

Gleanings
from
Joseph Stennett and Able Morgan
with others,
showing
● *The French Connection*
between the Waldenses-Albigenses of
Southern France to the London
Particular Baptists.

A

Review of Two Old Baptist Works

And

Other Related Historic Items Dealing With
Particular Baptist Origins Before 1641;

Gathered and selected

By

One who has been given a Reason to Hope He is a part of the
New Covenant Succession that Bears Testimony to Jesus Christ
in His exalted state, That He has returned to the glory He
had with the Father before the world was As the eternal Son
of God, the eternal God-Man.

2,000.

An
Answer
to
Mr. David Russen's Book
Entitul'd

Fundamentals without a Foundation, or a True Picture of the
Anabaptists, &c.

Together with

Some Brief Remarks on Mr. James Broome's Letter annex'd to
that Treatise.

By Joseph Stennett.

Mat. XXVIII:19, Go ye therefore and teach all Nations,
baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and
of the Holy Ghost.

London:

Printed and sold by D. Brown at the Black-Swan without
Temple-Bar, S. Crouch at the Corner of Pope's-Head-Alley in
Cornhil, and J. Baker at
Mervcers-Chapel in Cheapside.

1704.

and

Anti-Padeo-Rantism;
or
Mr. Samuel Finley's Charitable PLEA for the SPEECHLESS,
Examined and
Refuted:

The Baptist of Believers Maintained
and the Mode of it, by Immersion, Vindicated.

By Able Morgan,
at Middleton in East-Jersey.
Jer. 9:15: The leaders of this people cause them to err.

Mark 16:15,16, and he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved.

**Col. 2:12, Buried with Him in Baptism.
Philadelphia
Printed by B. Franklin, in Market-Street;
M,DCC,XLVII.**

TABLE OF CONTAINS

1. Title Pages
2. Introduction and Short History of Stennett and Morgan.
3. Chapter I. Various Views About Baptist Succession and Origins.
4. Chapter II. Visiting with the London Particular Baptists.
5. Chapter III. In Vindication of John Spilsbury.
6. Chapter IV. Testimonies about Baptist's Dipping Before 1641.
7. Chapter V. The Kiffen Manuscript and Particular Baptist Succession.
8. Chapter VI. Faults of the Kiffen Manuscript.
9. Chapter VII. The Kiffen Manuscript from The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.
10. Chapter VIII. Dipping Restored.
11. Chapter IX. The French Connection.
12. Chapter X. The Albigenses Visited and Vindicated.
13. Chapter XI. The Albigenses Traced to their Forefathers.
14. Chapter XII. The Southern and Northern Anabaptists in the 1,500s.
15. Chapter XIII. Particular Baptist Succession distinguished from General Baptist Succession.
16. Conclusion.

Introduction

In historical Baptist literature the first title is known simply as **Stennett 's Answer to Russen**. The second is known as **Morgan's Anti-Padeo-Rantism**. I will use these in directing us toward certain historical tracings of the origins of the Particular Anabaptists-Baptists in and about London, and their succession through certain of the middle and late Dark Ages groups of dissenters coming out of Southern France.

In 1704 Mr. Stennett did not hesitate in tracing Baptist Succession through those who were called the Albigenses. This is very important because it traces the Particular Baptist succession through the dissenters in Southern France. Mr. Stennett did not consider the Baptists as coming either from the Collegians in Holland or from any other German or Swiss group, but the Albigenses-Waldneses in Southern France. The London Churches

issued their second edition of **The First London Confession** in 1646. At that time a French "congregation of the same judgment" was in union with them. See the final statements in the Introduction.

As Williams shows in his **The Radical Reformation**, the Southern Dissenters-Waldenses-Albigenses, held to the Bondage of the Will and Predestination. Many, if not most, of the Mennonite-Anabaptists in the Northern Parts of Europe did not. They were moderate in favor of Free Will. Others held to the Bondage of the Will, but it became freed in the New Birth. Those in Northern Europe were mostly in favor of a limited Predestination. See my Review of Williams on the Predesternian Anabaptist.

The events that Stennett and Morgan give predate the Blount mission in 1641 as found in the Kiffen Manuscript. What is found in Kiffen Manuscript deals only with one church. Later, that one church would unite with the already existing Particular Baptist Churches in London and they would grow into the Seven London Churches and issue the **First London Confession of Faith** in 1644. I have given a very large and detailed historical account of this in my **Particular Baptist Origins** and my **Review of Dr. Asher**. Because of the importance attached to the Kiffen Manuscript I will deal with it in greater detail in this work.

Now we are able to trace our succession back through the Albigenses and their forefathers. While the Albigenses and Waldenses should be considered as one people in theology, doctrines and church order, they had a separate succession. It is my opinion that the London Particular Baptists, those issuing the First London Confession of Faith, claimed their succession through the Southern French Albigenses-Waldenses. The quotations from both Stennett and Morgan confirm this. Indeed, these statements are what started my thinking away from Kiffen Manuscript.

Landmarks of the True Succession

I have found a Landmark pointing this out from the **First London Confession of Faith**, edition of 1646. Now, consider D'Anvers' statement for a further Landmark to this succession:

●The Waldenses and their Recourses, Residences and Succession in England for Many Ages.

*And lastly, it does appear that in England itself, the Waldenses and their disciples out of France, Germany and Holland, had their frequent Recourse, Residence and Succession through many ages, as our Chronicles make manifest. viz. **Treatise of Baptism**, Page 135, our edition in Word 97.*

In my **Review of Dr. Asher's John Clark**, I find this interesting footnote (from page 7):

Dr. Asher gives us some of the most important historical information in a footnote on page 16. He shows us about the Lollard Anabaptists, their Schools and Colleges in England during the 1620s, and 1630s. You will note that John Fox's work is sited as one of the sources.

In conclusion to this chapter, we note that Dr. Clark arrived in New England as a recognized and practicing physician. His credentials were not questioned. He practiced his profession without any charges against him. If his credentials were not unquestionable and in order, the Puritans and other Pedobaptists would have charged him with practicing medicine without a proper license or education. This never came about.

From all this I understand that Dr. John Clark arrived in England, well trained as a physician, and a Particular Baptist minister. One of the Lollard Colleges in or about London, as late as the early or mid 1630s, trained him. All this suggests to me that Spilsbury, Clark, Luker, Hobson, Kiffen and Knollys knew about the old Lollards and their spiritual fore-fathers, the Waldenses and Albigenses. These brethren were in regular gathered churches and in fellowship with the Collegians.

Succession through the Kiffen Manuscript

When we study the **Kiffen Manuscript** we find Mr. Richard Blount going over into Holland and making contact with those Anabaptists known as the Collegians. Mr. Henry D'Anvers gives us a remarkable account of these old Anabaptists in his **A Treatise of Baptism**, section on History of the Anabaptists and their Baptisms, London; 1675. We now have this in Word 97. Mr. Blount returned home with one of the Anabaptist teachers. These men baptized several and out of this group three preachers gathered churches in fellowship with the already existing churches around Hobson, Kiffen and Spilsbury. These grew into the Seven Churches in London and one from France of the same faith and judgment.

Why Deal with Succession

I do not believe that succession gives validity or being to any people. I do believe that Christ's New Covenant teaches us that there will be a true succession of the people of Christ who are walking in visible gospel order. This succession is to show that Jesus Christ came the first time in the flesh and fulfilled the Old Covenant system. He then established a New Covenant system. The Holy Spirit keeps alive in this present evil world the New Covenant system as a witness to Jesus Christ in His exaltation at the Father's right hand. We do not hold to succession as the Papists, or those holding Bishop's succession among the Reformers. We simply hold to a succession maintaining the visible truth of Christ as set forth in the New Covenant.

Christ and Paul both promised a succession in every generation of this, the great church age, to the New Covenant people gathered into the gospel churches. Therefore, we enter upon this little work to show where this succession had been and is now. We do not attempt to speak for all those people called Baptists, nor even for all those called Particular Baptists.

However, long have been the time and many the questions about the origins of the people called Particular Baptists and their succession, and those who believed in the doctrines of grace. I hope to answer some of those old and often asked questions in this small work.

Chapter I.

Various Views About Baptist Origins and Succession.

Among the strict Baptist Church concepts there are two differing views about Baptist succession. These are the Particular or Calvinistic Baptist views, and the General or Arminian Baptist views. Certainly no Baptist is either fully Calvinistic or Arminian, but these are simply theological classifications. I do not mean any offense to either group, but use these terms to classify each group. I will give a brief historical summation of both these lines of succession.

Point of Caution

No one group of Baptists represents the totality of Baptist succession. The great mistake of most historians is to make all the Baptist fore-fathers into their kind of Baptists. This is a mistake because in each age there have been differing groups among the people called Baptists just as there are today. No one grouping will include all those differing theological groups among the people known as Baptists.

What do we look for in the Succession?

Another great concern is what is contained in the succession of those people called Baptists? Many simply want to trace a succession of adult dipping and free churches of dipped believers. Others want to trace a succession by means of differing names and links to dissenters throughout church history.

Still, others want to claim a certain kinship but nothing more. In my opinion we should look for groups or churches of dipped believers in a free church state who held to certain doctrines and practices centered around the true gospel and true and proper Christology.

Particular and General Baptist Succession

This work traces the Particular Baptists. The General or Arminian Baptists have a traceable succession and most of their older Baptist historians have given them much notice. One of their historians, Woods, writing in the mid 1800s, gives them a very good historical account. Another General Baptist historian, Hooke, wrote his historical account in about 1701, **A Necessary Apology for Baptized Believers**.

Both the General and the Particular Baptists go back into their succession through the Waldenses-Albigenses and then the Anabaptists-Mennonites of the 1500s. These were the radical, separatist dippers. However, until lately, no distinction had been made between the Predestination and the Arminian Mennonites. In addition, there were many among them who held parts of both systems just as there are today among those called Baptists.

New studies come to light because of the remarkable historical studies William's developed in his **The Radical Reformation**. We can make certain inroads into the differing theological groups of the Anabaptist-Mennonites of the 1500s. Williams gives us the distinctions between the predestinarian Anabaptists of Spain, Italy, Poland and Southern Europe and those who were the anti-predestinarian Anabaptists of the Northern parts of Europe. With those thoughts expressed, I will now present many of my recent findings joined with many older historians and their conclusions.

Chapter II

Visiting with the London Particular Baptists

Their Origins

This is what I have found out about the origin of the Seven Particular Baptist Churches that issued the **First London Confession of Faith**. These were not the FIRST Particular Anabaptists-Baptists in London, but rather the first Lasting Particular Anabaptists-Baptists. We do not care so much about their names as we do about their faith and order.

