A Short History of the Baptists

A SHORT

HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS.

BY
HENRY C. VEDDER.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
1420 Chestnut Street.

TO THE MEMORY OF

R. J. W. BUCKLAND,

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED

IN GRATEFUL REMEMBRANCE OF HIS BROAD SCHOLARSHIP AND KINDLING ENTHUSIASM THAT FIRST INSPIRED ME TO STUDY

BAPTIST HISTORY.

PREFACE.

A history of the Baptists, written in an interesting style, yet with scholarly accuracy, not so voluminous as to repel readers, and cheap enough to be owned by the poorest, has long seemed to be a greatly needed book. The Baptist brotherhood will decide whether this is the book needed. The chapters composing it were published about a year ago in the *Standard*, of Chicago. Before, during, and after their publication the author had the benefit of suggestions and criticisms from valued friends, as well as from strangers, who were kind enough to take an interest in the work. To one and all of these, he returns his hearty thanks. He has tried to avail himself of every suggestion or criticism. Slavishly adopting them all would have deprived the book of any value it might otherwise possess, as the expression of an independent judgment regarding facts and principles; while it would also have made the book ridiculous, since many of the things suggested were reconcilable neither with the author's general plan, nor with each other. Each suggestion, each criticism, has been separately and candidly weighed, with the one purpose of making the book as perfect as possible. Where a statement has been called in question, the facts have been investigated again, and the text has been modified wherever such investigation failed fully to sustain the original statement. Every chapter has been thus revised more or less, and several chapters have been entirely rewritten. It would be too much to hope that entire accuracy has been attained, but failure is at least not chargeable to lack of painstaking.

In cases not a few the author has not been able to adopt certain views that his critics have pressed. Even in those cases, however, the criticism has been helpful, since it has led to reexamination and the confirmation of opinions already expressed. Particularly is this the case regarding that feature of the history that has been most sharply condemned—its treatment, as lacking historical proof, of the hypothesis that there is an unbroken line of Baptist churches from the present time back to the Apostles. It would have been a great pleasure to make this hypothesis one's own, and to construct the book along these

lines. It is, however, the misfortune or the fault, as the reader pleases, of the author to have been born with an inveterate tendency to look at both sides of a question, and weigh the facts well before deciding. His mind is so constituted that it refuses to reason after this fashion: The eternal fitness of things demands that the facts should be thus and so; therefore, they are thus and so; but if, unfortunately, they are not thus and so, we will so distort them by concealing this, and magnifying that, as to make them appear to be thus and so. This may do for romance; it will possibly pass muster for polemics; it is not the way to write history.

This history, being written in the hope that it might prove adapted to a wide circulation among plain folk, who wish the results of scholarship without its machinery, has not been encumbered with foot notes. In the *Hints to Readers* prefixed to each part will be found means of verifying nearly every statement of importance, and of following up any special topic in which the reader may be interested. The lists of books might have been largely extended, but it seemed best to mention only those volumes that are of the highest authority and easiest to be found. It is hoped that this feature will prove a valuable one to those who desire a further acquaintance with Baptist history than can be gained from a volume of this size. In an Appendix will be found a fuller discussion of some controverted questions than was possible in the text, with the addition, in some cases, of original authorities.

In conclusion, the author wishes to express his specially grateful acknowledgments to his former instructor and present friend, the Rev. Howard Osgood, D. D., of the Rochester Theological Seminary, for the gift of a set of Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, for the loan of much valuable manuscript material, and for encouragement in historical study, but for which this book would never have been written. And now, as it goes forth on its mission, may this *Short History of the Baptists* help young Baptists, for whom more especially it has been prepared, in their work of the building up of the body of Christ: "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

NEW YORK, November 26, 1891.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

PART II.

THE PERSECUTED CHURCH.

PART I.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

HINTS TO READERS.

The best general work is Armitage's *History of the Baptists* (New York, 1887). The sections on the early and mediæval church are least valuable; from the Reformation down it contains the best narrative accessible. Cramp's *Baptist History* (Philadelphia, no date) is still a useful book, though needing a thorough re-writing. For additional details regarding the early church, consult especially the excellent handbook of Kurtz, and for special points the voluminous works of Neander and Gieseler. The latter is especially valuable for his copious quotations from the original sources. Volumes I. and II. of Schaff's *History of the Christian Church* (New York, 1882–8) are indispensable, and are a valuable guide to further study of the literature. In connection with chapter one, consult also Jacob, *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament* (London, 1871); Conant, *Baptizein*, and Burrage, *The Act of Baptism* (American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia); Schaff, *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (New York, 1885); Dean Stanley, *Christian Institutions* (New York, 1881). On chapter two, see Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotteranea* (London, 1879); Bennett, *Christian Archæology* (New York, 1888); and the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, (New York, 1886), the original sources for the history of this age. In connection with chapter three, and the theory there criticised and rejected, read for the opposite view Ray's *Baptist Succession* (St. Louis, 1890).

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCHES.

The Great Commission—faithfulness, thereto, of the early church. The ingathering of Pentecost. Baptism following conversion. Confession the basis of church membership. Passages emphasizing new birth. Views of Baptists and others on the relations of the Old and New Dispensations. The Scriptures silent as to infant baptism. Church membership means its privileges. The ordinances and their order. Church organization and officers. Church independency. The authority of the Council at Jerusalem moral. The interdependence of the churches. The first day of the week and worship. Worship patterned after that of the synagogue and simple in form. Christian communism. Not a fundamental principle of the church. The church's external history one of missionary activity.

"GO ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." In this parting injunction of the risen Lord to his disciples, which the Duke of Wellington aptly called the marching orders of the ministry, we have the office of the Christian Church for the first time defined. In obedience to this command the early Christians preached

the gospel, founded churches, and taught obedience to Christ as the fundamental principle of the Christian life. And though many of them could say with Paul that they spent their days "in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness," they found it a faithful saying that their Lord was with them alway. In so far as the church in all ages has been obedient to Christ's command it has experienced the truth of this promise.

The day of Pentecost was the birthday of the church of Christ. What existed before in germ then sprang into full being. The descent of the Holy Spirit was the preparation for the great missionary advance, of which the conversion of three thousand on that one day was the first fruits. Not only did this multitude hear the word and believe, but on the same day they were "added to the church," which can only mean that they were baptized. It was once urged, as an objection to the teaching and practice of Baptists regarding baptism, that the immersion of so many people on a single day is physically impossible. The missionary history of our own time has silenced this objection forever, by giving us a nearly parallel case. In 1879, at Ongole, India, two thousand two hundred and twenty-two Telugu converts were baptized on a single day by six ministers, two administering the ordinance at a time, the services being conducted with all due solemnity, and occupying in all

nine hours. It need not surprise us that on the day of Pentecost baptism immediately followed conversion. That, indeed, seems to have been the rule throughout the apostolic period, and without doubt modern Baptists have in this respect departed too far from the apostolic practice. It is true, that the converts were Jews, that they only needed to be convinced that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and to submit to him as Lord, to make them fit subjects for baptism; as it is also true that, with the prospect of persecution and even death before them, there was no temptation to make a false profession. This made possible and prudent a haste that in our day might be dangerous; but the principle should be admitted, as taught by all New Testament precedent, that no more time should separate baptism from conversion than is necessary to ensure credible evidence of a genuine change of heart.

That all those added to the church on the Day of Pentecost were capable of making intelligent personal confession of faith, is as certain as words can make anything. Nor is there the slightest indication in the New Testament writings that, during the apostolic age, any were received into the church save those who had come to years of personal responsibility and understanding. The fundamental constitution of the churches founded by the apostles, or by others under their sanction, may be briefly described in these words:

"The church is a spiritual body, consisting only of those regenerated by the Spirit of God, and baptized on a personal profession of faith."

A spiritual body, not lacking visibility, because of its spirituality, but a visible body because it is before all things spiritual. "Except a man be born anew (literally, *from above*) he cannot see the kingdom of God," said our Lord to Nicodemus. And again he states the truth yet more emphatically, this time with a reference to baptism, the symbol of the new birth, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3 : 1–21.) This new birth, the work of the Holy Spirit, is conjoined to "faith," "belief" in Christ on the part of man, and as its result man is justified in the sight of God. (1 Peter 1 : 5, 9; Rom. 5 : 1; Gal. 2 : 20; Heb. 10 : 38; 11 : 6.) The necessity of a new birth through faith in Christ is everywhere assumed in the epistles as a truth too familiar to be formally stated. It is the postulate, without which the apostolic writings cannot possibly be understood.

In the case of adults this is now granted by all evangelical Christians; no adult would be received into membership in an evangelical church except on profession of personal faith in Christ. Yet the Westminster Confession affirms that the church "consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion,

together with their children." Those who hold this theory generally assume that a continuity of life unites the Old Dispensation and the New. As children were by birth heirs of the promise through Abraham, so they are assumed to be by birth heirs of promise through Christ. In this view the New Dispensation is organically one with the Old; baptism merely replaces circumcision, the church replaces the synagogue and temple, the ministry replaces the priesthood, while the spirit of all continues unchanged. It appears to Baptists, on the other hand, to be clearly taught in Scripture, that the New Dispensation, though a fulfilling and completion of the Old, is radically different from it. Under the Old Dispensation a child was an heir of promise according to the flesh, but under the New Dispensation natural birth does not make him a member of the kingdom of God; he must be born from above, born of the Spirit. The church has for its foundation principle a personal relation of each soul to Christ, and not a bond of blood.

A candid student, moreover, cannot ignore the absolute silence of the Scriptures regarding the baptism of infants. Jesus took little children in his arms and declared that of the childlike is the kingdom of God (Matt. 19 : 14), but he nowhere authorized baptism save when preceded by faith. The cases where whole households were baptized do not fairly warrant the inference that they contained infants. Either they afford no positive

ground for inference of any kind (as in the case of Stephanas, 1 Cor. 1 : 16; 16 : 15), or they absolutely forbid the inference that infants were among the baptized (as in the case of the jailer at Philippi, where all who were baptized first had the gospel preached to them. Acts 16 : 32, 33). The case of Lydia and her household is often cited as one that proves infant baptism, but it is impossible to infer from the narrative (Acts 16 : 14, 15), anything certain, or even probable, regarding Lydia's family. Whether she was ever married, or whether she ever had children, or whether her children were not all dead or grown up are matters of pure conjecture. It is possible to guess any of these things, and a dozen besides, but guesses are not fair inferences, still less proofs.

Those who believe in a mixed churchmembership, including unregenerate and regenerate, often cite the parable of the tares. (Matt. 13 : 24–30.) The field, they say, represents the church, and as the tares and wheat were to be suffered to grow together till the harvest, so the regenerate and unregenerate are to be intermingled in the church. It is a decisive objection to this plausible theory that our Lord himself interpreted this parable to his disciples (Matt. 13 : 36–43), and declared that the field represents, not the church, but the world; the tares being separated from the wheat in the final judgment of mankind.

If infants are members of the church, equally with

adults, it follows that they are equally entitled to all its privileges. If they are fit subjects for baptism, they are fit subjects for the Lord's Supper. Whoso denies this assumes the burden of proving his position. There is nowhere in Scripture any authority to give the former ordinance, and to withhold the latter. The Greek Church recognizes the fact that infant baptism logically requires infant communion, and has the courage of its logic; but other Pædobaptist bodies save part of the truth, at the expense of consistency, by denying participation in the Lord's Supper to those baptized in infancy until these have reached years of understanding, and have made a public profession of faith.

The church at Jerusalem, composed of believers baptized on profession of personal faith in Jesus Christ, "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." There is no record in the New Testament that any joined in the breaking of bread, which is the usual term for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, without first having been baptized. What is stigmatized, therefore, as "close" communion is simply strict adherence to Scriptural order—an order that bodies forth the spiritual significance of the two ordinances delivered to his church by Christ: baptism, as the emblem of the new birth, following immediately upon that birth, and being administered but once; the Lord's Supper, the emblem of union

with Christ, and spiritual partaking of his nature, following and being often repeated. In coming to the table of the Lord, who shall venture to add or to take from the terms prescribed by himself and by apostolic example? Precisely because the table is the Lord's, and not theirs, his obedient followers are constrained to yield to his will.

Such was the first Christian church, as to constitution and ordinances; and such, in these particulars, the churches of Christ continued to be to the close of the apostolic era. Of organization there was at first none; this developed as the need of it became manifest. The first step was the appointment of deacons, in order to relieve the apostles from the labor and responsibility of distributing alms. These officers were chosen by the entire church and set apart to their work by prayer and laying on of hands—an apostolic precedent that Baptists have not always been careful to follow. The appointment of pastors to have oversight of the churches, as their numbers increased, was the next step, so that the apostles might be free to give themselves to their specific work of evangelization. We read, "And when they [Barnabas and Paul] had appointed for them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they had believed." The word translated "appoint" is conceded by all scholars to signify "to stretch forth the hand," probably for the purpose of voting. This is held to indicate that

the congregations chose each their own pastor, the apostles setting apart the chosen ones with prayer, and, as is implied in other passages, with the laying on of hands. With the election of pastors, the organization of the church became complete, and in the New Testament there is no evidence of any further ecclesiastical machinery. The officer variously called "bishop," "elder," "pastor," was the leader, overseer, director. In many churches there seems to have been a plural eldership, but whether in such cases one was the bishop *par excellence* or all exercised joint authority, there is no indication, and probably much depended on the character of the men. Any supremacy, however, was due at the first, not to official rank, but to personal qualities.

Simple in organization and democratic in government, the New Testament churches were independent of each other in their internal affairs. There is no instance of a single church, or of any body of churches undertaking to control the action of another, or of a church being overruled by superior ecclesiastical authority. To the teaching of apostles guided by the Spirit of God, they did, indeed, defer much, and rightly; but not so much to the apostolic office as to the Spirit of God speaking through the apostle. The so-called council of Jerusalem, which is the nearest approach to the control of local churches by exterior authority (presbytery), was held while the local churches throughout Palestine were

in a chaotic state, if indeed they may be said to have had an existence. Its authority was rather moral than ecclesiastical, and its decision was final rather because it was felt to be the wisest solution of a grave question than because it was imposed by ecclesiastical powers and enforced by ecclesiastical discipline.

The church, in the broadest sense of the term, in the New Testament, includes all the regenerate living in obedience to Christ. Hence, though for convenience of administration divided into local congregations, independent of each other as to internal management, it is still the one body of Christ. The interdependence and fraternity of the churches is a broader and more precious truth than their independence. If the former, when abused, leads to centralization and prelacy, the latter, pushed to extremes, leads to disintegration, discord, and weakness. The apostles urged upon churches as well as upon individuals the duty of bearing one another's burdens, comforting each other in trouble, assisting each other in need, and generally co-operating to further the interests of the kingdom of God.

The worship of the early Christians was simple and spiritual. The disciples met on the evening of the day on which their Lord rose from the dead, and from that time forward the first day of the week—the Lord's Day it was soon called—has been observed as the special Christian day of worship. For some time those Chris-

tians who had been Jews probably continued to observe the seventh day, or Sabbath, in their usual manner. There is no evidence, however, that among the Gentile converts the observance of the Sabbath was ever taught, except by those extreme Judaizers who would also have the Gentile converts circumcised and obligated to keep the whole Jewish law. For a brief time after the day of Pentecost, every day appears to have been a day of worship, as it even now is with churches during a season of special revival; and the Lord's Supper was at this time celebrated daily. At a later period it was celebrated, apparently, every Lord's Day, though there is nothing to indicate that this was regarded as obligatory. Any Baptist church, however, that should choose to spread the table of the Lord every Lord's Day would have sufficient Scripture precedent to justify it in so doing.

In the apostolic age, the services of public worship consisted of prayer, praise, and the preaching of the word, probably with reading of the Old Testament writings, and of the New Testament writings as they appeared and were circulated through copies. In these respects the first churches, as was natural, no doubt followed the customs of the Jewish synagogues, to which their members had been accustomed from infancy. Music filled an important place in this worship, as we may infer from the apostle's reference to the "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" as in common use. The

chanting of psalms, antiphonal and otherwise, was no doubt a marked feature of Christian worship from the first, especially among those educated as Jews. Traces of ritual are found in the New Testament, not only in the Lord's Prayer and the Doxologies, but in rhythmical passages in the apostolic writings. But this ritual was simple, plastic, voluntary; not a rigid and required service. Nothing is more marked in the spiritual life of the early church, so far as it is disclosed in the Acts and Epistles, than its spontaneity and freedom from the bondage of formalism. This is, of course, more markedly manifest in the informal gatherings, closely resembling the modern prayer meeting, that supplemented the more public and general assemblies of the Lord's Day. These, however, like the *agapae*, or love feasts, that for a time accompanied the celebration of the Supper, were liable to abuse, and against disorderly proceedings in them we find the Apostle Paul warning the Corinthian church.

For a brief period there prevailed in the church at Jerusalem a peculiar state of things that has often been called "Christian Communism," and is in these latter days held up to Christians as an example for universal imitation. "And the multitude of them that believed," says the record, "were of one heart and soul; and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things in com-

mon . . . For neither was there among them any that lacked, for as many as were possessed of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto each according as any one had need." It is evident to one who reads the entire account that this was a purely voluntary act on the part of the richer believers, prompted by a desire to relieve those whom the peculiar emergency had made specially needy. The voluntary nature of the sales and gifts is evident from the words of Peter to Ananias, who with Sapphira conspired to lie to the Holy Spirit—"Whiles it (the property Ananias had sold) remained, did it not remain thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" To sell all one's goods and give it to the poor was not a condition of discipleship even at this time and place. But there is no reason to suppose that after the temporary stress had been relieved, this community of goods continued among even the Jerusalem brethren, while there is every reason to believe that no other church in the apostolic age practiced anything of the kind. There is entire silence on the subject in the Epistles and the remainder of the Acts,—a thing inconceivable if Christian communism had been a fundamental principle of the apostolic church. It is not wise or fair to draw a sweeping conclusion as to present duty from premises so narrow and uncertain.

The external history of the apostolic church is barely outlined in the New Testament. It may be described as a succession of missionary tours, in the course of which every part of the Roman Empire was traversed, and churches were planted in every province. Especially were the great cities, the centers of influence and power, visited at a very early period. Through his companion, the "beloved physician," Luke, the journeyings and labors of Paul are known to us in considerable detail. Had John Mark performed a similar service for Barnabas and Peter, and had some other disciple made a record of John's missionary tours, our knowledge of the apostolic era would have been vastly increased. Enough is known, however, to justify our wonder at the rapidity with which the new leaven spread through the known world. It has been estimated, though this must be pure guess work, that when John, the last of the apostles, passed away, near the close of the first century, the number of Christians in the Roman Empire could not have been less than one hundred thousand. In so brief a time the grain of mustard seed had become a tree.

NOTE.—On the baptisms at Ongole, see Appendix A.

CHAPTER II.

MARKS OF DEGENERACY AND CORRUPTION.

Early degeneracy. Amalgamating the old with the new faith. Effort to do this successful. Substitution of formalism for spirituality. This the root of corruption. Attributing magic power to baptism. Passages in the New Testament favoring this view. Opposing passages ignored. Baptism unduly emphasized. Great stress on baptism justified. Not evaded. Importance causes abridgment. True principle in baptism missed. Baptism regarded as means of salvation. Clinic Baptism introduced. Validity disputed. Affirmed by Cyprian. Not readily adopted by the church. Affusion increasing. Baptism of infants introduced. Time uncertain. Nearly universal from sixth century. Prepared for papacy. Perversion of the Lord's Supper. Origin of the catechumenate. Education displacing conversion. The church thus corrupted. The growth of asceticism. Celibacy. Mariolatry, penance, and the confessional. Origin of the prelacy. Wealth and degeneration. Patronage doing what persecution could not. Risks of prosperity.

BEFORE the last of the apostles had passed away, there were unmistakable signs of degeneracy and corruption in the Christian churches. Warnings against heresies and false teachers, not as future dangers but as present, are found in all of the later New Testament writings. From the very first, the preaching of the cross was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness; and even when Jews and Greeks were converted they endeavored to amalgamate the old religion with the new. In spite of our Lord's assurance that the new wine could not be put into the old bottles without the

loss of both, this attempt went on. Profoundly as the religion of the Jews differed from that of the Greeks and of other heathen nations, yet all pre-Christian religions had one element in common—they promised salvation to those who would attain the scrupulous observance of ecclesiastical rites. The note of all religions before Christianity was salvation by works; Christianity alone taught salvation by faith.

The efforts of converts imperfectly converted to assimilate Christianity to their former faith were only too successful. They failed to grasp the fundamental principles of the new religion, that each soul's destiny is the result of a personal relation to Jesus Christ, that eternal life is not the mere escape from retribution hereafter, but that it begins here in an intimate and vital union with the Son of God. They imagined that eternal destiny is settled by outward act, that the wrath of God may be averted by rites and ceremonies. The natural result was the substitution of formalism for spirituality, devotion to the externals of religion taking the place of living faith. To this one root may be traced in turn every one of the corruptions of the church, all of its aberrations of doctrine and practice. So soon as the churches founded by the apostles lost sight of the truth that man must be born again, and that this new birth is always associated with personal faith in Christ, the way was prepared for all that followed.

The first step in degeneracy, chronologically as well as logically, was the attribution of some mystical or magical power to baptism. It must be confessed that there are a few passages in the New Testament writings which, if they stood alone, would favor this view. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:3.) "Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism." (1 Peter 3:14.) "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts 22:16.) If passages like these stood alone, unmodified, we should be compelled to the conclusion that faith alone, without baptism, does not avail to save. By ignoring to a great degree those other and relatively numerous passages in which the spirit is exalted above the letter, and faith is made the vital principle of the Christian life instead of ritual, the churches soon made outward rites of more significance than inward state. Baptism was regarded, not perhaps as absolutely necessary to salvation, but as so necessary an act that if it could not be performed precisely in accordance with Christ's command and apostolic precedent, some simulacrum of it must be substituted. We see the first trace of this belief in the document known as "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which scholars are inclined to assign to the first half of the second century. The injunction regarding baptism is: "Now concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: having first uttered all these

things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in running water. But if thou has not running water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice, into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer and the baptized fast, and whatsoever others can; but the baptized thou shalt command to fast for two or three days before."

The early Christians were indeed justified in laying great stress on the importance of obeying Christ in baptism. It never seems to have occurred to them, as it has occurred to Christians of recent times, to evade this command, because to obey was inconvenient or distasteful; or on the avowed ground that something else might be substituted for the act commanded that would be more accordant with the delicate sensibilities of cultivated and refined people. Their obedience was implicit, ready, complete. Its one fault was an excess of virtue—an attempt to obey in cases where obedience was impossible. When water in sufficient quantities for immersion was wanting, there could be no proper baptism; but, as baptism was now conceived to be so very important, something must be done, and water was in such cases poured upon the head thrice, in quantities as profuse as possible no doubt, thus counterfeiting immersion as nearly as might be. The true principle was missed—that where

obedience is impossible God accepts the willingness to obey for obedience itself; and the wrong principle was adopted—that God can be obeyed by doing something other than what he commands.

The next development was the regarding of baptism as necessary to salvation—not merely a type or symbol of regeneration, but the means by which the Spirit of God effected, or at least completed, regeneration. In the writings of the Ante-Nicene church Fathers, the use of "regenerate" to mean "baptize" is so common as to be almost the rule. For a time, doubtless, the usage was figurative, but the figure was soon lost sight of, and baptism was accepted as a literal means of regeneration. The first practical consequence of this was the usage known as "clinic" baptism (from *kliné*, a couch), or the baptism of those sick unto death.

The first recorded case of this kind, though others may have occurred before, is that of Novatian. Being very ill, and supposed to be near death, yet desiring to be baptized and wash away his sins, water was brought and poured in large quantities about him as he lay on his couch, immersion being thus simulated as closely as possible under the circumstances. Novatian recovered, however, or we should probably never have heard of this case. He afterward entered the ministry, but the validity of his clinic baptism was from the first disputed. The question of the validity of such baptisms was sub-

mitted to Cyprian, Bishop of Africa, and in one of the letters of that ecclesiastic we have an elaborate discussion of the matter. He was asked, he tells us, "of those who obtain God's grace in sickness and weakness, whether they are to be accounted legitimate Christians, for that they are not to be washed, but affused (*non loti sunt, sed perfusi*) with the saving waters." His conclusion was that "the sprinkling of water (*aspersio*), prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the church, when the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord, and by the truth of faith."

It will be noted by the attentive reader of these words that the decision rests wholly on the sacramentarian notion that baptism conveys God's saving grace. It was a natural conclusion by those who held this view that God's grace could work with a little water as well as with more. But it was long before Cyprian's view fully prevailed in the church. It was agreed, to be sure, that clinic baptism would suffice for salvation, but it was felt to be an incomplete and unsatisfactory form, and ordination was long refused those who had been subjects of this mutilated ceremony. The idea that affusion would serve as baptism in other than cases of extreme necessity made its way very slowly in the church, and that form of administration had no official sanction until the

Council of Ravenna, in 1311, decided that "baptism is to be administered by trine aspersion or immersion."

The first clinic baptisms, as we have seen, were performed by so surrounding the body of the sick person with water that he might be said to be immersed in water. It was, however, a short and easy step to diminish the quantity of water, and then to apply it to other than sick persons. The practice of perfusion and affusion gradually increased from the time of Novatian, though for several centuries immersion continued to be the prevailing administration of the ordinance. Aspersion was very uncommon until the seventeenth century.

Another consequence of the idea of baptismal regeneration was the baptism of infants. It logically followed, if those unbaptized were unregenerate, that all who died in infancy were unsaved. This was a conclusion from which the Christian consciousness of the early church revolted as strongly as that of our own day, which utterly rejects the Westminster declaration that "elect infants" are saved, with its logical corollary that non-elect infants are lost. The true solution of the difficulty would have been found in a return to apostolic ideas of the nature and function of baptism; but a contrary idea having become too deeply settled in the church for such a return, the only alternative solution was to baptize infants, so that they might be regenerated and saved if they died before reaching the years in which personal

faith is possible. Just when infant baptism began is uncertain; scholars have disputed long over the question without arriving at any decisive proof. It is tolerably certain, however, that by the time of Tertullian (A. D. 150–220), the practice was general, though by no means universal. We know, for example, that Augustine, though the son of the godly Monica, was not baptized in infancy, but on personal profession of faith at the age of thirty-three. Similar cases were frequent without a doubt, though from this time on they became more rare, until from the sixth century the practice of infant baptism was universal, or nearly so, Nothing in the history of the early church did so much as this departure from apostolic precedent to prepare the way for the papacy. It introduced into the church a multitude whose hearts were unchanged by the Spirit of God, who were worldly in aims and in life, and who sought for the worldly advancement of the church that thus their own power and importance might be magnified. This consummation was doubtless aided and hastened by the rapid contemporary growth of the church in numbers and its increase in worldly prosperity.

The idea of sacremental grace did not stop with the corruption of the doctrine of baptism, but extended to the Lord's Supper. There are passages in the early Fathers that amply justify the later doctrine known as the real presence and consubstantiation, if they do not

go to the extreme length of transubstantiation. With the decrease of vital faith the increase of ritual kept pace, and the administration of the Lord's Supper, from being a simple and spiritual ceremony, became surrounded by the cloud of observances that distinguish the mass of the Roman Church. Laying as great a stress as Luther did upon the mere letters of Scripture, the church insisted that the words "This is my body" were to be accepted by all faithful Christians as a literal statement of truth, and that Paul's words when he says that the broken bread is the body of Christ do not indicate a spiritual partaking of Christ's nature, but a literal and materialistic reception of it in and through the bread and wine.

In the section concerning baptism, already quoted from "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," the catechumenate is already recognized, at least in germ. Baptism was no longer to be administered upon the mere confession of faith, but was to be preceded by a somewhat elaborate instruction, for which the first six chapters of the "Teaching" were originally devised. The catechumenate was not in itself a departure from the fundamental principles of the primitive church. There was a necessity, such as is felt by the missionaries in heathen lands at this day, of instructing converts in the first principles of the Christian faith. It is true now in heathendom as it was then, that a sufficient knowledge

of the Christian faith for salvation may be gained in a comparatively brief time, while the convert is in a dense state of ignorance regarding all else that separates Christianity from his heathen faith. Accordingly, our own missionaries are compelled in some cases, perhaps in all, to exercise caution in the reception of those heathen who profess conversion, and to give them such preliminary instruction in Christian doctrine as will enable them intelligently to become disciples of Christ and members of the Christian church. But it is evident that instruction of this kind, prior to baptism, should be extremely simple and elementary, and need not be greatly protracted. So soon as the catechumenate was an established institution in the Christian church, its system of instruction became elaborate and prolonged, and candidates were delayed in these schools of instruction for many months, even for several years, before they were allowed to be baptized. The tendency of such an institution was to foster the idea that men might be educated into Christianity, and to decrease the reliance of the church upon the agency of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men. The practical result was to introduce many into the churches who had never been subjects of the regenerating grace of God, but had simply been instructed in Christianity as a system of theology or philosophy, and their intellectual assent to its teachings was accepted as equivalent to saving faith. What

might have been and doubtless was at first an effective agency for good, became an instrument for the corruption of the church.

The growth of asceticism was another development of the idea of salvation by works. The Manichæan heresy, though it was nominally rejected by the church, was in part accepted. Its Persian dualism was agreeable to the spirit of the age. Teaching an eternal conflict between spirit and matter, and that the latter is the source of all evil, this philosophy was easily reconciled with the idea of salvation by works. Sin was held to be the result of the union of man's spirit with a body, and only by keeping the body under, mortifying the flesh by fasting and maceration, could sin be overcome. The contempt for marriage and the undue exaltation of virginity that appears in the Fathers, notably in Jerome, not only gave impetus to monachism and the celibacy of the clergy, with their vast train of evils, but laid the foundation for the exaltation of Mary above her Son, and the idolatries and blasphemies of Roman Catholicism. The doctrine of penance, with its later accompaniment, the confessional, may be traced also to this same origin. All are alike branches from the root idea that salvation is not the free gift of God through Christ, but something to be earned by human effort or purchased from a store of merits laid up by the saints.

It is evident that this corruption in the life and doc-

trine of the church could not occur without a corresponding degeneracy,—or, as some would say, development—in the externals of the body. What we should thus expect *a priori* we actually find in history. The plural eldership, or presbytery, of the early churches gradually gave way to prelacy. The title of *episcopos*, at first common to all the elders, was appropriated by one, the rest remaining presbyters. For some time, however, the *episcopos* was only a local officer, chief in his own city, and there having precedence of the presbyters. Of diocesan episcopacy there is hardly a trace until late in the third century.

