHURCH RECORDS.

SO-CALLED KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

1633. There haveing been much discussing, These denying Truth of ye Parish Churches, and ye Church being now become so large yt it might be prejudicial, These following desire dismissal, that they might become an Entire Church, and further ye Communion of those Churches in Order amongst themselves, wch at last was granted to them, and performed Sept. 12, 1633, viz:

Henry Parker & Wife.
Jo. Milburn.
Widd. Fearné.
Arnold.
[Green] Hatmaker.
Mr. Wilson.
Mark Luker.
Tho. Allen.
Mary Milburn.

(1) To These Joyned Rich. Blunt, Tho. Hubert, Rich. Tredwell and his Wife Kath., John Trimber, Wm. Jennings and Sam Eaton, Mary Greenway, Mr. Eaton with some others receiving a further baptism.

Others Joyned to them.

1638. These also being of ye same Judgment wth Sam Eaton, and desiring to depart and not be censured, our intrest in them was remitted, wth Prayer made in their behalf, June 8, 1638. They haveing first forsaken Us, and Joyned wth Mr. Spilsbury, viz:

Mr. Peti Ferrer.
Wm. Batty.
Hen. Pen.
Mrs. Allen (died 1639).
Tho. Wilson.
Mr. Norwood.

Gould, *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich*, Intro., p. cxxii.

There was a congregation of Protestant Dissenters of the independent Persuasion in London, gathered in the year 1616, whereof Mr. Henry Jacob was the first pastor; and after him succeeded Mr. John Lathorp, who was their minister at this time. In this society several persons finding that the congregations kept not to their first principles of separation, and being also convinced that baptism was not to be administered to infants, but such only as professed faith in Christ, desired that they might be dismissed from that communion, and allowed to form a distinct congregation in such order as was most agreeable to their own Sentiments.

The church considering that they were now grown very numerous, and so more than could in these times of persecution conveniently meet together, and believing also that those persons acted from a principle of conscience, and not obstinacy, agreed to allow them the liberty they desired, and that they should be constituted a distinct church; which was performed the 12th of Sept., 1633. And as they believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, so they looked upon the baptism they had received in that age as invalid: whereupon most or all of them received a new baptism. Their minister was Mr. John Spilsbury. What number they were is uncertain, because in the mentioning of the names of about twenty men and women it is added, with divers others.

In the year 1638, Mr. William Kiffin, Mr. Thomas Wilson, and others being of the

(3)

APPENDIX A.

J. H. EATON'S BRACKETED PARALLEL.

1640. 3d Mo. [May.] The Church [whereof Mr. Jacob and Mr. John Lathorp had been Pastors], became two by mutual consent, just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richd. Blunt wth him, being convinced of Baptism, yt also it ought to be by dipping ye Body into ye Water, resembling Burial and rising again, Col. II., 12; Rom. VI., 4: had sober Conference about it in ye Church, and then wth some of the forenamed, who also were so convinced: And after Prayer and Conference about their so enjoying it, none having then so practiced in England to professed Believers, and hearing that some in the Nether Lands had so practiced, they agreed and sent over Mr. Rich'd Blunt (who understood Dutch), wth Letters of Commendation, who was kindly accepted there, and Returned with Letters from them, Jo. Batten a Teacher there, and from that Church to such as sent him.

(2)

1641. They proceed on therein viz: Those persons yt ware perswaded Baptism should be by dipping ye Body, had mett in two Companies, and did intend so to meet after this; all these agreed to proceed alike together; and ther Manifesting (not by any formal Words) a Covenant (wch Word was Scrupled by some of them), but by mutual desires and agreement each testified: These two Companies did set apart one to Baptize the rest, so it was solemnly performed by them.

Mr. Blunt baptized Mr. Blacklock, yt was a Teacher amongst them, and Mr. Blunt

same judgment, were upon their request, dismissed to the said Mr. Spilsbury's congregation.

In the year 1639, another congregation of Baptists was formed, whose place of meeting was in Crutched—Fryars; the chief promoters of which were Mr. Green, Mr. Paul Hobson and Captain Spencer.

Crosby, vol. 1. pp. 148-9.

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.

(4)

Crosby, vol. 3, p. 41.

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 into the water, in resemblance of a burial and resurrection according to Colos. II., 12, and Rom. IV., 4. That they often met together to pray and confer about this matter, and to 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 Blunt, who understood the Dutch language: That he went accordingly, carrying letters of

(5)

APPENDIX A.

J. H. EATON'S BRACKETED PARALLEL.

being baptized, he and Mr. Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends yt ware so minded, and many being added to them they increased much.

Gould, *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich*, Intro., pp. cxxiii, cxxiv.

recommendation with him and was kindly received both by the church there and Mr. John Batten, their teacher.

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

Crosby, vol. 1, pp. 101-2.

APPENDIX B.
ORIGINAL KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

1633. Sundry of ye Church whereof Mr Jacob and Mr John Lathrop had been pastors, being dissatisfyed with ye Churches owning of English Parishes, to the true Churches desired dismission & joyned together among themselves, as Mr Henry Parker, Mr. Tho Shepard, Mr. Sam Eaton, Marke Luker & others, with whom joyned Mr. Wm Kiffin.¹

1638. Mr Thomas Wilson Mr. Pen, & H. Pen, & 3 more being convinced that Baptism was not for infants, but professed Believers joyned with Mr Jo Spilsbury, ye Churches favor being desired therein.²

1640. 3d Mo: The Church became two by mutual consent just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, & ye other halfe with Mr H Jessey.³ Mr Richard Blunt with him being convinced of Baptism yt also ought to be by dipping in ye Body into ye Water, resembling Burial & rising again. 2 Col. 2. 12. Rom. 6. 4 had sober conference about in ye Church, & then with some of the forenamed who also ware so convinced. And after Prayer & Conference about their so enjoying it, *none having then so practiced in England to professed believers* & 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, & returned with letters from them Jo: Batte a Teacher there and from that Church to such as sent him.⁴

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

Those two Companies did set apart one to Baptize the rest; & so it was solemnly performed by them.

Mr Blunt baptized Mr Blacklock yt was a Teacher amongst them & Mr Blunt being baptized, he & Mr Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends that ware so minded, & many being added to them they increased much.⁵

"The names of all 11 Mo. Janu: begin etc." A list of forty-one names, to which twelve were added January 9, making fifty-three in all as follows: &c.

"1639. Mr Green wth Captn Spencer had begun a Congregation in Crutched Fryars, to whom Paul Hobson joyned who was now with many of that Church one of ye seven."⁶

1 Crosby, Vol. I, p. 148; Vol. III, p. 41.

2 Crosby, Vol. I, p. 149; Vol. III, p. 42.

3 Crosby, Vol. III, p. 41.

4 Crosby, Vol. I, pp. 101, 102,

5 Crosby, Vol. I, p. 102.

6 Crosby, Vol. I, p. 149; Vol. III, p. 42.