John Spilsbury gathered the Church at Wapping, by 1633. Because of Archbishop Laud's Reign of Terror, there seemed to be no further lasting outreach from Wapping till the late 1630s. The Anglicans imprisoned Sam Eaton, one of their ministers, in the mid 1630s and he therein died. While in prison, he still preached and sought to spread the cause of Jesus Christ. He came to a sudden and mysterious end. Hundreds attended his remains to their graveside. Earlier Eaton had left, with many others, the Jessey Pedobaptist Church and joined with the Wapping Church. John Spilsbury baptized and ordained him in typical "Anabaptist Fashion" according to John Taylor, Anglican.

John Spilsbury, George Tipping, and Samuel Richardson helped issue the First London Confession of Faith and were some of this church's earlier ministers and signers of the 1644 Confession. Samuel Richardson did not sign the 1652 edition but Joseph Sansom or Joseph Simpson did.

William Kiffen gathered the Church at Devonshire Squire in 1638. Thomas Patience was with Kiffen in the early 1640s and signed the 1644 and 1646 Confessions. During the later 1640s he was with the soldier churches in Dublin, Ireland and was a military officer. By 1652 Thomas Pault or Paul signed with Kiffen.

Paul Hobson and Thomas Goare or Gower gathered the Church at Crutched Fryars in 1639. They signed the 1644 and 1646 Confessions. Captain Paul Hobson and Thomas Goare were anti-Cromwell and paid dearly for their convictions. By the early 1650s both of these men were at the baptized church of Jesus Christ at Newcastle where Hobson issued some more works defending the Particular Baptist position.

Thomas Skippard, or Sheppard, and Thomas Munday gathered the Church at Southwark between 1640 and 42. This church is one that came under the succession of the Richard Blount mission in 1640. In 1646 George Tipping was at this church. I cannot identify this church in 1652 nor who signed the confession for it.

Thomas Kilcop and John Webb gathered The Church at Petty France, between 1640 and 1642. It too, is one of the London churches coming from Richard Blount. Thomas Kilcop issued his work on Baptism near 1641. He replied to Praisegod Barebones and justified the separation and succession of the Baptists and their baptism. Perhaps this is the earliest work on that era by any of these brethren. In 1652, Edward Harrison signed the Confession on behalf of Petty France.

Thomas Gunne and John Mabbatt gathered The Church at the Glasshouse in 1640-1642 as a result of the Blount mission. John Mabbatt published his Reply to Mr. Knutton in 1645 and is one of the earlier works issued by these ministers. William Conset and Richard Graves served this church in 1652. Edward Drapes returned home from Ireland in the late 1640s but was dead by 1651 and did not sign any of the Confessions. John Vernon also ministered here.

Joseph Phelps and Edward Heath gathered the last of the seven churches issuing the 1644 Confession between 1640 and 1642. I have been unable to find out anything about its history or its succeeding ministers.

Hansard Knollys gathered the Church at Great St. Heleans by 1645. Later Thomas Holms assisted him. Soon after this, the church sent forth Thomas Tillam as a church messenger. By 1652 John Watson

served with Hansard Knollys and it became known as the church meeting at Coleman Street. Earlier Roger Garner was with Hansard Knollys and this old church.

Another mystery of 1646 is the "French Congregation of the same judgment," Denis Le Barbier and Christophle Duret served. I have found out nothing as to the origin and following history of this church. Now, since I have become aware of this French Connection, I am trying to find out all I can about this church and its ministers.

Since beginning this work, Brother Mark Thomas has kindly provided me with additional information about Duret. It seems he was a Huguenot and there is much material about him and his family in the Huguenot archives. Many special thanks to brother Mark for this info. I will include this info, and other related items in a separate chapter.

By 1652 the brethren gathered several more churches in or about London and issued the First London Confession. Some of the additional ministers were Hugh Gosnell, Joseph Patshall, Thomas Waters, Henry Forty and Thomas Young who was at a church meeting at Stokesley.

Chapter III.

In Vindication of John Spilsbury

John Spilsbury and an unbaptized administrator

When many of the older Baptists debated with the Pedobaptists, they affirmed that baptizedness was not essential to a qualified administrator. The Pedobaptists affirmed that it was. To answer them the Baptists pointed to John the Baptist who was not baptized in water, but was a qualified administrator. The Pedobaptists did not regard John as a proper gospel administrator. Because John the Baptist was a qualified administrator who baptized by a commission, the older Baptists regarded baptism as valid even though the administrator himself was unbaptized, *if he had a proper commission*. This commission must come either from God directly as in the case of John, or from the gospel church.

In almost all the older Particular Baptist works I have read, they regarded John as a qualified gospel administrator. Most of them understood Acts 19 to teach a rebaptism or an Anabaptism and refused to follow Calvin's reasoning on this point as Dr. Gill later did. They did not regard John's baptisms as invalid. The lacking in Acts 19 was due to some other thing.

John Spilsbury, with the majority of the Baptists in the early 1600s, held that a proper administrator of baptism received his authority to act from his commission and not his baptism. There is no reason to read anything else into his statements. He came upon the Particular Baptist stage at least by 1633 or before as an Anabaptist. He baptized and ordained in Anabaptist fashion. He did not favor an unbaptized administrator as an orderly practice, nor did he originate baptism de novo. If he held these views, the others who issued the **First London Confession** would not have fellowshiped with him.

John Spilsbury helped gather the first lasting Particular Baptist Church in London, beginning at least by 1633. It still exists and holds to the First London Confession of Faith. A few years back their pastor contacted me by email. Shortly thereafter my computer crashed and I lost all that info. He was already a known, tried and tested minister or teacher from one of the country churches according to Hansard Knollys. See the final pages of Knolly's **A Moderate Answer to Dr. Bastwich**. Here are Knollys' clear statements:

● *Hansard Knollys on the Origin of the London
● Particular Baptist Churches*

Here is the title page from Knolly's remarks work explaining the differences between the Presbyterian Church Government and the Baptist Church Government. In this work he shows how the Particular Baptist ministers did arrive in London and did gather these lasting Particular Baptist Churches.

This is not to say there were no ministers before John Spilsbury or churches before the gathered church at Wapping, for there were. However, this is to say they did not last because of persecution. When Cromwell and his Reformation overcame Laud's Reign of Terror, then the churches and ministers were able to maintain a different type of existence and continue on, to this very day. John Spilsbury's old church, gathered at Wapping is still in existence and still maintains the faith of the First London Confession.

This is one of the first works I placed into modern English. I did it about 15 years ago but never made the tie to John Spilsbury and his efforts until just recently. Strange how the truth can be right before us for so long and unless the Lord gives us eyes to see, we cannot see. Hope you enjoy this.

A
MODERATE ANSWER
IUNTO
IDr. BASTWICK'S BOOK
CALLED,
● Independence not God's Ordinance
Wherein,
Is declared the manner how some churches in this city
were gathered, and upon what terms their members
were admitted; That so both the Doctor and the
Reader may judge, how near some believers
who walk together in the Fellowship of the

**gospel, do come in their practice to these
apostolic Rules which are propounded
by the Doctor as God's method in
gathering Churches And
admitting members
●By Hanserd Knollys
●Printed and published according to order
Imprimatur, Ja: Cranford
LONDON
IPRINTED IANE COE. 1645**

At the conclusion of this remarkable work, Mr. Knollys shows us the way in which these London Particular Baptists came into constitutional order. Here are his words:

. I shall give the reader the result of all, that the Doctor hath written from page 100 to the end of his book, *touching God's method, and the Apostles practice in gathering of churches and admitting members*, viz. First, that Christ having given a commission to his Apostles to teach all Nations, and baptize them Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; the Apostles practiced accordingly. Acts 2:37-38; 10:44-48 and so did Philip Acts 8:35-38. And Ananias Acts 9:10,18. Secondly, that the condition or terms, which they were to propound unto all Nations and people upon which, they were to be admitted into the Church were Faith, Repentance and Baptism. Mark 15:15-16. For the commission was delivered to the Apostles, that they should admit whosoever believed, and would be baptized, and they, that believed not and would not be baptized, were not to be admitted, page 102 and 104. *The Apostles (saith the Doctor) propounded no other condition or terms for making all and every on members of the Church but repentance, and baptism, acts 2:37-38. Thirdly, that the Apostles and all succeeding ministers of the Gospel should admit whosoever believed, and were baptized, to be members of the Church, and teach them to observe no other things but what Christ commanded them, and for which they had his Word and warrant:* Pages 101 and 103. Matt 28:19-20. And this (saith the Doctor) the Apostles did practice, without requiring them to take a private covenant, or enter into the church by way of a particular covenant, Page 105. Acts 2:37-38. This being the sum and result of that method and practice, which the Doctor conceives should be done in gathering Churches an admitting members, which the Scriptures will warrant, and Christ Jesus approve of as his fathers will, *I shall now take liberty to declare, what I know by mine own experience to be the practice of some Churches of God in the City. That so both the Doctor and the reader may judge how near the Saints, who walk together in the Fellowship of the Gospel, do come in their practice, to these Apostolic rules and practice propounded by the Doctor as God's method in gathering Churches, and admitting Members. I say, that I know by mine own experience (having walked with them) that they were thus gathered; viz.*

Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the countries, where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, came to sojourn in this great City, and preached the Word of God both publicly, and from house to house, and daily in the Temples and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ: and some of them have dwelt in their own hired houses, and received all that came in unto them, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. And when many sinners were converted by their preaching of the Gospel, some of them that believed, consorted with them, and of professors a great many, and of the chief women not a few. And the condition which those Preachers both publicly and privately propounded to the

people, unto whom they preached, upon which they were to be admitted into the Church was Faith, Repentance and Baptism; and none other.

And whosoever (poor as well as rich, bond as well as free, servants as well as masters) did make a profession of their Faith in Christ Jesus, and would be baptized with water into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were admitted members of the Church; but such as did not believe, and would not be baptized they would not admit into Church-communion.

This hath been the practice of some Churches of God in this City, without urging or making any particular covenant with Members upon admittance, which I desire may be examined by the Scriptures cited in the Margent, and then compared with the Doctors three conclusions from the same Scriptures, whereby it may appear to the judicious Reader, how near the Churches some to them come to the practice of the Apostles rule, and practice of the primitive Churches, both in gathering, and admitting members. And my humble request to the Doctor is; That he will use all means, that he method of God, and practice of the Apostles in gathering of Churches, and admitting members, may be conscionable practiced by his brethren of both sides according to the revealed Word and Will of the Father.

The End

I did take this from pages 10 and 11 of our Modernized version.

Beloved Knollys made three important observations:

1. He knew of the manner of these churches and their constitutions because he had been walking with them and experiencing their order, discipline and constitutions;
2. He shows how the preaching or ministering brethren WERE ALREADY KNOWN, TESTED AND APPROVED OF BY PREVIOUS CHURCHES BEFORE THEY CAME INTO LONDON; that is very important. John Spilsbury in particular and the other preaching brethren in general, were not free lancers. I will show how the older brethren did this after these remarks.
3. The way of church constitutions was that of faith, repentance and baptism, no other way, for in any would not give into unto this order, they were not received

Let me quote this important statement again:

Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the countries, where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, came to sojourn in this great City.