The rapidity with which the doctrine, ritual, and polity of the early church degenerated, was directly proportioned to its growth in wealth and worldly prosperity. There is no lesson taught by the early church that needs to be learned now by Baptists more than this. So long as the church was feeble, persecuted, and poor, though in some things it departed from the standard of the New Testament, it was comparatively pure in both doctrine and life. Adversity refined and strengthened it; prosperity weakened and corrupted it. What the persecutions of Nero and Domitian were powerless to accomplish, the patronage of Constantine and his successors did only too well. Baptists have had their period of adversity, when they inherited Christ's promise, "Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and

say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." Will they endure the harder test of prosperity, when they are great in numbers, in wealth, in influence, so that all men speak well of them?

NOTE.—For Cyprian's letter on clinic baptism, see Appendix B.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH IN THE WILDERNESS.

Rome's claim as God's vicegerent. Claims of an unbroken history. Those opposing Rome, schismatics. Anglican and Baptist search for antiquity. Historic continuity and succession of baptism. Of no importance. Assume what Christ did not promise. Revelation, chapter twelfth, and church history. A large view of each sees mutual correspondence. A lost battle not a lost campaign. Baptist theory of church and apostolic succession. True succession, that of faith. Other succession impossible to trace. Early historic sects, not modern Baptists. Montanists, ascetic and unscriptural. Not unlike modern Irvingites. Novatians and Donatists, prelatic and unbaptistic. Manichæans, dualistic. Led to immorality. Unlikeness of other sects to Baptists. Christian character of these not denied. Historic continuity not susceptible of disproof. Cannot bear historic tests. Incapable of establishment.

"THOU art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." Such was the reply of our Lord when his ever-confident disciple answered the question, "Who say ye that I am?" in the memorable words, then for the first time uttered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The Church of Rome points to this text as conclusive proof of her claims to be God's vicegerent on earth, the true church, against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail. It further points to its unbroken succession, and a history, which, if dim and uncertain at the first, since the fourth century, at least,

has not a break, and not improbably extends back to the apostolic era, if not to Peter himself. It challenges any of the bodies that dispute its claim to show an equal antiquity and a succession from the days of the apostles as little open to serious question. Those that accept this test, and fail to meet it, must confess themselves schismatics and heretics, resisters of God, and doomed to overthrow here, as well as condemnation hereafter.

Many Protestants accept Rome's challenge, while rejecting Rome's interpretation of our Lord's words, and regarding the "rock" on which the church is to be builded as rather Peter's confession than Peter himself. Anglican divines have great faith in a pleasing tradition that the Church of England was founded by the Apostle Paul during a third missionary tour, hinted at in the New Testament, but not described; and they flatter themselves that they thus establish an antiquity not second to that of Rome. Some Baptists have been betrayed into a similar search for proofs of antiquity, misled by the idea that such proof is necessitated by the promise that "the gates of Hades shall not prevail against" the true church. If then, they reason, Baptist churches are true apostolic churches, they must have existed from the days of the apostles until now, without break of historic continuity. This exaggerated notion of the worth of antiquity as a note of the true church, is strengthened by the theory of baptism held by some

Baptists, namely, that no one is baptized unless he is immersed by one who has himself been immersed. This is to substitute for the apostolic succession of "orders," which the Roman Church boasts, an apostolic succession of baptism. The theory compels its advocates to trace a visible succession of Baptist churches, from the days of the apostles to our own, or to confess that proof is lacking of the valid baptism of any living man.

Passing by this latter theory, as of no present importance save in its bearing on the question of antiquity, is it not evident that in accepting the challenge of Rome, Protestants in general and Baptists in particular, commit as great an error in tactics as in exegesis? To assume the necessity of an outward continuity in the life of the church is gratuitously to read into the words of our Lord what he carefully refrained from saying. Rome for her own purposes assumes the only possible import of the words to be that Christ's church will have a historic continuity that can be proved by documentary and other evidence. This is by no means a self-evident inference from what Jesus says. He promises indeed the ultimate victory of his church over all the forces of earth and hell that may be arrayed against her; but he does not promise victory in every contest.

There is in the Revelation of John, a divinely given help toward the interpretation of our Lord's promise. The woman clothed with the sun (chapter 12), who is

held by nearly all interpreters to represent the church, flees away to the wilderness to escape persecution, and is there "nourished for a time, times and half a time," while the nominal church itself becomes apostate, a persecutor, the Harlot drunk with the blood of the saints. That there should be a considerable period when the gates of Hades would appear to be prevailing against the church seems to be clearly implied in the Revelation. No one can read chapters twelve to fourteen inclusive of that book without being impressed by the wonderful way in which the prophecies correspond to the history of Christianity This at least is true if one is content to trace only general correspondence, to take a large view of both the prophecy and the history, and not attempt to fit each item of the one to a feature of the other. We may safely conclude, therefore, that what our Lord promised to his church is her ultimate, but not her continuous, triumph. A victorious campaign is not inconsistent with the loss of a battle and apparent disaster at some time during its progress. Christ's promise would not be broken though we should find the church at some period of history apparently overcome by Satan, and suppressed, though no trace of it should be left in literature, though no organized bodies of Christians holding the faith in apostolic simplicity could be found anywhere in the world. The truth would still be, as he had promised, witnessed somewhere, somehow, by somebody; and in

due time the hidden stream would reappear. The church does not cease to be because it is driven into the wilderness.

To Baptists, indeed, of all people, the question of tracing their history to remote antiquity should appear nothing more than an interesting study. Our theory of the church as deduced from the Scriptures requires no outward and visible succession from the apostles. If every church of Christ were to-day to become apostate, it would be possible and right for any true believers to organize to-morrow another church on the apostolic model of faith and practice, and that church would have the only apostolic succession worth having—a succession of faith in the Lord Christ and obedience to him. Baptists have not the slightest interest therefore in wresting the facts of history from their true significance; our reliance is on the New Testament, and not on antiquity; on present conformance to Christ's teachings, not on an ecclesiastical pedigree, for the validity of our church organization, our ordinances, and our ministry.

By some Baptist writers, who have failed to grasp this principle, there has been a distressful effort to show a succession of Baptist churches from the apostolic age until now. It is certain, as impartial historians and critics allow, that the early church, including the first century after the New Testament period, was organized as Baptist churches are now organized and professed the

faith that Baptist churches now profess. It is also beyond question that for fully four centuries before the Reformation there were bodies of Christians under various names stigmatized by the Roman Catholic Church as heretics, who professed nearly—sometimes identically—the faith and practice of modern Baptists, and with whom we have a demonstrable historic connection. But a period of a thousand years intervenes, in which the only visible church of unbroken continuity was the Romish Church, which had far departed from the early faith. How is it possible to trace during this time a succession of Baptist churches?

Nevertheless, the attempt has been made, at one time or another, to identify as Baptists nearly every sect that separated from the Romish Church. It will not suffice to prove that most of these sects held certain doctrines from which the great body of Christians had departed—doctrines that Baptists now hold, and that are believed by them to be clearly taught in the New Testament—or that the so-called heretics were often more pure in doctrine and practice than the body that assumed to be the only orthodox and Catholic Church. This is quite different from proving the substantial identity of these sects with modern Baptists. Just as, for example, it is easily shown that Methodists and Presbyterians hold a more Biblical theology and approach nearer to apostolic practice than the Roman or Greek churches; while yet all know that

a considerable interval separates them from Baptists. It is one thing to prove that the various heretical sects bore testimony, now one, now another, to this or that truth held by a modern denomination, and quite another thing to identify all or any of these sects with any one modern body. This is equally true, whether the investigation be confined to polity or to the substance of doctrine.

One of the earliest bodies through which certain writers have sought to trace the line of Baptist descent is the Montanists, whose origin dated from about the year 150 A. D. Montanism began in a protest against the corrupt life and teachings sanctioned by the degenerated church of the second century. It gradually attracted to itself, as Dr. Schaff well says, "all the ascetic, rigoristic, and chiliastic elements of the ancient church." Not at first so much a departure from the faith as a morbid overstraining of practical morality and discipline, it speedily identified with itself many forms of fanaticism and false religious teaching—false because opposed to the Scriptures. It approved the doctrine of the modern Friends, that the gift of prophecy and special divine inspiration was perpetual in the church. It was the original propagandist of "faith cure" and pre-millennarian teachings. The Montanist prophets spoke with tongues, and when their prophecies conflicted with the Scriptures, a higher authority was asserted for the former than for the written word.

This single note would serve to show a complete separation in spirit between Montanists and Baptists, whose fundamental belief is that in the canon of Scripture we have a complete and authoritative revelation from God, and that whatever contradicts the written word is of necessity to be rejected as untrue. One may trace a curious correspondence in many things between the history of Montanism and the rise in our own day of the sect known as Irvingites, though they prefer to call themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church. The one sect is as truly Baptist as the other. The Montanists, it may be added, were in polity no whit different from the Roman Catholic Church, both having abandoned the apostolic simplicity of congregationalism for episcopacy.

The Novatians (250 A. D.) and Donatists (311–415 A. D.) are other sects through which some have fancied that the lineage of Baptists may be traced. These bodies were alike in two essentials: they differed in doctrine in no fundamental respect from the Romish Church, but were mere schismatics on a question of polity. They were prelatic in government, having bishops rival to those of the Romish Church, and though among their teachings there is some truth that Baptists of this day hold, there is much that we should not tolerate for a moment. Our descent cannot be traced along this line.

A group of sects, variously known as Manichæans,

Paulicians, Cathari, and Albigenses, having a practical continuity of belief if not an absolute historic connection with each other, is relied on by some Baptists as furnishing proof of our antiquity. These sects, though differing considerably in teaching, have one fundamental element in common, that was furnished by the first named body. Manichæism is not properly a form of Christianity, but a distinct religion, as distinct as Mohammedanism. It originated in Persia, about 250 A. D., in the teachings of Mani. Its distinctive feature is a theodicy, rather than a theology, an explanation of the moral phenomena of the universe by the hypothesis of the eternal existence of two mutually exclusive principles or forces, one good, and the other evil. These forces, conceived as personal, and corresponding to the God and Satan of the Christian theology, are in everlasting conflict, and neither can ever overcome the other. In Manichæism the good spirit was represented as the creator of the world, but his work was vitiated by the agency of the evil spirit, which introduced sin and death. The Paulicians, accepting this dualistic system, taught that the world is the creation of the evil spirit, not of the good. Manichæism, as it advanced from Persia through the Roman Empire, came into contact with Christianity, and borrowed from it some of the latter's features that lent themselves most easily to such grafting, but it was essentially an alien religion, and not a Christian heresy. The Paulicians,

Cathari, and Albigenses, on the contrary, were more distinctively Christians, though they borrowed the dualistic theology, and attempted to incorporate it with Scripture teaching. Manichæism was also remarkable for its hierarchical system, which was as elaborate and rigid as Roman Catholicism. It would be difficult to name, in all the history of Christianity, a body that had less in common with Baptists than this. In Augustine's day, though many (including himself for a time) were persuaded into accepting this religion in lieu of Christianity, it had become a nursery of immorality. The division of those professing the religion into "hearers" and "perfect," the latter of whom were regarded as freed from the obligations of the moral law—precisely as the Christian doctrine of election was perverted by the Antinomians—lent itself readily to abuse, and the result followed that might have been foreseen.

The Paulicians, Cathari, and Albigenses have more superficial agreement with the views of Baptists. Nevertheless, their dualistic theories are essentially unchristian, and separate them sharply from such as profess to be guided solely by the teachings of the word of God. For the most part they either rejected or thought lightly of the Old Testament, and the Paulicians even refused to acknowledge part of the New. Like the Friends, they rejected water baptism in favor of the baptism of the Spirit bestowed on every believer at his conversion.

They also rejected the Lord's Supper as an obligatory ordinance for all time. The Cathari substituted an *agape*, or love feast, in which believers partook of bread only, but not as a memorial of the body of Christ, broken for his people. A vein of fanaticism and of ascetic observances runs through the history of all these sects, due in part to their professed principles, and doubtless in part to be explained by their continued persecutions.

In thus emphasizing the divergences of those sects from the teaching of the Bible, as Baptists have always understood that teaching, no denial is implied of the excellent Christian character manifested by the adherents of these erroneous views. In many instances the purest life of an age is to be found, not in the bosom of the truly Catholic Church, but among these despised and persecuted sectaries. Not one of them failed to hold and emphasize some vital truth that was either rejected or practically passed by in the church that called itself orthodox. God did not leave his truth without witnesses at any time. Now a sect, now an individual believer, like Arnold of Brescia or Savonarola, boldly proclaimed some precious teaching, perhaps along with what we must regard as pernicious error. But it is impossible to show that any one person, or any one sect, for a period of more than a thousand years, consistently and continuously held the entire body of truth that Baptists believe

the Scriptures to teach, or even its vital parts. It is possible that with further research such proof may be brought to light: one cannot affirm that there was not a continuity in the outward and visible life of the churches founded by the apostles down to the time of the Reformation. To affirm such a negative would be foolish, and such an affirmation, from the nature of the case, could not be proved. What one may say, with some confidence, is that in the present state of knowledge no such continuity can be shown by evidence that will bear the usual historic tests.

It ought always to be borne in mind, however, that for the larger part of our information regarding those stigmatized as heretics we are indebted, not to their own writings, but to the works of their opponents. Only the titles remain of the bulk of heretical writings, and of the rest we have, for the most part, only such quotations as prejudiced opponents have chosen to make. That these quotations fairly represent the originals would be too much to assume. Even with this conceded, it still remains true that the more carefully one examines such literature of the early and mediæval church as relates to the various heretical sects, the stronger becomes his conviction that it is a hopeless task to trace the history of the apostolic churches by means of an unbroken outward succession. A succession of the true faith may indeed be traced, in faint lines at times, but never en-

tirely disappearing; but a succession of churches, substantially like those of our own faith and order in doctrine and polity—that is a will-o'-the-wisp, likely to lead the student into a morass of errors, a quagmire of unscholarly perversions of fact.

PART II.

THE PERSECUTED CHURCH.

HINTS TO READERS.

On this general period, see the histories already cited. On chapter four there is very little literature accessible in English. Articles in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* on the persons and sects mentioned in the text will be helpful to some extent. On chapter five, read Burrage's *The Anabaptists of Switzerland.* (American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1882.) On chapters six and seven, see volume six of Schaff's history (New York, 1888), the best account in English, so far as it goes, of German Anabaptists, but occasionally open to criticism. On chapter eight, see Crosby's *History of the English Baptists* (London, 1738–40), especially volume one; Evan's *Early English Baptists* (London, 1862). Dexter's *True Story of John Smyth, the Se-Baptist* (Boston, 1881); *Publications of the Hanserd Knolly's Society* (ten volumes of carefully edited documents of the Puritan period), especially the volume of *Confessions* (London, 1846–54).

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH REAPPEARS.

The development of Roman Catholicism. Revolts against the tyranny of this. These arose in the church. The Reformation born of these. Peter of Bruys, and his protest. Tradition rejected for Scripture, and the church a spiritual body. Quotation from Peter of Clugny, on this point. Sacramental grace and the doctrine of purgatory denied by the Petrobrusians. Their beliefs, in the main, held by Baptists to-day. Henry of Lausanne's preaching, power, and imprisonment. Abelard and his lecture room. Arnold of Brescia, a political reformer. His doctrine of soul liberty. His views of Church and State. Fairly claimed by Baptists. Peter Waldo. Significance of name. His arousal, and disposal of his goods. His study of the Gospels and Psalms. Telling the story of the cross. The poor men of Lyons. Persecution prospers them. The soil prepared by previous sects. Doctrines of the Waldenses and Petrobrusians substantially identical. Testimony of Roman writers. The later pedobaptism of the Waldenses. Not inconsistent with the earlier probable rejection of infant baptism. Believers' baptism probably practiced by them. The spiritual ancestors of the Anabaptists. The two movements intimately related. Truth not extinguished.

THERE were Protestants before Protestantism, Reformers before the Reformation. The corruption of the primitive church, and the development of Roman Catholicism was a logical process that extended over a period of centuries. As the church diverged more and more widely from the faith once delivered to the saints, as the papacy gradually extended its power over all Europe, except, where the Greek Church successfully resisted its claims, it was inevitable that this tyranny

should, from time to time, provoke revolts; that against this apostasy there should be periodic reactions toward a purer faith. From the beginning of the twelfth century these uprisings within the church became more numerous, until the various protests combined their forces, in large part unconsciously, to form the movement since known as the Reformation. It is a curious fact that each of these revolts against the corrupt doctrine and life of the church had an independent origin within the church itself. None of them is traceable to the earlier heresies and schisms. If there was any such connection, it was so subtle and so well concealed that no extant literature or other evidence can be adduced to prove the fact. But if we may not trace, by unbroken historical descent, a line of sects protesting against the corruptions and usurpations of the Roman Catholic Church, and so establish the antiquity of any one modern Protestant denomination, it still remains an unquestioned historic fact that these successive revolts constituted a gradual and effective preparation for the general movement known as the Reformation, and for the rise of modern evangelical bodies.

The earliest of these protests that took definite form grew out of the work of Peter of Bruys. Not much is known of the life of this teacher, beyond the facts that he was a pupil of Abelard, that he began preaching in Southern France soon after the beginning of the twelfth

century, and that he was burned as a heretic in the year 1126. His doctrines are known to us solely through his bitter enemy and persecutor, Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, who wrote a book against the detestable heresy of the Petrobrusians. With due allowance for the mistakes honestly made by this prelate, and for the misrepresentations that he seems deliberately to have recorded, we may deduce approximately the teachings of this body. We find their fundamental principle to be the rejection of tradition and an appeal to Scripture as the sole authority in religion. The Abbot often complains in his treatise that these heretics will not yield to tradition or the authority of the church, but demand Scripture proof for everything; because it would have been easy for him to confute them by quoting any quantity of passages from the Fathers, only these obstinate heretics would have none of the Fathers. The second capital error ascribed to the Petrobrusians by their opponent is that they held the church to be a spiritual body, composed only of believers, and that baptism ought to be administered only to such as have believed on Christ. Among the sayings that the Abbot quotes from these heretics, are the following: "The church of God does not consist in a multitude of stones joined together, but in the unity of believers assembled." Also, according to him, they denied "that children, before they reached the age of understanding, can be saved by the baptism of Christ, or

that another's faith could avail those who could not exercise faith since, according to them [the Petrobusians] not another's, but their own faith saves, according to the Lord's words, 'He who shall believe and be baptized shall be saved, but he who will not believe shall be condemned.'" "Infants, though baptized by you [Romanists], because by reason of age they cannot believe, are not saved; [that is to say, are not saved by baptism; this is evidently what the Petrobrusians taught, not a denial of the salvation of infants; to a Romanist, denial of baptism was a denial of salvation, but not so to the Petrobrusians]; hence it is idle and vain at that time to wet them with water, by which ye may wash away the filth of the body, but ye cannot cleanse the soul from sin. But we wait for the proper time, and when one can know God and believes in him, we do not (as you accuse us) rebaptize him, but we baptize him who can never be said to have been baptized—to have been washed with the baptism by which sins are washed away."

A third capital error, according to the same authority, was that the Petrobrusians denied sacramental grace, especially the doctrine of transubstantiation, the keystone of the sacramental system: "They deny, not only the truth of the body and blood of the Lord, daily and constantly offered in the church by the sacrament, but declare that it is nothing at all, and ought not to be offered to God." They say, "Oh, people, do not believe the

bishops, priests, and clergy who seduce you; who, as in so many other things, so in the office of the altar, deceive you when they falsely profess to make the body of Christ, and offer it to you for the salvation of your souls. They clearly lie. For the body of Christ was made only once by Christ himself the day before his passion, and only at this time was given to his disciples. Hence it is neither made nor given by any one."

These words convey an utter absurdity, that Christ, while still in the flesh, made and gave his body to his disciples; but the absurdity is doubtless one of the Abbot's blunders. What is certain is the repudiation by the Petrobrusians of the sacrifice of the mass.

These same stiff-necked heretics denied the doctrine of purgatory and of prayers for the dead, taught that churches ought not to be built, that crosses should be pulled down and destroyed, and the like. A few of their teachings were perhaps extreme and unwise, a not unnatural result of the vigor of their reaction against the false teaching and wicked practices current in the church, but in the main the beliefs attributed to them are such as are firmly held to-day by Baptists the world over. It is true that Peter the Venerable assures us that they did not receive the Epistles as of equal authority with the Gospels, but this may easily be a misunderstanding or a perversion of what was actually taught and believed among them.

The question is already practically answered, Were the Petrobrusians Baptists? In their main principles they certainly were. Those, therefore, who attempt to trace the descent of modern Baptists through the Petrobrusians have at least a plausible starting point. Any body that holds to the supremacy of the Scriptures, a spiritual church, and believers' baptism, is fundamentally one with the Baptist churches of to-day, whatever else it may add to or omit from its statement of beliefs. Contemporary records have been sought in vain to establish any essential doctrine taught by this condemned sect that is inconsistent either with the teaching of Scripture or with the beliefs avowed in recent times by Baptists. With regard to the act of baptism contemporary record says nothing. There was no reason why it should, unless there was some peculiarity in the administration of baptism among the Petrobrusians. It cannot be positively affirmed that they were exclusively immersionists; but if they were, the fact would call for no special mention by contemporary writers, since immersion was still the common practice of the church in the twelfth century.

There were other preachers of a pure gospel, nearly contemporary with Peter of Bruys and more or less closely connected with him. Henry of Lausanne (1116–1150) is described by some as a disciple of Peter, though others insist that he did not share Peter's heresies. Certain is it that at one time they were close companions,

and the balance of evidence indicates that Henry of Lausanne was powerfully influenced by his predecessor and co-laborer. He was also a pupil of Abelard, a monk of Clugny, who put off the cowl to become a preacher of righteousness. Like Luther in later years, his first impulse of resistance to the church was caused by the wicked lives led by the clergy, and the corruptions not only tolerated but abetted if not openly practiced by all the higher dignitaries. He is described as a man of great dignity of person, of a fiery eye, a thundering voice, impetuous speech, mighty in the Scriptures. His preaching was largely Scriptural, an exhortation to shun the prevalent corruption of life and seek righteousness. His labors in Southern France were abundant, and Bernard of Clairvaux, who in spite of his saintly character hated this heretic most heartily, describes the effect of his preaching to have been such that the churches were deserted, "the way of the children of Christians is closed, the grace of baptism is refused them, and they are hindered from coming to heaven; although the Saviour, with fatherly love, calls them, saying, 'Suffer little children to come unto me.'" In 1148, this noble preacher and teacher was condemned by the Council of Rheims, not to suffer immediate martyrdom, but to undergo perpetual imprisonment, and he soon after died in solitary confinement. The words quoted from Bernard seem to prove that he taught and practiced the baptism of believers

only, while it is certain that he held to the supreme authority of Scripture and rejected the authoritative claims of tradition and the church. His followers were known for a time by the distinctive name of Henricians, but after his death they either wholly disappeared or, as is more likely, were absorbed into other bodies professing similar beliefs.

Arnoldo da Brescia was another of the pupils of Abelard who became a Reformer and a heretic. It was not without reason, from its own point of view, that the Roman Church condemned Abelard; for, whether he were himself in strictness a heretic, he was certainly the cause of heresy in others. The three most serious revolts of the twelfth century against the church are directly traceable to his lecture room. Arnold, after the completion of his studies, became a monk, but was unable to continue his vocation. The political corruptions of the church in Italy at this period made a deeper impression on him perhaps than the religious; and throughout his career he was a reformer of political even more than of religious institutions. In his view the State should be, not the empire at that time regarded as the ideal earthly government, but a pure republican democracy. Every city, he taught, should constitute an independent State, in whose government no bishop ought to have the right to interfere; the church should not own any secular dominion, and the priests should be satisfied to enjoy the

tithes of nature, remaining excluded from every temporal authority. This teaching differed totally from the then prevailing notion of a universal *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, the one ruling spiritual affairs, the other temporal, the civil ruler receiving his authority from the spiritual, and in turn protecting the latter with his sword and enforcing its decrees. A temporary and delusive success of Arnold's views in Rome itself was followed by defeat, surrender, and martyrdom, his body being burned and the ashes thrown into the Tiber. The chief significance of Arnold, as regards Baptist history, is that he was the first to proclaim with insistence and eloquence, the doctrine of soul-liberty and the separation between church and State. He may be fairly claimed by Baptists as belonging to them, since he was condemned by the Lateran Council for his rejection of infant baptism, and his Roman opponents charge that his followers administered baptism only to believers. These followers did not, however, maintain a traceable existence long after his death, though they doubtless went to swell the numbers of other heretical sects that rose soon after.

The twelfth century Reformer whose labors made the deepest and most lasting impression was Peter Waldo. The surname Waldo, more properly Valdez (Latin, *Valdesius*), probably indicates the place of his birth—in the Canton of Vaud perhaps; and as Peter of the Valley he was distinguished from the numerous other

Peters of his day. We first gain sight of him about the year 1150, when, already past middle life, he was a rich and respected merchant of Lyons. He became troubled regarding the salvation of his soul, not being able to find peace in the round of rites and penances prescribed by the church. Consulting a learned theologian, he was informed that there are many ways of salvation. "Of all the roads that lead to heaven," he asked, "which is the surest? I desire to follow the perfect way." To this characteristic query his mentor made reply in the words of Christ, "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come take up thy cross and follow me." Understanding these words in their literal sense, and being determined to obey the will of his Lord in all things, he returned to his house, divided his property with his wife, who did not share his anxiety, out of his moiety provided for his two daughters, and distributed the rest in alms to the poor. He then betook himself to the study of the Scriptures, and finding that he could understand the Latin but imperfectly, obtained the services of two priests to make a version of the Gospels and Psalms into the common dialect of the country. This version he studied and meditated on until it flowed almost spontaneously from his lips. What was more natural than that he should begin to talk of it to others? At this time there were in Southern France

many strolling minstrels to whose tales in rude verse the people listened greedily. Peter Waldo found it easy to persuade the people to listen to the story of the cross; and as he told it from city to city and from village to village, the numbers of his proselytes multiplied rapidly. Those fitted for the work and believing themselves called of God to it became preachers like their master. Soon the whole of Southern France was filled with lay preachers of the word, who were known as the Poor Men of Lyons, and later as Valdesians, or Waldenses. Waldo himself died in or about the year 1217, but before his death he and his adherents were condemned by the Council of Verone (1183), and expelled from Lyons. Thence they scattered all over continental Europe, and increased in numbers marvelously, in spite of bitter persecutions.

This rapid growth of the body cannot be explained wholly by the general preparedness of the church for the preaching of a more spiritual faith; or, rather, that state of feeling itself requires explanation. In the scattered fragments of preceding sects, notably of the Petrobrusians, soil was found most favorable for the propagation of the teachings of Waldo. The Waldenses, in their earlier history, appear to be little else than Petrobrusians under a different name. For, though there is reason to suppose that Waldo himself owed nothing to Peter of Bruys, but arrived at the truth inde-

pendently, he at once became the spiritual heir of his predecessor and namesake, and carried on the same work. The doctrines of the early Waldenses are substantially identical with those of the Petrobrusians, the persecutors of both being witnesses. For example, Roman writers before 1350 attribute the following errors to the Waldenses.

1. The New Testament alone, without the decrees of the church, suffices for salvation, and whatever is not proved by the text of the Bible they hold to be fable. (Reinerius.) Yvonetus asserts that they received only the Gospels, but this is doubtless an error.

2. They say that the mass is of no value at all, and the church singing infernal clamor. This last remark was intended against the singing of hymns in Latin, a tongue not understood of the people, and is not a note of antipathy to singing hymns *per se.* In fact, their first literature took the form of hymns.

3. They alone were the Church of Christ. (Yvonetus.) No one is compelled to faith; no one is holy but God. (Reinerius.)

4. They say that a man is then truly for the first time baptized when he is brought into their heresy. But some say that baptism does not profit little children, because they are never able actually to believe. (Yvonetus.) Concerning the baptism, they say the catechism is of no value. . . . Little children do not become holy through baptism. . . . The washing that is given to infants does

not profit. (Reinerius.) One argument of their error is that baptism does not profit little children to salvation, who have neither the motive nor the act of faith, as it is said in the latter part of Mark, "He who will not believe will be condemned." (Stephen of Bourbon.)

5. They do not believe it to be really the body and blood of Christ, but only bread blessed, which by a certain figure is said to be the body of Christ, as it is said, "But the rock was Christ," and similar passages. They observe this in their conventicles, reciting those words of the Gospel at their table and participating together as in the supper of Christ. (Yvonetus.) They say that the oblation made by priests in the mass is of no value and does not profit. They condemn altars. They say that the Holy Scriptures have the same effect in the vulgar tongue as in the Latin, whence they make (the body of Christ) in the vulgar tongue and give the sacraments. (Reinerius.)

Other less serious heresies are alleged: as that the followers of Waldo all preached without ordination; that they declared the Pope to be the head of all errors; that confession was to be made to God alone; that they abhored the sign of the cross. Also we find attributed to them certain tenets that were afterward characteristic of the Anabaptists; such as, "In no case, for any necessity or usefulness must one swear"; and "For no reason should one slay."

In the face of all-but-unanimous testimony of Roman authorities, it has been denied that the early Waldenses rejected infant baptism. Stress is laid on the fact that in the earliest of their literature that has come down to us the Waldensians are Pædobaptists, or at least do not oppose infant baptism. It is also an unquestioned fact that the later Waldensians, those who found a refuge in the valleys of Savoy after the crusade of Simon de Montfort in Southern France, are found to be Pædobaptists at the earliest authentic period of their history. But all this is not necessarily inconsistent with the accounts of the sect as given us by contemporary Romanists. Nearly three hundred years elasped between the crusade and the Reformation, and during these centuries the escaped Waldenses dwelt among the high valleys of Eastern France and Savoy, isolated and forgotten. Great ignorance came upon them, as is testified by the literature that has survived, and in time they so far forgot the doctrines of their forefathers that many of the writers saw but little difference between themselves and the Romanists. Some of the old spirit remained, however, so that when in 1532 a Pædobaptist creed was adopted under the guidance of Swiss reformers (Tavel and Olivetan), a large minority refused to be bound by this new creed, declaring it to be a reversal of their previous belief.

On the whole, then, the balance of evidence is in

favor of the conclusion that the early followers of Waldo taught and practiced the baptism of believers only. Dr. Keller, the latest and most candid investigator of the subject, holds this view: "Very many Waldenses considered, as we know accurately, the baptism on [profession of] faith to be that form which is conformable with the words and example of Christ. They held this to be the sign of the covenant of a good conscience with God, and it was certain to them that it had value only as such." This belief would logically exclude infant baptism, and accordingly Dr. Keller tells us, "Mostly they let their children be baptized [by Romish priests?] yet with the reservation that this ceremony was null and void." Maintaining these views, they were the spiritual ancestors to the Anabaptist churches that sprang up all over continental Europe just before the Lutheran Reformation. And it is a curious and instructive fact that these Anabaptist churches were most numerous precisely where the Waldenses of a century or two previous had most flourished, and where their identity as Waldenses had been lost. That there was an intimate relation between the two movements, few doubt who have studied this period and its literature. The torch of truth was handed on from generation to generation, and though it often smouldered and was even apparently extinguished, it needed but a breath to blaze up again and give light to all mankind.