Therefore, those brethren in general and John Spilsbury in particular were already godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the ministry before they came into London.

Why did they come into London? They came into London to hide from Laud and his prelates. Where did they come from? They came from the countries about London. Beloved Knollys does not mean by this foreign countries, but the country areas in England. It follows that Particular Baptist Churches did exist in these countries before these ministering brethren such as John Spilsbury arrived in London.

Churches Scattered But Not Destroyed

At this point we must remember that when churches are scattered this does not mean they *ceased*. They merely went into hiding and members relocated later to come out of hiding and walk in regular gospel order when they are able. This is true of those older Particular Baptist brethren in the early 1600s. One of the members of John Spilsbury's church made this statement about the difficulty of find a church following the great persecutions under Laud:

A fourth hindrance was in relation to Persecution, I judged I should not be fit to suffer for it [though a truth of Christ] until all those scruples were removed.

*These, with others of the like nature, were the groundless thoughts that kept me from my duty; but though kept back by these for a time, yet I had such strong convictions that I could not leave it so, but was much endeavoring after satisfaction, and in the use of means God was pleased to satisfy me; but by reason of persecution there was no Church I knew of, but only in London, and therefore I could not immediately do it; but being to be married soon after, . . . Pages 21,22, **Choice Experiences, of Jane Turner, London; 1646***

After the Prelates scattered the country churches, many of the ministers and members fled into London for hiding. This would be in the late 1620s and early 1630s. As these first ministers gathered the lasting churches, John Spilsbury being one of them, they also soon attracted the attention of the Prelates. The Prelates again imprisoned some and others scattered to Holland and New England.

There is no lack of churches nor unqualified administrators here. John Spilsbury, being one of the first to gather the new churches, was as Hansard Knollys said:

I shall now take liberty to declare, what I know by mine own experience to be the practice of some Churches of God in the City. That so both the Doctor and the reader may judge how near the Saints, who walk together in the Fellowship of the Gospel, do come in their practice, to these Apostolic rules and practice propounded by the Doctor as God's method in gathering Churches, and admitting Members. I say, that I know by mine own experience (having walked with them) that they were thus gathered; viz.

Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the countries, where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, came to sojourn in this great City, and preached the Word of God both publicly, and from house to house, and daily in the Temples and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ: and some of them have dwelt in their own hired houses, and received all that came in unto them, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. And when many sinners were converted by their preaching of the Gospel, some of them that believed, consorted with them, and of professors a great many, and of the chief women not a few. And the condition which those Preachers both publicly and privately propounded to the people, unto whom they preached, upon which they were to be admitted into the Church was Faith, Repentance and Baptism; and none other.

Is there any de-novo or se-baptism here? No. This is the orderly way of gathering a gospel church. As Knollys said, there was ***NONE OTHER***.

John Spilsbury and Succession

John Spilsbury did not deny church succession, but affirmed it in his **God's Ordinances the Saint's Privilege**, London; 1646. In this work Spilsbury relies upon many of the promises found in the **Book of Revelation** to prove church succession. Spilsbury wrote this work against the Seekers who denied the succession of the New Covenant Church. This work is also available in **Word 97**. However, we must remember that John Spilsbury and the others did not believe that succession is what made a church into a true church. They held that Biblical identity and conformity is what made a group of baptized saints into a true church. They maintained that the New Covenant church and its ministers, ordinances and members is promised a succession and the **Book of Revelation** proves that succession.

I will now quote from our Word 97 edition of Spilsbury's **God's Ordinances**, written against the no succession people called the Seekers, pages 37, 38:

Objection 10:

The Godly Are Now Under the Captivity of Antichrist in Babylon

As of old in Israel there was a cessation of Ordinances in their temporal captivity, and chiefly that in Babylon: and at their return there was a prohibition from eating of the most holy things, until there stood up a Priest with Urim and Thummin, Ezra 2:62; Neh. 7:65. So it is to be with the godly now in their captivity in spiritual Babylon, whereof that was a type.

Answer

There was no Cessation of Ordinances in Israel's Captivity

*It does not appear to me that in Israel's captivity there was a cessation of Ordinances, no nor yet in that of Babylon, but the contrary. But if were so, yet Israel in all her captivities **was still a true constituted Church under that instituted Ordinance of Circumcision**, by which God separated them from all Nations in the world, as a people to Himself for His great Name, **as He***

*does now by baptism. Which Israel had still her **ministry and ministerial power and order**, and at her return out of Babylon, she came forth with the same, Ezra 2:36, 70 and 3:1-6; Neh. 3:1. The prohibition, Ezra 2:62, was only of the house of Hahajah, Koz, and Barzillai, whose Register could not be found, and therefore, they were as polluted and put from the Priesthood, Ezra 2:61, 62, 63. And so these only the words are spoken, and not of the whole Congregation, who had an high Priest, and a Priestly power and order, Neh. 3:1; Ezra 2:36; and 3:1-6.*

No Lack Of A Ministry

*So that if there was a cessation of Ordinances in Israel, it was not for a lack of a Ministry, **as the cause is made with us**, but as this is our type, then with a true proportion from the type to the anti type, we that believe, and so are true Israel in substance, are not to cease from enjoying our Ordinances **for a lack of a Ministry**, but to hold fast our true profession and inheritance once delivered into the hand of faith in all our captivity, as Israel of old did.*

Objection 11

Since all true ordinances, churches and ministries have been lost, believers must wait and not take them up of themselves

Believers now have lost the profession of all Administrations, for there has been a cessation for these many years, both of Ministry, Church and Ordinances, according to the first Rule and institution of Christ. Therefore men are to wait upon God for Him to restore the same again in power and not to take up ways and ordinances of themselves.

Answer

God's Ordinances Have Never Been Lost To Believers.

*Believers have **never lost their right to any truth or ordinance of Christ**, for they, **by faith, do or ought to possess all truth once given unto them**, I Cor. 3:21-23; 2 Cor. 6:10, Jude 3. If any depart, and forsake their own mercies through unbelief, they are to return again to the same by faith. God prohibits none, that believe in His Son, in **their usage of His ordinances** which have been ordained by Him for their **comfort and confirmation of their faith**, but helps them on to the same by giving His Spirit for their guide, and His Word for their rule and Himself for their warrant who commands them to obey Him in all truth that He shall make known unto*

them. Men are indeed to wait upon the God of truth for Him to discover truth. But when He has not only made it known to them, but also revealed truth in them, and by the power of it, made the heart one with it, then men take not up truth of themselves, but are taken up by truth, into the nature of truth, and shall stand by the power of it, when such as take up truth of themselves, and for their own ends, shall lay it down again to their own destruction.

Objection 12

God has Ordained a Proper Ministry In the Gospel

God ordained a Ministry in the Gospel which ever was in order. First, namely, Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists, by whom Churches were planted. Then other officers were ordained for these Church's well-being.

Answer

This Orderly Ministry Exists Now and Planted Our Churches

*This Ministry I confess and own, and therefore I say still, that men must come from God with truth, and with **ability to deliver the same for the converting of men to the faith.** Now when God shall assist His Word with **power**, to bring over men's hearts to believe and obey the same, such the Scriptures hold out to be **true Messengers sent of Christ, declared by their work as it answers to the Rule.** This way men were convinced, and Churches were planted that now stand under the profession of Christ. This is how Churches were planted and other officers were ordained, by those God made the first instruments to bring on the work, in communion with the rest, as to direct and assist them in the same, Titus 1:5; Acts 14:23.*

Spilsbury spoke about succession and no succession in these terms:

Objection 20

The Church and Its Ordinances have Departed and are Not Restored Yet

It is said, Rev. 6:14, That heaven departs, & c. Which must be understood of the Church and Ordinances, and we do not find when she appeared in the like manner again.

Answer

That this must necessarily be understood of a departing of the Church and ordinances is not so certain as is imagined. See the like prophecy in Isaiah 34:4, and note well what went before in vers. 2, 3, and what follows in verses 5, 6-11 and then consider whether Isaiah did there prophecy of such a departure of the Church and Ordinances as is now spoken of. That departing of heaven as a scroll, spoken of in Rev. 6:14, shall then be when the Sun becomes black as sackcloth, and the Moon as blood; when the stars of heaven fall unto the earth, as figs from a fig-tree shaken with a mighty wind; when every mountain and island are moved out of their places, when the Kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich, and the chief Captains and the mighty, and every bondman, and every free-man hide themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains, &c. See the place, viz. Rev. 6:12-16, and then judge whether it be certain that this prophecy is fulfilled, and the heavens departing as a scroll is a departing of the Church and Ordinances.

But let this seem as granted for the present; (because heaven in this Book of the Revelation, does sometimes signify the Church:) but then also mind that the Church's departing is here set forth by a similitude of a book or scroll folded together, which before lay open. So then the Church sometimes lay open in her glory, and her light did shine abroad among the Nations; but now when that great opposition and persecution did rise against her, she retired herself in a more private way. A book or scroll is not defaced nor destroyed when it is rolled up together, but is as perfect in itself as before, only it lies not so open for every one to look into: and so it is with the Church, her departing is not from being a Church, but in respect of her obscuring and hiding of herself from her enemies, as Isaiah 26:20; Rev. 12:6, 14. For she only departed as a scroll when it is rolled together, and so continued in herself a Church, enjoying (as her right) her ordinances and her communion still. For in the next Chapter there is the Lord upon His throne, with His Church and Ministry about Him worshipping. The Church then here departed (as is aforesaid) from her enemies, together with her Ordinances, to a more retired and obscure condition then before, but never departed from herself.

Objection 21

There is now no Entering into Church Order

It is said, Rev. 15:8, That the Temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from His power, and no man was able to enter into the Temple, till the seven plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled; whence it is gathered, that in the time of Antichrist, and the Beast's reign, there is no entering into any Church-order, &c.

Answer

This Teaches There is a Church and Ministers Who Come Out of Her

- 1. Consider whether it be not a **manifest property of an erring spirit**, to wave clear places of the Scripture, **calling for the perpetual use of the Ordinances of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper**; as Matt. 28:19; I Cor. 11:26, and other like places; and to choose to walk in the dark, retiring to obscure places (not yet understood) for a seeming refuge.*

- 2. Consider whether this place do not manifestly allude to that in I Kings 8:10, 11, and whether that place do import that there was **any cessation of Ordinances in Solomon's time**.*

- 3. Then notice that this place in Rev. 15, if it **does not hold forth unto us a Church, and a glorious one too**. For here is a Temple out of which the seven Angels go with their seven golden vials full of the wrath of God against Antichrist, or the Beast. For this see Rev. 15:1, 5, 6; Rev. 16:1, &c. **Are not these the Ministers of Christ, which go forth of the Temple, which is the Church of Christ, into which men must first come, or else they cannot go out thence: for no man can be said to go out of a place that he never came in.***

*Thus this Scripture well considered, shows the weakness of those that take up the same to oppose the Saint's fellowship now, **and their confession of Christ in their professed to His order of the New Testament. This text is so far from keeping any back, that it rather calls all that have faith to come, seeing Christ will have at this time (even under the reign of Antichrist) such a Church, out of which God shall raise such notable instruments to encounter with His enemies.***

The Various Conditions of the Church are Like Jesus Christ

and

His Various Conditions and Appearances.

Though the Church lay sometimes low and obscure, yet God at sometimes raises her up again. The Church is as the Temple, sometimes open and sometimes shut, and as the Moon, sometimes at the full and sometime in her change; and a wife, sometime sporting with her husband, (as Rebecca with Isaac, Gen. 26:8.) and sometimes in travail and pain: sometime singing the song of Moses and the Lamb, and sometime hanging her harp upon the willows. Thus she is made conformable unto Christ her head, Who is sometime in blood, sometime on His throne, sometime in a cloud, and sometime with His face shining as the Sun; sometime with a rainbow on Head, and sometime in the brightness of His glory. Therefore, although that truth does not always in like manner appear, yet this frees not man from his obedience unto it when it appears, but rather engages him the more. Ibid., pages 30-38.

If Spilsbury and the others did not believe in Church Succession, then please explain their answers to the Seekers and their usage of these Scriptures. The problem today is that too many are dispensationalists. They viewed the **Book of Revelation** as future to the church age. Spilsbury and the brethren then did not. They used the Book of Revelation to prove church succession.

The Cause of the Blount Mission

The Richard Blount mission came about because certain, who withdrew from the Jacob-Jessey Pedobaptist church, did **NOT KNOW ABOUT THE ANABAPTISTS STILL BEING IN AND AROUND LONGON.** Those who came from the Jessey Pedobaptist Church around Richard Blount, rejected infant's baptism, but to their knowledge, they knew not of anyone who baptized true baptism. The problem was their lack of knowledge. Persecution under Laud caused the older brethren to be very hidden and secret as to their practices. It was a case of not knowing, but not a case of lack of existing.

The older brethren presented their views of succession in **King's Way to Sion** and Spilsbury's **God's Ordinances.** We now have these works in **Word 97** with many of the other works of that era. The brethren, who left with Richard Blount and Wright, in the 1640-41 era, did so because they became aware of the need for the adult baptism of believers in opposition to infant's baptism. They also wanted a traceable succession in this baptism. Once they satisfied their minds about baptism and a traceable succession, there was no division between the brethren who issued the **First London Confession of Faith.** We must remember, that after these brethren received their baptism from the older Collegians, they became one in fellowship with Kiffen, Hobson and Spilsbury.

Both Groups came from the older Waldenses-Albigenses

When the Blount mission became completed and the three new churches gathered, after the newer brethren secured their baptism from those in Memmonite-Waldensian-Albigensian succession, they became one with the older churches under Spilsbury; Kiffen and Hobson. Is it likely that the newer brethren under Blount, Kilcop, Mabbitt and the others, would have joined with the older churches if there had been any deficiency in their baptism or succession?

The older group came from the scattered country churches that had their origins back in the Lollard-Wycliffe movement, or before, and the later group came from the Collegians in Holland. Henry D'Anvers gives us much information about all these several groups in his invaluable history. I have that contained in a separate work called D'Anvers and The French Connection.

Why, then, did not these newer brethren simply join with the older churches rather than going all the way over the Holland? **Because those brethren did not yet know that these older brethren had become Particular Baptists.** All they knew was that some of those brethren had left the Pedobaptist churches. Further information the brethren did not shed forth until the newer brethren became manifested in their true baptism and church constitutions. It was a question of trust and persecution. After the new churches became formed, William Kiffen helped to bring together the two groups into the one London Particular Baptist Association. I review this in my work called **Studies on the Kiffen Manuscript**.

We cannot for a moment believe that saints who went to all the trouble of sending one of the ministers over to Holland to make contact with the old Collegians would fellowship those whom they considered as unbaptized. None of these brethren were for open or mixed church membership or communion. B. W. White, of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, in his work **Particular Baptist Organization**, shows this truth. We also have it in **Word 97**.

John Spilsbury and Pulpit Affiliation

Did John Spilsbury practice pulpit affiliation? Did William Kiffen and John Spilsbury divide for any reason? The answer to both these questions is **NO!** John Spilsbury was the ringleader of the **Dipped Separatist Anabaptists** in the early and mid 1600s. He did not practice pulpit affiliation.

I don't know when this false report and slander began, but Crosby may have started it. J. R. Graves circulated it in his work, **Old Landmarkism**. It is sad that Graves lived in a time when the true facts about Spilsbury were not known. I give the following reasons showing that John Spilsbury did not practice Pulpit Affiliation:

1. He was a member of the strict rigid Separatist Anabaptists. None of these did this. Had Spilsbury done this, they would have disowned him, but they did not.
2. John Turner and Jane Turner were members of Spilsbury's church, Jane Turner wrote her **Choice Experiences**. In this work she explained the **Ordinance of Hearing**. The Particular Baptists excluded their members for hearing the Pedobaptist and other unbaptized members. Jane Turner shows that the Particular Baptists held that they should only hear the approved ministers of their own churches. John Spilsbury wrote one of the introductions to Jane Turner's work. Had Spilsbury been an affiliationist, he would not have done this, nor would have the Turners been in fellowship with him.
3. All the closed communion associations of Particular Baptist Churches held close fellowship with John Spilsbury and William Kiffen. This they would not have done had Spilsbury been a pulpit affiliationist. These old Particular Baptist Associations did not practice pulpit affiliation, but they did exclude their members and ministers who heard and joined with the Pedobaptists. This practice continued until the Keach led era of the 1680s.

I insert the following chapter from my larger work, **In Vindication of the Old Landmarks**:

V.

IN VINDICATION OF THE OLD LANDMARK

OF GOSPEL AND CHURCH SEPARATION OR NON-RECOGNITION

OF THOSE WHO ARE NOT OF TRUE GOSPEL ORDER.

These old Baptists **separated** from those who were not in the Baptized way. In addition, they separated from those Baptists **who would fellowship with the unbaptized**. Here are the concepts of separation and groups:

- A. The **Particular Baptists** separated from all **Pedobaptists** as well as the **mixed communion Baptists** of John Bunyan and Henry Jessey, John Tombs, and the **General Baptists**.
- B. The **General Baptists** separated from the **Pedobaptists**, the **mixed communion Baptists** and the **Particular Baptists**.
- C. The **Mixed Communion Baptists** separated from the **Papists**, and other **Nationalists**, and wanted fellowship with all dissenters. They were denied **church** fellowship with any of the **Particular** or **General** Baptists. **The separation arose because the Baptists believed their churches, baptisms and doctrines were special, they had a Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession.** Here are some of the major works dealing with the separation of our old Particular Baptists and some General Baptists, as well.
- D. John Canne - **A Stay Against Straying--Wherein is Proved the Unlawfulness of Hearing Ministers of False Churches**; London; 1639.
- E. Francis Cornwell - **A Description of the Spiritual Temple--Differences Between Christian and Antichristian Churches**; London; 1646.
- F. Wm. Kiffin - **A Brief Remonstrance of the Reasons of Those People Called Anabaptists for their Separation**; London; 1645.
- G. Benjamin Cox - **An After-Reckoning with Mr. Edwards--State Churches are not True Churches**; London; 1646.
- H. Richard Lawrence - **The Antichrist Presbyter--Antichrist Transformed Assuming the New Shape of A Reformed Presbyter as His Last Disguise to Deceive the Nations**; London; 1647.
- I. Richard Lawrence - **The Wolf Striped of His Sheep's Clothing or The Antichrist Clergymen Turned Right Side Outward**; London, 1647.
- J. Thomas Collier - **A Brief Discovery of the Corruption of the Ministry of the Church of England**; London, 1647.
- K. John Spittlehouse - **Rome Ruined by Whitehall, or The Papal Crown Demolish: Containing a Confutation of the Three Degrees of Popery viz: Papacy, Prelacy and Presbytery, Answerable to the Triple Crown of the Three headed Cerberus the Pope**; London, 1649.
- L. Samuel Fisher - **Baby Baptism mere Babism--Anti-Sardetism the Deep Dotage of the Divines Discovered or The Antichrist Clergy Cleared to be That Themselves**; London, 1653.
- M. John Onley (Baptist) vs. John Bryan (Presbyterian) in Debate - **Whether the Parishes (Presbyterians and Puritans) of This Nation Generally Be True Churches**; London, 1655. The Baptists affirmed they were not, but Babylonian.
- N. Richard Lawrence - **Gospel Separation Separated from Its Abuses**; London, 1657.
- O. John Tombs - (Open Membership Particular Baptist) published **Theodulia or A Just Defense of hearing the Sermons and Other Teachings of the Present Ministers of England**; 1668. This was against the Baptist work :

- P. **A Christian Testimony Against Them That Serve the Image of the Beast (Greek Title) or in English--A Christian and Sober Testimony Against Sinful Compliance;** 1668.
- Q. **Jerrubball or An Answer to John Tombs' Theodulia Against Hearing Pedobaptist Ministers;** 1670.

THE BAPTISTS ISSUED AGAINST JOHN BUNYAN:

1. Thomas Paul - **Some Serious Reflections on Bunyan's Confession and Inter-Communion;** 1673.
2. Henry D'Anvers - **A Treatise of Baptism** - with a Special Answer to John Bunyan - The 1674 edition does not have this, but rather an answer to Richard Baxter; 1673.
3. John Denne - **Truth Outweighing Error** - against John Bunyan; 1673.
4. William Allen, **Some Baptismal Abuses, AS ALSO Discovering the Disorder and Irregularity that is in Mixt Communion of Persons Baptized, with Such as Are Unbaptized, in Church-Fellowship;** London 1653.
5. John Child, **A Moderate Message to Quakers, Seekers, and Socinians with 3 Questions to John Bunyan,** London; 1767.
6. William Kiffen, **A Sober Discourse of Right To Church-Communion,** London, 1681.

The following take up the general subject of separation:

1. Hercules Collins - **Some Reasons for Separation;** 1682.
2. Thomas Delaune - **A Plea for the Nonconformists, Giving the True State of the Dissenters Case - Protestant Separation from Rome - Baptist Separation from Protestants;** 1684.

The following are two representative works dealing with separation:

23) Hansard Knowlys - **An Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation;** 1689, under Revelation 17.

24) Thomas Grantham - **Christianismus Primitivus** - section on Separation from the World, Book 2, Chapter 4; p.50 and the "**Sixth Treatise Gospel Separation**" - Book IV, p. 171.

The following are from:

"The Associational Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660" published by the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain.

Part I is from South Wales and the Midlands.