CHAPTER V.

THE ANABAPTISTS OF SWITZERLAND.

Origin obscure. Their doctrines antedated the Reformation. The difficulty of limiting their origin to the Reformation. Not ignorant fanatics. Their churches fully formed from the first. Zwingli practically at first an Anabaptist. His mistake in not continuing such. Anabaptist leaders Zwingli's earlier lieutenants. Conrad Grebel the most prominent. The break between Zwingli and his radical associates. The adverse decision of the Council. Appeal to the civil power. Fines and imprisonment. The forced recantation of Hubmaier. Subsequent cruelties. The execution of Mantz, Falk, Rieman, and others. Zwingli's responsibility for these persecutions. The disappearance of the Anabaptists. Their doctrines well known. Their confession of faith. Similarity of their views to those of Baptists. Obedience to Scripture their crime. Cruelty versus piety.

THE origin of the Anabaptists of Switzerland is obscure. The testimony of contemporaries is that they derived their chief doctrines from sects that antedated the Reformation, and this testimony is confirmed by so many collateral proofs as to commend itself to many modern historians. Vadian, the burgomaster of St. Gall, and brother-in law to Conrad Grebel, says of the Anabaptists, "They received the dogma of baptizing from the suggestions of others." The industrious Fusslin reached this opinion: "There were before the Reformation people in Zurich who, filled with errors, gave birth to the Anabaptists. Grebel was taught by them; he did not discover his own doctrines, but was taught by

others." In our own day impartial German investigators have reached similar conclusions. Thus Heberle writes in the "Jahrbucher fur Deutsche Theologie." (1858, p. 276, seq.):

"In carrying out their fundamental ideas, the party of Grebel paid less attention to Dogmatics than to the direction of church, civil, and social life. They urged the putting away of all modes of worship which were unknown to the church of the apostles, and the restoration of the observance, according to their institution, of the two ceremonies ordained by Christ. They contended against the Christianity of worldly governments, rejected the salaries of preachers, the taking of interest and tithes, the use of the sword, and demanded the return of apostolic excommunication and primitive community of goods.

"It is well known that just these principles are found in the sects of the Middle Ages. The supposition is therefore very probable that between these and the rebaptizers of the Reformation there was an external historical connection. The possibility of this as respects Switzerland is all the greater, since just here the traces of these sects, especially of the Waldenses, can be followed down to the end of the fifteenth century. But a positive proof in this connection we have not . . . . In reality the explanation of this agreement needs no proof of a real historical union between Anabaptists and their

predecessors, for the abstract Biblical standpoint upon which the one as well as the other place themselves is sufficient of itself to prove a union of the two in the above-mentioned doctrines."

The utmost that can be said in the present state of historical research is that a moral certainty exists of a connection between the Swiss Anabaptists and their Waldensian and Petrobrusian predecessors, sustained by many significant facts, but not absolutely proved by historical evidence. Those who maintain that the Anabaptists originated with the Reformation have some difficult problems to solve, among others the rapidity with which the new leaven spread, and the wide territory that the Anabaptists so soon covered. It is common to regard them as an insignificant handful of fanatics, but abundant documentary proofs exist to show that they were numerous, widespread, and indefatigable; that their chief men were not inferior in learning and eloquence to any of the Reformers; that their teachings were Scriptural, consistent, and moderate, except where persecution produced the usual result of enthusiasm and vagary. Another problem demanding solution is furnished by the fact that these Anabaptist churches were not gradually developed, but appear fully formed from the first—complete in polity, sound in doctrine, strict in discipline. It will be found impossible to account for these phenomena without an assumption of a long existing cause.

Though the Anabaptist churches appear suddenly in the records of the time, contemporaneously with the Zwinglian Reformation, their roots are to be sought farther back.

One paramount reason why the Anabaptists do not appear, distinctively as such, in the early stages of the Zwinglian movement, is found in the fact that Zwingli was at first himself practically an Anabaptist. As he frankly confesses, he was for a considerable time inclined to reject infant baptism, in obedience to the fundamental principle he had adopted of accepting the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice, and rejecting everything that had no clear Scripture warrant. He had but to go on consistently in this way to have made the Zwinglian Reformation an Anabaptist movement. But having put his hand to the plough, he suffered himself to look back. He was in bondage to the idea of a State Church, a Reformation that should have back of it the power of the civil magistrate, instead of being a spiritual movement simply. But to fulfill this ideal, infant baptism was a necessity. The moment the church was made a spiritual body purely, consisting wholly of the regenerate, it of necessity separated itself from the world. This seemed to Zwingli suicide at the start, for he could see a possibility of success only through the support of the civil power. In this conviction is to be found, not only his reason for breaking with the Anabaptists, but

the secret of his mistakes and the cause of his untimely death. He gained, it is possible, for his Reformation a more immediate and outward success, only to establish it on a foundation of sand.

Up to the time of their separation on the question of infant baptism, those who afterward became Anabaptist leaders were among the most active and trusted of Zwingli's lieutenants. This was particularly true of Conrad Grebel. The son of one of the citizens of Zurich, he was socially a man of more importance than Zwingli, whose father was a peasant farmer. In eloquence, he appears to have been little the inferior of his leader, and he is described by Zwingli himself as "most studious, most candid, most learned." He was born in the last decade of the fifteenth century, and was educated at the universities of Vienna and Paris. At both institutions he attained high rank among his fellows, but his life was wild and dissipated. Some time before 1522 he was converted, and from this time on his life was one of perfect rectitude and piety. Though not a profound scholar, he was a learned man for his time, and his views regarding the church were derived from careful study of the original Scriptures, especially of the Greek New Testament. Another of the Anabaptist leaders was Felix Mantz, also a native of Zurich, the son of a canon, liberally educated, and especially versed in the Hebrew Scriptures. He was the firm friend and adher-

ent of Zwingli, until the latter gave up his early principle of the supremacy of the Scriptures. Mantz could not chop about so easily. Faithfully following the principle to its necessary conclusions, he became convinced that the baptism of infants is nowhere authorized in Scripture, but is, on the contrary, excluded by the requirement of personal faith as a precedent to baptism. Other prominent men among the Anabaptists were George Blaurock, a former monk, who for his eloquence and zeal was known as a second Paul; Ludwig Hetzer, of whose former career little is known, and who had but recently become an Anabaptist; and Balthasar Hübmaier, of whose labors a more particular account will be given in a subsequent chapter.

By the summer of 1525 the break between Zwingli and his more radical associates in the work of reform had become marked. A public discussion was demanded, in which the question at issue should be put to the test of Scripture and reason. Other discussions, private and public, had preceded this, strengthening the Anabaptists, but this was to be followed by an official discussion. It is not probable that the Anabaptists expected a victory, knowing that Zwingli was opposed to them, and that his influence was all-powerful with the Council. The Zwinglians brought forward the arguments of which later Pedobaptists have made so free use, that the Abrahamic Covenant continued in the New Dispensation, and that bap-

tism replaced circumcision. The Anabaptists, like Baptists of to-day, argued that there is no command or example for infant baptism in the New Testament, and that instruction and belief are enjoined before baptism. Incidentally, Zwingli reproached the Anabaptists for being separatists; to which they made the unanswerable reply that, if they were such, they had as good a right to separate from him as he had to separate from the Pope. The Council, however, made an official finding, to the effect that "each one of the Anabaptists having expressed his views without hindrance, it was found, by the sure testimonies of Holy Scripture, both of the Old and the New Testaments, that Zwingli and his followers had overcome the Anabaptists, annihilated Anabaptism, and established infant baptism." So little confidence had the Council in this annihilation of Anabaptism, in spite of their swelling words, that they proceeded to do what they could to annihilate it by means of the civil power. On this occasion they contented themselves with ordering all persons to abstain from Anabaptism, and baptize the young children. They added this grim warning: "Whoever shall act contrary to the order, shall, as often as he disobeys, be punished by the fine of a silver mark; and if any shall prove disobedient, we shall deal with him farther and punish him according to his deserts without further forgiveness."

That this was no light and unmeaning threat the Ana-

baptists had immediate reason to know. Grebel, Mantz, Blaurock, and others prominent in the movement, were summoned before the Council and commanded to retract their errors; on refusal they were thrown into prison loaded with chains, and kept there several months. Hubmaier, who had been compelled to seek a refuge in the canton, was thrown into prison also; and there sick, weak, [and it is said] tortured by the rack, he yielded for the moment and consented to make a public recantation. When brought into the pulpit, however, his spirit reasserted itself, and instead of pronouncing his recantation he made an address declaring his opposition to infant baptism and defending rebaptism. His amazed and disappointed hearers unceremoniously hustled him back to his prison, and by prolonged imprisonment and repeated totures at length extracted from him a written recantation. This was only a weakness of the flesh. that is no more honorable to Zwingli and his followers than to Hubmaier. On his release, he resumed his Anabaptism and remained faithful to his convictions until his death.

It would be a painful and useless task to detail the cruelties that followed. No persecution was ever more gratuitous and unfounded. Some of its later apologists have alleged that it was more political than religious, that it was a necessary measure to protect the State from seditious persons. It is sufficient to reply that contemporary records make no charge of sedition against

the Anabaptists. They were condemned for Anabaptism, and for nothing else; the record stands in black and white for all men to read. The Zwinglians found that having once undertaken to suppress what they declared to be heresy by physical force, more stringent remedies than fines and imprisonments were needed. In short, if persecution is to be efficient and not ridiculous, there is no halting-place this side of the sword and the stake. The Zwinglians did not lack courage to make their repressive measures effectual. On March 7, 1526, it was decreed by the Zurich Council that whosoever rebaptized should be drowned, and this action was confirmed by a second decree of November 19. Felix Mantz, who had been released for a time and had renewed his labors at Schaffhausen and Basel, was rearrested on December 3, found guilty of the henious crime of Anabaptism, and on January 5 was sentenced to death by drowning. This barbarous sentence was duly carried out. On the way to the place of execution, says Bullinger, a bitterly hostile historian, "his mother and brother came to him, and exhorted him to be steadfast; and he persevered in his folly, even to the end. When he was bound upon the hurdle and was about to be thrown into the stream by the executioner, he sang with a loud voice, *In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum* (into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit); and herewith was drawn into the water and drowned."

No wonder Capito wrote to Zwingli from Strasburg: "It is reported here that your Felix Mantz has suffered punishment and died gloriously; on which account the cause of truth and piety, which you sustain, is greatly depressed." If anything could depress the Zwinglian movement, one would think it would be this brutal treatment of those whose only fault was that they had been consistent where Zwingli himself had been inconsistent, in keeping close to New Testament teaching and precedent. About two years later Jacob Faulk and Henry Rieman, having firmly refused to retract, but rather having expressed their determination to preach the gospel and rebaptize converts if released, were sentenced to death, taken to a little fishing-hut in the middle of the river Limat, where, says Bullinger, "they were drawn into the water and drowned."

For these persecutions Zwingli stands condemned before the bar of history. As the burning of Servetus has left an eternal stain on the good name of Calvin, in spite of all attempts to explain away his responsibility for the dark deed, so the drowning of Mantz is a damning blot on Zwingli's career as a reformer. All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten the hand that has been stained with the blood of one of Christ's martyrs. If Zwingli did not take an active part in the condemnation of Mantz, if he did not fully approve the savage measures of the Council, he did approve of the suppres-

sion of Anabaptism by the civil power. There is no record of protest of his, by voice or pen, against the barbarous cruelties inflicted in the name of pure religion on so many of God's people, though his influence would have been all-powerful in restraining the Council from passing their persecuting edicts. He cannot be acquitted, therefore, of moral complicity in this judicial murder. Though not personally a persecutor, he stood by, like Saul at the stoning of Stephen, approving by silence all that was done.

Grebel was spared the fate of Mantz by an untimely death. His fiery spirit made him a natural leader of men, and at Schaffhausen, at St. Gall, at Hinwyl, and at many other places, he preached the gospel with great power and gathered large numbers of converts into churches. His labors continued little more than three years, and his name appears in the Zurich records for the last time early in March, 1526. All that we know of him further is that he died, probably soon after, of the pest. Had he lived a few years longer, his fitness for leadership would have given him a large following among his countrymen, the character of the Swiss Reformation might have been radically changed, and the history of Switzerland turned into a new channel for all time. Hubmaier was banished, to meet his martyrdom elsewhere. Blaurock was burned at the stake at Claussen, in the Tyrol, in 1529. Hetzer, driven out of Zurich,

went to Strasburg for a time, but being banished thence made his way to Constance, where he was apprehended, imprisoned for four months and then put to death. The formal charge against him was bigamy. He is said in some accounts to have had twenty-four wives, according to others he had nineteen, while some content themselves with saying vaguely "a great many." In the trial record at Constance he is said to have confessed that he married his wife's maid while his wife still lived. There is not a line of confirmatory evidence in the correspondence between Zwingli and his friends at Constance, nor in a contemporary account of Hetzer's last moments by an eye-witness. His death was after a godly manner, and the account says: "A nobler and more manful death was never seen in Constance. He suffered with greater propriety than I had given him credit for. They who knew not that he was a heretic and an Anabaptist could have observed nothing in him. . . . May the Almighty, the Eternal God, grant to me and to the servants of his word like mercy in the day when he shall call us home." This is not the way in which adulterers and vulgar scoundrels die. Dr. Keller pronounces the charge against Hetzer "an unproved and unprovable statement. Resting as it does on an [alleged] confession that is wholly unconfirmed, the official charge is to be regarded as a calumny invented to conceal the fact that there was no fault found in him save that he was an Anabaptist.

Thus one by one the leaders were killed or driven away or died by natural causes. By this means the persecutors at length attained their end. Though persecution at first increased the number of Anabaptists, they were for the most part plain, unlettered folk, rich in nothing else than faith, and little able to hold out unaided and unled against a persecution so bitter and determined. Gradually the Anabaptists disappear from the annals of Switzerland, but not without having left the impress of their character on the nation, and on the Zwinglian Reformation.

The teachings of the Swiss Anabaptists are accurately known to us from three independent and mutually confirmatory sources: The testimony of their opponents, the fragments of their writings that remain, and their confession of faith. The latter is the first document of its kind known to be in existence. It was issued in 1527 by the "brotherly union of certain believing, baptized children of God," assembled at Schleitheim, a little village near Schaffhausen. The author is conjectured to have been Michael Sattler, of whom we know little more than that he was an ex-monk, of highly esteemed character, who suffered martyrdom at Rothenberg in the same year this confession was issued, his tongue being torn out, his body lacerated with red-hot tongs, and then burned. The confession is not a complete system of doctrine, but treats the following topics: baptism, excommunication,

breaking of bread, separation from abominations, shepherds in the congregation, sword (civil government), oaths. It teaches the baptism of believers only, the breaking of bread by those alone who have been baptized, and inculcates a pure church discipline. It forbids a Christian to be a magistrate, but does not absolve him from obedience to the civil law; it pronounces oaths sinful. With the exception of the last two points—in which the modern Friends have followed the Anabaptists in interpreting the Scriptures—the Schleitheim Confession corresponds exactly with the beliefs avowed by Baptist churches to-day. It is significant that what is opprobriously called "close" communion is found to be the teaching of the oldest Baptist document in existence. With this Confession agrees the testimony of Zwingli and other bitter opponents of the Anabaptists. The only fault charged against them by their contemporaries, that is supported by evidence, is that they had the courage and honesty to interpret the Scriptures as Baptists to-day interpret them. Among the fragments of their own writings that survive are hymns that breathe an exalted spiritual life, a devout and simple faith in the teachings of Christ. Of their deep piety there is as little doubt as there is of the cruelty with which that piety was punished as a crime against God and man.

CHAPTER VI.

THE GERMAN ANABAPTISTS.

Name synonymous with error. Denounced by Romanist and Lutheran alike. Better understood. Historic vindication. The name opprobrious and often untrue. Three principal parties and epochs. First appearance at Zwickau. Misrepresentation of their views. No trace of fanaticism. Connection with mediæval efforts at reform. Hubmaier in South Germany. His career as student and preacher. His adhesion to Anabaptism. His success and flight to Switzerland. New work in Moravia. Imprisonment and martyrdom at Vienna. His purity and scripturalness. John Denck. His talents and mysticism. His influence mischievous. The Anabaptists and civil government. Two parties: one non-participant, the other inculcated the duties of citizenship. Hubmaier on the treatment of heretics. Anabaptists, and civil and religious liberty. A spiritual church tolerant. No Anabaptist a persecutor.

THE name Anabaptist stands in the literature of the Lutheran Reformation as a synonym for the extremest errors of doctrine, and the wildest excesses of conduct. The Anabaptists were denounced by their contemporaries, Romanist and Protestant alike, with a rhetoric so sulphurous that an evil odor has clung to the name ever since. If one were to believe the half that he reads about these heretics, he would be compelled to think them the most depraved of mankind. Nothing was too vile to be ascribed to them, nothing was too wicked to be believed about them—nothing, in fact, was incredible, except one had described them as God-fearing, pious

folk, studious of the Scriptures, and obedient to the will of their Lord, as that will was made known. The masses of the Anabaptists, as of the Lutherans, were uncultured people; but among their leaders were men unsurpassed in their times for knowledge of the original Scriptures, breadth of mind, and fervidness of eloquence. Historians of their own land and race are beginning to do these men tardy justice. The day is not far distant when German diligence and scholarship will prepare a complete vindication of the men whom German Reformers so maligned. In the meantime, enough is already known to set right many erroneous statements that have been handed down from historian to historian for centuries, and accepted as undoubtedly true without re-investigation.

The name Anabaptist was a convenient epithet of opprobrium, bestowed by the dominant party on all who opposed them. Many who are called by this title in Reformation literature were never Anabaptists, but practiced pedobaptism as consistently as any Lutheran or Romanist of them all. Others who were so far Anabaptists as to have rejected infant baptism, had not grasped the principle on which rejection of infant baptism properly rests, the spiritual constitution of the church. Three principal parties of Anabaptists (to follow Dr. Keller's classification) came upon the stage, one after the other, in three epochs, under different leaders. In

the period which lies between the years 1525 and 1530, such men as Balthasar Hubmaier and John Denck were the leading spirits. From 1530 to 1535, Melchior Hoffman and John of Leyden became masters of the situation in large measure. After the downfall of Münster, Menno Simons obtained a controlling influence. These three epochs or stages in the Anabaptist movement are worthy of brief examination in detail.

The first appearance of Anabaptism in Germany was in 1521, at Zwickau, on the border of Bohemia. Luther and Melancthon were greatly troubled by the prospect of a reformation within the Reformation. It has been the fashion among the church historians, following the lead of the Lutherans, to represent the Zwickau Anabaptists as a band of fanatics and disturbers of the peace, misled by a belief in their own prophetic inspiration and believing themselves endowed with a gift of tongues. The earliest Anabaptist literature, however, gives no support to this view. A strong tinge of mysticism is, indeed, found in the writings of some, and possibly an admixture of heterodoxy regarding the doctrine of the Trinity—though this last is doubtful. Of fanaticism, however, or encouragement of disorder, there is not so much as a trace. Of the "Zwickau prophets," as the Lutherans called them, the chief men were Nicholas Storch, said to be a poor tailor, Marcus Stübner, an educated man, and Thomas Münzer, a Lutheran, and a

preacher of fervid eloquence. Storch and Stübner appear to have been true Anabaptists, but little is known of their subsequent history. Of Münzer we know only too much. Undertaking to reform Church and State by physical force, he experienced the proof of the Scripture, "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

Though a definite time may thus be assigned for the first historical mention of Anabaptists in Germany, it is in the highest degree improbable that the real beginnings of the movement are to be sought in 1521. Dr. Ludwig Keller, State archivist at Münster, the latest, the most thorough and least prejudiced of German investigators of this period, holds that their origin lies far back of this time. He traces a connection between the Anabaptists and the mediæval endeavors at reform, a connection not merely unconscious, but historico-genetic and personal. The descendants of the mediæval "heretics" found nurseries and places of refuge in the obscure parts of Europe, and even in the towns among the guilds. Anabaptism is, in Keller's view, the real reformation movement, from which both Luther and Zwingli turned aside for political reasons. This is a view to which many circumstances lend strong confirmation.

The Anabaptists of South Germany, whenever they first became established there, owed no small part of their rapid growth to the teachings of Balthazar Hubmaier. This apostle of Anabaptism was born in the latter part

of the fourteenth century at Friedburg. In 1503, he entered the University of Friedburg, winning the praise of John Eck (then a tutor) for his preparatory acquisitions. He had a brave struggle with poverty, but completed his studies, and in 1511 we find him one of the Friedburg instructors. The following year he was made professor of theology at the University of Ingoldstadt, and also was pastor of the University church, in 1515 being made rector of the University. Called by Eck the most eloquent man in Europe, and equally esteemed for his learning and his piety, he was invited in 1516 to be the pastor at the Cathedral at Regensburg, where for six years his success as a preacher was so great that he might well have considered the highest offices in Bavaria open to him. At this time his conscience was roused by Luther's writings, and he could no longer remain in the Church of Rome. Resigning his position, and giving up his brilliant prospects without hesitation, he went to Waldshut, where he became pastor of a reformed church. But he could not rest satisfied with the position Luther had taken, and loyalty to the Scriptures compelled him to reject infant baptism. For a time he tried to compromise with his conscience by advising his people against the baptism of their children, yet performing the ceremony when the parents insisted on it; but ere long he became an uncompromising Anabaptist. In May, 1524, he called his church together and informed them

of his decision; and they almost unanimously decided to adopt his views of the nature of the Christian Church and the administration of its ordinances.

In the summer of this year the emperor demanded the surrender of Hubmaier, but his townsmen refused the demand. That they might not be punished for defending him, he voluntarily withdrew and sought an asylum at Schaffhausen. Two years before this he had been in friendly correspondence with Zwingli, and the latter was then inclined to agree with him about the unscripturalness of infant baptism. The times had changed, however, and Zwingli had changed with them. His former friend he now treated as an enemy. A few months later we find Hubmaier again at Waldshut, whence he vehemently protested against the persecuting edicts of the Zwinglians, though up to this time he had not himself been baptized. He had gone too far to retreat now, had he been so disposed; but, to do him justice, he does not appear to have hesitated when once his duty became clear to him, though to be baptized was to separate himself from all his former friends and expose himself to privation and danger. In 1525, he was baptized by William Reublin, and in less than ten days he had baptized more than four hundred of his congregation at Waldshut. The approach of the Austrian army compelled him to flee a second time in December of that year, and he sought refuge in Zurich. How he

was treated by Zwingli, his former friend—a man certainly not his superior in learning, piety, or eloquence—has been told in a previous chapter. On his release from his Swiss prison, he made his way to Moravia, and at Nicolsburg began a new and great work. Many Swiss Anabaptists had sought refuge in Moravia, as Waldenses had done earlier, and the way was prepared before him for the spread of the truth. His ministry was abundantly successful, his preaching attracting great crowds, but it was brief. Toward the end of 1527, he was seized by order of the emperor and conveyed to Vienna. There he was kept in prison three months, during which Roman theologians like Faber and Beck did their utmost to induce him to retract. On March 10, 1528, he was taken through the streets of the city in a wagon, red-hot pincers being thrust into his flesh on the way to the scaffold, where his head fell under the headman's axe and his body was burned. So died one of the purest spirits of the Reformation, a man against whose character no contemporary brought a charge, whose piety was equal to his learning, and who in eloquence was surpassed by no man of his time. Of his writings many remain to witness the character of his teaching, the scripturalness of his views.

Hubmaier was no mystic. He believed in no inner light other than the illumination of the Spirit of God that is given to every believer who walks close with God.

His appeal on all disputed points is not to this internal witness of the Spirit, for which other voices might be mistaken, but to the written word of God which cannot err. To the law and the testimony he referred every doubtful question, and by the decision thus reached, he loyally abided. Another leader of this time, John Denck, was a man of different mental caste. Educated at Basel, whence he was graduated an excellent classical and Hebrew scholar, he became a proof reader and teacher. By January, 1525, he had become heretical enough to be banished from Nuremburg and forbidden to return on pain of death. Going to Augsburg, he resumed his profession, and not long after was baptized by Hubmaier. He was saved from martyrdom by dying in 1527, while yet a young man. His contemporaries unite in praising his brilliant talents and exemplary life. "In Denck, that distinguished young man," says Vadian, "were all talents so extraordinarily developed that he surpassed his years, and appeared greater than himself." His work as translator and author was of high quality. His translation of the Hebrew prophets, made in connection with Hätzer, preceded Luther's by several years, and was freely drawn upon by the latter, which is one testimony among many to its merit. Denck was, however, a mystic: a believer in the inner light; and this belief not only led him into some doctrinal vagaries, but had a very mischievous effect on his followers. The

charge that he did not believe in the divinity of Christ, Dr. Keller thinks is unproved, but it is admitted that he believed in the final restoration of mankind. He obtained a large following in Southern Germany, where the influence of his work was felt for many years after his untimely death.

Two views prevailed among the Anabaptists of this period regarding civil government. One is that of the Schleitheim Confession, which defines the sword as "an ordinance of God outside of the perfection of Christ . . . ordained over the wicked for punishment and death," and forbids Christians to serve as magistrates. A very considerable part of the Anabaptists advocated those principles of non-resistance that have been professed by the Friends of later date. Hubmaier and Denck differed from this view in part. They held that the Scriptures direct men to perform their duties as citizens; that Christians may lawfully bear the sword as magistrates, and execute the laws, save in persecution of others. In his tract on the *Christian Baptism of Believers*, Hubmaier says: "We confess openly that there should be secular government that should bear the sword. This we are willing and bound to obey in everything that is not against God." In his treatise on the sword he defines and distinguishes civil and religious powers, pointing out the true relations of Church and State, with a clearness that a modern Baptist might well imitate, but

could not excel. "In matters of faith," said Denck, "everything must be left free, willing, and unforced." Hubmaier denounced persecution in his *Heretics and Those Who Burn Them*, written at Schaffhausen before he had by his rebaptism fully ranged himself with the Anabaptists: "Those who are heretics one should overcome with holy knowledge, not angrily but softly . . . If they will not be taught by strong proofs, or evangelical reasons, let them be mad, that those that are filthy may be more filthy still . . . This is the will of Christ, who said, 'Let both grow together till the harvest, lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat with them!' . . . Hence it follows that the inquisitors are the greatest heretics of all, since they against the doctrine and example of Christ condemn heretics to fire, and before the time of harvest root up the wheat with the tares . . . And now it is clear to every one, even the blind, that a law to burn heretics is an invention of the devil. Truth is immortal." These disconnected sentences give an idea of the course of thought through his brief tract, which is written with a fire that may well have stirred to wrath the persecutors whom it arraigned. The Anabaptists of this period were the only men of their time who had grasped the principle of civil and religious liberty. That men ought not to be persecuted on account of their religious beliefs was a necessary corollary from their idea of the nature of the church. A

spiritual body, consisting only of the regenerate, could not seek to add to itself by force those who were unregenerate. No Anabaptist could become a persecutor without first surrendering this fundamental conviction; and though a few of them appear to have done this, they ceased to be properly classed as Anabaptists the moment they forgot the saying of Christ, "My kingdom is not of this world."

CHAPTER VII.

THE ANABAPTISTS OF GERMANY AND HOLLAND.

Doctrinal vagaries in North Germany. Hoffman pious, but illiterate. Development of his ideas pernicious. Disorders under Münzer. Not chargeable to Anabaptists. Protest of Swiss leaders. Anabaptists not responsible for Peasants' war. Münster disorders more justly chargeable to them. The leaders of these. The wildest excesses. Münster captured. The principles of Rothmann opposed to his conduct. Anabaptist literature and these disorders. Recent views and Anabaptists' connection therewith. Their contemporaries unjust. The atrocities of the authorities. Endurance of the persecuted Anabaptists. Their disappearance at length from the history of Germany. Their origin in Holland under Menno Simons. Dissent of Menno from teachings of Münsterites. His success despite opposition. Similarity to Baptists. The permanence of the sect. Dissensions among them. "High" and "Low" parties. Establishment in Russia. Emigration to America.

IT was in Northern Germany that the anarchistic and doctrinal vagaries of certain few Anabaptists found their fullest development. He who has been called the leading spirit of the movement that culminated at Münster, never countenanced or taught the use of the sword in the cause of religion. Melchior Hoffman, a Swabian currier, was a man of fervent piety, of evangelical spirit, of pure and devoted life, but his mind was of the dreamy, mystical type, and his lack of thorough knowledge of the Scriptures in the original tongues and his deficiency in general mental culture made him an easy victim to speculations and vagaries. It was not

until 1529, after he had been some years a Reformer, but not a Lutheran, that he came to Strasburg, and there coming under the influence of Swiss Anabaptists, accepted their doctrines. His view of the sacraments had long been Zwinglian rather than Lutheran, and he now developed a peculiar doctrine of the person of Christ, according to which the eternal Word did not assume flesh from Mary. Hoffman was pure in life and mild in character, but not a few of his teachings contained germs of evil, and their development under his successors made the name Anabaptists a byword and a hissing in Germany to this day.

The fanatical outbreaks in South Germany had no connection with Hoffman. Their chief leader, if not instigator, was Thomas Münzer. He is invariably called an Anabaptist, but in reality he never belonged with that body. It is true that he wrote and spoke against the baptism of infants, but he regularly practiced it, and was therefore a Pædobaptist. The disorders under his leadership, culminating at Mülhausen in 1525, can not be justly laid to the charge of the Anabaptists, even if a few of their number should be proved to have been enticed into following this leader. The Swiss leaders, Grebel, Mantz, and Blaurock, addressed a letter of warning and remonstrance to Münzer in September, 1524, which did not reach him, but still exists in the archives at Schaffhausen to testify to the sound views of its author. "Is it true,"

Grebel asks, "as we hear, that you have preached in favor of an attack on the princes? If you defend war or anything else not found in the clear word of God, I admonish you by our common salvation to abstain from these things now and hereafter." It is impossible to say what effect this fraternal reproof might have had, but not receiving it Münzer went on his way, and by his rash attempt to mingle civil and religious reform, and enforce both by the sword, he forfeited his life.

Neither is it posssible to make the Anabaptists responsible for the Peasants' War of 1525–6. The peasants had a righteous cause, if ever men had one who strove for liberty with the sword, and the justice and moderation of their demands as made in their twelve articles is conceded by every modern historian. The authorship of these articles is attributed to both Hubmaier and Münzer. In both cases the ascription is pure guess work, but the latter is the more probable guess of the two. The peasants marred their cause by a few outrages, but these are not to be mentioned in comparison with the frightful cruelty of the nobles in suppressing the insurrection. Certain few Anabaptists may have engaged in this uprising for civil liberty, but they acted as isolated individuals; the body had no connection with these disorders as every fair hisiorian now confesses.

With a greater show of justice the Münster disorders have been charged to the Anabaptists. So vigorously was

the charge made in the first instance, and so faithfully has it been reiterated ever since, that to casual readers of history Anabaptist and Münster are almost synonymous. The troubles in that city began in 1532, when Rothmann, a Lutheran, preached the reformed doctrines with such power that practically the whole city became converts. The Roman Catholic clergy were driven out and a citizen militia was enrolled, for protection ostensibly, though it was soon used for persecution. Rothmann avowed himself an Anabaptist, and taught communistic and chiliastic doctrines, mingled with other vagaries. For a time Jan Matthys, a baker of Amsterdam, who had proclaimed himself a prophet, was the ruler of the city, but he fell in a sortie. He found a speedy successor in Jan Bockhold or Bockelssohn, better known as John of Leyden, who appeared at Münster in 1534 and gained great popularity as a preacher. All the fanatics and enthusiasts and madmen in Germany seem to have flocked into the city about this time. The wildest excess soon prevailed. Unbelievers were expelled; John of Leyden established a theocratic government, with himself at its head as prophet and king; polygamy was proclaimed, the prophet taking seventeen wives, while Rothmann contented himself with four. The town was besieged, taken June 24, 1535, and the ringleaders were put to death with frightful tortures, except Rothmann, who was killed in the assault.

The entire responsibility for these disorders was at once thrown upon the Anabaptists. There was this excuse for so doing, that several of the ringleaders, and a considerable number of their followers, called themselves or were called by that name. Yet the principles of Rothmann, in his writings that remain, are totally opposed to his conduct at Münster. In none of the Anabaptist literature of the time is there anything but horror and detestation expressed for the Münster doings; and even before they were made the scapegoats of this uprising, their writings were full of reproofs spoken against any who would propagate religion by the sword. Münster was not more decidedly contrary to the teachings of the Reformers than it was to the teachings of the Anabaptists. It is no more fair to hold the Anabaptists responsible for what occurred there, because Bockhold was an Anabaptist, than it is to hold the Lutherans responsible because Rothmann was a Lutheran when he began his evil career. Cornelius, the able and judicial Roman Catholic historian of the Münster uproar, says justly: "All these excesses were condemned and opposed wherever a large assembly of the brethren afforded an opportunity to give expression to the religious consciousness of the Anabaptist membership." Füsslin, a conscientious and impartial German investigator, says: "There was a great difference between Anabaptists and Anabaptists. There were those amongst them who held strange doc-

trines, but this cannot be said of the whole sect. If we should attribute to every sect whatever senseless doctrines two or three fanciful fellows have taught, there is no one in the world to whom we could not ascribe the most abominable errors."

But though these juster views now prevail, even in Germany, contemporary opinion pronounced an Anabaptist worthy of any punishment that could be devised. The most atrocious crimes were not avenged with a severity greater than was visited on the members of this unfortunate sect. The Diet of Speier decreed, in April, 1529, that "every Anabaptist and rebaptized person of either sex be put to death by the sword, or fire, or otherwise," and it was no empty form of words. Though the greatest cruelties were practiced in Roman Catholic countries, Protestant Germany was not far behind; and both, by their savage persecutions, branded themselves with an indelible disgrace. Cornelius, though a Roman Catholic a most candid writer on this period, says of the extent of these persecutions: "In Tyrol and Görz, the number of the executions in the year 1531 already reached one thousand; in Ensisheim, six hundred. At Linz, seventy-three were killed in six weeks. Duke William, of Bavaria, surpassing all others, issued the fearful decree to behead those who recanted, to burn those who refused to recant. Throughout the greater part of Upper Germany the persecutions raged like a

wild chase. The blood of these poor people flowed like water; so they cried to the Lord for help. But hundreds of them, of all ages and both sexes, suffered the pangs of torture without a murmur, despised to buy their lives by recantation, and went to the place of execution joyful and singing Psalms."

After the savage persecution following the downfall of Münster, one might have expected the Anabaptists to have been extirpated. Their prominent leaders, it is true, disappeared, some being put to death, some dying of hardships and excessive toils. They were not entirely without leadership, however, and their dauntless fidelity to the truth continued. In Moravia, about the middle of the sixteenth century, there were seventy communities of Anabaptists, prosperous farmers and tradesmen, acknowledged to be among the most thrifty and law-abiding element of the population. In Strasburg, in Augsburg, in Bohemia, and in Moldavia, they were also found in large numbers, and wherever found they were marked men by reason of their godly lives and good citizenship. Fifty years later, however, persecution had done its work only too well, and early in the seventeenth century we find the Anabaptists disappear from the history of Germany.

In Holland, they had better fortune; and under the name of Mennonites they flourished, grew strong, and still exist. Menno Simons, who gave his name to this

branch of the Anabaptists, was a Roman priest, born in Friesland, in 1492. His study of the Scriptures roused doubts in his mind regarding the teaching of the church, and he had begun to see some glimmerings of the true light. While in this state of mind he hears of the martyrdom of one Sicke Snijder (as his surname indicates, only a poor tailor), who, on the 30th of March, 1531, was condemned, as the court record reads, "to be executed by the sword; his body shall be laid on the wheel, and his head set on a stake, because he has been rebaptized and perseveres in that baptism"; all of which was duly done. The blood of that poor tailor produced a host of followers of the Lord, for whom he joyfully gave all that he had, even his life; for it led Menno Simons, after a long and hard struggle, to decisive action. He resigned his priest's office, and, in 1536, he was rebaptized on confession of faith, and became numbered among the Anabaptists. The issue of his *Fundamental Book of the True Christian Faith*, in 1539, established his doctrinal teaching on solid grounds. It differed from the Reformed theology only in maintaining the spiritual idea of the church, as a communion of true saints, and the necessary consequence of this idea, the rejection of infant baptism. From the first, Menno repudiated the ideas of Münster. In his *Exit from Papacy*, he wrote as follows: "Beloved reader, we have been falsely accused by our opponents of defending the doctrine of

Münsterites, with respect to king, sword, revolution, self-defense, polygamy, and many similar abominations; but know, my good reader, that never in my life have I assented to those articles of the Münster Confession; but for years, according to my small gift, I have warned and opposed them in their abominable errors. I have, by the word of the Lord, brought some of them to the right way. Münster I have never seen in all my life. I have never been in their communion. I hope, by God's grace, with such never to eat or drink (as the Scriptures teach), except they confess from the heart their abominations and bring forth fruits meet for repentance and truly follow the gospel."

From his baptism to his death in 1559, Menno was an apostle of the truth, preaching and founding churches across the whole of Northern Europe, from France to Russia. In spite of the severest edicts and the bloodiest persecutions, he continued faithful to his calling, and found willing hearers of the gospel wherever he went. The churches thus established increased in numbers rapidly, and in Holland they have a foothold to this day. Menno and his followers, while they grasped the fundamental idea of the spiritual constitution of the church, did not reach the full truth as Baptists understand it. They baptized only those who gave credible evidence of regeneration, but, misled by the practice of all other churches about them, they re-

garded affusion as a sufficient baptism.[1] After 1581, their mild, peaceable, and law-abiding character gained for them a measure of toleration that other Anabaptist bodies failed to enjoy; and with the independence of the Netherlands, came religious freedom, the Mennonites being formally recognized in 1672. This is probably the reason why they alone, of the Anabaptist parties of the Reformation, have survived to the present day.

Neither their love of Christ nor their fear of persecution was able to keep the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century from internal dissensions. In several localities, including the Netherlands, they separated into "High" and "Low" parties, the cause of division being chiefly the exercise of the ban, or excommunication. The "High" party demanded a rigorous discipline, extending beyond Scripture precedent, and concerning itself with the minutest details of daily living. The "Low" party were in favor of a more rational measure of Christian liberty. In some cases, the "High" party also insisted as an article of faith on letting the beard grow, and condemned the use of buttons on the clothing; while the "Low" party denied that the use of the razor was contrary to the word of God, and refused to see a means of grace in hooks and eyes. One branch of

[1] While this is true of the bulk of the Mennonites, some of them practice immersion, and probaby have practiced it from the first.

Menno's followers, those especially in Lithuania, at the invitation of Empress Catherine II., emigrated to Russia, and there founded flourishing agricultural communities, especially in the Crimea. They were for a long time treated with exceptional favor, their faith not only being tolerated, but the male members being exempted from military service on account of their religious scruples against bearing arms. Their descendants abode there until, in 1871, an imperial decree deprived them of this exemption, since when many of them have emigrated to America, forming strong colonies in several of our Western States.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS—ORIGIN AND DOCTRINES.

Their existence from the time of the Apostles discredited. Traditions of such unfounded. Appearance in the sixteenth century. Fleeing from Holland. Harried in England. These Anabaptists inoffensive. Baptist in the main. Proclamation against them. Relation to civil power. Persecution to the death. A prison Confession of Faith. Churchmen's references to Anabaptists. Their ultimate disappearance. No permanent impression on English people. Baptist Origin in the seventeenth century. Advent from Holland. Doctrinal Tenets. General and Particular Baptists. The latter's Confession of Faith. Explicit as to immersion. Maintains Scriptural order of the ordinances. This universal among Baptists. Immersion not novel. Found still in the English Church in seventeenth century. Practiced by some English Baptists from the first. Action of a London church. Blunt's mission to Holland. Immersion henceforth alone regarded as baptism. Doctrine of religious liberty formulated. Mark of Christian progress. Its authors and modern Baptists. The pioneers of liberty in worship.

IT has been maintained that Baptists existed in England from the times of the apostles down, but no evidence worthy of the name is producible for such an assertion. The traditions of a remote origin cherished by a few Baptist churches rest on no documentary or archæological proofs, and are probably of comparatively recent origin. Nothing is more common than a claim of vast antiquity for institutions that are demonstrably only a few centuries old. The sole thing that we are entitled to affirm with regard to Baptists in England is that traces of them appear in historical documents early

in the sixteenth century. It does not clearly appear that any of these were of English birth; certainly the major part were of Dutch origin, having fled to England to escape the persecutions that then raged in Holland. In this they were doomed to disappointment, for England harried the Anabaptists no less than Holland, casting them into prison and burning them at the stake.

That these Anabaptists were really an inoffensive folk, and that they held the views of the modern Baptists in the main, is proved by one of the earliest documents in which they are mentioned, a proclamation of Henry VIII., in which their alleged heresies were thus enumerated: "Infants ought not to be baptized; it is not lawful for a Christian man to bear office or rule in the commonwealth; every manner of death, with the time and hour thereof, is so certainly prescribed, appointed, and determined to every man by God, that neither any prince by his word can alter it, nor any man by his willfulness prevent or change it." In the sermons of Roger Hutchinson, published by the Parker Society, is a discourse preached prior to 1560, the following from which describes one tenet on which the Anabaptists of that day laid special stress:

"Whether may a man sue forfeits against regrators, forestallers, and other oppressors? Or ought patience to restrain us from all suit and contention? 'Aye,' saith master Anabaptist; 'for Christ our Master, whose ex-

ample we must follow, he would not condemn an advoutress woman to be stoned to death according to the law, but shewed pity to her, and said, 'Go and sin no more,' John 8; neither would he, being desired to be an arbiter, judge between two brethren, and determine their suit, Luke 12. When the people would have made him king, he conveyed himself out of sight, and would not take on himself such office. Christ, the Son of God, would not have refused these functions and offices if with the profession of a Christian man it were agreeable with the temporal sword to punish offenders, to sustain any public room, and to determine controversies and suits; if it were lawful for private men to persecute such suits, and to sue just and rightful titles. He *non est dominatus sed passus;* would be no magistrate, no judge, no governor, but suffered, and sustained trouble, injury, wrong, and oppression patiently. And so must we: for Paul saith, 'That those which he foreknew he also ordained before—*ut essent conformes imagini Filii sui*—that they should be alike fashioned into the shape of his Son.'"

In 1550, Joan Boucher, of Kent, was burned for heresy. She held a doctrine common among the German Anabaptists, from the time of Melchior Hoffman, that though Jesus was born of Mary, he did not inherit her flesh; the idea being that, if he had, he must have shared her sinful human nature. It was crude theology, but the harmless error of untrained minds. A wise

church would have winked at a matter that so slightly concerned a godly life; but for this offense, and the kindred crime of being an Anabaptist, Joan of Kent suffered death at the stake. In 1575, Hendrik Terwoort, a Fleming by birth, died in the same way for rejecting infant baptism, and the bearing of arms. A confession of faith that he penned while in prison contains the first declaration in favor of complete religious liberty made on English soil:

"Observe well the command of God: 'Thou shalt love the stranger as thyself.' Should he then who is in misery, and dwelling in a strange land, be driven thence with his companions, to their great damage? Of this Christ speaks, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.' Oh, that they would deal with us according to natural reasonableness, and evangelical truth, of which our persecutors so highly boast! For Christ and his disciples persecuted no one; on the contrary, Jesus hath thus taught, 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you,' etc. This doctrine Christ left behind with his apostles, as they testify. Thus Paul, 'Unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place; and labor, working with our own hands: being reviled, we bless; being persecuted, we suffer it.' From all this it is clear, that those who have the one true gospel doc-

trine and faith will persecute no one, but will themselves be persecuted."

The writings of this period, and the published sermons of English divines (such as Latimer, Cranmer, Hutchinson, Whitgift, and Coverdale) are full of references to the Anabaptists and their heresies. Thus, in 1589, one Dr. Some, a man of standing in the English Church, wrote *A Godly Treatise*, in which he charged the Anabaptists with holding the following deadly errors:

"That the ministers of the gospel ought to be maintained by the voluntary contributions of the people;

"That the civil power has no right to make and impose ecclesiastical laws;

"That people ought to have the right of choosing their own ministers;

"That the high commiccion court was an anti-Christian usurpation;

"That those who are qualified to preach ought not to be hindered by the civil power," etc.

Traces of the presence in England of Anabaptists of foreign origin continue through the reign of Elizabeth, but with the decline of persecution on the continent their numbers dwindled until they disappeared. They may have converted to their views a few Englishmen here and there, but they do not seem to have made any permanent impression on the English people, nor is the his-

torical connection clear between them and the later bodies of Englishmen bearing the same name.

For when, in the seventeenth century, the real history of the English Baptists begins, it is on this wise. In the year 1611, Thomas Helwys and others founded in London the first General Baptist Church. They came thither from Holland, where they had been baptized on profession of faith by Rev. John Smyth. This erratic, though able man had been a clergyman of the Church of England, and vicar of Gainesborough, Lincolnshire. Becoming a Separatist, or Independent, he emigrated on account of persecution to Amsterdam, where he united with the English Separatist Church, but was soon excommunicated on account of a work called *The Character of the Beast*, in which he opposed infant baptism. With Helwys and others, he formed a church on the Baptist model, and having baptized himself, baptized them. This se-baptism was probably, though not certainly, an affusion; the early English Baptists, like those on the continent, practicing both affusion and immersion, and laying stress rather on the nature of the church and the unscripturalness of infant baptism, than on the outward act. This church founded by Helwys was Arminian in theology. Baptists of this belief are, in England, called General Baptists, from the fact that they hold to a general atonement—that God's grace is offered through the atoning merits of Christ to all men alike. In spite

of persecutions, the General Baptists throve, and in 1626 they had eleven churches in England; while in 1644, by the admission of their bitter opponent, Dr. Featley, they had forty-seven.

An account of the founding of the first Calvinistic or Particular Baptist Church is thus given by William Kiffin, an eminent Baptist of that time:

"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 Lathrop, who was their minister at this time. In this society several persons, finding that the congregation 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 formed the 12th of September, 1633. And as they believed that baptism was not rightly adminis-

tered 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. Their number is uncertain, because to the mention of the names of about twenty men and women, it is added, "with divers others."

In the year 1639, another congregation of Particular Baptists was formed; and by 1644, the number of the Calvinistic churches had increased to seven. In that year these seven churches and one French church of the same faith united in issuing a Confession of Faith, composed of fifty articles, which is one of the chief landmarks of Baptist history.

The Confession, besides giving a brief exposition of gospel truth according to the Calvinistic theology, pronounces baptism "an ordinance of the New Testament given by Christ, to be dispensed upon persons professing faith, or that are made disciples; who, upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized, and afterward to partake of the Lord's Supper." It then specifies, "That the way and manner of dispensing this ordinance is dipping or plunging the body under water." The Confessions issued before this time are not so explicit in defining baptism as immersion, but they are equally plain in placing baptism before participation in the Lord's Supper. One of the fourfold confessions issued by the Smyth-Helwys

Church in Holland says: "The Holy Supper, according to the institution of Christ, is to be administered to the baptized." Indeed, in the whole history of Baptists not a Confession can be produced that advocates the invitation or admission to the Lord's Table of the unbaptized. "Open communion is as unhistorical as it is unscriptural."

Furthermore, though this Confession is the first to define baptism in explicit terms as immersion, this was not a novel idea among Baptists. Indeed, the practice of immersion had not yet died out of the English Church, though it was rapidly becoming uncommon. So late as 1644, an English clergyman, Blake, rector of Tamworth, says: "I have been an eyewitness of many infants dipped, and I know it to have been the constant practice of many ministers in their places for many years together." While it is certain that from about 1640 immersion was the uniform practice of Baptists, there is every reason to believe that it was at least occasionally practiced among them from the first. That they had the idea we know, and practice would naturally have followed the idea. As early as 1614, Leonard Busher, a citizen of London, wrote in his *Religious Peace*, "And such as shall willingly and gladly receive it [the gospel] he hath commanded to be baptized in the water; that is dipped for dead in the water." In 1640, the Baptist Church of the Calvinistic faith in London became convinced that the

true baptism had been lost. It would appear that this church had inherited sprinkling from its Independent parent, and had first considered the subjects of Baptism to the exclusion of the proper outward act. Believing that immersion was the only scriptural baptism, and knowing no body of Christions in England that immersed, they sent Richard Blunt to Holland where there were some immersionists of their faith. He was baptized by one John Batte, and on returning baptized Samuel Blacklock, the two then baptizing the rest. From this time forth there is no case known among English Baptists of anything being performed or recognized as baptism save an immersion.

The Confession of 1644 is outspoken also in the advocacy of religious liberty as the right, and of good citizenship as the duty, of every Christian man. The following article is worth quoting in full, as the first publication of the doctrine of freedom of conscience in an official document representing a body of associated churches:

"XLVIII. A civil magistracy is an ordinance of God, set up by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well; and that in all lawful things, commanded by them, subjection ought to be given by us in the Lord, not only for the wrath, but for conscience' sake; and that we are to make supplications and prayers for kings, and all that are in authority, that

under them we may live a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

"The supreme magistracy of this kingdom we acknowledge to be King and Parliament. . . . And concerning the worship of God; there is but one lawgiver, ... which is Jesus Christ. . . . So it is the magistrate's duty to tender the liberty of men's consciences, Eccles. 8 : 8 (which is the tenderest thing unto all conscientious men, and most dear unto them, and without which all other liberties will not be worth the naming, much less the enjoying), and to protect all under them from all wrong, injury, oppression, and molestation. . . . And as we cannot do anything contrary to our understandings and consciences, so neither can we forbear the doing of that which our understandings and consciences bind us to do. And if the magistrates should require us to do otherwise, we are to yield our persons in a passive way to their power, as the saints of old have done, James 5 : 4."

This is a great landmark, not only of Baptists, but of the progress of enlightened Christianity. Those who published to the world this teaching, then deemed revolutionary and dangerous, held, in all but a few points of small importance, precisely those views of Christian truth that are held by Baptists to-day. For substance of doctrine, any of us might subscribe to it without a moment's hesitation. On the strength of this one fact, Baptists might fairly claim that, whatever might have

been said by isolated individuals before, they were the pioneer body among modern Christian denominations to advocate the right of all men to worship God, each according to the dictates of his own conscience, without let or hindrance from any earthly power.

PART III.

THE EVANGELIZING CHURCH.

HINTS TO READERS.

On the English Baptists, Crosby should, of course, be consulted constantly as the chief authority. See also Ivimey's *History of the English Baptists* (London, 1811–30. 4 vols.), of which Vols. III. and IV. especially contain much valuable material; Masson's *Life of Milton* (London, 1859–80. 6 vols.); Brown's *John Bunyan, his Life, Times and Work* (London, 1885); Bunyan's *Complete Works* (many editions); Vedder's *Baptists and Liberty of Conscience* (Cincinnati, 1884); also the collected works of John Gill, Robert Hall, Andrew Fuller. Among the numerous books on American Baptists, only a few of the best can be noted: Backus' *History of the Baptists of New England* (reprinted by the Backus Historical Society, Newton, Mass., 1871. 2 vols.), the best single authority on the ante-Revolution period; *Publications of the Narragansett Club* (out of print, but to be had at libraries), a collection of reprints, mainly of the works of Roger Williams, that should not be neglected; Benedict's *General History of the Baptist Denomination in America* (New York, 1848), copious materials for a history, rather than a history, but founded on wide study of original sources; Guild's *Chaplain Smith and the Baptists* (American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1885) throws much light on Baptists of the Revolutionary period; *Baptists and the National Centenary* (Philadelphia, 1876), a collection of historical essays, some of them exceedingly valuable; Cathcart's *Baptist Encyclopædia* (Philadelphia, 1880), defective in some respects, but the best general reference book in print, and especially useful in its biographical articles; Judson's *Life of Adoniram Judson* (New York 1883), the best biography of the founder of Baptist missions; Smith's *Missionary Sketches* and *Rambles in Mission Fields* (Boston, 1880 and 1885), excellent brief histories of Baptist

foreign missions; Wayland's *Principles and Practices of the Baptists* (New York, 1857), still the best popular exposition of the distinctive features of Baptist faith and polity. On other than "regular" Baptists, see Goadby's *By-Paths in Baptist History* (London, 1871); Miller's *Doctrines of the Brethren Defended* (Indianapolis, 1876), a vindication of the doctrine and practice of the Tunkers; Lewis's *Critical History of the Sabbath and the Sunday* (Alfred Centre, 1886), the most scholarly exposition of the Seventh-Day Baptist views, and a valuable historical monograph. Stewart's *History of the Free Will Baptists* (Dover, 1862), is the best work of its kind.

CHAPTER IX.

ENGLISH BAPTISTS—THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY.

The Protectorate. Immunity from persecution. Prosperity of Baptists. Cromwell's toleration. Legal rights still withheld from Baptists. Toleration a matter of necessity. Baptist sincerity questioned. As a whole loyal to the Commonwealth. Conspiracies against government condemned. Protests against Fifth Monarchy movement. Efforts to make a toleration law. Presbyterian opposition. Milton's burning words. The end of the Long Parliament prevents persecution. Charles Stuart and religious toleration. Venner's insurrection. Baptists not connected therewith. Again persecuted and hindered. Bunyan's imprisonment. *Pilgrim's Progress* born of captivity. Protestant union under James II. The Act of Toleration under William III. Imperfect but decisive. Quaint customs of seventeenth century Baptists. Fallen into disuse.

THE period of the civil war, and of Cromwell's protectorate, was one of complete immunity for those Christians who had theretofore been persecuted without mercy. The Baptists profited by this respite, and throve apace. Some of the men high in Cromwell's confidence, and occupying positions of prominence and trust, were Baptists. Among these may be named General Harrison, and Colonel Hutchinson, Governor of Northampton. Nevertheless, even these years were not without their perils. The Baptists were accused of sedition, and various pretexts were found to justify their persecution; but Cromwell could never be induced to move against them. He came nearer than any man of his time in

public life to the adoption of the Baptist doctrine of equal liberty of conscience for all men. He came, at least, to hold that a toleration of all religious views—such as existed among Protestants, that is to say—was both right and expedient; though he seems to have had no insuperable objections to a Presbyterian, or Independent Church established by law and maintained by the State. The toleration of the Baptists from 1643 to 1660 was not a legal status; they still had no civil rights that their stronger neighbors were bound to respect; and it was only the dire necessity of uniting all forces against the king which led the Presbyterian Parliament to refrain from active measures of repression. The leading Westminster divines rebuked Parliament in sermons and pamphlets for suffering the Baptists to increase, but political considerations were, for a time, paramount. A single incident illustrates the Presbyterian idea of liberty of conscience at this time. In 1646, one Morgan, a Roman Catholic, unable to obtain priest's orders in England, went to Rome for them, and on his return, was hanged, drawn, and quartered for this heinous offence. The unspeakable Papist could not be tolerated on any terms by the Presbyterian party.

But it might be urged—in fact, it has been urged with insistence and bitterness—that the Baptists were not sincere in their professions of zealous devotion to the principle of liberty of conscience for all; or, at least, that

the declarations already quoted from their Confessions and from their published writings did not represent the Baptists as a whole—that there were Baptists as intolerant and as desirous of persecuting their opponents as the most zealous Presbyterian of them all. The events of the year 1653 are appealed to as furnishing full confirmation of this view of the case. In that year the "Rump" Parliament was dissolved, and Cromwell was proclaimed Lord Protector, according to the provisions of an Instrument of Government framed by a Convention he had called for the purpose of devising a scheme to regulate the affairs of the nation. It should seem that some of the Baptists were ardent Republicans, and in these proceedings of Cromwell they saw only the workings of his ambition to be king. We know that four years later certain Baptists protested against the proposition to confer this title upon him, and that their protest had weight. Some of them, especially General Harrison and the Rev. Vavasor Powell, protested now; the latter denouncing Cromwell from the pulpit at a meeting in Blackfriars of certain "Fifth-monarchy" men. There were fears also for a time of trouble in Ireland from the Baptists, who were reported to be extremely disaffected with the new Government. On these facts a charge is based that a part of the Baptists, at least, were disposed toward a religious movement that must have resulted in persecution.

The simple fact is that the Baptists, as a body, were loyal to the Commonwealth and its head; and the few who were disaffected opposed Cromwell, partly on civil grounds, and partly in the belief that the time had come for the setting up of the Fifth Monarchy, which was to be the kingdom of Christ upon earth. Men's laws and traditions were to be altogether swept away, and the world was to be ruled by the law of Christ. This would, of itself, exclude the idea of persecution when once this kingdom should have been established; and before its establishment persecution would not have been possible. It is not true that the "Fifth Monarchy" men, as a body, believed in setting up this kingdom by the sword, as their public declarations clearly show. To prove that a Baptist was concerned in these "Fifth Monarchy" demonstrations, does not show that he cherished any idea of punishing dissent by the sword, or by any form of persecution; still less does it show that his brethren sympathized with any persecuting notions.

But we have abundant testimony that the great body of the Baptists had no sympathy with the chiliastic ideas that lay at the basis of the Fifth Monarchy movement; that they utterly condemned all conspiracies against the *de facto* Government; and that they exhorted all their brethren to follow their example in rendering loyal obedience to the powers that be. An extant letter from William Kiffin and others to the Baptists in Ireland

gives interesting evidence as to the feeling of the English Baptists. The writers express sorrow that "there is raised up in many amongst you [the Baptists in Ireland] a spirit of great dissatisfaction and opposition against this present authority," and exhort them to think better of their determination to protest publicly against Cromwell. They say:

"And this we are clearly satisfied, in that the principles held forth by those meeting in Blackfriars, under pretense of the Fifth Monarchy, or setting up the kingdom of Christ, to which many of those lately in power adhered, had it been prosecuted, would have brought as great dishonor to the name of God, and shame and contempt to the whole nation, as we think could have been imagined."

The letter closes with a solemn appeal in these words:

"We do therefore beseech you for the Lord's sake and for the truth's sake, that it be not evil spoken of men, seriously weigh these things; for surely if the Lord gives us hearts we have a large advantage put into our hands to give a public testimony in the face of the world. That our principles are not such as they have been generally judged by most men to be; which is, that we deny authority, and would pull down all magistracy. And if any trouble should arise, either with you or us, in the nation, which might proceed to the shedding of blood, would not it all be imputed and charged upon

the baptized churches? And what grief and sorrow would be administered to us, your brethren, to hear the name of God blasphemed by ungodly men, through your means? This we can say, that we have not had any occasion of sorrow from any of the churches in this nation with whom we have communion; they, with one heart, desiring to bless God for their liberty, and with all willingness to be subject to the present authority. And we trust to hear the same of you, having lately received an epistle written to us by all the churches amongst you, pressing us to a strict walking with God, and warning of us to take heed of formality, the love of this world; that we slight not our mercy in the present liberties we enjoy."

Whether to this appeal or to the sober second thought is to be attributed the subsequent quiet of the Irish Baptists is not quite certain, but a letter in Thurloe's *State Papers* informs us that there was no further trouble:

"As to your grand affairs in Ireland, especially as to the Anabaptist party, I am confident they are much misconceived in England. Upon the change of affairs here was discontent enough, but very little animosity. For certainly never yet any faction, so well fortified by all the offices, military and civil, almost in the whole nation, did quit their interest with more silence."

The Baptists were conscious that toleration was not likely to continue long unless the principle were incorpo-

rated in the law of the land. They continued in their writings and confessions, therefore, to urge the duty of all Christians to tolerate those who differed from them in religious belief. With this they uniformly coupled a disclaimer of any such doctrine of liberty as implied license, and enforced the duty of the Christian to render obedience to the civil magistrate in all secular affairs.

Against a general toleration the Presbyterians protested vigorously. Thomas Edwards declared that "Could the devil effect a toleration, he would think he had gained well by the Reformation, and made a good exchange of the hierarchy to have a toleration for it." Even the saintly Baxter said, "I abhor unlimited liberty and toleration of all, and think myself easily able to prove the wickedness of it." Well might Milton, incensed by such teachings and by attempts in Parliament to give them effect, break forth in his memorable protest, moved by a righteous indignation that could not find expression in honeyed words or courteous phrases:

> "Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword
> To force our consciences, that Christ set free,
> And ride us with a classic hierarchy?"

And with bitter truth he added,

> "New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large."

Not in vain, as we have seen, was his subsequent appeal to Cromwell for protection from these wolves in

sheep's clothing, who had broken down one tyranny only to erect on its base another more odious:

> "Peace hath her victories
> No less renowned than war; new foes arise,
> Threat'ning to bind our souls with secular chains;
> Help us to save free conscience from the paw
> Of hireling wolves, whose gospel is their maw."

Nothing but the overthrow of the Long Parliament, and with it the Presbyterian domination, prevented a more tyrannous and implacable persecution than any that disgraces the fair page of England's annals.

In the year 1660, Charles Stuart was brought back with great rejoicing to the throne of his fathers. The Baptists must have seen in this event the death-knell of their hopes of religious liberty, yet it does not appear that they raised voice or hand against the new king, though they were far from trusting his smooth words and promises never meant to be kept, of toleration. He was hardly seated on his throne when one Thomas Venner, and a band of Fifth Monarchists and other irreconcilables made an insurrection, whose object was the dethronement of the new monarch and the setting up of the kingdom of Christ on earth. The slanders of the time accuse the Baptists of complicity in this disturbance. Beyond the repetition of these stale slanders, there is not a particle of evidence producible that any Baptists took part in the insurrection. Conclusive evi-

dence that they did not, we have in their protest made at the time, and in the verdict of every candid Pædobaptist historian who has carefully gone over the facts. Venner himself was a Pædobaptist, and it is not known that a single Baptist was among his followers. Nevertheless, persecution on account of alleged disloyalty and heresies was active and bitter; and if it did not cause many to fall away, it seriously interrupted the spread of Baptist principles and the growth of the churches.