- 1 Exclusion of Thomas Proud for mixing Baptists with Pedobaptists: 1651; p. 5.
- 2 May Baptists join with or hear Pedobaptists? **No-** the answer is given in full on **page 25: ANSWER: Baptized believers ought not to hear the national ministers preach nor join with them in their public worship, their pretended ministry being Babylonish, Rev. 18:4; Neither may they so hear or join with unbaptized persons, though hoped to be godly, because they are disorderly in carrying on a public ministry without baptism, Col. 2:5; 2 Thess 3:6; no, nor with baptized persons neither if not sound in the faith which is the cause of those that are called free willers, Proverbs 19:27. June 4-6, 1656 p. 25.**
- 3 They were not to PRAY with the unbaptized, p. 31.
- 4 Baptized ministers who fellowship the unbaptized are not to be recognized as qualified to officiate in the churches, p. 59.

Part II. The Abingdon Association:

- 1 Baptized believers are not to bury their dead in the churchyards of the national churches and Pedobaptists because such places were considered holy ground (by the Pedobaptists, REP), p. 152. (This is the basic reason the old Baptists had church burial grounds--because the other burial grounds were held to contribute toward salvation in the resurrection).
- 2 No mingling in life, so not in death either, p. 152, 153, 158.
- 3 Don't go to the baptismal feasts of the Pedobaptists, page 153.
- 4 The Pedobaptist or National ministers are a part of the Whore of Babylon- p. 154.
- 5 Saints are not to hear the national ministry-to hear is Babylonian idolatry- p. 159.
- 6 To be among the false worshippers is to partake with them - p. 159.

RANDOM SELECTIONS:

- 1 Don't pray with or before the worldly, pp. 59, 65, 68.
- 2 Don't worship with the worldly - p. 58.
- 3 Pedobaptist ministers are Babylonian Clergy, p. 22.
- 4 Pedobaptists are a part of the Whore of Babylon; pps. 154-156.
- 5 Believers are to flee from all forms of Babylonian; pps 151, 152, 155, 156, 169.
- 6 Separation in Public Worship; pps. 8, 22, 25, 37, 39, 54, 61, 62, 63, 167, 168, 102, 153, 169, 172.
- 7 In Private worship - p. 31.
- 8 Separation in Prayer; p. 31.
- 9 Separation in Burial- p. 152, 158.
- 10 Separation in Marriage- p. 21, 22, 55. In addition, by reading these scriptures and pages from these old Particular Baptists, you are able to see that they didn't even believe in **asking grace before the world and among the unbaptized.**

Kiffen and Spilsbury Did Not Divide

In or near 1651 John Spilsbury left the London area and moved out near Bromsgrove. He did this to escape persecution that followed him everywhere he went as a leader among the strict and rigid Dipped Anabaptist Separatists, as the Pedobaptists called them. The new church Spilsbury went to serve was a large and numerous church. Richard Cromwell tried to enlist Spilsbury as an official of the Cromwellian government in Ireland, in the early 1650s. Spilsbury declined due to his involvement with his new and numerous people. This may be found in Dr. Brown's *The Baptists and the Fifth Monarchy Movement*.

Please note the following points:

1. The Bromsgrove church which Spilsbury served was in the Abington Association; though not by that name: Notice this statement from the Abington Association:

- 1 Baptized believers are not to bury their dead in the churchyards of the national churches and Pedobaptists because such places were considered holy ground (by the Pedobaptists, REP), p. 152. (This is the basic reason the old Baptists had church burial grounds--because the other burial grounds were held to contribute toward salvation in the resurrection).
- 2 No mingling in life, so not in death either, p. 152, 153, 158.
- 3 Don't go to the baptismal feasts of the Pedobaptists, page 153.
- 4 The Pedobaptist or National ministers are a part of the Whore of Babylon- p. 154.

- 5 Saints are not to hear the national ministry-to hear is Babylonian idolatry- p. 159.
- 6 To be among the false worshippers is to partake with them - p. 159.

John Spilsbury became a part of this association when he left London. Had Spilsbury been in favor of pulpit affiliation, they would have been disowned him.

2) When the closed membership or Old Landmark type of Particular Baptists, both in New England and Old England as well, wrote to the London Brethren, they always addressed the One Church of Spilsbury and Kiffen and those in fellowship with them. Here are some samples of this:

an ensuing epistle which was subscribed by the messengers to the churches of Henly, Kensworth and Eversholt and afterwards by the churches of Abington and Reading:

To the church of Christ of which our brethren John Spilsbury and William Kiffen are members and to the rest of the churches in and near London, agreeing with the said church in principles and constitutions and accordingly holding communion with the same, the churches of Abington, Reading, Henlie, Kensworth and Eversholt send greeting:

Faithful and beloved brethren:

The Lord our God having made us to lay to heart how the churches of Christ in the apostles' days held a firm communion each with other and how necessary it was for us to endeavor to do the same, as it becomes particular assemblies which make up but one Mount Sion, Is. 4:5. 4:5, that we might endeavor to keep each other pure and to clear the profession of the Gospel from scandal and to manifest our love to all the saints, and thereby to manifest ourselves to be true churches of Christ, and that we may show ourselves sensible of the need that we have, or may have, one of another, and that the whole or God, wherein all the churches are concerned, might be the better carried on by a combination of counsels, prayers and endeavors. Through the assistance of the same God (after many conferences and seeking to the Lord) we solemnly entered into such an association each with other as this enclosed copy of our Agreement does manifest. And we have agreed to the confirmation of some conclusions of which we also send you an enclosed copy. These things we thus present unto you, not only because we desire to conceal nothing of this nature from you, but also that we may manifest both our due esteem of you and also our desire to partake of the benefit of the gifts which God has given you for the counsel and advice and brotherly assistance; and for the increase and furtherance of love and amitie and good correspondence between us, not doubting but that you will receive this our declaration with the right hand and so construe the same as the Spirit of love shall direct you.

The Brethren wrote this in 1653. That is after the date Kiffen and Spilsbury are supposed to have divided. Note Kiffen and Spilsbury are said to be in ONE CHURCH, and the epistle is also addressed to the other churches in or near London who walk with this ONE CHURCH of Kiffen's and Spilsbury's.

Next is from New England. Obediah Holmes wrote to the London Particular Baptists about his mistreatment and severe beatings at the hands of the Pedobaptists. Here is his salutation from page 27 of our **Word 97** edition:

Obediah Holmes Writes To The Brethren In London, England Recounting The Lord's Dealings With Him While In Custody

Unto the well beloved Brethren John Spilsbury, William Kiffin and the rest that in London stand fast in that Faith and continue to walk steadfastly in that Order of the Gospel which was once delivered unto the Saints by Jesus Christ. Obediah Holmes, an unworthy witness that Jesus is the Lord and, of late, a prisoner for Jesus' sake at Boston, sendeth greeting, Dearly beloved and longed after.

Do you think for a moment that Holmes, Clark and Randel would have been treated so badly if they were not strict old Landmarkers in church order? Of course they would not. Holmes saw no problem in addressing Spilsbury and Kiffen with the others who walked according to the New Testament order. This he would not have done had Spilsbury been a pulpit affiliationists.

Do any of you believe for a moment that these men would have so addressed John Tombs, John Bunyan or Henry Jessey? No, they would not have nor did they.

I conclude this chapter with these remarks from my larger work, **Particular Baptist Origins**:

Before passing from this old association, let me note the following points that will further show and document their union with the London Particular Baptists in general, and John Spilsbury in particular:

The church at Watford is known from one external source: in 1669 John Crawley taught in that town in his own house and John Coleman was also a Baptist teacher, O. P. II.883. James Stuart, op. Cit., 9ff., quotes church records to indicate that the Baptists there in the 1650s grew from 'a branch of a church in London meeting at a place called Coal Harbour, Mr. John Spilsbury being

pastor.’ Among local preachers were Richard Coleman, George Eve, John Crawley and John Reeve. The church was maintained, with help from London preachers, for a number of years but during the years of persecution, while one group tended to keep their links with London, many others joined the Hemel Hempstead congregation. B. R. White, **Particular Baptist Records**, p. 214.

The Abington Association and John Bunyan

From its very beginning the ministers and churches that formed this association were strict communionists and closed membership. By that, I mean they were in church in their ordinances and they gathered their churches only of baptized believers.

John Bunyan was the opposite. We know he practiced open communion and walked with an open membership church. Now, please note B. R. White’s remarks:

The Bedford church reported that one of their members, John Taylor, had been suspended for attempted suicide. This helps to prove that the church was not the one known as Bunyan Meeting. In any case these associations were ‘closed-membership’ Calvinistic Baptists and so neither Bunyan Meeting or any other which tolerated infant baptism would be welcome to join. In any event no such case as John Taylor’s figures at that period on Bunyan Meeting’s records. Ibid.,

Speaking of another church then, White continues:

It is clear that this church must have practiced ‘closed membership’ to be considered ‘orderly walking’ by Benjamin Coxe and his friends. Ibid., page 214.

The reason there has been so much confusion about these old Particular Baptists is because there often existed Particular Baptist Churches in the same town or area, one was mixed membership and the other was closed membership. In these churches also there seems to have been a going back and forth of some of the members. Moreover, to add more problems, often times men or women of the same names would be found in different places and in different churches.

However, this one thing is certain, the closed communion and closed membership Particular Baptist Churches gathered around the First London Confession of Faith and measured themselves by the walk, principles and constitution of the one church of John Spilsbury and

William Kiffen. This is very important, as I shall later tie this all-together dealing with the origin of the London Particular Baptist Churches.

Whitsittism Would Make John Spilsbury and John Bunyan Agree

on Communion and Mixed Church Membership

For now, let me observe that John Bunyan practiced open communion and mixed church membership. He and his church were not among these old Baptists. Get this point very well; the Whitsittes claim John Spilsbury held these views. **John Bunyan, not John Spilsbury practiced open communion and mixed church membership.**

The rejection of John Bunyan and his open communion and mixed membership church in the old Abington Association and its measuring itself by William Kiffen and John Spilsbury and all the other churches of London of the same constitution, order and principles as that church, prove, beyond doubt, **that both Kiffen and Spilsbury and their one church were strict communion and closed membership.**

Therefore, Whitsittism is again weighed in the balances and found wanting.

William Kiffen, John Spilsbury, Benjamin Coxe and the London

and Abington Churches were One

These old churches were all strict communion and closed membership churches, that is, they were made up of baptized believers only. Bunyan, Tombes (who will be considered under the Midland Association), Jessey and Powell, were all open membership and open communion Baptists. They stood outside of these old churches. Whitsittism would make Spilsbury into the very same type of Baptists as these open membership and open communion Baptists.

The Old Particular Baptist Associations

Before passing on, it may be well to show some of the ancient ways of those old Particular Baptists and their Associations.