Among those cast into jail at this period was John Bunyan; whose offence was that he would preach the gospel, not being an ordained minister of the Church of England. Bunyan may fairly be reckoned among the Baptists, though there is no contemporary testimony that he was immersed on profession of faith, and though there is reason to believe that he permitted his children to be "baptized" in the parish church. To his third and last imprisonment we owe the immortal allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, a book rendered into more languages than any other save the Bible itself; a book which, next to the Bible, has been the most effective teacher of peasant and of prince; which has been the never-failing delight of childhood, has comforted our weary hours in manhood, and will be our treasure in old age. As our experience broadens and deepens we shall see new beauties in it, for it is a book of which it may be truly said that it "was not of an age, but for all time."

How many of us have taken the journey with Christian, not in imagination merely, but in sober fact. We have borne the same intolerable burden, have entered, like him, the little wicket-gate at Evangelist's bidding, falling, perchance, by the way, into the Slough of Despond, or misled by Mr. Worldly Wiseman's bad advice, and have, like him, lost our heavy load at the foot of the cross. We have had to climb the Hill Difficulty, and not a few of us have been seduced into By-Path Meadows, only to fall into the clutches of Giant Despair, and to be cast into Doubting Castle. We have been tempted by the gay shows of Vanity Fair, and have passed through the dangers of the Enchanted Ground. We have been cheered on our way by Hopeful and Faithful, instructed by Interpreter, and entertained at the House Beautiful. On one day we have caught glimpses of the Delectable Mountains, only on the next to enter the Valley of Humiliation, and fight for our lives with Apollyon. We have seen one and another of our companions pass through the dark river, whose waters our feet must soon enter, and happy are we to whom a vision has been granted of the Shining Ones, conducting them into the gates of the City, which, when we have seen, we have wished ourselves among them.

The events of the reign of James II. were favorable to the development of a spirit of toleration among Protestants, who were driven into a closer political and relig-

ious alliance by the fear of Roman Catholic supremacy. The revolution that overthrew James placed on the throne the Prince of Orange, the descendant of that heroic leader of the Netherlands in their long struggle to throw off the yoke of Roman Catholic Spain, the first ruler in modern history who was statesman enough and Christian enough to incorporate the principle of religious liberty into his country's laws. Thanks to William III., the Act of Toleration was passed in 1689, which, though a mass of absurdities and inconsistencies when carefully analyzed, was yet a measure of practical justice to the majority, and of great relief to all. Even then Papists and Jews were exempted from its provisions, and men so enlightened and liberal-minded as Tillotson and Locke protested against granting toleration to them. But from that day the grosser forms of persecution ceased forever as regarded all Protestant bodies, though the principle of complete religious liberty has never yet found general acceptance in England.

The Baptists of the seventeenth century had many curious customs, some of which were borrowed from them by the Friends, and survive among the latter body to this day. The quaint garb of the Quaker is that of the seventeenth century Baptist. In public worship men and women sat on opposite sides of the house, both participating in the exhorting and "prophesying," as the "Spirit moved." Whether singing was an allowable

part of worship was fiercely disputed, and a salaried or "hireling" ministry was in great disfavor. The imposition of hands was practiced, in the ordination not only of pastors, but of deacons, and in many churches hands were laid on all who had been baptized, an act that has given place among American Baptists, at least, to the "hand of fellowship." Fasting was a common observance, feet-washing was practiced by many churches, though its obligation was earnestly questioned, and the anointing of the sick was so common as to be almost the rule. Pastors and deacons were often elected by the casting of lots, and love feasts before the Lord's Supper were a common practice. The supervision of member's lives was strict. Marrying out of meeting, as among the Friends, was followed by excommunication, and the amusements that might be indulged in were carefully limited. Disputes between husbands and wives, between masters and servants, were made subjects of church discipline and adjudication, and such offences as covetousness, slander, and idleness were severely dealt with. To the Baptists of to-day this kind of discipline seems a meddlesome interference with personal rights and private affairs, and it has fallen into disuse in all but a few localities.

NOTE.—On the Fifth Monarchy men, see Appendix C. For a fuller discussion of the Presbyterian opposition to Toleration, see Appendix D. On Bunyan's Denominational position, see Appendix E.

CHAPTER X.

ENGLISH BAPTISTS: FREEDOM AND GROWTH.

Persecution borne better than freedom. The Confessions of Faith. Basis of existing ones. False doctrine and decline of spiritual power. Centralizing tendencies. Adverse to church independency. Undue interference with churches and individuals. The General Assembly divided. Major portion Unitarian. Failure of strong Government. Different course of Particular Baptists. Not a court of appeals. Antinomianism and Hyper-Calvinism. Gill's responsibility for false views. General decline in spiritual life. Baptists share in this decline. The Wesleys and the Second Reformation. A new era for Baptists. The birth of modern missions. Carey's famous sermon. Formation of the English Baptist Missionary Society. The missionaries, Carey and his companions. Change from strict to "open" communion. Principal factor in this, Robert Hall. Mixed membership churches the result. The ultimate goal, extinction of such churches. Strict communion practiced by many. These gaining. Spurgeon and "down grade" controversy. Benevolent enterprises. The Welsh churches sound in doctrine. The Scotch Baptists have some peculiar views. Constant and healthful growth. Irish soil uncongenial to Baptists. Six-Principle, Seventh-Day, and New Connection Baptists.

FEW people have borne the ordeal of persecution better than the English Baptists; but for a century after the passage of the Act of Toleration, it seemed that they were unable to bear freedom. At first, indeed, they appeared likely to grow with unusual rapidity. The Confessions issued by them at about this time show how quickly they felt the impulse of hope, and how rapid, for a season, was their development. In 1677, the Particular churches published a modified form of the West-

minster Confession, which they reissued in 1689. This still forms the basis of the English Confessions, and, under the name of the Philadelphia Confession, is the system of doctrine approved by a large number of Baptist churches of our Southern and Southwestern states. The General Baptist brethren issued their Confession in 1678, and it is noticeable that its Arminianism is of a type that can hardly be distinguished from the milder forms of Calvinism. But while the immediate effect of toleration was stimulating, its later result was unfavorable to sound growth. Centralizing tendencies manifested themselves, false doctrine crept in, and there was a marked decline of spiritual power.

The centralizing tendencies were strongest among the General Baptists, and began with the formation of an Association of the Somerset churches, in 1653. The Midland Association, formed in 1655 and reconstructed in 1690, still exists. By 1671, a General Assembly had been organized. These bodies from the first undertook to exercise powers incompatible with the independence of the churches. Not content with such legitimate activities as proposing plans of usefulness, recommending cases requiring pecuniary support, and devising means for the spread of the gospel, they undertook the reformation of inconsistent or immoral conduct in ministers and private Christians, the suppression of heresy, the reconciling of differences between individuals and

churches, and giving advice in difficult cases to individuals and churches. Some Baptists of our own day, who lament the lack of a "strong Government," will find this something closely approaching their ideal. But mark the sequel. One Matthew Caffyn, a Sussex pastor of undoubted piety and alleged (but doubtful) learning, was charged with unsound views concerning the nature of Christ. There is little doubt that his theology, if sound at first, came to be Arian. He denied the Deity of Christ, though calling him "divine"—a fine-spun distinction that some modern Unitarians also make. Two parties sprang up in the Assembly, and the body was finally divided in 1689, when Caffyn's views were pronounced heretical. A new assembly was formed, and by 1750 the major part of the General Baptists had become Unitarian in their beliefs. The "strong Government" had miserably failed to repress heresy, or to prevent schism.

The Particuar Baptist churches organized their General Assembly in 1689, by the agency of the London churches, and this body also still lives. At its fourth meeting, in 1692, the Association had in its fellowship 107 churches. Warned by the experience of their General brethren, they "disclaimed all manner of superiority or superintendency over the churches." They were willing to give advice in regard to queries, but had no notion of becoming a Court of Appeals to settle church quarrels

and try heretics. This was not for lack of heretics to try, for the Particular churches had their difficulties at this time with certain troublers in Israel, who professed Antimonian doctrines and complete santification; the results of which teachings were disputes and divisions that caused a great decline. Hyper-Calvinism was developed in one section of the Particular churches, and everywhere proved a blighting doctrine. The London Association, formed in 1704 by delegates from thirteen churches, deemed it necessary to condemn this Antinomian perversion of Calvinism, regarding its action, however, not as a judicial decision, but as the deliberate opinion of a representative body of Baptists. The ablest and most learned of the Baptists of this time, John Gill, cannot be absolved from responsibility for much of this false doctrine. His Calvinism was of that rigid supralapsarian type that can with difficulty be distinguished from Fatalism and Antinomianism. If he did not hold that the elect live in a constant state of sanctification (because of the imputed righteousness of Christ), even while they commit much sin, he did hold that because of God's election Christians must not presume to interfere with his purposes by inviting sinners to the Saviour, for he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and on no others.

It must, however, in justice be said that this was a time of general decline in religion among Englishmen.

The state of all the religious bodies was deplorable. In the Established Church the manners and morals of the clergy, as depicted in contemporary literature, were frightful. The drunken, lecherous, swearing, gaming parson is a familiar character in the plays and romances of the period, and survives even to the beginning of the present century. The corruptions sown during the Stuart period were bearing abundant fruit in church and society long after the Stuarts had lost the throne of England forever. The Baptist churches shared in this general decline, but they did not originate it. The decrease in vital piety was probably the cause, rather than the consequence, of the doctrinal aberrations of this period, among both the General and the Particular Baptists.

When the preaching of the Wesleys and Whitefield brought about the Second Reformation, and shook all England to the center, the Baptists participated in the general awakening. Then began a new era in their history, an era of growth, of zeal, of missionary activity, that has continued to the present time, and has given them a leading place among the Nonconformists of England. Important modifications were made in both doctrine and practice. A modified form of Calvinism was taught by Andrew Fuller and other divines. Many of the old, peculiar customs were gradually dropped. Still, the old customs and the old teachings died hard. When the youthful William Carey ventured to speak

in favor of missions to the heathen, the aged John Ryland said to him, sternly, "Young man, sit down; when the Lord wants to save the heathen, he will do it without your help or mine." The Calvinism that makes of the Great Commission a form of empty words is fortunately dead, but in its day it did great harm to the English Baptists.

And yet their greatest development during the last century has been in connection with missions. At its meeting in 1784, the Northamptonshire Association appointed a monthly concert of prayer for missions. This missionary concert has been an untold blessing to the churches that have since adopted it, as well as a chief means of diffusing missionary knowledge and increasing the missionary spirit. Eight years later, May 31, 1792, at a meeting of this Association, in Nottingham, William Carey preached his famous missionary sermon from Isaiah 54: 2, 3, which he divided into two heads that have ever since been oft-quoted watchwords: "Expect great things from God—Attempt great things for God." This sermon led to the formation of "The English Baptist Missionary Society," in October, 1792. At its organization this body was composed of just twelve persons, who contributed to its treasury the sum of £13 2s 6d. From this meeting dates the beginning of the modern missionary enterprise. In the year following William Carey sailed for India, and was soon joined by Joshua Marsh-

man and William Ward. From the first the mission prospered, in spite of the obstacles thrown in its way by British officials and the fire of ridicule kept up in the rear by men like Sydney Smith, who ought to have been in better business. The first secretary of this body was Andrew Fuller, to whose indefatigable labors was due much of its growth in financial strength and missionary zeal. The Society has at several times extended its operations, and, in addition various enterprises have been conducted by churches and individuals in Africa and Italy. In this work, and in many other forms of service, the General and Particular Baptists unite.

One of the most important revolutions in the practice of the English Baptist churches was the change from strict to "open" communion. As we have seen, the earlier English Baptists, whether General or Particular, held that only the baptized should partake of the Lord's Supper, believing this to be taught by Apostolic precedent as well as implied in the symbolism of the two ordinances. In this they agreed with the Anabaptists of Holland and Germany, and, indeed, with the entire Christian Church, ancient and modern, under all names. Among all the "heresies" recorded in ecclesiastical literature, before the seventeenth century, there is no record of any who held that the unbaptized have a right to the Supper of the Lord. In the time of John Bunyan, and under his immediate leadership, we first hear

of Baptists who held that baptism has no necessary relation to church membership, that it is a matter wholly between the individual and God, and that its omission is no bar to church fellowship. But even Bunyan's powerful advocacy did not gain for these views anything like a general acceptance among the Baptist churches, though some accepted them. It was reserved for the present century to witness this departure from the ancient Baptist faith and the teaching of the Scriptures. The most powerful factor in producing this twofold defection was Robert Hall. Starting from premises that Socinus would have heartily approved, he reached the conclusion that the neglect of baptism is to be tolerated by the churches as an exercise of Christian liberty (a Christian at liberty to disobey Christ!), and that sincerity rather than outward obedience is the test that the "genius of Christianity" proposes. Under the influence of such teachings, large numbers of Baptist churches became "open." This change has been followed by its logical result—a result inevitable wherever "open" communion is adopted and given full opportunity to work itself out—the formation of churches of mixed membership. In many so-called Baptist churches of England the ordinance of baptism is seldom or never administered; Pædobaptists are received to membership on equal terms with the baptized; they are chosen to office, and even in some cases to the pastorate. In short, so effectually is the

church disguised that the same body will not infrequently be reckoned by both Baptists and Independents in their annual statistics. And why not? Surely such a church is more truly denominated Independent than Baptist.

The final result of "open" communion will be the extinction of the Baptist churches that adopt the practice. And, indeed, it would be difficult to say why they should maintain a separate existence. Any difference of belief or practice that is no bar to an invitation to the Lord's Table is too trifling to justify a separate and schismatic church organization. Many English churches, especially those of the Particular order, still practice strict communion. Numerically they are nearly half the whole number of the Baptists of England, and their numbers are increasing from year to year. Within a few years steps have been taken to bring them into a closer connection with their American brethren, and these efforts give promise of good results on both sides of the ocean.

At the present time most of the English Baptists are connected, rather than united, by the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, a home missionary and social organization. There was in 1888 a prospect that this Union would be disrupted. The Rev. Charles Haddon Spurgeon, a preacher whose fame is world-wide, withdrew from the body because of what he held to be a "down-grade" tendency in the theology of many in its

fellowhip. He was not followed by any considerable number of ministers or churches, and the strength of the Union remains practically unimpaired. Many of the Particular Baptists are members of the Union, but the "strict" churches sustain a tract and book society in London, and a theological school at Manchester. Other theological schools, or "colleges," as the English call them, are located at Bristol, Rawdon, London (in connection with the Metropolitan Tabernacle), Regent's Park, Pontypool, Haverford-West. The churches also sustain societies for Bible translation, the support of aged ministers, and the like. In these enterprises the Baptists of Scotland and Wales unite with their English brethren to a considerable extent.

The last allusion naturally suggests a few words regarding the Baptist churches in the other divisions of the United Kingdom. Not much is to be said. There are traditions among the Welsh churches of an ancient origin, but not much is known to show their existence prior to the Commonwealth. Since that time Baptists have been, perhaps, the most flourishing of the Protestant bodies, and among their preachers have been such men as Vavasor Powell, Morgan John Rhees, Christmas Evans, John Williams, and Hugh Jones. These Welsh churches are sound in doctrine,—though at one time Arminian teachings made considerable progress among them,—and are faithful to the discipline and order that

Baptists have from the first believed to be taught in the New Testament.

The Baptist churches in Scotland owe their existence mainly to Archibald McLean, originally a Presbyterian, then a Glasite or Sandemanian, who about 1765 adopted the Baptist view of the constitution of the church. From many of his Sandemanian notions he never fully freed himself, and the Scotch Baptists have perpetuated some of these peculiarities, insisting on a plurality of elders in each church, on the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the like. The Scotch Baptists owe much to the labors of the brothers Haldane. Robert Haldane was a layman, a man of large wealth and great charities, a student of the Scriptures, and a faithful Christian according to his light. James Alexander Haldane was a minister of great energy and eloquence. The Scotch Baptists have had a constant and healthful growth, are Calvinistic in theology, and most of their churches allow mixed communion, in this respect differing from the Calvinistic Baptists of England.

Baptist churches were planted in Ireland before 1650, but they have ever found this an uncongenial soil; and after more than two centuries of struggle, there are but two dozen churches of the faith in the Island. To have produced the illustrious scholar, Alexander Carson, is their chief contribution to Baptist progress, and one of which a larger body might be proud.

Besides the General and Particular Baptists, there have been and still are several organizations in England, holding Baptist principles in general, but adding to them some distinguishing peculiarity of faith or practice.

The Six Principle Baptists were so called from the stress they laid on the "six principles" enumerated in Heb. 6 : 1, 2: repentance, faith, baptism, laying on of hands, the resurrection of the dead, and eternal life. Of these, the fourth is the only one really peculiar to this body; they laying hands on all after baptism, as a token of a special impartation of the Spirit. In March, 1690, the churches holding these views formed an Association. This continued with varying fortunes for some years; at its strongest, numbering but eleven churches in England, though there were others in Wales when the Calvinistic Baptists withdrew, and the rest of the churches were gradually absorbed into the general body.

The Seventh Day Baptists (so called from their observance of the seventh day of the week for rest and worship, instead of the first) were founded in 1676 by the Rev. Francis Bampfield, a graduate of Oxford, and at one time prebend of Exeter Cathedral. It has always been a small body, and at the present time but one church survives, in Whitechapel, London. This church was, a few years ago, reduced to a membership of about half a dozen, and could secure no pastor of its own faith in England. The property being very valuable, special

efforts were made in behalf of the church, a pastor was sent to them from America, and they are now more prosperous than for many years before.

The New Connection of General Baptists owed its rise to a protest of the orthodox against the anti-Trinitarian views that had become common among the older General Baptist churches. Its founder was Dan Taylor, a Yorkshire miner, converted under the Wesleyan preaching; a man of slight culture, but of great native shrewdness, and a tireless worker. The New Connection Theology is Arminian, but not extreme. Their practice in regard to the communion is not uniform; the churches were strict communionists until recent years, but now most of them are probably "open." They maintain a theological school at Nottingham, which was founded in 1797.

NOTE.—On the unhistorical character of "open" communion, see Appendix F. On the number of English Baptists practicing "close" communion, see Appendix G.

CHAPTER XI.

BAPTISTS IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

Their history marked by three periods. Autochthonous in this country. History began with Roger Williams. Dissatisfied with Puritanism. Conceived of Church and State as separated. Banished for its advocacy. The foundation of Rhode Island. Its corner stone religious liberty First organized government on this principle. Williams its standard bearer. His baptism and sub equent withdrawal. The six-principle division and First Church of Providence. Baptists in Massachusetts. Persecution of Dunster, Clark, and Holmes. Progress slow. History in other portions of New England. Growth in Middle States more favorable. Stuyvesant rebuked for persecuting. Religious liberty in New Jersey. Foothold gained in Pennsylvania. Rapid increase in the South. Persecution in Virginia. Championship of Jefferson and Patrick Henry. Progress despite opposition. Spirit of worldliness not escaped. The theocracy in New England. Spiritual corruption and the Half-way Covenant. Evils springing from the latter. The great awakening of Edwards and Whitefield. Division occasioned. Unitarianism an offshoot. New England Baptists a bulwark against this. Profound effect of their orthodoxy.

THE history of American Baptists naturally divides into three periods or movements. The first coincides nearly with the colonial period of our secular national history. It is marked by faithful witness to the truth on the one hand, and by bitter persecution on the other. The second period also corresponds with an era of secular history, the time of territorial expansion, and is marked by unexampled growth and missionary activity. (1776–1845.) The third period extending from about the time of the Mexican War to our own day,

may be called the period of evangelism and education. These divisions are largely arbitrary, of course, and there are no well-marked lines of division, the periods designated overlapping each other. The division has, however, a certain mnemonic value; and as we proceed, the characteristics attributed to each period will be seen to be justified by the facts.

The Baptists of America, like those of England, seem to have been autochthonous, not, as might have been expected, planted here like Puritanism by immigration. It has been asserted, and also denied, that there were some Baptists among the Puritan immigrants. One of the best known of these was Hanserd Knollys. Of the details of his stay in America little is known save that it was barely three years. He was pastor of a church at Dover, New Hampshire, where he is known to have taught believers' baptism, but it is not known positively whether his church shared his views. Benedict says the church "was probably on the mixed communion plan," and local tradition is said to sustain this conclusion. As the church removed, almost in a body, to Long Island, in 1641 to escape persecution, it is not easy to assign any definite value to local tradition two centuries and a half diluted. Without attempting to solve the insoluble, and decide in the absence of documentary evidences whether Knollys at this time was fully a Baptist or whether his church was a Baptist

church, it is sufficient for our present purpose to say that neither he nor any other English Baptist had any appreciable influence on the religious history of this country.

The history of American Baptists really begins with Roger Williams. Of English birth (about the year 1600) though of Welsh stock, a graduate of Cambridge, and a priest of the Church of England, he had from the first a strong bent toward Puritanism. He emigrated to America in 1630, but he was by no means satisfied with the half-way reformation that the New England Puritans were disposed to make. He saw the inconsistency of the Puritan theocracy, in which the functions of the Church and State were so interblended that the identity of each was in danger of being lost. He had grasped the principle that the Church and the State should be entirely separate and independent each of the other. It is not at all certain that Williams had imbibed these notions from the English Baptists, or that he even knew of their holding such doctrines. At this time he was not, at any rate, an Anabaptist, but a Puritan Separatist. He found no fault with the Congregational doctrine or discipline, but denounced the principle of a State Church, and upheld the right of soul-liberty on natural and Scriptural grounds alike. In spite of his heterodoxy, he was called to be minister to the church at Salem, where he was highly esteemed for his zeal and eloquence. In October, 1635, he was banished from the Colony for holding that

"the civil magistrate's power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward state of men." Other charges, it is true, were made against him, but the evidence is complete that this was the real grievance. The plea that he was banished for civil causes alone, and because he made himself a disturber of the peace of the commonwealth, was never made by any reputable historian until of late years, and is so manifest an afterthought as not to be worth considering.

Williams made his way to Narragansett Bay, and in June, 1636, he settled at what is now Providence, founding a colony that developed into the State of Rhode Island. The corner-stone of this colony was the principle of religious liberty. The compact entered into by the original settlers reads thus: "We whose names are hereunder written, being desirous to inhabit in the town of Providence, do promise to submit ourselves in active and passive obedience to all such order or agencies as shall be made for the public good of the body in an orderly way, by the major consent of the present inhabitants, masters of families, incorporated together into a township, and such others whom they shall admit into the same, only in civil things." A few other countries had before this, and for periods more or less brief, tolerated what they regarded as heresy; this was the first government organized on the principle of absolute liberty to all, in matters of belief and practice, that did not conflict

with the peace and order of society, or with ordinary good morals. And though this government was insignificant in point of numbers and power, it was the pioneer in a great revolution, its principle having since become the fundamental law of every American State, and influenced strongly even the most conservative European States. Though he did not originate the idea of soul-liberty, it was given to Roger Williams, in the providence of God, to be its standard-bearer in a new world, where it should have full opportunity to work itself out, and afford by its fruits a demonstration that it is of God and not of man.

Up to this time, Williams was not a Baptist; but his continued study of the Scriptures led him to the belief that the sprinkling of water on an unconscious babe does not constitute obedience to the command of our Lord, "Be baptized." Having arrived at this conviction, he wished to be baptized, but in this little colony, separated from other civilized countries by an ocean or a wilderness, where was a qualified administrator to be found? In the meantime, other converts to the truth had been made; whether by his agency, or by independent study of the word. Some time about March, 1639, therefore, Williams baptized Ezekiel Holliman, who had been a member of his church at Salem; and, thereupon, Holliman baptized Williams. Eleven others obeyed their Lord in this way, and the first Baptist Church on Amer-

ican soil was formed. Soon after, Williams arrived at the conclusion that this baptism by one who had not himself been baptized in an orderly manner was not valid baptism. He withdrew himself from the church, and for the rest of his life was unconnected with any religious body, calling himself a "seeker." He seems to have been misled by an idea that, if logically carried out, would unchurch every church, by making all administration of ordinances invalid.

Whether the present First Baptist Church of Providence is the lineal successor of this church founded by Roger Williams is a difficult historical question, about which a positive opinion should be expressed with diffidence. Tradition maintains that the line of succession has been unbroken; but the records to prove this are lacking. The facts appear to be that the church, in 1652, was divided, a colony going out to form a Six-Principle Baptist Church; the "Regular" branch became extinct shortly afterward, while the Six-Principle wing survived, and is the First Baptist Church of Providence. In 1639, John Clarke and others formed a settlement at Newport; and soon after we find there a Baptist Church that has had a demonstrably uninterrupted existence since that time. Many, therefore, hold that to this body should be awarded the honor of recognition as the oldest church of our faith and order in America.

In Massachusetts, church organizations were of later origin. There are from time to time records of Anabaptists among the pestilent heretics that disturbed the commonwealth, but the most eminent instance was Henry Dunster, the first president of Harvard College. For preaching against infant baptism, this learned, godly, and zealous man was indicted by the grand jury, condemned to suffer a public admonition, and placed under bonds for good behavior, finally being compelled to resign the presidency of the college, of which he had been the greatest benefactor. Shortly after he was arraigned for refusing to have his child baptized, but was saved from further persecution by death. His example and teaching bore fruit later, but what he escaped in the way of immediate reward for his steadfast devotion to truth may perhaps be inferred from the treatment of John Clarke, the founder of the Newport Church, and Obadiah Holmes, who was destined to be Clarke's successor. While they were spending the Lord's Day with a brother who lived near Lynn, it was concluded to have religious services in the house. Two constables broke in while Mr. Clarke was preaching from Rev. 3 : 10, and the men were hauled before the court. For this offence they were sentenced to pay, Clarke a fine of £20, and Holmes, one of £30, in default of which they were to be "well whipped." A friend paid Clarke's fine, and he was set at liberty whether he would or no; but Holmes was "whipped

unmercifully" (the phrase is Bancroft's) in the streets of Boston, for the atrocious crime of preaching the gospel and of adding thereto the denial of infant baptism.

This happened September 6, 1651, but so far was it from stamping out this detested heresy, that in 1663, a Baptist Church was formed at Swansea by John Miles and seven other brethren, while two years later a church was organized in Boston. The second church in Boston was not formed until 1743, as a result of the Whitefield revival; and though active persecution ceased after 1692, the progress of the Baptists in Massachusetts continued to be slow. In 1682, a church was organized at Kittery, Me., then a part of the Massachusetts Colony, but it was so harried by fines and imprisonment that it was broken up. Some of the members removed to South Carolina, and in 1683 organized what is now the First Baptist Church of Charleston. No other Baptist church was organized in Maine until 1764. The oldest church in Massachusetts proper, north of Boston, is the First Haverhill, founded in 1765 through the labors of Rev. Hezekiah Smith, one of the most remarkable men of his day, a native of Long Island, a graduate of Princeton, and a worker of indefatigable zeal. Churches at Bellingham, Middleborough, Adams, Danvers, North Attleboro, Seekonk and Fall River, to mention only a few, were organized between 1750 and 1776, and Backus gives the number of churches in 1784 as seventy-three,

with a membership of three thousand and seventy-three.

The first Baptists of Connecticut were from Rhode Island, a church being formed at Groton in 1705. Churches at Saybrook, Colchester, and Stonington followed at no long interval after. Their increase was so slow, however, that in 1760 only eight or nine churches had much more than a name to live, and even these were feeble bodies. The first church in New Hampshire to maintain an existence was that in Newton, organized in 1775, but growth was fairly rapid; for Backus gives a list of twenty-five churches and four hundred and seventy-six members in 1784. Vermont, being settled later, has no Baptist history prior to about 1780, but in the next decade thirty-two churches were planted there, making the total thirty-five, with one thousand and six hundred members. In 1784, the entire strength of New England Baptists was one hundred and fifty-one churches and four thousand seven hundred and eighty-three members. Of course, these figures are only approximate, though as to the number of churches they are probably very nearly accurate.

In the Middle States the conditions of growth were, on the whole, more favorable. The only persecution experienced was in the colony of New York, and that was for a brief time under the governorship of Peter Stuyvesant. The Dutch were too hearty lovers of religious

liberty, and had experienced too much of the horrors of the Inquisition, to play long the role of persecutors. The choleric and tyrannical Peter soon received orders from Holland: "Let every man remain free, so long as he is modest, moderate, his political conduct irreproachable, and so long as he does not offend others or oppose the government." But before the policy could be thus changed, Baptists had suffered considerably, and later under the English rule the same difficulty was experienced. The first Baptist minister to labor in New York City, so far as is known, was Rev. William Wickenden, of Providence, some time before 1669; and for these labors he was incarcerated four months. A church is said to have been formed in 1699, but persecution soon ended its feeble life. It was revived in 1702, and after about 1712 it had the regular visits of Rev. Valentine Wightman, of Groton. The second church in this colony was founded at Oyster Bay, Long Island, about 1700, but most of its members removed to New Jersey to escape persecution. In 1790, there were about sixty churches; and during the following twenty years the increase was so rapid that in 1812 there were reported two hundred and fifty-two churches and seventeen thousand nine hundred and eight members.

The liberal offers of complete religious liberty in New Jersey drew Baptists to that colony as early as 1660. The first church organized was that at Middletown in

1688, composed mainly of those who had fled from persecution in New York and other colonies. Piscataway (1689), Cohansey (1690), Cape May (1712), Hopewell (1715), and Morristown (1752), were the next to follow. The ministers that labored among these churches were among the ablest of their day. The names of Abel Morgan, John Gano, Hezekiah Smith, and James Manning suffice to prove this statement no exaggeration. In 1795, the number of churches is said to have been thirty, and of members two thousand one hundred and seventy-seven. Pennsylvania had about the same number of churches, but only half this membership. Though Rhode Island Baptists settled in Bucks County in 1684, the church they organized did not endure, and the first permanent foothold was gained in 1636 by Welsh immigrants at Pennepeck. Numerous Welsh and German Baptists settled in the State from time to time, but not till 1688, when the Lower Dublin Church was constituted, did the English-speaking Baptists really begin to have a history. This church, of twelve members at the beginning, had as its first pastor Elias Keach, son of the well-known Baptist minister of London, Benjamin Keach. The First Church of Philadelphia was founded in the following year, but its members were all connected with the Lower Dublin Church until 1746, when they were formally constituted a separate and independent church. From this time on the

growth of Baptists in Pennsylvania was steady, if slow.

The most rapid increase of Baptists was in the South. In Maryland, in spite of exceptional liberty, but two churches had been formed prior to 1772, and to this day the Baptist strength there is less than in any other Southern State. In neighboring Virginia, where the Episcopal Church was established by law and Baptists were persecuted with exceptional severity, they throve from the first. In 1714, Baptists emigrated from England and settled in the southeastern part of the State; others came from Maryland and occupied the Northwestern part; and a third company was from New England in 1754. The first two were of the "Regular" persuasion, while the third were "Separates," or New Lights, as the followers of Whitefield were termed. For some time the progress of the denomination was greatly hindered by this division; but in 1787 a union was effected. In 1790, their churches were said to be two hundred and ten, and their members twenty thousand. In no colony were Baptists more oppressed, but they gradually found champions in such men as Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry; the latter, though a member of the Established Church, being too genuine a lover of liberty to have any part in persecution. In 1798, the Legislature repealed all laws vesting property in any religious sect, as well as penalties

for dissent, thus placing all religious bodies on an equality before the law. The growth of the Baptist churches has been uninterrupted from that day to this.

There were traces of Baptists in North Carolina from 1695, and the first Baptist churches seemed to have been formed about equally by companies from New England, and immigration from Virginia. South Carolina, as we have seen, received its first Baptist settlers from Maine. The first Georgia Baptists came from England, and others from New England, and the other colonies. It would not be profitable to go further into the details of this early progress in a narrative like this. Enough has been said to show in what manner the early churches were founded, how they were made to bear great burdens and persecutions, and how, in spite of all, the good providence of God gave them increase, and favor in the sight of men.

During the first century of their history, American Baptists did not escape the effect of that spirit of worldliness that nearly paralyzed the churches of the "standing order." They were firm in adherence to the true Scriptural principle, that the church should be composed of the regenerate only, but they lived in communities where it was hard even to get a hearing for this idea. The New England community was a theocracy, and the privileges of citizenship were enjoyed only by those who were members of the church. The theory of *imperium*

and *sacerdotium* was not more firmly insisted on, and not half so consistently followed, in the relations between the Mediæval Church and the Holy Roman Empire, as in the connection of Church and State in New England. They were like the obverse and reverse of a coin, two aspects of one indivisible entity. The certain result of such a polity in modern Christianity, as in ancient Judaism, must be to corrupt the spiritual body, to destroy all distinction between regenerate and unregenerate. The adoption of the Half-way Covenant, in 1662, was at once the natural result, and an aggravation of the state of things that had come to pass. This Covenant provided that those baptized in infancy were to be regarded as members of the church to which their parents belonged, although not to be admitted to the communion without evidence of regeneration. Such persons were allowed to offer their children for baptism, provided they publicly professed assent to the doctrine of faith, and were not scandalous in life. It was not long before ministers declared that sanctification was not a qualification for the Lord's Supper, but saw in it a converting ordinance, and a means of regeneration. Consequently, persons who had been baptized in infancy, and were not charged with scandalous conduct or heresy, were regarded as entitled to full communion with the church.

Against this worldly condition of the church a reaction was certain to come. It manifested itself in the

Great Awakening that began at Northampton, in 1743, under the preaching of Jonathan Edwards, and gradually extended throughout the towns of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The visit of Whitefield to this country in 1739, gave a new impulse to this revival of true religion, extending it far beyond the bounds of New England. With this second revival began a new era in the spiritual life of American Christians. The leaven did not spread without opposition, and among Baptists two parties were formed—the "Regulars," who adhered to the old ways and disparaged revivals, and the "New Lights," who adopted the evangelistic methods of Whitefield. The literature of the times is full of this controversy, and shows that the newer and more Scriptural method of preaching did not win its way to its present general acceptance without bitter opposition.

Logically, the history of another movement belongs here; though, chronologically, it developed itself fully a generation later. Just as the Reformation of Luther produced the counter-reformation of Loyola, so the Edwards-Whitefield revival produced the Unitarian reaction; produced in the sense of precipitating, not in that of original causation. Unitarianism had, for some time, been in solution in New England, and the revival caused it to crystallize into visible form. What had been a tendency became a movement; a mode of thinking became a propaganda; the doctrines of an esoteric

few became the openly avowed basis of a sect. I can only touch on this interesting topic as we pass by, its place at all in a survey of Baptist history being justified merely by the fact that the New England Baptists stood as a chief bulwark against the heresy. In 1800, two of the six orthodox churches left in Boston were Baptist; while eight Congregational churches and one Episcopal church had gone over bodily to Unitarianism. Samuel Stillman and Thomas Baldwin were the pastors of these two churches during these troublous times, and no two men did more than they to resist false doctrine by preaching the truth. Indeed, throughout New England, not one Baptist church forsook the faith, and not one Baptist minister of note became a Unitarian. This staunch orthodoxy of the Baptists had a profound effect on the history of American Christianity, as will be pointed out in another connection.

CHAPTER XII.

BAPTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES—THE PERIOD OF EXPANSION.

Three marked characteristics. Religious liberty secured. Baptist growth as a result. Missionary zeal. Settlers in the West. Heroism and services of these settlers. System not wholly satisfactory. Organization of Home and Foreign Mission Societies. Judson and his companions. Conversion to Baptist views The Triennial Convention. Missionary operations. The North and South divided. The Southern Convention. Birth of the Missionary Union. Wonderful growth of Baptists. Baptists and the American Bible Society. Formation of American and Foreign Bible Society. Division in the new Society. Origin of the American Bible Union. Prejudice against its version. Bible Convention at Saratoga. The Anti-Masonic agitation. Lessons springing therefrom. The Campbellite controversy. Consequent discord and division.

THE second period in the history of American Baptists reveals to the student three strongly marked characteristics: 1. A great increase in missionary fervor. 2. The gradual inception of vast missionary enterprises. 3. An unexampled rapidity of growth in both numbers and spiritual power. As eddies in these great currents, we find several controversies, caused by sectional and doctrinal differences, that at times threatened the very existence of the denomination.

With the attainment of civil liberty, came a spirit that made men see in religious persecution the tyranny and shame that it was. Virginia led the way, with such

men as Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry to point it out, in placing all forms of religious belief on an equality. The spirit of intolerence lingered longest in New England, and it was not until 1833 that the last remnant of proscriptive laws was swept from the statute book of Massachusetts. And then so good and wise and great a man as Lyman Beecher thought the bottom had dropped out of things because his State no longer compelled his unwilling Baptist neighbor to contribute to his support. Their disabilities removed, the Baptist churches grew apace. As the population extended over the Alleghanies into the new regions of the Great West, the missionary zeal of the churches kept step with the colonizing enterprise of the people. Without societies or other means of organizing their scanty resources of men and money, they pushed out boldly into the regions beyond. Many Baptists from North Carolina and Virginia were among the first settlers of Kentucky and Tennessee, and in the latter State their churches were organized as early as 1765. By 1790, there were eighteen churches and eight hundred and eighty-nine members in the State. In 1782, Baptist churches were formed in Kentucky; and in 1790, there were forty-two churches and three thousand and ninety-five members.

They were among the first to enter Ohio as settlers and religious workers, a church having been organized at Columbia in 1790, and the Miami Association being

organized in 1797. In Illinois, Baptists from Virginia were the first Protestants to enter and possess the land; a number settling there not later than 1786. In the following year a Kentucky pastor preached there, but the first church was not formed until May, 1796, at New Design, St. Clair County.

It is impossible to estimate too highly the services of these men of faith and of works. If they did not wander "in sheepskins and goatskins," like ancient heroes of faith, they wore deerskins; and homespun took the place of sackcloth. Their dwelling was "all out-o'-doors," and their houses of worship were God's own temples—the woods. Living in the plainest manner, sharing all the hardships of a pioneer people, making hazardous journeys, in danger from floods, from wild beasts, and from fiercer Indians, the circuit preacher labored in a parish that, as one of them said, "took in one-half of creation, for it had no boundary on the West." The preaching was of a rough-and-ready order, suited to the people addressed; the preacher being hardly more literate than his hearers, who were fortunate if they could read their Bibles and write their names. Yet these men, uncouth as they would now seem, led multitudes to Christ, built up churches, and laid denominational foundations, deep and broad, throughout the great West. We who have entered into their labors do well to honor men whose shoes we are not worthy to loose.

This unsystematic system of evangelizing the West, though undoubtedly effective for a time, was not entirely satisfactory, even while it lasted. As the opening of the Western Middle States to settlement advanced, it became evident that more systematic evangelism was necessary. Satisfactory provision for the permanent work of Home Missions was first made in 1832, when the American Baptist Home Mission Society was organized. From the first, its headquarters have been in New York City, but its motto, "North America for Christ," indicates that no local interests have ever been permitted to circumscribe its sympathies or activities. Missionaries in their own languages are employed among the Germans, Scandinavians, French, Bohemians, Poles, and Chinese, as well as among the colored race and the Indians. Missions in Mexico are also supported. Many of the most flourishing churches of the Central and Western States owe their existence to this Society, the First Church of Chicago being a conspicuous instance. There has been no other agency so effective in planting and nourishing Baptist churches in the various States, as they have been settled and developed. The Society has a Church Edifice Fund, from which gifts and loans are made to churches in the newer parts of the country. By an expenditure of about fifty thousand dollars annually, this fund secures to the denomination property worth two hundred thousand dollars. The Society has also

done a valuable educational work in the South and the Indian Territory, where it maintains a large number of institutions of academic and collegiate grade. The value of the property possessed by these schools, or held by the Society for their maintenance, closely approximates a million dollars.

Though the work of home missions was thus first in point of time and in pressing necessity, it was not the first to be organized on a permanent basis. Long before this had come about, a clear providential summons had come to Baptists to fulfill the Great Commission, and preach the gospel to every creature. This was accomplished through Adoniram Judson, the son of a Congregational minister of Massachusetts, who was educated at Brown University and Andover Theological Seminary. His intimate friends in the Andover Seminary were Samuel Nott, Jr., Samuel J. Mills, Jr., James Richards, Luther Rice, and Gordon Hall. At about the same time these young men became impressed with their duty to devote themselves to the work of foreign missions and formed a missionary society. In February, 1810, near a haystack in Williamstown, these young men solemnly dedicated themselves to this work. The great foreign missionary enterprises of American Christians had their birth in that hour and place. A letter, signed by four of these six young men, to the General Association of Massachusetts, notifying this body of their decision, led

to the formation, on June 28, 1810, of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

In 1812, Adoniram Judson and his wife, Ann Hasseltine Judson, and Luther Rice, were appointed missionaries by the newly organized American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and sailed for India. Knowing that he would encounter English Baptist missionaries, and that possibly controversy might ensue, Mr. Judson undertook to prepare himself by study of the Scriptures for this possible emergency. But by this study he was convinced that the only baptism recognized in the Scriptures is the immersion of a believer. True to this conviction, he was immersed by the Rev. William Ward, at Calcutta, September 6. This necessitated his withdrawal from the service of the American Board, and left him in a strange land without denominational support or financial resources. Mr. Rice, who had also been led by independent study to accept Baptist views, and had also been baptized, returned to this country and traveled among the Baptist churches, relating these facts and appealing for the support of himself and the Judsons in this work. This roused the churches to a sense of their duty to foreign missions, as perhaps no other thing could have aroused them. In May, 1814, thirty-six delegates from eleven States and the District of Columbia, met in Philadelphia, and organized the Baptist General Convention, which afterward become known

as the Triennial Convention, from its meeting once in three years. In the meantime the Judsons had been driven out of British India by bigoted English officials, and had established themselves, in July, 1813, in Rangoon, where they began missionary work among the Burmese. In July, 1819, the first convert, Moung Nau, was baptized. The war between England and Burmah broke out just as the work began to prosper, and for three years he and his devoted wife suffered incredible tortures of body and spirit. After the war the mission came under British protection and prospered. A mission to the Karens was begun about this time by Rev. George Dana Boardman; and missions were successfully established in Assam, and Siam, among the Telugus in Southern Hindustan, in China, and in Japan.

For thirty years all the foreign mission work of American Baptists was done through this one Convention, but in 1844 the differences between the Northern and Southern Churches, growing out of the anti-slavery agitation then going on, culminated in a separation. The churches in the Southern States organized the Southern Baptist Convention in the following year, and this Convention is their agent, through various standing Boards, for all their general missionary operations. The Convention is a strictly delegated body, and its meetings are held for the transaction of business, not for platform oratory. Its Home Mission Board employs missionaries,

who labor in fifteen States and Territories, and also maintains a mission in Cuba, and publishes a series of Sunday-school papers and helps. The Convention's Foreign Board sustains missions in Mexico, Brazil, Italy, South Africa, and Northern China. The Southern Baptist Convention represents the white Baptists of the South; the colored Baptists have a separate organization, the Baptist Foreign Missionary Convention of the United States. Though very numerous in the South, they are poor, and their chief present enterprise is the maintenance of a mission in West Central Africa. The Baptists of the South, white and colored, are fully two-thirds of the three million members now reported by the "Regular" Baptist churches of the United States.

When the Southern Baptists withdrew from the Triennial Convention, that body was suffered to die, and the Northern churches provided for the carrying on of their foreign work by organizing, in 1846, the American Baptist Missionary Union, with headquarters at Boston. This body is composed of delegates appointed on a fixed basis. The main business is done by a Board of Managers, of whom one-third are elected at each annual meeting, and by an Executive Committee chosen by this Board. During the years since its first organization, the Union has done a great work in the foreign field. Its chief labors have been in Asia, but missions have also been maintained in Germany, France, Spain, Greece,

Italy, and Sweden; and within a few years an established mission in Central Africa has been turned over to American Baptists, and is conducted by them. Two auxiliary organizations were formed in 1871: the Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society, having its headquarters in Boston, and the Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of the West, with its headquarters at Chicago.

At the beginning of the Revolution, American Baptists numbered less than ten thousand, but even approximate figures are lacking. In 1792, according to Dr. Rufus Babcock, there were four hundred and seventy-one churches, four hundred and twenty-four ministers, and thirty-five thousand one hundred and one members. By 1800 they had increased to an estimated number of one hundred thousand. In 1850, the numbers had risen to eight hundred and fifteen thousand two hundred and twelve, of whom six hundred and eighty-six thousand eight hundred and seven were "Regular" Baptists. In other words, in 1776, Baptists were about one to two hundred and sixty-four of the population; in 1800, they were one to fifty-three, and in 1850, they had become one in twenty-nine. If these figures are substantially accurate, as I believe them to be, the period of greatest actual and relative advance among American Baptists was the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Several causes contributed to this result, chief among them being the

granting of religious liberty in all the States, the missionary activity of the pioneer preachers, and the harmony between the democratic spirit of the people and the congregational polity of the Baptist Churches. Though subsequent growth has not reached these unexampled figures, it has been and still exceeds the rate at which population increases, and that in spite of the immense influx of foreign peoples, on many of whom Baptists have not yet succeeded in making any perceptible impression.

When the American Bible Society was first organized, Baptists co-operated heartily, in proportion to their means, in the work of translating and circulating the word of God at home and abroad. Both in this country and in England their missionary operations forced them to be pioneers in this work. Baptists had had the honor, in many instances, of being the first to give the Bible to a heathen people, in some cases being the first to reduce the language to writing, and begin a literature. William Carey translated the New Testament into Bengali, about 1800, which was the first version made in modern times in a heathen tongue. He afterward assisted in translating the Scriptures into no fewer than twenty-four different languages and dialects of India, and these versions (upon which he did far the largest share of the work) are said to be capable of being read by one-third of the inhabitants of the globe. The first version into Chinese

was made by Joshua Marshman, Carey's fellow-laborer. Many versions have also been made by the American Baptist missionaries. The first and only version in Burmese was made by Adoniram Judson; the first and only Karen version by Francis Mason; the first complete version of the Bible in both Assamese and Japanese by Nathan Brown, and the first Telugu version to be generally circulated was that of Lyman Jewett. Besides these, versions are at present projected, or partially completed in the Garo, Naga, Congo, Bateke, and Balolo languages, the last three being languages spoken in Central Africa.

For the publication and circulation of the earliest versions made by Baptist missionaries, the American Bible Society voted appropriations. After a time objection was made to them that they rendered "baptizo" uniformly by a Burmese word signifying "dip" or "immerse," and in May, 1836, the Society adopted a rule to "encourage only such versions as conform in the principle of their translation to the common English Version"; that is, versions that transliterated "baptizo" instead of translating it, whether according to the Baptist or the Pædobaptist view of the true meaning of the word. The Baptist members of the Board vainly urged that the Society had already appropriated eighteen thousand dollars for the circulation of Dr. Judson's version, with full knowledge of its nature; that this was the only

version in Burmese in existence, and that the alternative was either to circulate this or deprive the Burmese of the gospel; and that the adoption of the rule introduced a new and necessarily divisive principle into the Society's policy. On the adoption they felt constrained to withdraw from co-operation with the Society, and in April, 1837, a Convention held at Philadelphia organized the American and Foreign Bible Society, to "aid in the wider circulation of the Holy Scriptures in all lands."

From the first, there was a division of sentiment in the new Society. Some were in favor of continuing the circulation of the King James version, and confining the work of making new translations wholly to foreign tongues; while another party insisted that the principle of faithful translation required the Society also to revise the English Scriptures, or make a new translation. This conflict of opinion finally broke out into a violent controversy, and in 1850 a strong minority withdrew and formed the American Bible Union, whose object was declared to be "to procure and circulate the most faithful versions of the Scriptures in all languages throughout the world." The principle of translation adopted by the Union was to render every word of the original Scriptures into the vernacular word which would most nearly represent its meaning as determined by the best modern scholarship. A version of the New Testament, made on these principles, was issued in 1865; and from time

to time parts of the Old Testament have been published, and eminent scholars are now completing a translation, with notes, of the remaining books, under the auspices of the American Baptist Publication Society. The Bible Union version, while it has a certain value as a literal and scholarly rendering of the New Testament in English, was a failure from the first as a version for popular circulation. It was stigmatized as a "sectarian" translation, and its use among Baptists themselves has never been large. Thousands of Baptists have never seen a copy; many have never even heard of it. For a time, these two Bible societies flourished, and had devoted adherents; but those who founded them for the most part passed away years ago, and a generation succeeded that was indifferent to either, or hostile to both. The work declined, but the controversies continued. At length, in the year 1883, a Bible Convention at Saratoga effected a settlement of the questions at issue, recommending that the foreign Bible work be done by the Missionary Union, and the home work by the Publication Society; and that the latter should circulate according to demand the Bible Union, King James, and Revised Versions.

No controversy was more disastrous to the Baptist churches of the Middle States than the anti-Masonic struggles between the years 1826 and 1840. One William Morgan, a Mason, who had published a book pur-

porting to expose the secrets of the order, suddenly disappeared in 1826, and was believed to have been foully dealt with. A body was discovered and identified as his, though the identification has always been regarded as doubtful. Excitement against the Masons, and secret fraternities generally, rose high, until the dispute became a political issue in State and even National elections, and the churches took the matter up. In a large number of Baptist churches the majority opposed secret fraternities, declaring them to be unscriptural and dangerous to the peace and liberties of the commonwealth. In many cases the minority were disfellowshiped, and not a few flourishing churches were crippled, or even extinguished, while the growth of all was much retarded. The lessons of that period have taught American Baptists to be chary of interfering through church discipline with questions not strictly religious, and to beware of attempting to settle by an authoritative rule questions of conduct which it is the right and duty of each Christian man to decide for himself. Thus, while at the present time, the majority of Baptists favor strongly total abstinence as a rule of personal conduct and prohibition as a practical policy, in very few churches is either made a test of fellowship.

The Baptist churches of the South and West were much disturbed during the second quarter of this century by the agitation that culminated in the establishment of the Disciples as a separate body. Under the

leadership of Alexander Campbell the entire Mahoning Baptist Association of Ohio adopted the new views, and a large number of churches in other Ohio Associations followed this example. The "Reformation," as it was called, spread to Kentucky and Virginia, dividing churches and Associations, and causing fierce religious controversy. It has always been and still is a debatable question how far Alexander Campbell's views really differed from such as have always been tolerated, if not approved, in Baptist churches, nor is it easy to apportion justly the blame of schism that occurred.

The first overt acts of separation were committed by the Baptist churches for what they deemed not only sufficient but controlling reasons. The Beaver Association of Ohio, about 1829, issued a circular denouncing the Mahoning Association and Mr. Campbell as disbelieving many of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. In the autumn of 1832 the Dover Association of Virginia, after careful deliberation, advised the churches constituting it "to separate from their communion all such persons as are promoting controversy and discord under the specious name of 'Reformers.'" This advice was given on the ground that the doctrines taught were "not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ, disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency, and therefore ought to be disavowed and resisted by all the lovers of sound truth and

piety." Twenty years after, Rev. Jeremiah B. Jeter, one of the ablest Baptist opponents of the Disciple movement, and one of the authors of this resolution, published it as his belief that the report adopted by the Dover Association contained "some unguarded, unnecessarily harsh expressions," and particularly acknowledged that this characterization of the doctrines of Campbell as "demoralizing in their tendency" was unjust. After the action of the Dover Association those who sympathized with Mr. Campbell either voluntary withdrew from the Baptists or were disfellowshiped by them, and in a decade the separation was complete. The separation was accomplished at a great cost to the Baptist churches, for the denomination was rent in twain in the West and South. Churches were split in two or completely dissolved, or even went over bodily to the new sect; a few whole Associations became Disciples; and seeds of bitterness and discord were sown that have born fruit in more than a generation of unfraternal strife and disorganization.

NOTE.—On the causes which led to the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention, see Appendix H.

CHAPTER XIII.

BAPTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES—THE PERIOD OF EVANGELISM AND EDUCATION.

Historic periods not easily defined. The era of great revivals and revivalists. A change in this regard. Pastors more evangelistic. Expansion of educational work. The establishment of Brown University. Other institutions of learning. Provisions for academies. Founding of Rochester University. Serious lack of unity in educational matters. Formation of American Baptist Education Society. Local missionary work not overlooked. Efficiency of State Conventions and Associations.

AS was pointed out in the beginning, the line of demarcation between the periods of American Baptist history is uncertain, and dates cannot be positively fixed. Overlapping the period of rapid growth and missionary extension, ending at the latest about the year 1850, is a movement of another sort, manifesting itself in the spiritual quickening and edification of the churches. For nearly a half-century after the Great Awakening, there had been no great revivals of religion. Then a great revival wave, beginning in New England about the year 1790, swept over the whole country within the next ten years. In the Southwest it was marked by a fanaticism and a series of remarkable physical phenomena, that tended to bring revivals into disfavor with the sober-minded and judicious. There-

upon ensued another period of inaction, lasting about a generation. It was broken by the revivals of Finney, through whose agency in the ten years following 1825 there were added fully one hundred thousand persons to the northern Presbyterian churches. The year 1857 saw an even more remarkable wave of revival, from the influence of which no part of the country was exempt, and a half million are said to have been converted in a single year. Since then the norm of church life seems changed. No longer do we have periodic waves of intense religious excitement, with intervening periods of coolness and indifference, but a slowly rising tide of spiritual power. Progress is no longer by occasional leaps, but by a steady advance. Evangelism is not less genuine now than in the days when a Finney or a Knapp stirred whole communities as they never were stirred before, but now an evangelist preaches weekly from nearly every pulpit. The type of preaching has changed; it is simple and direct; it aims more consciously at the conversion of men. It is more intelligently adapted to reach the will through the intellect and the affection, and to produce an immediate decision for or against Christ. Whether the change is permanent, it would be rash to pronounce. The names of Moody and Sam Jones, unworthy as they are in other ways to be pronounced together, testify to the fact that both at the North and at the South it is still possible to interest great crowds in religion, and that

occasional revivals may be expected rivalling all that we read of in past years.

Another chief distinguishing feature of American Baptist history since 1850 may be said to be the remarkable development of educational work. The beginnings of that work, of course, considerably antedate that year, especially in New England. The churches of that region were happily a unit in entering on and prosecuting their educational enterprises, and began to found institutions of learning at a comparatively early date in their history. Curiously enough, the first impulse was given by the Philadelphia Association, which, soon after its organization, began to consider the propriety of founding a college for the training of young men in general, and of Baptist ministers in particular. Through the agency of this Association, James Manning went to Rhode Island to interest Baptists there in the project. In 1765, he became President of the infant Rhode Island College, just established at Warren, Rhode Island. The college celebrated its first commencement, September 7, 1769, when the degree of Bachelor of Arts was conferred on seven young men. In 1770, the college was removed to Providence, and in 1804 its name was changed to Brown University, in honor of a generous benefactor, Nicholas Brown. This, the oldest and best-known Baptist institution of learning, has a long and distinguished roll of alumni and a property valued at two million, eight hun-

dred and seventy-five thousand dollars. Very soon the need of more distinctively theological education was felt, but for some time nothing was done. The Newton Theological Institution owes its origin to a meeting of ministers and laymen held in Boston, 1825. Its early years were marked by difficulties and debt, but at length a permanent endowment was secured. It has graduated or instructed about eight hundred students, and among its alumni are many of the most useful and distinguished preachers and teachers of the denomination. Another New England institution is Waterville College, Maine, which was founded in 1818 by the Rev. Jeremiah Chaplin, as the outcome of a private school maintained by him at Danvers. The collegiate charter was granted in 1820. The early history of the institution was one of continual struggle with adversity, but of late years it has found generous friends. In recognition of the benefactions of one of these, Gardner Colby, the name was changed, in 1867, to Colby University.

New England Baptists have been wiser in their day than those of most other sections, by providing liberally for secondary or academic education. Thus Colby has three Maine academies closely connected with it as feeders, while New Hampshire and Vermont have each a flourishing Academy. Worcester Academy, in Massachusetts, and the Suffield Literary Institution, in Connecticut, care for the Baptist youth of those States, and

are among the principal sources whence Brown University derives students. The educational system of New England Baptists therefore stands on a solid foundation; they have not committed the error of resting the pyramid on its apex.

In the Middle and Western States, and to some extent in the South, there has not been this unity of action in educational matters. New York Baptists had a school for higher education as early as 1820, which in 1834 developed into the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution. In 1846, the literary department was chartered as a university, its name being changed to Madison University, the theological seminary being maintained as a separate institution, but in harmony with the college. The village of Hamilton was thought by many Baptists to be an unsuitable site for a denominational school, and in 1847 an effort was made to remove it to a better location.

The city of Rochester offered special inducements and was decided upon as the new site. But a party rallied to the defense of the old site, discussions grew warm, passionate feelings were excited, and the end was a division—part of the faculty and supporters going to found a new institution, since known as the University of Rochester. The new institution opened its doors to students in 1850. For a time the collegiate and theological departments at Rochester were maintained in

close connection, but since 1855 the Rochester Theological Seminary has been an independent school. It has a German department for the education of students to preach the gospel in that language to their own countrymen, and in the general catalogue of 1889 reports nine hundred and seventy-nine students as having been educated for the ministry during its history. The division of the New York Baptist institution has been marked by a corresponding division among the churches, part of which have supported the one and part the other. The old bitterness has somewhat subsided of late years, but it is in the highest degree unfortunate that the present generation should seem willing to perpetuate divisions caused by the unwisdom and contentiousness of their fathers. This experience has been duplicated in several Western States, and rival institutions have been founded in excess of educational needs, with the result of making all poor and inefficient, where a single strong institution might have been established. So serious had become the lack of unity, and the consequent waste of money and labor, that there was organized at Washington, in May, 1888, an American Baptist Education Society, under whose leadership it is to be hoped that the mistakes of the past may be avoided. Its great achievements thus far in assisting the Southern and Western institutions to add to their endowments, and the foundation of the new University of Chicago, through the liberality of Mr. John

D. Rockefeller, warrant the highest expectations as to its future work.

We can do little more than name the principal schools of learning founded by Baptists during the last half century; if it were attempted to give even a brief sketch of the career of each, these chapters would stretch out to such proportions as to make the name "Short History" meaningless. The following should at least be named: Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill. (1867); Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa. (1868); Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. (1858); Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. (1846); Columbian University, Washington, D. C. (1821); Richmond College, Richmond, Va. (1832); Denison University, Granville, Ohio (1832). The omission of other names does not imply that institutions equally worthy and doing excellent work do not exist in many parts of our land. In all there are seven theological schools and thirty-four colleges, besides thirty-two institutions of collegiate grade for young women exclusively. Of these, Vassar College, founded in 1861, at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., by the beneficence of Matthew Vassar, is the best endowed college for women in the world. There are also forty-two academic institutions, most of which are unendowed, and seventeen schools for negroes and Indians. In all, Baptists conduct one hundred and forty-seven institutions, in which twenty-two thousand four hundred and thirty-eight

pupils were instructed in 1890, and the value of the educational plant (many institutions not reporting) is returned at twenty million seven hundred and seventy-five thousand three hundred and seventy-three dollars. In 1890, besides unreported gifts, nine hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars were given for educational purposes.

The large place filled in local and State work during the past fifty years should be by no means overlooked, for it is one of the chief factors in Baptist progress. The State Conventions or General Associations now organized in every State are missionary bodies, whose usefulness it would be difficult to overrate. In the Baptist Missionary Convention of the State of New York, one of the oldest and most active of these bodies, will be found a good type of all. The object of this Convention is declared in its constitution to be "To promote the preaching of the gospel, and the establishment and maintenance of Baptist churches in the State of New York; to encourage the common educational interests of the denomination within the State, the general care and encouragement of denominational Sunday-school work, to promote denominational acquaintance, fellowship, and growth." Forty-three local Associations are found in the territory of this Convention. Many of the local Associations—which in the oldest States usually follow county lines—do a similar work, and often on a scale not inferior to that of the State

organization, though in a field more circumscribed. Of these the Southern New York Association is a good type. Organized for "The cultivation of fraternal sympathy, the promotion of each other's spiritual welfare, and the establishment and strengthening of Baptist churches within its bounds," its churches maintain an efficient City Mission Society in the metropolis, to which is largely due the present strength of the New York Baptists.

CHAPTER XIV.

BAPTISTS IN THE UNITED STATES—IRREGULAR BAPTIST BODIES.

The Free Baptists. Arminian and "open" communion. Their missions and educational institutions. Other small bodies. Anti-Mission and Seventh-Day Baptists. The Tunkers. Of German origin. Hold peculiar views. Opposed to theological training and a salaried ministry. The Winebrennarians. Their creed, the Scriptures. Evangelical in doctrine and godly in life.

THUS far, we have considered only the "Regular" Baptists in the United States. There are numerous other bodies that agree with these "Regular" Baptists in their fundamental doctrine of the constitution of the Church and the nature of baptism, but differ from them more or less widely on other points of doctrine or practice. The most important of these are the Free Will Baptists, or Free Baptists, as they now call themselves. Their separate organization dates from 1780, when Benjamin Randall organized the first church of this order at New Durham, New Hampshire. He had been converted under the preaching of Whitefield, and was at first a Congregationalist, but adopted Baptist views and joined a Regular Baptist Church, by which he was disfellowshiped for rejecting Calvinistic doctrines. The Free Will Baptists, as their name implies, have been

Arminian in theology, and practice "open" communion. In 1827, they organized a General Conference, which meets triennially. During the anti-slavery agitation they took strong ground in favor of abolition, and declined overtures for union made by about twelve thousand Baptists of Kentucky, because the latter favored slavery. The Free Will Baptist Foreign Mission Society was organized in 1833, and has a vigorous mission in India. A Home Mission Society was formed in 1834, and an Education Society in 1840. The denomination sustains Hillsdale College, in Michigan; Bates College, in Maine; besides numerous schools of academic grade. They also have a publishing house, formerly located at Dover, New Hampshire, but now at Boston, Massachusetts. They now have but little short of one hundred thousand members.