B. R. White's studies and his publication of the **Particular Baptist Records to 1660** are a must study for any serious student of Particular Baptist history during those times. By a careful study of those records from their original sources, we note the following:

1. The old associations met often at one of the churches. The officers in the hosting church served as the leaders of the association.
2. The minutes were copied by the clerk of the hosting church and preserved as a part of the official church records.
3. There was much inner communion among the churches, that is, inner church workings, but I have not found any instances of their taking the Lord's Supper, at any of the meetings or of the practice of an inner Lord's Supper. I have found no document, nor statement, nor sermon from that time period dealing with an inner Lord's Supper between the churches,
4. The churches had no standing officers, such as modern associations or conventions have, but they did have strong aggressive outreach efforts. Many of them had begetting ministers, or church messengers, some even, in the case of the Somerset Association, had an apostle, Thomas Collier.
5. These men functioned outside of the pastoral office of a particular church and served at large to preach, baptize and constitute new churches. They were often called evangelists, apostles, or church messengers. They were also known as begetting ministers in distinction from the feeding minister or pastor. They believed strongly in a God-called and church-sent ministry. Please go to my work **A Vindication of the Old Paths**, and therein study well the documented statements on the old Particular Baptists and church sending.
6. These old associations were not executive associations in any way, for those old Brethren rightly believed in the old Baptist concept that the power was in the people. The saints in a gospel church called out one from themselves and ordained him as their shepherd.
7. As to Associational officers as such, the mostly didn't have any. Thomas Collier seems to have been the only exception to this rule. He wanted the Somerset association to choose him, ordain him at large, and send him forth. This they did. His case seems to have been a very rare one and was not the practice of the churches of that time. However, in all but this the Somerset Association was one with the London Association. I will show this when we deal with the Somerset Association.

Next, consider the following about the Irish Particular Baptist work and the London Particular Baptists in general and Spilsbury in particular:

The Irish Connection

As we continue our travel back to London, and the 1630-40s, we must pause briefly and note the Particular Baptist outreach into Ireland. At this point, I am not as certain as I would like to be about several points:

1. I have not yet been able to document when or by whom the Particular Baptist outreach went into Ireland;
2. Cathcart feels like Thomas Patient may have been the first. However, many other brethren were in Ireland just as soon, if not sooner, than Patience.
3. Edward Drapes and John Vernon were both in Ireland in the mid to late 1640s. They were both from the Glasshouse church.
4. In addition to the many different preaching brothers from the London Particular Baptist Churches, Christopher Blackwood was also there.
5. The Calvinian, Francis Cornwell, baptized Blackwood, a Particular Baptist. Blackwood belongs to that group of "Renegade Baptists" who believed in taking state pay for preaching. For this reason, he was never involved in the affairs of the London Particular Baptists though he wrote several interesting works. See our classifications of the Particular Baptists at the first part of this study.
6. When we first visit the Irish work and learn about their successes and their problems we find certain things present:
 7. Well established gospel churches and ministers with a close connection with William Kiffen and John Spilsbury;
 8. A close inner communion between the churches (not Lord's Supper, but church fellowship);
 9. The Irish brethren looked upon the London Particular Baptists as their foundation standard by which they measured themselves;
 10. The problem of open communion and open church membership came into Ireland and the strong and clear majority of the brethren put it down.

Because of the increasing concerns about open communion, the brethren drafted, signed and sent a large letter from Waterford to Dublin on Jan. 14, 1652. **White, page 122**. I do not now have this letter, if I secure it I shall add it later.

The Irish Particular Baptist records show us the close union between the Particular Baptists in Ireland and in London. In fact, most of the known ministers came from the Seven Particular Baptist Churches in London.

One important highlight of the Irish Baptist work occurred after Oliver Cromwell died. Henry, the new Protector of the United Kingdom, tried to bring John Spilsbury over into Ireland in an

effort to make sure the Irish Anabaptists remained loyal to him as they did to his father. In her remarkable work, **The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum**, Dr. Louise Fargo Brown records this interesting fact about Henry Cromwell, Oliver's son, and his efforts to secure the services of John Spilsbury in Ireland:

He followed his father's advice in using efforts to conciliate the Baptists still hostile to the government, assiduously circulating the loyal address of the Welsh Baptists to Cromwell. He endeavored, too, to secure for Ireland the ministry of Spilsbury, the Baptist minister who had so successfully interceded with his brethren the previous year. That worthy divine had, however, just accepted a call from a "very great people" in England, and was not obtainable.

The date is documented at the note on the bottom of the page as Feb. 19, 1655/6; p. 160.

Spilsbury referred to the newly gathered church at Bromsgrove as the "very great people"

As we dig deeply into the pedobaptist writers, we find several bits and pieces of some value from Gangarea or Thomas Edwards, Presbyterian. In his **Gangraena**, volume 1, London 1646, he stated:

They (the Anabaptists-REP) send forth into several Countries of this Kingdom from their Churches in London, as Church acts, several Emissaries, members of their Churches, to preach, and spread their errors, to dip, to gather and settle Churches. They are not content with their own meetings on Lord's days, week days, keeping constant Lectures in set places for all to come to that will, thereby poisoning many in the City. They endeavor the leavening of all the Counties, as I might give instances of Lam, (Lamb, the General Baptist, REP) Kiffen, with many others sent abroad, yea are some sent into the North as far as York. Page 65.

Trying to make the Anabaptists look like the Jesuits, Edwards stated:

As the Jesuits are famous for sending out Emissaries into several Countries, to corrupt, not contenting themselves to do mischief at home, so do our Sectaries send forth their members into all Counties and places of this Kingdom. They lay hands upon, and send them as a church act to preach such and such errors, to rebaptize ect. Pages 45, 46.

He makes this interesting statement:

. . . these men were sent down from the Church as a Church Act unto the country of Esses to make Disciples and propage their way, and indeed into most counties of England (where these men can do with safety) some Emissaries out of the Sectaries Churches are sent to infect and poison the counties, some out of Lamb's, some out of Kiffen's, some out of others. About September last one Kiffen, an Anabaptist, went his progress in Kent, and did a great deal of hurt; and I have been informed from good hands, by the means of some that are acquainted and intimate with them, that not only Emissaries from London go into these nigher counties, as Esses, Kent, Suffolk, Harford, Cambridge, &c., but into Yorkshire and those Northern parts (since reduced to the Parliament) and no doubt also into the West; and several Sectaries went early to Bristol and those parts, as one Mr. Bacon, Sumonds, &c., and into Wales, also, so that we are like to have Sectarisme like a universal Leprosy over-spread this whole Kingdom. I pray God keeps it out of Ireland; and I hope Scotland by God's mercy, and the benefit of the Presbyterial Government will keep it out there. Page 93.

From these comments, we can gather that the Particular Baptists had not sent their "Emissaries" into Ireland yet in 1645. It is interesting to note that Edwards knew about their way of church sending.

The Irish notes came from White's Particular Baptist Records to 1660, pages 110-124.

I will conclude this chapter with the following from my larger work **Particular Baptist Origins:**

Spilsbury and Kiffen Never Divided

The last false concept I will correct is that John Spilsbury and William Kiffen divided over pulpit affiliation. This began to be circulated by Thomas Crosby. Even J. R. Graves adopted this view and promoted it. It is not so. You will see that when Kiffen and Spilsbury parted it was due to Spilsbury's leaving London because of persecution and his moving into the country where he took over the charge of a new church with a large membership. Kiffen and Spilsbury remained one until their respective deaths. Centuries later, the Whitsittes would claim the same about J. M. Pendleton and J. R. Graves. Modern Southern Baptists and others claim that these old men of God parted ways in the early 1860s over the issue of Old Landmarkism, Pendleton abandoned Graves and Old Landmarkism. This is not true either. Pendleton was a Northern and a Federalist. He and Graves parted company over the American Civil War. In Pendleton's own final work, *Reminiscences of a Long Life*, written just three months before he died, he affirms to the end his stand in favor of Old Landmarkism. Here are some of John Spilsbury's personal beliefs:

1. He believed in the true and proper deity of Jesus Christ, and affirmed particular redemption in opposition to general redemption;
2. He did not believe in the universal, invisible church; but held that all particular or gospel churches made up the one Mt. Sion or the general church. This was made up not of individuals but of churches;
3. He believed that the Papal church and her daughters, all Pedobaptists churches, were from Babylonian;
4. He believed that the general Baptist ministers were of Satan as well as all others who taught Arminianism;
5. He believed that a gospel or particular church was made up of baptized believers, and that following baptism, then persons were to be admitted to the Lord's Supper;
6. He believed in the continued succession of the true gospel, the true ministry, the true baptism and the true church and all other gospel ordinances;
7. He held to the ordinance of hearing, that is, the saints should only hear the true ministers of the gospel, those of their faith and order, and all others should not be heard;
8. He held to the congregation order of a gospel church and affirmed that believers in a gospel church could rightly choose out from among themselves one to be their minister or pastor;

He strongly believed these as well as other Biblical points. Here is his personal confession of faith:

JOHN SPILSBURY'S

PERSONAL CONFESSION OF FAITH

1. I do believe that there is only one God, who is distinguished in 3 persons; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; yet but one in nature, or essence, without divisions, and incommunicable, who made the world, and all things therein, by the word of his power, & governs them by his wise providence.

2. I believe that God made man in his own Image, an upright and perfect creature, consisting of soul and body: which body God framed of the earth, and breathed into the same the breath of life, and man became a living soul. To whom God gave a law, upon his keeping of which depends all his happiness, and upon the contrary attended his misery, which took effect; for he breaking that law, he fell under the curse, and wrath of God lay

upon him and all his posterity. By which fall man lost the knowledge of God, and utterly disabled himself of all ability ever to recover the same again.

3. I believe God out of the counsel of his will, did, before he made the world, elect and choose some certain number of his foreseen fallen creatures, and appointed them to eternal life in his Son, for the glory of his grace: which number so elected shall be saved, come to glory, & the rest left in sin to glorify his justice.

4. I believe that God in the fullness of his own time, did send his son, the 2d. person, who in the womb of the virgin Mary, assumed mans nature, and in the same he suffered death upon the cross, only as he was man, to satisfy his Fathers justice, for the sins of his elect, & that he lay 3 days and 3 nights in his grave, from whence he arose the third day by the power of his Godhead, for the justification of all for whole sins he dyed, and that in the same body Christ dyed, he arose from the death, and afterwards ascended into heaven, the place of glory, where he was before, and there to remain until he comes at the last day to judge the world in righteousness.

5. I believe that God of his grace, in his own time, effectually calls such as shall be saved to the knowledge of the truth, who is said, of his own will to beget us by the word of truth: in which work of grace, nature is as passive, as a child in the parents begetting of it; and so God by His Spirit works faith in the hearts of all such to believe in Christ, and his righteousness, only for justification. And thus they are made righteous before God in Christ, and so conformable to the will of God the Father through the Son; and also made holy through the work of regeneration, and the holy Spirit of grace dwelling in them; yet all such have still, as long as they live here in the flesh, remaining in them, an old man, that original corruption, the flesh that wars against the spirit, which hinders them in their obedience both to God and to man, and many times draws them to that which is evil, and contrary to their intentions; yet all of them shall through Christ overcome, and safely be brought to glory at last.