The Separates, or Free Communion Baptists, rose in Rhode Island and Connecticut during the Whitefield revivals, organizing themselves into the Groton Union Conference in 1785. Since 1841, they have been mainly absorbed by the Free Will Baptists, though there are still returned forty-eight ministers and five thousand nine hundred members of this persuasion. A few Baptists are known as the Cumberland Free Baptists, but they have no separate organization and publish no statistics; their numbers are estimated at one thousand. Various other unassociated Baptist churches holding Free Will

doctrines, are said to exist, to the estimated number of thirteen thousand one hundred and ninety.

In 1822, a small denomination, holding Arminian views, but practicing strict communion was formed in the West, principally in the States of Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Kentucky. Under the name of General Baptists. They were estimated in 1890 to have over two thousand churches and thirteen thousand members.

A considerable number of the "Regular" Baptists in the early part of this century separated from the other churches on account of doctrinal and practical differences. Holding a hyper-Calvinistic theology, they were opposed to missions, Sunday-schools, and all "contrivances which seem to make the salvation of men depend on human effort." They have been known as Anti-Mission Baptists, "Anti-Effort," "Old," and "Hard-shell" Baptists. In 1854, they had sixty-six thousand and five hundred members, but they have gradually decreased in number and influence, though they are still strong in the country regions of Georgia and other Southern States. They had in 1890 about one thousand and eight hundred churches and forty-five thousand members.

The Seventh Day Baptists had an origin in Rhode Island, quite independent of the English body of the same name, a church being founded at Newport, in 1671, by Stephen Mumford. A General Conference was organ-

ized early in the present century, which has met triennially since 1846. They formed a Foreign Missionary Society in 1842, and support a Tract and Publishing House. Their headquarters are at Alfred Center, New York. They have one hundred and twelve churches, and over nine thousand members. German immigrants, settling at what is now Germantown, Pa., in 1723, formed the first German Seventh Day Baptist Church, and they have since grown to an estimated membership of three thousand five hundred.

From the year 1639 Six Principle Baptist churches have existed in Rhode Island, and the churches of this order have a present membership of nine hundred and thirty-seven.

The Tunkers, called also "Dunkers," "Dunkards," "German Baptists," and "Brethren," are found mainly in Pennsylvania, where they settled in considerable numbers from 1719 to 1730, and have prospered greatly in numbers and wealth. They hold in the main the same doctrines as the "Regular" Baptists, but add some peculiarities of practice. They have an ordained ministry, but pay ministers no salary, regarding even the receiving of fees with great disfavor. They oppose Sunday-schools, and secret societies, practice feet washing as a religious ordinance; interpreting literally the words of the apostle in 1 Cor. 16 : 20, they "greet one another with a holy kiss." They bore consistent testimony against slavery, and are

now active advocates of total abstinence. They were for a time inclined to regard higher education as conforming to the world, but they have now several colleges and high schools, in which co-education is practiced. They still oppose the establishment of theological schools and seminaries. They publish no statistics, having conscientious scruples against so doing, but they are believed on good grounds to have about six hundred and thirty churches, two thousand four hundred and forty-five preachers, and one hundred thousand members. A division of the Tunkers has joined the German Seventh Day Baptists, if, indeed, they are not, as some authorities maintain, the originators of that body.

The Winebrennarians, or "Church of God," owe their origin to the labors of Rev. John Winebrenner, who in the year 1820 was settled as pastor of the German Reformed Church at Harrisburg, Pa. A great revival of religion began among his people, and the work aroused much opposition in the church, which looked unfavorably upon such manifestations of abnormal excitement (as they viewed revivals). After five years of conflict, Mr. Winebrenner and his people separated from the German Reformed Church, and formed an independent congregation. About this time similar revivals occurred in the surrounding towns, and resulted in the organization of new churches. In the meantime, Mr. Winebrenner had been studying the Scriptures, and came to the conclusion that

neither in doctrine nor in discipline did the German Reformed Church correspond to the apostolic model, which he now conceived to be independent churches, composed only of believers, and without any human creed or laws, the Scriptures alone being accepted as the rule of faith and practice. In October, 1830, a meeting was held at Harrisburg, at which a regular system of co-operation was adopted by the churches sympathizing with these views, and Mr. Winebrenner was elected Speaker of the Conference. This body now meets annually, and fourteen other conferences or annual elderships have since been organized, besides a general eldership that meets triennially. The Church of God has an itinerant ministry, the appointments being made by the respective elderships; they practice feet-washing as a religious ordinance, recognize only immersion of believers as baptism, and hold that the Lord's Supper should be administered to Christians only, in a sitting posture, and always in the evening. The church has a publishing house at Harrisburg, an academy at Boshey-ville, Pa., and a college at Findlay, Ohio. Their numbers were last returned at four hundred and seventy-five churches, four hundred and fifty ministers, and twenty-nine thousand six hundred and eighty-three members. Their godly living and evangelical zeal are witnessed by all who know them intimately.

CHAPTER XV.

BAPTISTS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Emigration from New England to the maritime provinces. Mixed church membership general. First Baptist Association. More strict and more prosperous. Increasing number of Associations. The churches active in missionary work. Prominent in educational work. Churches in Quebec and Ontario. Planted by missionaries from the United States. Conditions for growth more favorable in Ontario. Zealous in missionary and educational work. The McMasters. History rapidly making. History of Baptists in France. Many obstacles. Aid from American Baptists. Little doubt of permanence. Growth of Baptist principles in Germany. The conversion of Oncken. Baptism by Barnas Sears. A church constituted. Growth steady from that time. Baptists self-supporting. Missionary enterprise for other peoples. Authorities jealous of Baptist growth. Baptists in Russia and Sweden. Persecuted in former country. Wiberg's leadership in the latter. Rapid growth. Early persecutions. The question of aid to churches. Baptists in Australia. Missionary work among convicts. Continuous progress in the main. An estimate of Baptist membership.

THERE were Baptists in Nova Scotia from the year 1760, when Samuel Dimock and family and the Rev. John Sutton emigrated from Connecticut and settled at Newport. After about a year, during which he baptized several, Mr. Sutton returned, and no church was formed. The first Baptist Church in the province was that of Sackville (now in New Brunswick), which was the result of an emigration of the Second Church of Swansea, Mass. It died out after a time, but a second church was formed there in 1799. A church was

also constituted at Horton in 1778, which two years later so far denied Baptist principles as to admit Congregationalists to their fellowship. The practice of mixed membership was general in the churches during the remainder of the eighteenth century, the church at Halifax being the only one at that time that in strictness can be called a Baptist church.

The first Association of Baptist churches in British North America was formed in 1800, at Lower Granville, and consisted of nine churches. After about 1809 the practice of strict communion prevailed among these churches, and a more rapid growth was the result of this faithfulness to principle. By 1821, the Association had so grown that for convenience it was divided into the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Associations; the former was, in 1850, divided into the Eastern, Central, and Western Associations, and the latter, in 1847, divided into the Eastern and Western, while from it was organized, in 1850, a Southern Association, and, in 1868, the Prince Edward's Island Association. These churches from the first felt the obligations of the Great Commission, and have been active in missionary work, a Society having been formed in 1815 in Nova Scotia, one in 1820 in New Brunswick, which have vigorously prosecuted work both at home and abroad. In educational work the maritime provinces have also been honorably prominent. When they had but twenty-nine churches

and one thousand seven hundred and seventy-two members, they established an academy at Horton, Nova Scotia, and another not long afterward at Fredericton, New Brunswick. Acadia College, founded about 1820, is their chief institution. It has an endowment of one hundred thousand dollars, an efficient faculty, and a large corps of students.

Churches were organized almost simultaneously in Quebec and Ontario—in the former province in 1794, and in the latter in the following year. Most of the early churches were planted by missionaries from the United States, but some of the earliest were composed of Scotch settlers. In Montreal no Baptist church was organized until 1830, and the French Roman Catholic population of the province of Quebec has been an unfavorable soil for the growth of Baptists, though the flourishing Grande Ligne Mission has done a good work among them, having been the means, it is said, of bringing some five thousand people to the knowledge of the truth. Ontario has afforded better conditions of increase, and Baptist churches are there numerous and growing, especially since the great revival that swept over the country in 1834. Controversies over the communion question have been no small hindrance to Baptist progress in Canada, these controversies causing the division of churches and the dissolution of missionary organizations. The Canada Baptist Union, formed in 1843, after the model of the

English organization, has had a more stable existence than its predecessors. The Home Mission Society, formed in 1854, has been a helpful and aggressive organization, planting new churches and sustaining weak interests. The Foreign Mission Society was for some years auxiliary to the American Baptist Missionary Union, but has since 1873 maintained independent enterprises and has a flourishing mission among the Telugus.

In educational work Canadian Baptists have been notably zealous and prospered. A theological institution founded at Montreal succumbed to debt and other misfortunes in 1849, but this is the sole instance of failure. A college founded at Woodstock about 1860, still flourishes, though it has lately been transformed into an academy. What was once a theological department of this school was in 1880 transferred to Toronto, and became the Toronto Baptist College. It was the wise liberality of the Hon. William McMaster that brought about this result, and to him is also due the founding of McMaster University, the Arts Department of which is well established. With this University are affiliated the Woodstock Academy and the Toronto Baptist College, as well as the Moulton College for women, which has been more recently established by Mrs. McMaster. To these two large-minded and large-hearted givers are due the establishment on firm foundations of a very complete educational system for Canadian

Baptists. The influence of these deeds will be felt in the Dominion to the remotest generations. The Baptists in Canada are making history rapidly, but it is too soon to attempt to write it.

Chronologically, the history of European Baptists of modern times begins with the beginning of a mission in Paris, by the Triennial Convention, now the American Baptist Missionary Union, in 1832. A church was not organized until 1835, when it consisted of but six members. The first native pastor, Rev. Joseph Thieffry, was ordained the following year; he labored in the North of France until an advanced age. By 1838, there were seven churches, and one hundred and forty-two members connected with the mission. The Baptists had many obstacles to contend against in the way of unjust laws and police restrictions, and in some cases both preachers and hearers were fined or imprisoned. The Revolution of 1848 abolished this state of things, and, though complete religious liberty has never in reality existed in France, serious persecution has not since been known. During recent years the French Baptists have owed much to the sympathy and pecuniary help of their Baptist brethren. During its half century of life, the mission has made but a slow growth, but the establishment of a theological school in 1879 did much to ensure the permanence of the work. Supplied with an educated ministry, the churches will be

able to make steady progress. From American Baptists these churches have received little direct pecuniary aid during a decade or more, but they have continued to advance. One who is not over sanguine in estimating probable growth need have little doubt of the permanence of Baptist principles in France as represented by these churches.

The most remarkable growth of Baptists, however, all things considered, has been seen in Germany, where the very name has been an epithet of scorn and contempt for three centuries. If an attempt had been deliberately made from without to establish a Baptist mission in that country, failure would doubtless have resulted. In no event was the providence of God more clearly manifested than in the beginning of the modern German Baptists. Johann Gerhardt Oncken, born in Varel, Oldenberg, in 1800, was from 1823 the agent of the British Continental Society and the Edinburgh Bible Society among his own people. The son of a Lutheran minister, he was, of course, a Pædobaptist. About the year 1830, by independent study of the Scriptures, he was convinced that the only baptism is the immersion of a believer, but for a time he thought himself alone in this conviction. Some one told him that beyond the sea in America there was a people called Baptists who held like views, and he heard later that one of these American Baptists was then in Germany studying. He sought and made the acquaint-

ance of Professor Barnas Sears, then of the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution; and Mr. Sears, on the night of April 22, 1834, baptized in the water of the Elbe, near Hamburg, Mr. Oncken and seven other believers of like views. On the following day they were organized into a church, and Mr. Oncken was ordained as their pastor. In the following September, the American Baptist Triennial Convention, now the Missionary Union, employed Mr. Oncken as a missionary, and in a little more than four years there were four churches and one hundred and twenty-one members.

Since then the growth has been uninterrupted and steady; at times, rapid; until now the Baptists of Germany proper are almost twenty thousand. Long ago the Missionary Union was able to withdraw its financial support, and for many years German Baptists have been self-supporting, and now maintain missions of their own in China and South Africa, besides doing home missionary work in Turkey and Russia. In the latter country the Baptist churches are barely tolerated, their ministers being often imprisoned; and though more liberty has been given them at times of late years, they are subject to the whim of a despotic government, and are without recognized legal rights. The German Baptists, during their earlier years, suffered quite seriously from persecution, Mr. Oncken himself having been treated with marked cruelty, and many of his followers being fined or

imprisoned, or both. A decree was even issued that none but members of his own household should attend his family worship. Baptists were compelled to bring their children to Lutheran ministers for so-called baptism, on pain of imprisonment. In Hanover the property of some was confiscated, and in Hesse Baptists were fined and banished. In spite of all, they throve and spread, and though this severity was gradually relaxed, to this day government officials and Lutheran ministers look with a jealous eye on the rapid increase of Baptists. From Germany lay missionaries extended the work to Denmark, Finland, Poland, Holland, Switzerland, Austro-Hungary, and Bulgaria, in all of which countries numerous churches have been established, partly by immigration, but more largely by making converts among the people of the various countries. The establishment of an excellent Theological School at Hamburg promises to give these churches an educated ministry as rapidly as the men can be found and trained; and a flourishing Publication House in the same city furnishes the churches with a denominational literature that is of the greatest service.

The Swedish Baptists owe their existence, in the providence of God, to their brethren in New York City. A Swedish sailor named Gustaf W. Schroeder, converted on shipboard, found his way into the Mariners' Church, of New York, one Sunday about the year 1845. He then

first saw the ordinance of baptism scripturally administered, and so deep an impression was made on his mind that in a few weeks he asked for and obtained baptism in the same church. After his return to Sweden, he met Frederick O. Nilsson, also a Swedish sailor, who had been converted in New York in 1834, and was then a colporteur in the employ of the American Seamen's Friend Society. Led by Schroeder to inquire into the subject of baptism, Nilsson was soon anxious to obey his Lord, but sought in vain in Sweden for anybody to administer the ordinance. He was at length baptized, September 21, 1848, by a German minister, sent for the purpose by the church in Hamburg. The following year Nilsson was ordained in Hamburg and began to preach in Sweden, until there were fifty-two Baptists gathered through his labors. After several arrests and imprisonments, he was banished from Sweden in 1856, and soon after headed a colony of emigrants to this country, who settled in a Western State.

A successor was speedily found in Andreas Wiberg, who had been educated for the Lutheran ministry, in which he served for six years. In 1849, he found himself unable to remain in the Lutheran Church, where he was obliged to administer the communion to converted and unconverted alike. While in a transition state, he met Mr. Oncken, and soon after an independent study of the Scripture led him to the Baptist view of the New

Testament teachings. He was baptized at Copenhagen by Mr. Nilsson, and after spending some time in the United States, returned in October, 1855, to labor in Sweden as a colporteur of the American Baptist Publication Society. During his absence, Swedish Baptists had not stood still, their number having become nearly five hundred, and from this time on their growth was rapid and continuous. Mr. Wiberg was as wise and energetic a leader in Sweden as Oncken proved himself to be in Germany. Both men were evidently raised up by God to be pioneer workers in his cause, and each served his generation faithfully in his own way. In 1856, a Missionary Union was formed at Stockholm, which did much to organize and unify the work. In 1866, the mission was transferred from the Publication Society to the Missionary Union, and one of the first fruits of the change was the establishment of a theological school, known as the Bethel Seminary, which has since then educated more than two hundred and fifty ministers. In 1867, the work was extended to Norway, and the following year Finland was entered. Missions have since then been conducted among the Laplanders. In the two kingdoms there are now not far from forty thousand Baptists. A considerable measure of toleration is now enjoyed by them, since persecution is unpopular, and both priests and magistrates shrink from it. In the early days of Baptist growth, there was much suffering.

One minister was summoned before the courts sixteen times, and one was six times cast into prison, was shackled for many days and was fined a considerable sum. It seems incredible that such things should have happened in the nineteenth century in a civilized country, whose people call themselves Christians.

The Missionary Union formerly maintained missions in Spain and Greece, but for some years no appropriations have been made to these countries. In none of them have the Baptist churches planted increased with much rapidity or made any appreciable impression on the population, though they still live and grow slowly. It cannot be said, however, that Baptists have a specially promising future in either of these countries. If an exception is to be made at all, it is in favor of Spain, where there are several devoted native pastors who are laboring under great difficulties and discouragements, yet with undaunted faith.

The belief has become of late years very general that it is unadvisable for American Baptists to maintain missions in European countries, by direct support of missionaries or pastors. So soon as churches are formed, it is believed to be best that they support their own pastors. Help may well be given from this country for the education of a native ministry, and occasionally for other exceptional forms of work. Whatever is done beyond that, experience seems to show, does not tend to the ultimate

stability of the churches or the permanent growth of the cause. Churches, like men, are the better for being self-reliant, and early learning to stand alone. It is an open question whether aiding churches in our own country has not too frequently resulted, like indiscriminate giving to beggars, in pauperizing a large number of bodies that if properly stimulated to self-help might long since have become robust. But this is to leave the domain of the historian and enter that of the social philosopher.

A very few facts only can be gleaned regarding the Baptists of Australasia, mainly from Armitage's *History* and the English Baptist *Year Book*. Rev. John Saunders, a Baptist minister, who had established two churches in London, became very desirous of preaching to the convicts and planting a Christian church at Botany Bay. He formed the Bathurst Street Church. His arduous labors finally broke his health, but a worthy successor was found in Rev. James Voller, by whose effort an Association was formed, that in 1891 reports twenty-six churches and one thousand four hundred and sixty-one members. The Baptist Church in Melbourne, Victoria, was organized in 1845 by Rev. Willian Ham, and the cause has prospered continuously. There are now forty-four churches and four thousand five hundred and fifty-eight members. In South Australia the First Baptist Church to be established was the Hinders Street

Chapel of Adelaide, which dates from 1861. Progress here has been hindered by an excess of the spirit of independency and too little co-operation, but there are fifty-two churches and three thousand six hundred and sixty-five members. The Wharf Street Chapel in Moreton Bay, Queensland, was built in 1856, after Rev. B. G. Wilson had preached there for several years, and from this the Baptists of the Colony have increased to twenty-seven churches and two thousand one hundred and seventy members. During the past few years there has been a slight loss of members here. In New Zealand there are twenty-eight churches and two thousand seven hundred and seventy-eight members; and besides the work among the white people a mission is maintained among the Maoris, of whom there are still about fifty thousand. The Baptist cause here owes its present prosperity largely to the labors of Rev. D. Dolomore, who went thither in 1851. The first church was organized in 1854, and from that time growth was steady, especially in the southern section. A Baptist Union was formed about 1880, which has been a great help to the churches, especially in uniting them in missionary efforts. Work was begun by the Baptists in Tasmania in 1834, but there have been meagre results here, in spite of many years of hard labor, there being at present but nine churches and five hundred and seventy-four members.

According to the latest statistics, compiled from

official sources, the Baptists of the world number three million seven hundred and eighty-six thousand six hundred and three. It is safe to predict that by the end of the century the number will be over FOUR MILLIONS.

CHAPTER XVI.

PROGRESS OF BAPTIST PRINCIPLES.

Baptist numerical strength. Not of itself sufficient. Weight as well as numbers needed. Value of Baptists to the World. Principles contended for—now common property. One of these—the Church a spiritual body. Generally accepted. Opposed by idea of the State Church. Its great value to Baptists in New England. Influence on others. Regeneration demanded for membership by most churches. Baptismal controversy practically at an end. The verdict of scholarship. The place of the Lord's Supper. Baptists not peculiar in their views of this. Sustained by others. Sophistries cleared away by Baptists. The union of Church and State. Baptists against this. Champions of religious liberty. Baptists alone in this. Their doctrine now common law. The idea of church independency. Prevalent among all. Baptists share in general religious work. Baptists modified by others. An asserted remark of Mr. Spurgeon. Growth implies change. Not necessarily deterioration. Three modifications. A more scriptural worship. Less puritanic and stern. More rich in tone. Baptists less rigid in Calvinism. A changed emphasis in preaching. Love and not torment the motive power. These changes permanent. Baptist continuity of faith. Held without creed. No central authority. Adhesion to God's word. This their past strength. This their future hope.

AS we have seen, the number of Baptists by the end of the present century is likely to be fully four millions. But a denomination that has nothing better upon which to congratulate itself than mere numbers is to be pitied. Numbers alone are not strength. Any body must be weighed as well as counted before its value to the world can be estimated. It therefore becomes necessary to ask and answer the question, What have

Baptists contributed to the religious thought and life of the world, and what is the value of that contribution?

It may be sufficient to reply to this question that the value of the Baptist contribution to Christian life and thought is sufficiently proved by the fact that nearly all the principles for which Baptists have contended are now the common property of Christendom. This may seem a sweeping, if not a rash statement. Let us proceed to justify it in detail.

The chief of the distinctive principles of Baptists, as has been set forth in a previous chapter, relates to the nature of the church. Baptists have always contended that the church is not a worldly, but a spiritual body. Spiritual, not in the sense of lacking a local organization or visible identity, but because organized on the basis of spiritual life. In other words, the church should consist of the regenerate only—that is, of persons who have given credible evidence to the world that they have been born again of the Spirit of God. This principle of Baptists, which was scouted at first and for centuries, has now won its way to general acceptance among nearly all Protestant denominations, such bodies as call themselves evangelical. In Europe, where State churches still exist, the principle has, it is true, made comparatively little progress. Where citizenship and church-membership are practically identical terms, it is evident that the church cannot insist upon regeneration as a condition of mem-

bership. Every one who is born into the State and upon whom some form of so-called baptism has been practiced, must be presumed to be regenerate, and therefore to be a fitting person for all the privileges of church-fellowship, unless by a notoriously immoral and profligate life he negatives the assumption and warrants the State-supported minister or priest in refusing him communion. In many of the New England towns during the early period, church membership was essential to the full enjoyment of the rights of citizenship, the State being in fact and almost in form a theocracy. It was natural, therefore, that persons who lacked spiritual qualifications for church membership should yet desire a formal membership, in order to avail themselves of the accompanying civil privilege. How this pressure brought about the "Half-way Covenant," with its disastrous effects on the churches, has already been told. It was for vehemently protesting against these evils that Jonathan Edwards was driven from his pastorate at Northampton, and sent forth like Abraham "not knowing whither the Lord should lead him."

The Baptist churches, as we have seen, through insistance upon a regenerate membership, were a bulwark against the rising tide of anti-scriptural doctrine that for a time threatened to overwhelm evangelical religion in New England. The influence of these facts was potent, not only among the Congregationalists, but among Presbyterians

and other Protestant bodies. The necessity was clearly seen of a reform that should separate the worldly from the spiritual elements in the church. Gradually but surely, without outward change in their formularies or an avowed alteration of practice, these bodies came virtually to adopt the Baptist principle of a regenerate membership. They still to a certain extent vitiate the principle by maintaining the unscriptural practice of infant baptism, but they are quite rigid in the requirement that those thus baptized in unconscious infancy shall, on reaching years of maturity, make a public and personal profession of religion before they are received into full membership. And in many churches, Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, if not in all, this profession is not a mere form of words, but care is taken by the officers of the church to secure credible evidence of regeneration before the candidate is received. In many cases the examination is quite as careful and searching as that to which candidates for baptism are subjected in Baptist churches. While, therefore, we regret that our evangelical brethren of other faiths do not see the truth as we see it and that they are yet, as we believe, rendering an imperfect obedience to the commands of Christ, we have reason to rejoice that Baptist example has so far borne fruit—that these brethren have in so large measure adopted, as their rule of church order, the cardinal distinctive principle of Baptists.

We may note as a second contribution of Baptists to Christian thought the fact that what is known as the baptismal controversy is now practically at an end. The issue has been decided and the verdict of scholarship is rendered. It is true that there are some Pædobaptists who imagine that the war is still going on, just as there are said to be mountaineers in Tennessee who still imagine that Andrew Jackson is a candidate for the presidency. But Andrew Jackson is not more unmistakably dead and buried than the baptismal controversy. No scholar of world-wide repute would risk his fame by denying that the primitive baptism was immersion and immersion only. Not more than one or two Greek lexicons ever printed give any other meaning for the word *baptizo* than "immerse" or "dip" or their equivalents in other languages. No exegete of the first rank attributes any other meaning than this to the word wherever it occurs in the New Testament. No church historian whose name is recognized as that of an authority of the first rank has put his name to any other statement than that in apostolic times baptism was always the immersion of an adult believer. The admissions to this effect from Pædobaptist scholars of all countries during the last three centuries are numbered by scores, even by hundreds.[1] There is no voice to the contrary except from men of scant scholarship, and

[1] See the little tract of Dr. W. W. Everts, called *Concise Comments on Baptism.*

the question is no longer disputed by anybody who is worth the attention of a serious person.

It would be flattering to denominational pride to say that a third Baptist contribution to Christian thought is the doctrine as to the place of the Lord's Supper among the ordinances of Christ; but to say this would not be true. The Baptist doctrine in this respect has never been peculiar, though opponents have sometimes made strenuous efforts to represent it as such. There is not, there never has been, a Christian body whose standards authorized its clergy to administer the communion to the unbaptized. Individual ministers have stretched church law to cover their own wrong practice in this regard. It is not uncommon, for example, for Episcopal clergymen to admit to the communion practically all who present themselves and are not known to them to be persons of immoral life, and they sometimes invite people whom they know to be Christians not in fellowship with their church. These things are, however, done in spite of the rubric, which says, "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." If Episcopal ministers here and there violate the well-established rule of their own church, that can not be regarded as altering the rule. This principle applies equally to pastors of Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational churches that of their own motion or on

their own authority invite to the Lord's Table other than baptized Christians. Their church formularies authorize no such invitation. Only the exceptionally ignorant or the exceptionally unscrupulous now reproach Baptists because of their "close" communion, since intelligent and candid Pædobaptists know and acknowledge that we stand precisely where all Christendom stands, and where all Christendom always has stood from the days of the apostles until now, with regard to the qualifications for communion. All that Baptists can claim to have done in this matter is to have cleared away the mass of sophistries with which opponents had beclouded this question, until no excuse for ignorance and no apology for misrepresentation are possible.

But if Baptists cannot properly claim the honor of contributing this principle to Christian thought, they can honestly claim to have added another principle, namely, that the union of Church and State is contrary to the word of God, contrary to natural justice, and destructive to both parties to the union. Next to a regenerate church membership this has been the principle for which Baptists have most strenuously contended and with which they have been most prominently identified. For this teaching they were from the time of the Reformation until a period within the memory of men now living, despised and rejected of men, loaded with opprobrium, reviled, persecuted, put to death. Toleration was a

byword and a hissing among all parties of Christians, and religious liberty was an idea that apparently never entered men's minds until it was professed, defended, and exemplified by Baptists. It is difficult for Americans, living in an atmosphere of perfect religious liberty, where no law restrains any man from worshiping God in any way that his conscience dictates, or compels him to contribute of his substance to the support of any worship that he does not approve—it is hard for us even to imagine a state of society in which the majority determined what the community should believe, how men should worship God, and repressed all dissent with savage laws and penalties that did not stop short of the stake and the scaffold. The once despised teaching of Baptists has become a commonplace of thought in our country, a fundamental principle of law, and he would be laughed at who should propose its overthrow or even its modification. But to appreciate what change has been wrought by this idea in American religious and civil life, an American must study the institutions of Europe, where there is no State that has not its established church, where dissent from the established religion is punished more or less severely by civil and social disabilities, if not by imprisonment and fines, and where even if unmolested, those who dissent from the established religion are, nevertheless, heavily taxed for its support. This was the principle that prevailed during the colonial period in

our own land. This would be the system under which we should now be living had not this despised principle of the Baptists become incorporated into the very spiritual and moral fibre of the American people.

The Baptist principle of the independence of each church has also won its way to a very considerable degree of acceptance among churches of all orders. Among the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Methodist churches, although in theory there is a more or less centralized and hierarchical government, the independence of the local church is practically unquestioned. The Methodist bishop still retains his theoretical power of ordering any man to any church, but it somehow happens that where a church desires a certain pastor and the pastor desires to settle with that church, the bishop makes that identical appointment. The Episcopal bishop has, in theory, large powers; in practice, every Episcopal church chooses its own rector as absolutely as though there were no bishop. In theory, no Presbyterian church can call a pastor, and no pastor can be dismissed, without the concurrence of presbytery; but where both parties have made up their minds, presbytery always concurs.

Baptists have also contributed their share to the world's advancement by their interest in missions, in education, in Sunday-schools, and in general philanthropic movements. The facts that justify this claim have been given in detail in previous chapters of this history, and only

this statement need be made here, by way of giving completeness to this brief summary. Though not, strictly speaking, pioneers in most of these forms of religious activity, our churches have helped to bear the heat and burden of the day.

Though Baptists have thus powerfully influenced other bodies of Christians, it would be a mistake to infer that they have themselves escaped modifications in belief and practice through the influence of other Christian brethren. Mr. Spurgeon was reported, some time ago, as proudly remarking that he had never changed an opinion, and that he preaches now precisely what he did when he began his ministry. The remark is probably not authentic, and is certainly not true; and if it were true, it would be a reflection on the intelligence of a man who could spend fifty years in the ministry without learning anything. Mr. Spurgeon's admirers, and their name is legion, cannot think so meanly of him. If a great preacher cannot live and labor a half-century without having his beliefs modified, still less can a large body, composed of many elements, some of them discordant, exposed to numerous hostile and disintegrating influences, and subject to those laws of development and growth that affect all social organisms. Change was inevitable, but change is not necessarily deterioration. Whether the modification is for the better may be left for the decision of theologians; the historian merely records the fact.

Modifications in Baptist faith and practice during the last two centuries may be noted (1) in the tendency toward a more scriptural worship, (2) in a less rigidly Calvinistic theology, (3) in a change of emphasis that marks the preaching of our day.

The Baptists existed before the Puritan era, but were so powerfully affected by the Puritan spirit as to be almost identified with Puritanism. The stern and austere form of devotion approved by Puritanism was the type of Baptist worship until very recently. More conservative than the descendants of the Puritans themselves, we have clung to the shell after the substance had departed from it. But the conviction has been deepening and widening of late years that our public worship lacks elements of color, and variety, and richness that it should have, and that it has departed from the Scriptural method, in practically giving over the public worship of God to two hired functionaries, the minister and the choir. The introduction of congregational singing and the responsive reading or chanting of the psalms, as well as the use of certain ancient forms of devotion that are the common heritage of Christendom and not the property of any church, has followed close on the conviction.