6. I believe the holy Scriptures to be the word of God, and have the only authority to bind the conscience to the obedience of all therein contained, and are the all sufficient rule, by the Spirit of God to guide a man in all his obedience both to God and man.

7. As for the absence of original sin, and power in the will to receive and refuse grace and salvation being generally offered by the Gospel, and Christ dying for all persons universally, to take away sin that stood between then and salvation, and so laid down his life for a ransom for all without exception, and for such as have been one in God's love, so

as approved of by him in Christ for salvation, and in the Covenant of Grace, and for such to fall so as to be damned eternally, and all of the like nature, I do believe is a doctrine from beneath, and not from above, and the teachers of it from Satan, and not from God, and to be rejected as such that oppose Christ and his Gospel.

8. I do believe the resurrection of the dead, that all shall rise and come to judgment, and every one give account of himself to God, and receive according to the things done in their bodies, whether they be good or bad; therefore no conscience ought to be forced in the matters of Religion, because no man can bear out another in his account to God, if in case he should cause him to sin.

9. I do believe the powers that are, as the civil Magistrates, and so, are of God, to whom God hath committed the Sword of justice, for the punishing of evil doers, and for the good of such as do well, in which respect they ought to be honored, obeyed, and assisted by all men, and of Christians especially, and that out of conscience to God, whose ordinance and ministers they are, and bear not the sword in vain, Rom. 13, I Pet. 2, Tit. 3.

And lastly, I do believe that there is an holy and blessed communion of Saints, that God of his grace calls such as belong to life by election, unto the fellowship of his Son by the Gospel, of which matter, God by his word and Spirit joins them together in his Covenant of grace, and so constitutes his Church, as I have before showed: And as God hath thus built for himself an holy habitation of such pure matter, and also after so holy a manner, even so hath he provided a way of preservation and safety for the same; as Isa. 26:1. We have a strong City, salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks: which City is said to have a wall both great and high, and built upon twelve foundations; great, that none shall break through, and high, that none shall overtop or get over, and strong in the foundation, that nothing shall shake it, and God hath said, that he will be a wall of fire round about, and the glory in the midst of it, and that he will keep it, and watch over it by night and by day, that nothing shall hurt it; and as God hath built himself a house after his own mind, and is a guard to the same; even so he is also said to beautify the same with salvation, and to make the place of his feet glorious, and that he will lay all her stones with fair colors, and her foundations with Sapphires, and her windows of Agars, and her gates of Carbuncles, and all her boarders of pleasant stones, and all her children taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of her children. And as Christ does thus signify unto us the nature of his church both in respect of her matter, her form, her grace, and comely order in him her head; even so he holds forth his love to her, and delight in her, by these and the like expressions of comfort and solace. The Lord hath chosen Zion, &c. Pas. 132.13,14; p.H. 2:21,23. Pas. 87.2,3; Gal. 4:26,31. Isa. 2.2; Isa. 62. 1,12, Ezek. 48:35. Rev. 21. 12,14, Zech. 2.5, Isa. 26.3, Isa. 4. 11,12,13. Rev. 21. 11,18,21, Cant. 4.7, Psal. 45.13.

FINISH

Taken from John Spilsbury's Treatise of Baptism; pps. 73, 74.

If he were alive today, where would we place him? I conclude by quoting this from my Particular Baptist Records, what the Pedobaptists said about John Spilsbury in the 1640s:

In the early 1640s, the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland sent Mr. Robert Baillie, Minister at Glasgow, into England. The English Presbyterians called out to Scotland for help against the Anabaptists, to repress them. Mr. Baillie issued his

Anabaptism, The True Foundation of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, and Familism, and the most of the other Errors, which for the time do trouble the Church of England, Unsealed. Also, The Questions of Pedobaptism and Dipping handled from Scripture. In A Second Part of The Dissuasive from the Errors of the time. London, Samuel Gellibrand; 1647.

Mr. Baillie set forth this thesis in his work: The English Anabaptists of the 1600s are one with the older Anabaptists in Germany and other places, from the 1500s. He covers the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and makes sure he can place before his readers as many evil reports and slanders as he can dig up. However, in spite of all this, he gives a very good overview of those times and their different groups of Anabaptists.

One of the constants in his work is the place of John Spilsbury and his leadership among the London Particular Baptists. He shows that John Spilsbury wrote most of the First London Confession of Faith.

Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists were rigid Anabaptist dipper separatists. They were not only separatists, but also rigid dipper separatists. He explains by showing that they withdrew from all others who were not of their dipped way. He then shows that the English Anabaptists are just like them in this same regard of dipped separation.

Baillie claims one of the main problems with the Anabaptists of the 1500s was their desire to have a church made up only of true believers dipped. This is what led them away from all other groups. He then shows the same is true of the Anabaptists in England during his time, the 1640s.

In his efforts to make the Anabaptists look like an unorganized mob of dipped madmen with many, many different opinions, he singles out John Tombes for closer consideration. Baillie introduces us to John Tombes, the first English writer in favor of open communion in England. It seems that Tombes promoted open communion Baptist concepts a few years before he became baptized and joined up with some of the Anabaptists.

Baillie settles this question for us, did Spilsbury and the others walking with him in their church constitutions, practice open communion and mixed membership? He lists them as part of the rigid separatists Anabaptists like those of the 1500s. They were not open communion or open church membership like Tombes and later Jessey, and still later, John Bunyan. Baillie shows us that the conclusions of Gould and Whitsitt, centuries later, were unfounded, misleading and false.

John Tombes is placed almost alone and the Rigid Anabaptists are centered around John Spilsbury where they should be. Baillie shows us that the English Rigid Anabaptists held to the ordinance of hearing, that is, they would not even hear the Pedobaptist ministers. He shows us that they inherited this practice from the older Anabaptists of the 1500s. Remember that John Spilsbury was the main mover and writer among the Rigid English Anabaptists. In Baillie's work, Spilsbury is targeted as the main writer of the First London Confession and the leader among the Rigid Anabaptist Dippers. He succeeded in causing John Spilsbury later to move into the country away from London due to persecution.

As I give Baillie's definition of Rigid Separation, please remember he shows that the English Anabaptists of his days practiced the same concept. This destroys the groundless falsehood that Spilsbury and Kiffen separated over Pulpit Affiliation, that is, Spilsbury invited unbaptized men into his pulpit.

Along with Featley and Taylor, Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and the English Anabaptists of the 1600s were constant dippers. Thus, he destroys the very foundation of Whitsittism.

Please read the entire section in my Particular Baptist Origins. I rest my case in favor of John Spilsbury.

Chapter IV

Testimonies about English Dippings Before 1641

Before going into the history of Dipping in England, let me quote from **the Transactions of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland**:

More about the Blount Mission

When Mr. Richard Blount returned from his mission, John Batten accompanied him back to London and helped in the great gathering of the churches there. I have gleaned the following statements from the **Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain and Ireland**:

*John Batten taught a congregation of Collegiants at Leyden, according to Barclay, who cites no evidence. Dr. Lofton quotes Professor Rauschenbusch finding Jan Batte mentioned in the *Geschiedennis der Rhynsburgische Vergadering*, as one of the early and prominent teachers. Dr. Christian gives the title of this book as "*Historie Der Binsburgsche Vergadering . . . MDCCCLXXV*, and confirms Barclay by translating from it a reference to Jan Battern from Leiden as a usual speaker at the meetings before 1618 which resulted in the organization of the Collegiants, who restricted themselves to immersion.*

*The conferences, the journey of Blunt, his own baptism and his return took several months, and the next date is 1641, even towards the end of the year. Taken from the **Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society**, London, 1910; Volume One page 233.*

I quote from D'Anvers' **History of the Anabaptists**, page 136, from our new edition in **Word 97** about the Collegiants:

Comenius' History of the Anabaptists of Moravia in his History of Bohemia

But that which is most considerable in the account we have to give of Bohemia, is what we meet with in the **History of Bohemia**, written by **Comenius**, page 134.

They Lived in Colleges

Who, giving an account of the distresses that fell them upon the defeat of Frederick, by the Emperor's Forces at Prague, tells us: That when the enemy resolved to exercise their cruelty against us, they began the year after the victory with the Anabaptists in Moravia, who professing

above 45 homes or Colleges (many families dwelling together in them) having all things managed in partnership, in a public stock or in common, according to their custom, lived in common, according to their custom, lived peaceable under their own Discipline, troublesome or grievous to none, but beneficial to all by their Trades or Callings. They vanished, said he, these first in the year 1622, about Autumn, being forced to leave their houses, lands and vineyards, though the time of Vintage was at hand, and carrying the weaker sort with them in some Hundreds of Carts, went in great troops into the neighboring countries of Hungaria, and Transylvania, where he said, they could find fit seats for themselves, and whereby they avoided those evils that were after to be suffered by us that were left behind.

Bishop Usher on the Collegians

*And that these were of the stock that had been instructed by the Waldenses of old, may appear by this custom of living together in houses or colleges, which was their custom, as **Bishop Usher**, in the **State of the Church**, tells us, **page 292**; maintaining themselves by their manufactures. And living together, not only for the benefit and comfort of their souls, having the better opportunity for religious service,, eyeing also that primitive pattern, Acts 4, but to free themselves from more observation and persecution, which flocking together from several parts, might occasion.*

The Collegians in Several Countries in 1675

In which way, upon good information, I find they continue together in Hungaria, Transylvania, Poland and in some parts of Germany to this day, (1675 REP).

Hungarian Scholar Reports to Gov. D'Anvers about the Collegians in 1675

Concerning whom, an Hungarian scholar, that about five or six years since, came from those parts, and had lived amongst them, gave me, with a few days, this particular account: "That he himself knew four Colleges of them in those parts, viz., two in the lower Hungary, one at a place called Cosola, and another at Turkas Hida; and in the upper Hungary, another famous College in a place called Saras Patack, in which town he himself lived (as he told me) and knew the people very well, and that there were near 100 families in that College, who are reputed a very Holy, Harmless, Innocent People; and that they do support themselves by their manufactures, brought into one Joint stock, eat all together in one great Hall, worship God together twice a day; each several manufacture being arranged together, both as to their work Rooms, lodgings, and Table in the Common Hall, having public officers to manage all their affairs, and schools for their children.

Collegiants in Transylvania

In Transylvania, he said, he knows another, at a place called Alinez. All which, he said, are the remains of those who came out of Moravia and Bohemia, about 50 years since. I understand that near Heidelberg in the Palatinate, there is another great College, consisting of near 100 families, and that in Prussia there are others of them also.

The Collegiants were not Socinians

Vossius in his Book De Baptism, page 77, tells us that the Ministers in Transylvania do reject infant's baptism, and rebaptize only upon profession; but he withal said, that many of them are infected with Socinianism; though the Hungarian Gentleman tells me, that the Collegiants are very free from that infection.