That both Calvinism and Arminianism have been so modified as to bear little relation to the systems once passing under these names is so well understood and so little likely to be questioned that it is not worth while to

waste space in more than a statement of the fact. Each has reacted on the other, and between the latest statements of the two opposing systems a critical student can discern little more than a difference of emphasis. Both assert the sovereign election and free grace of God as the ground of the sinner's salvation; both admit that the will of man, free as regards all external constraint, accepts God's proffered grace; the Calvinist laying the greater stress on the former idea, the Arminian on the latter.

This matter of a changed emphasis has not been confined to theological circles alone; it has affected every pulpit. Any one who will read the published discourses of a century ago and compare them with those of the present day must be struck by this fact. The same doctrines are professed and believed as then, but how different the mode of presentation. The eternity of future punishment is still an article of faith, but the preacher no longer threatens sinners with a hell of material fire. Retribution is conceived as something at once more spiritual and more terrible than the physical torture of an everlasting roasting, and God is no longer pictured as inflicting tortures like an omnipotent Torquemada. The infinite love of God as shown in the redemption of a lost world, the atonement a satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, salvation not a thing of the future life, but beginning here and now, not a mere rescue from hell, but the consecration of a life to God—these are

some of the ideas that appear prominently in the preaching of to-day, in distinction from the type of pulpit discourse that many of us, not so venerable, can remember in our childhood.

Whether these changes have been for the better or for the worse, they are undeniable and they are permanent. Revolutions of this quiet and persistent kind never go backward. Yet, in the judgment of men of other faiths, the most characteristic fact in the history of the Baptists during the last two centuries has been their marvelous continuity of belief, their orthodoxy of doctrine. It is the wonder of many members of other churches having elaborate written standards, and an ingenious system of checks and devices to prevent and punish heresy, that a denomination without a creed, without a government, with no central authority or other human device for preserving unity, with each local organization a law unto itself and responsible to none save Christ,—that such a rope of sand should hold together at all, much less sustain a strain that the strongest bodies have borne none too well.

But one cause can be plausibly assigned for this phenomenon, and that is, Baptist loyalty to their fundamental principle, the word of God the only rule of faith and practice. The Scriptures are easily understanded of the people, even the unlettered who approach them with open minds, desiring to know the will of God. Such may

not become great Biblical scholars, but they will learn everything that it is important for them to know for their eternal salvation and daily guidance. They may not become profound theologians, but they will learn the cardinal truths of the Christian faith, and learn them more accurately in their right relations than the student of some human system is likely to learn them.

Loyalty to this principle has been the strength of Baptists in the past, and as they are loyal to it in future they may expect increase in numbers, in strength, and in unity.

APPENDIX.

A.

THE ONGOLE BAPTISMS.

A favorite argument among Pædobaptists against immersion is that it would have been physically impossible for the apostles to baptize 3,000 persons in one day. This has been often shown to be no objection at all, but perhaps never so forcibly as in the following extract from a letter of Rev. D. Downie, telling of the baptism of Telugu converts:

"With reference to your question, 'How many men does it take to baptize 2,222 persons in *one* day?' I should say that depends on several things, but in the present case the simple reply is 'six.' But lest this be too laconic, I will enlarge a little. Bear in mind that the baptistery was admirably situated for expeditious work. It was at the ford of a river, with a sort of basin on either side. No time was lost in coming and going, as the water was sufficiently deep close up to the road. Remember, too, that the examinations and all other necessary preparatory work had been previously attended to. The people were arranged in groups according to their villages. Only two preachers baptized at one time. When these were tired, two others took their places. These in turn were relieved by the other two, and so on. The baptizing commenced about 5 A. M., and continued till 10. It was resumed at 2 P. M. and completed at 6. It will thus be seen that the baptism of 2,222 converts occupied two preachers nine hours, or about thirty seconds for each candidate. If the *six* preachers had *all* been employed *at the same time*, the 2,222 converts would have been baptized in just THREE HOURS."

It is a simple sum in mental arithmetic, and we hope that some of our Pædobaptist "esteemed contemporaries" will solve it. If six ministers can baptize 2,222 converts in nine hours, how many could the twelve apostles have baptized in the same time.—*From the "Examiner," March 27, 1879*

B

CYPRIAN ON CLINIC BAPTISM.

The following is the part of Cyprian's Epistle (LXXV.) that relates to clinic baptism:

"You have asked also, dearest son, what I thought of those who obtain God's grace in sickness and weakness, whether they are to be accounted legitimate Christians, for that they are not to be washed, but sprinkled, with the saving water. In this point my diffidence and modesty prejudges none, so as to prevent any from feeling what he thinks right, and from doing what he feels to be right. As far as my poor understanding conceives it, I think that the divine benefits can in no respect be mutilated and weakened; nor can anything less occur in that case, where, with full and entire faith both of the giver and receiver, is accepted what is drawn from the divine gifts. For in the sacrament of salvation the contagion of sins is not in such wise washed away, as the filth of the skin and of the body is washed away in the carnal and ordinary washing, as that there should be need of saltpetre and other appliances also, and a bath and a basin wherewith this vile body must be washed and purified. Otherwise is the breast of the believer washed; otherwise is the mind of man purified by the merit of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity compels, and God bestows his mercy, the divine methods confer the whole benefit on believers; nor ought it to trouble any one that sick people seem to be sprinkled or affused, when they obtain the Lord's grace, when Holy Scripture speaks by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel, and says, 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. And I will give you a new heart and a new spirit will I put within you.' Also in Numbers: 'And the man that shall be unclean until the evening shall be purified on the third day, and on the seventh day shall be clean: but if he shall not be purified on the third day, on the seventh day he shall not be clean. And that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of sprinkling hath not been sprinkled upon him.' And again: 'And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them, to cleanse them: thou shalt sprinkle them with the water of purification.' And again: 'The water of sprinkling is a purification.' Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the Church, where the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of

the Lord and by the truth of faith."—*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Amer. ed. Vol. v., p. 400.

It will be observed how Cyprian anticipates the modern Pædobaptist exegesis of Scripture for the defense of sprinkling. There is nothing new under the sun, even in religious controversy.

C.

THE FIFTH MONARCHY MEN.

The Fifth Monarchy men have been much misrepresented as to their intention of violently overthrowing government and instituting a persecution of all who did not acknowledge the new Kingdom. The following extract from one of many contemporary documents will suffice to prove this:

"Though in this day and Kingdom of patience (which measures the militant state) neither doth the Lord, nor must the servant of the Lord strive, much less strike nor use the Sword, or any violence to *propagate* Religion, or to *displace* the powers of the world, (how much sover they suffer under them) yet Christ hath all along in a most *clean* unblemished righteous way of proceeding come upon these his, and his Churches Enemies, and hath raised up adversaries against them, who have avenged the Churches quarrel upon them, as he raised *Cyrus* against *Babilon*, and many times he gives these *Nimrods* up to the invasion of the *Civil* rights and liberties of men, whereby they give men a just quarrel against them, and thus he *divides* the waters, and makes way for his ransomed ones.

"Though the spirit of this Kingdom of Christ doth not carry forth the Subjects of it to War or *violence* for *Religion* sake, (that is to avoid *personal* suffering, or to *impose* their light upon others) but they leave God to persuade *Japhet* and to *aveng* their injuries of that kind) yet it doth not make it unwarrantable or unlawful for them in a cause of *civil liberties* under *lawful* powers that shall take up the defence of their Country, and their *established* laws and liberties to use the material Sword; for by being the subjects of a *higher* Kingdom than this world, they are not discharged from the duty they owe their Prince, their Country, themselves *as men*, in case of unjust *invasion* or of *usurpation* within, or from without, but are the fittest and best instructed men to use the Sword aright, their *civil* relation to humane Society, being not dissolved, but *improved* by this higher relation, and therefore Christ himself disowns not the title of a Warriour, but is called the *Lord of Hosts*, and in *righteousness* doth he judge and *make War*."—*The Visible Glory of the Reign of Christ on Earth no Ways repugnant to the Spirituality of his Kingdom.* London. 1677.

D.

ENGLISH PRESBYTERIANS AND TOLERATION.

Some modern defenders of the English Puritans, with more zeal than knowledge of the facts, have imputed malicious misrepresentation to the author, for his statements regarding the persecuting opinions and practices of the Presbyterian party. I could fill a volume the size of this with quotations in proof of the accuracy of my statements, without going outside my own library and note-books. The following samples of the evidence in my possession must suffice, and every candid reader will admit that further proof would be superflous:

"We confesse and acknawledge Empyres, Kingdomes, Dominiounis, and Citties to be distincted and ordained be God; . . Mairover, to Kings, Princes, Rulers, and Magistrates, wee affirme that chieflie and most principallie the conservation and purgation of the Religiouns apperteinis; so that not onlie they are appointed for civill policie, bot also for maintenance of the trew Religioun, and for suppressing of Idolatrie and Superstitioun whatsoever, as in *Dvid*, *Josaphat*, *Ezechias*, *Josias*, and utheris highlie commended for their zeale in that case may be espyed."—Article XXIV of the *First Scotch Confession*. 1560.

"It perteinis to the office of a Christian magistrat to assist and fortify the godly proceedings of the Kirk in all behaltes; and namely, to see that the publique estait, and ministrie thereof, be mainteinit and susteinit as it apperteins, according to Godis Word. . . . To assist and manteine the discipline of the Kirk; and punish them civilly, that will not obey the censure of the same, without confounding alwayis the ane jurisdiction with the other."—*Second Book of Discipline* of the Church of Scotland. 1578.

"4. And because the power which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another; they who upon pretense of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God. And for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity, whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation; or to the power of godliness; or such erroneous opinions or practices as, either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to

the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church; they may be lawfully called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church, and by the power of the Civil Magistrate "— *Westminster Confession*, Chapter xx.

"These are some of the many considerations which make deep impression upon our spirits against that great *Diana* of *Independents*, and all the sectaries so much cryed up by them in these distracted times, viz.: *A Toleration, A Toleration.* And, however, none should have more rejoyced then ourselves in the establishment of a brotherly, peaceable, and Christian accommodation; yet this being utterly rejected by them, wee cannot dissemble how upon the forementioned grounds, we detest and abhorre the much-endeavoured Toleration. Our bowels are stirred within us, and we could even drown our selves in teares, when we call to minde how long and sharp a travell this Kingdom hath been in for many yeares together, to bring forth that blessed fruit of a pure and perfect Reformation, and now at last, after all our pangs and dolours and expectations, this reale and thorough Reformation is in danger of being strangled in the birth by a lawlesse Toleration that strives to be brought forth before it,"—*A Letter of the Ministers of London*, to the Westminster Assembly, presented January 1, 1645.

"None provoking the people to idolatry ought to be exempted from the punishment of death. . . . The whole tribes did in very dede execute that sharp judgment against the tribe of Benjamin for a less offense than idolatrie. And the same ought be done wheresoever Christ Jesus and his Evangiel is so received in any realme, province, or city, that the magistrates and people have solemnly avowed and promised to defend the same, as under King Edward of late days was done in England. In such places, I say, it is not only lawful to punish to the death such as labour to subvert the true religion, but the magistrates and the people are bound to do so unless they will provoke the wrath of God against themselves."—John Knox, *History of Reformation in Scotland*, pp. 264, 265.

"God permitts these gracious men [Goodwin and the Independents] to be many wayes unhappie instruments. as yett their pride continues; but we are hopefull the Parliament will not own their way so much as so tolerate it, if once they found themselves masters. For a time they are loath to cast them off, and to put their partie to a despaire, lest they desert them." (Letter of August 10, 1644.)—"Our next worke is, to give advyce what to doe for the suppressing of Anabaptists, Antinomians, and other sectaries." (August 28.)—"We spent a number of sessions on some propositions of advyce to the Parliament for suppressing Antinomians, Anabaptists, and these who preaches (*sic*) a libertie for all religions." (September 16.)—"The Assemblie having put

the Independents to shew what positively is their judgement in things controverted, we have been quyte of their cumber these six or seven weeks. Every day this month we have been expecting their positive tenets, but as yet we have heard nothing of them; only in their sermons in the City they are deviating more and more towards old and new errours, especiallie libertie of conscience; Their wayes are daylie more and more dislyked." (May 5, 1645.)—"Many of them [Independents] preach, and some print, a libertie of conscienee, at least the great equitie of a toleration for all religions; that every man should be permitted without any feare, so much as of discountenance from the magistrate, to professe publicklie his conscience, were he never so erroneous, and also live according thereunto, if he trouble not the publick peace by any seditious or wicked practice." (December 27, 1644.)—Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journal*, Vol. II., *passim*.

"Such opinions and practices as make an evident schisme in a *Church*, and set up two distinct Churches, of different forms of Government, and pretending to different institutions of Christ, of which the one must by the nature of their principles labour, the destruction of the other, can not be tollerated, &c., for each pretending their fellow churches to bee of man, and so of the devill, though they should both make one true invisible Church, agreeing in all fundamentals, and many other truths, yet sure the whole should be a kingdome devided against itselfe, and this destroyeth peace and unity."—Samuel Rutherford, *A Free Disputation against pretended Liberty of Conscience.* London. 1649.

"Liberty of Conscience, and Toleration of all or any Religion is so prodigious an impiety, that this religious Parliament cannot but abhorre the very nameing of it."—Robert Baylie, *A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time.* London. 1645.

"I humbly beseech the Parliament seriously to consider the depths of Satan in this designe of a Toleration, how this is now his last plot and designe and by it would undermine and frustrate the whole work of Reformation intended, 'tis his Master-piece for *England;* and for effecting of it, he comes and moves not in Prelates and Bishops, not in furious Anabaptists, etc., but in holy men, excellent Preachers, moderate and faire men, not for a Toleration of heresies and gross opinions, but *an allowance of a latitude to some differences with* peaceableness. . . . In a word, could the devill effect a Toleration, he would think he had gained well by the Reformation, and make a good exchange of the Hierarchie to have a Toleration for it."—Thomas Edwards, *Autapologia.* London. 1646.

"The Magistrates should execute some exemplary punishment upon some of the most notorious Sectaries and Seducers, and upon the wilful abetters of these abominable Errours, namely,

the Printers, Dispersers, and Licensers, and set themselves with all their hearts, to find out wayes, to take some course to suppresse, hinder, and no longer suffer these things: To put out some Declaration against the Errours and wayes of the Sectaries, as their sending Emissaries into all parts of the Kingdom to poyson the Countreys, as their dipping of persons in the cold water in winter, whereby persons fall sick, dye, &c., declaring that they shall be proceeded against as Vagrants and Rogues that go from Country to Country; and if any fall sick upon their Dipping and dye, they shall be endicted upon the statute of killing the King's subjects, and proceeded against accordingly. 'Tis related of the Senate of *Zurich*, that they made a decree against the Anabaptists, after they had been dealt with by ten several Disputations, and continued still obstinate, that whosoever rebaptized any that had been formerly baptized, he should be cast into the water and drowned. And in one word, to cause all the people to stand to the Covenant; as 'tis said of *Josiah*, 2 *Chron.* 34 : 32, that is, to keep them in such awe by the Magistrates Authority and Penal Laws, as that they shall not dare but stand to the Covenant."—Thomas Edwards, *Gangræna*, p. 98.

"If you do not labor according to your duty and power to suppress the errours and heresies that are spread in the kingdom, all these errours are your errours, and these heresies are your heresies; they are your sins, and God calls for a Parliamentary repentance from you for them this day. You are the Anabaptists, you are the Antinomians, and it is you that hold all religions should be tolerated."—Sermon of Dr. Calamy before the House of Commons, October 22, 1644.

"The divisions and havock of the Church is our calamity; we intended not to dig down the banks or pull up the hedge, and lay all waste and common, when we desired the prelates' tyranny to cease. My judgment in that much disputed point of liberty of religion I have always freely made known. I abhor unlimited liberty and toleration of all, and think myself easily able to prove the wickedness of it."—Richard Baxter, *Plain Scripture Proof of Infant Church Membership and Baptism*, p. 246. London, 1650.

"That which is a plain breach of the Sixth Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, is no Ordinance of God, but a most heinous sin. But the ordinary practice of baptizing over head and ears in cold water, as necessary, is a plain breach of the sixth commandment: Therefore, it is no Ordinance of God, but an heinous sin. And, as Mr. Cradock shows, in his book of *Gospel Liberty*, the magistrate ought to restrain it, to save the lives of his Subjects. . . . And if those who would make it men's religion to murder themselves, and urge it upon their consciences as their duty, are *not to be suffered* in a commonwealth, any more than highway murderers, then judge how these Anabaptists, that teach the necessity of such dipping, are to be suffered."—*Ibid*, p. 134.

E.

WAS BUNYAN A BAPTIST?

No single passage in this History has been so frequently and severely criticized as the statement regarding John Bunyan. It is only fair, before examining other evidence, to let Bunyan state his own position. In his work called *The Heavenly Footman*, which he left in manuscript to be printed some years after his death, he gives this counsel to Christians:

"Mistrust thy own strength and throw it away; down on thy knees in prayer to the Lord for the Spirit of truth; search his word for direction; flee seducers' company; keep company with the soundest Christians that have most experience of Christ; and be sure thou have a care of Quakers, Ranters, Free-willers; also do not have too much company with some Anabaptists, though I go under that name myself."

Again, in his *Peaceable Principles and Truth*, published during his controversy on the communion question, in reply to the question asked him, "How long is it since I was a Baptist," he says:

"And since you would know by what name I would be distinguished from others, I tell you, I would be, and hope I am, A CHRISTIAN; and choose, if God should account me worthy, to be called a Christian, a believer, or other such name which is approved by the Holy Ghost. And as for those factious titles of Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or the like, I conclude that they came neither from Jerusalem nor from Antioch, but rather from hell and Babylon, for they naturally tend to divisions: you may know them by their fruits."

Language could not well be plainer than this. In no other form of words could Bunyan have said more distinctly that, although commonly called an Anabaptist and commonly accepting that title as a convenient designation, he utterly repudiated it as a sectarian or denominational badge, claiming to be simply a Christian and not a sectary. It is certain that denominational distinctions and principles sat very lightly upon Bunyan. There is no evidence that he ever was in any strict sense of that term (that is to say, in any sense that would be accepted to-day among us) a Baptist. He is commonly said to have been the pastor of

a Baptist Church in Bedford. The Rev. John Brown, however, in his painstaking and scholarly biography (*John Bunyan, His Life, Times, and Work.* London. 1885), has clearly shown from the records of this Bedford church that it was never, properly speaking, a Baptist church. There were doubtless Baptists in it from the first, but it was from the first one of that type of churches, still common in Great Britain, composed of both Baptists and Pædobaptists—in other words, a union church. Many such now existing in England have at one time a Baptist pastor, at another time a Congregational; and the same church is not infrequently claimed in the year-books of both the Baptist and Congregational (Independent) bodies. It is also frequently stated that Bunyan was baptized in the river Ouse, in 1653, by the Rev. John Gifford, at that time pastor of this Bedford church. The sole authority for this statement is a biographical sketch appended, as a continuation of Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*, to the seventh edition of that work, issued in 1692, four years after Bunyan's death, and thirty-nine years after the alleged baptism. The sketch itself is anonymous, professing only to be the work of "a true friend and long acquaintance of Mr. Bunyan's." Mr. Brown conjectures that the author was "probably George Cokayne, a Bedfordshire man, the ejected minister of Soper Lane, London, and subsequently the pastor of the congregation in Red Cross street." No authority is given for the statements of this biographical sketch, and no great importance can be attached to any statement contained in it unless otherwise corroborated. For example, the writer is so ill-informed concerning Bunyan that he does not even know the number of his children, stating it as four instead of six. He makes a mistake of a whole year in the date of the death of Bunyan's widow, Elizabeth Bunyan; he gives the date of Bunyan's death as the 12th of August instead of the 31st; he makes Bunyan's release from prison to be brought about by Bishop Barlow, whereas he did not come into the diocese as bishop until three years later. A sketch containing errors so gross as these, on matters that occurred during Bunyan's later years, can hardly be regarded as a valuable authority on the earlier part of his life.

Moreover, there is no proof whatever that Mr. Gifford ever immersed anybody, or that he was ever properly called a Baptist more than Bunyan himself. He was pastor, as has been said, of

a union church, and on his death-bed he composed a letter to be read to his flock, which Mr. Brown tells us is still read once a year to the Bedford church. He appealed to his brethren in these dying words not to divide the church on questions of outward order:

"Concerning separation from the church about baptism, laying on of hands, anointing with oil, psalms, or any externals, I charge every one of you respectively, as you will give an account for it to our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge both quick and dead at his coming, that none of you be found guilty of this great evil, which, while some have committed—and that through a zeal for God, yet not according to knowledge—they have erred from the law of the love of Christ, and have made a rent from the true church, which is but one."

This indicates clearly that in this Bedford church the question of baptism, though so strenuously agitated as to be in danger of dividing them, was not a point about which all were agreed either in theory or in practice. Mr. Gifford is called by Crosby a Baptist pastor, but beyond this unsupported assertion of Crosby there is no evidence that he was a Baptist.

In Bunyan's case, moreover, the facts are not fully stated when we have said that positive contemporary evidence is lacking of his immersion, or of his serving as pastor of a Baptist church. Two at least of his children were christened according to the order of the Church of England. The Parish register of Elstow shows the following entries:

"Mary, the daughter of John Bonion, baptized July 20, 1650.
"Elizabeth, the daughter of John Bonyon, was born 14th day of April, 1654."

The first case, occurring three years before Bunyan's conversation and alleged baptism, of course, proves nothing. He was at that time, as is well known, a nominal adherent of the Church of England. The second entry states, to be sure, the birth not the baptism, of his daughter Elizabeth, but this form of entry was due to the fact that in the previous year an act of Parliament was passed requiring the date of birth instead of the date of baptism to be inserted. There is good and sufficient reason, in view of numerous other confirmatory circumstances, to believe that the entries of births in the parish register under this

law were in fact entries of baptisms. But should any cavil at this conclusion there is another entry in the register of the parish of St. Cuthbert's, Bedford, under the year 1672 as follows:

"Baptized, Joseph Bunyan, ye son of John Bunyan, November 16."

St. Cuthbert's was the parish in which, as we know, Bunyan resided after his release from prison. It should seem that this release took place either very late in the year 1671, or very early in 1672, since in the records of the Bedford Church we find that a meeting was held on the 31st of December, 1671, to consider the calling of Bunyan to the pastorate; and this call, it further appears from the minutes, was given on the 21st of January, 1672, it being added:

"And he accepting thereof, gave up himself to serve Christ and his church in that charge; and received of the elders the right hand of fellowship."

It has been attempted (Armitage, *History of the Baptists*, pp. 483 sq.) to argue that this Joseph Bunyan was the son of John Bunyan, Jr., the eldest son of the preacher by his first wife. Not to mention the fact that the record would have stated the father to be John Bunyan, Jr., had he been the father, a comparison of dates makes the supposition intrinsically absurd. It is known that John Bunyan, Jr., though the eldest son, was younger than his sisters Mary and Elizabeth. The exact date of his birth has not yet been recovered from any of the parish registers, but allowing him to have been two years younger than his sister Elizabeth, who was four years younger than her sister Mary, he was at the birth of this Joseph Bunyan but sixteen years of age. It seems far more reasonable to accept the plain sense of the entry in the register that the senior John Bunyan, forty-four years of age, was the father of Joseph Bunyan rather than John Bunyan, Jr., a lad of sixteen. Granting this as beyond any reasonable question, and also accepting the statement of Mr. Brown that the hearth-tax list of St. Cuthbert's parish contained but one householder of the name of John Bunyan, there can be no doubt that the youngest son of the Bedford preacher was christened in the

Church of England. It is impossible to reconcile this fact with the theory that Bunyan was a consistent Baptist, but it is entirely possible to reconcile it with his own statement of his own religious beliefs and practice. He believed that to be a Christian was more than to be a member of any denomination, and esteemed lightly those divisions that separate the various Christian bodies from each other. It is no part of my duty as a historian to defend or condemn this belief of Bunyan's and the practice that naturally followed from it. I merely state the facts.

F.

"OPEN" COMMUNION UNHISTORICAL.

"Open communion," that is, the inviting to the Table of the Lord those who have not been baptized on profession of faith, which alone is a real baptism, is unscriptural, illogical, and unhistorical. The latter assertion will be here verified by quotations from Baptist Confessions, from the earliest times until now. No binding authority is attributed to these Confessions, for Baptists recognize the Scripture alone as authoritative, but the Confessions show plainly what Baptists of all ages have believed the Scriptures to teach in the matter of Christ's ordinances,

From the Schleitheim Confession, the oldest Baptist document known, 1527:

"All who would break one bread for a memorial of the broken body of Christ, and all who would drink one draught as a memorial of the poured out blood of Christ, should beforehand be united to one body of Christ: that is, to the church of God, of which the head is Christ, to wit, by baptism."

From the Confession of John Smyth and his church, 1610:

"The Holy Supper, according to the institution of Christ, is to be administered to the baptized; as the Lord Jesus hath commanded that whatsoever he hath appointed should be taught to be observed."

From another and longer form of the same:

"That only the baptized are to taste the elements of the Lord's Supper."

From the Confession of Seven London Churches, 1544:

"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, given by Christ, to be dispensed upon persons professing faith, or that are made disciples; who upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized, and after to partake of the Lord's Supper."

From the Appendix to the above, prepared by Benjamin Cox:

"Though a believer's right to the use of the Lord's Supper do immediately flow from Jesus Christ apprehended and received by faith; yet inasmuch as all things ought to be done not only decently, but also in order, 1 Cor. 14: 40; and the word holds forth this order, that disciples should be baptized, Matt. 28: 19: Acts 2: 38; and then be taught to observe all things (that is to say, all other things) that Christ commanded the apostles, Matt. 28: 20; and accordingly the apostles first baptized disciples, and then admitted them to the use of the Supper, Acts 2: 4-42; we therefore do not admit any to the use of the Supper, nor communicate with any in the use of this ordinance, but disciples baptized, lest we should have fellowship with them in their doing contrary to order."

From the Somerset Confession, 1656:

"That it is the duty of every man and woman, that have repented from the dead works, and have faith toward God, to be baptized. . . . . And being thus planted in the visible church or body of Christ . . . . do walk together in communion, in all the commandments of Jesus. . . . That we believe some of those commandments further to be as followeth: 1. Constancy in prayer. 2. Breaking of bread," etc. [The omissions noted are mainly of passages of Scripture quoted in proof of the statements].

From *A Brief Confession of Faith* (London, 1660):

"That the right and only way of gathering churches (according to Christ's appointment, Matt. 28: 19, 20) is first to teach or preach the gospel (Mark 16: 16) to the sons and daughters of men; and then to baptize (that is English, to dip) in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, such only of them as profess *repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*. . . . That it is the duty of such who are constituted as aforesaid, to continue steadfastly in Christ's and the apostles' doctrines, and assembling together, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and prayers. (Acts 2: 42)."

From *An Orthodox Creed*, 1678:

"And no unbaptized, unbelieving, or open profane, or wicked heretical persons, ought to be admitted to this ordinance to profane it."

The only Baptist confession extant that fails to speak explicitly for restricted communion is that of 1688, which is designedly silent for the reason stated in the appendix to that document:

"We are not insensible, that as to the order of God's house, and entire communion therein, there are some things wherein we (as well as others) are not at a full accord among ourselves; as for instance, the known principle and state of the consciences of divers of us, that have agreed in this confession is such, that we cannot hold church communion with any other than baptized believers, and churches constituted of such; yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our spirits that way; and, therefore, we have purposely omitted the mention of things of that nature, that we might concur in giving this evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves, and with other good Christians, in those important articles of the Christian religion, mainly insisted on by us; and this, notwithstanding we all esteem it our chief concern, both among ourselves and all others that in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours, and love him in sincerity, to endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; and in order thereunto, to exercise all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love."

Open communion was never more than the tolerated weakness of a small minority of Baptists, except in England during the present century.

G.

"CLOSE" COMMUNIONISTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

At the meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, in May, 1891, Rev. D. O. Davis, of Rockdale, England, was introduced and addressed the body. Among other things he said that the close communionists constitute a majority of the Baptists of Great Britain. He made out his figures as follows: "In Wales there are ninety thousand four hundred and seventy-nine Baptists, almost to a man close communionists. In Scotland, thirty-three thousand six hundred and thirty-seven, nearly all close communionists, so that we have in Wales and Scotland one hundred and twenty-five thousand one hundred and sixteen close communionists. We have in England at least sixty

thousand close communionists. In the United Kingdom we have a total of one hundred and eighty-five thousand one hundred and sixteen close communionists. There are one hundred and thirty-four thousand six hundred and thirty-nine open communionists." Mr. Davis is responsible for these figures, not I. The most I have dared to say in the text is that the close communionists are "nearly half" the whole number of English Baptists.

H.

SEPARATION OF NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN BAPTISTS.

The separation of Northern and Southern Baptists would probably have become inevitable on the outbreak of the civil war, but it preceded that conflict. From the beginning of the Triennial Convention's work, Southern and Northern churches co-operated with equal heartiness and on terms of equal rights. When, in 1817, the scope of the Convention was enlarged so as to include domestic missions, there was no change. And when, in 1826, its operations were again restricted to the foreign field, while domestic missions were committed in 1832 to the Home Mission Society, both organizations found fast friends and fellow-laborers in the South as in the North. Prior to 1844, nothing occurred to interrupt the harmony of these relations, though there was increasing difference of opinion about slavery and growing bitterness in the discussion of differences. Up to this time the rule for the appointment of missionaries was, to approve "such persons only as are in full communion with some church in our denomination, and who furnish satisfactory evidence of genuine piety, good talents, and fervent zeal for the Redeemer's cause." By the year 1844 some of the advocates of the abolition of slavery endeavored to make this a test of fellowship, but the Triennial Convention of that year almost unanimously adopted the following, after careful consideration of all the questions involved:

"*Resolved*, That in co-operating together, as members in this Convention, in the work of Foreign Missions, we disclaim all sanction, either expressed or implied, whether of slavery or anti-slavery; but as individuals we are free to express and to

promote elsewhere our views on these subjects in a Christian manner and spirit."

The Executive Board at Boston adopted in the following December this new rule regarding the appointment of missionaries: "If any one that shall offer himself for a missionary, having slaves, should insist on retaining them as his property, we could not appoint him. One thing is certain, we can never be a party to any arrangement which would imply approbation of slavery."

The Home Mission Society, at its meeting in April, 1845, adopted resolutions declaring it is "expedient that the members now forming the Society should hereafter act in separate organizations at the South and at the North, in promoting the objects which were originally contemplated by the Society."

The organization of the Southern Baptist Convention followed at once and the breach between the Baptists of the North and South was complete. Though that breach has been narrowed in recent years, it has never been closed.

GENERAL INDEX.