Collegiants or Fraterinian Waldenses in Poland

*And further, that this truth was spread in Poland, (where the Waldenses as you will afterwards find, had much to do) appears from what we find out of **John a Lasco**, the Polonian Baron, in his book **De Sacramentis**; where he tells us, That the Anabaptists do refuse to baptize their children, because they neither do believe nor understand the spiritual mystery thereof, and say there is no ground from circumcising children under the law, to baptize them under the gospel; because say they, there is a command for the one, and none for the other, and that God had other ways to save the children that died in their infancy, than by such external ceremonies. And that neither by circumcisions were children to be saved of old; for then would the Females as well as the Males have been enjoyed the same, and that it was God's Covenant of Grace, and no outward rite or ceremony that were to be leaned upon to effect the same, to all which as an enemy of their persuasion, he largely relies in the said book. He also in **his Theologia Museovitica, page 157**, tells us, that the ministers of these Fraternities in Poland, do for the most part live single lives, though under no public vows, or constraint, admitting marriage to any that desire the same; and that they live very pious lives, as **Dr. Usher, page 363**. **Crantzzy, in his History Valdenses, l. 8**, tells us of many Christians of the Waldenses faith, that were put to death at Zudentze in Poland.*

(Accord to Williams' **The Radical Reformation**, the Polish Anabaptists-Waldenses were a part of the Predestination Anabaptists.)

The Waldenses and their Recourses, Residences and Succession

in England for Many Ages

And lastly, it does appear that in England itself, the Waldenses and their disciples out of France, Germany and Holland, had their frequent Recourse, Residence and Succession through many ages, as our Chronicles make manifest, viz.

My Conclusions about the Collegiants

I conclude this about the Collegiants:

1. They were throughout Europe, including but not limited to France; and were Predestinists
2. They practiced dipping or immersion;
3. They were true Trinitarians, not Socinians.
4. They were the spiritual forefathers of our Particular Baptists.

I conclude this about the Collegiants *and* the London Particular Baptists in the 1630s.

1. Spilsbury, Clark, Luker, Kiffen, Hobson, Eaton and Knollys were among the Lollard-Collegians succession during the 1630s.
2. They were all in regular order as rigid, dipped separatists, "baptizing and ordaining in typical Anabaptist fashion," Taylor.

I now quote from Dr. Christian's **Did they Dip?**

CHAPTER III

IMMERSION IN ENGLAND

I have not space, nor has the busy reader time to read, a complete history of immersion in England. It began with Christianity in England, continued as the general practice till the seventeenth century and is even now the theory of the Established Church. France was the first country that tolerated sprinkling for baptism in the fourteenth century. Although the climate, in England was cold, immersion did not give place to sprinkling till long after. Scotland under the

influence of Calvin and Knox, soon after the Reformation, began to practice sprinkling and pouring, but it had but little effect upon England. These facts are fully set forth by the historians, but I shall take space for the words of but a few of them.

Dr. Wall, an Episcopalian, says:

"One would have thought that the cold countries should have been the first that should have changed the custom from dipping to affusion, because in cold climates the bathing of the body in water may seem much more unnatural and dangerous to the health than in the hot ones (and it is to be noted, by the way, that all of those countries of whose rites of baptism, and immersion used in it, we have any account in the Scriptures or other ancient history, are in hot climates, where frequent and common bathing both of infants and grown persons is natural, and even necessary to the health). But by history it appears that the cold climates held the custom of dipping as long as any; for England, which is one of the coldest, was one of the latest that admitted this alteration of the ordinary way." (Wall's Hist., Vol. I., p. 575).

I will let Dr. Schaff tell something of the universality of immersion in England:

King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were immersed. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549) followed the Office of Sarum, directs the priest to dip the child in water thrice: "first, dipping the right side; secondly, the left side; the third time, dipping the face toward the font." In the second Prayer Book (1652) the priest is simply directed to dip the child discreetly and warily; and permission is given, for the first time in Great Britain, to substitute pouring if the godfathers and godmothers certify that the child is weak." During the reign of Elizabeth," says Dr. Wall, "many fond ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priests to have their children pass for weak children too tender to endure dipping in the water." The same writer traces the practice of sprinkling to the period of the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly. This change in England and other Protestant countries from immersion to pouring, and from pouring to sprinkling, was encouraged by the authority of Calvin, who declared the mode to be a matter of no importance; and by the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643-1652), which decided that pouring and sprinkling are "not only lawful, but also sufficient." The Westminster Confession declares: "Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person." (Teach., pp. 51, 52).

Sir David Brewster says:

During the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556 a book was published in that place containing "The Form of Prayer and Ministration of the Sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin," in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it upon the child's forehead. These Scotch exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country, with Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted: 25 voted for sprinkling and 24 for immersion; and even this small majority was obtained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that assembly. Sprinkling is therefore the general practice of this country. Many Christians, however, especially the Baptists, reject it. The Greek Church universally adheres to immersion. (Edin. Ency., Vol. III., p. 236).

I shall give but one other authority in this connection and that is the scholarly Dean Stanley. He says:

We now pass to the changes in the form itself. For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word baptize; that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water. That practice is still, as we have seen, continued in Eastern Churches. In the Western Church it still lingers among Roman Catholics in the solitary instance of the Cathedral of Milan; amongst Protestants in the numerous sect of the Baptists. It lasted long into the Middle Ages. Even the Icelanders, who at first shrank from the water of their freezing lakes, were reconciled when they found that they could use the warm water of the geysers. And the cold climate of Russia has not been found an obstacle to its continuance throughout that vast empire. Even in the Church of England it is still observed in theory. The Rubric in the public baptism for infants enjoins that, unless for special causes, they are to be dipped not sprinkled. Edward VI. and Elizabeth were both immersed. But since the beginning of the seventeenth century the practice has become exceedingly rare. With the few exceptions just mentioned, the whole of the Western Churches have now substituted for the ancient bath the ceremony of letting fall a few drops of water on the face. (Christian Institutions, pp. 17, 18).

Many events of English history show how deeply imbedded in the English mind was the idea of immersion. In the year 429 the Britons won a great battle over the Saxons. The following events then occurred;

"The holy days of Lent were also at hand and were rendered more religious by the presence of the priests, insomuch that the people being instructed by daily sermons, resorted in crowds to be baptized; for most of the army desired admission to the saving water; a church was prepared with boughs for the feast of the resurrection of our Lord, and so fitted up in that martial camp as it were in a city. The army advanced, still wet with the baptismal water; the faith of the people was strengthened, and whereas human power had before been despaired of, the Divine assistance was now relied upon. The enemy received advice of the state of the army, and not questioning their success against an unarmed multitude, hastened forward, but their approach was, by the scouts, made known to the Britons, the greater part of whose forces being just come from the font, after the celebration of Easter, and preparing to arm and carry on the war, Germanus declared he would be their leader." (Bede's Eccl. Hist., B. I. c. XX).

One of the most notable events of English history was the baptism, A. D. 596, of ten thousand Saxons in the river Swale. Fabyan, the old chronicler, thus speaks of the success of the work of Augustine: "He had in one day christened xm. of Saxons or Anglis in ye west ryur, yt is called Swale." (Fabyan's Chronicle, Vol. I., p. 96).

Pope Gregory in a letter to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, informs him of this great success of Augustine's. He says:

"More than ten thousand English, they tell us, were baptized by the same brother, our fellow bishop, which I communicate to you to announce to the people of Alexandria, and that you may do something in prayer for the dwellers at the ends of the earth." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. LXXVII, p. 951).

Gregory understood this baptism to be an immersion. He said: "We baptize by trine immersion." (Patrol. Lat., Vol., LXXVII, p. 498).

Gocelyn, in his life of Augustine, says:

"He secured on all sides large numbers for Christ, so that on the birthday of the Lord, celebrated by the melodious anthems of all heaven, more than ten thousand of the English were born again in the laver of holy baptism, with an infinite number of women and children, in a river which the English call Sirarios, the Swale, as if at one birth of the church from the womb. These persons, at the command of the divine teacher, as if he were an angel from heaven, calling upon them, all entered the dangerous depths of the river, two and two together, as if it had been a solid plain; and in true faith, confessing the exalted Trinity, they were baptized one by the

*other in turns, the apostolic leader blessing the water. * * * So great a prodigy from heaven born out of the deep whirlpool." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. LXXX, p. 79).*

It is also reported that Paulinus, A. D. 629, baptized ten thousand in the same river. Camden says the Swale was accounted sacred by the ancient Saxons, above the ten thousand persons, besides women and children, having received baptism in it in one day from Paulinus, Archbishop of York, on the first conversion of the Saxons to Christianity. (Britannia, Vol. III., P. 257).

Alcuin says of King Edwin and his Northumbrians:

"Easter having come when the king had decided to be baptized with his people under the lofty walls of York, in which by his orders, a little house was quickly erected for God, that under its roof he might receive the sacred water of baptism. During the sunshine of that festive and holy day he was dedicated to Christ in the saving fountain, with his family and nobles, and with the common people following. York remained illustrious, distinguished with great honor, because in that sacred place King Edwin was washed in the water." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CI., p. 818).

Bede, referring to a period shortly following the baptism of the king, says:

"So great was there the fervor of the faith, as is reported, and the desire of the washing of salvation among the nations of the Northumbrians, that Paulinus at a certain time coming with the king and queen to the royal country seat, which is called Adgefrin, stayed with them thirty-six days, fully occupied in catechizing and baptizing; during which days, from morning till night, he did nothing else but instruct the people, resorting from villages and places, in Christ's saving word; and when instructed, he washed them with the water of absolution in the river Glen, which is close by." (Bede's Eccl. Hist., B. II. c. xiv.).

Bede also tells us of the baptism of the Deiri:

"In that of the Deiri also, when he [Paulinus] was wont often to be with the king, he baptized in the river Swale, which runs by the village Catheract; for as yet oratories, or fonts, could not be made in the early infancy of the church in these parts." (B. II. c. xiv.).

Bede says that a priest, A. D. 628, by the name of Deda told him that one of the oldest persons had informed him, that he himself had been baptized at noonday, by the Bishop Paulinus, in the

presence of King Edwin, with a great number of people, in the river Trent, near the city, which is called in the English tongue Tiovulfingacestir. (B. II. c. xvi.).

Alcuin states that after the death of Penda, Osway the king of the Mercians caused them to be washed in the consecrated river of baptism. (Patrol. Lat., Vol. Cl., p. 824).

The Venerable Bede, A. D., 674-735, gives this testimony:

"For he truly who is baptized is seen to descend into the fountain—he is seen to be dipped into the waters; but that which makes the font to regenerate him can by no means be seen. The piety of the faithful alone perceives that a sinner descends into the font, and a cleansed man ascends; a son of death descends, but a son of the resurrection ascends; a son of treachery descends, but a son of reconciliation ascends; a son of wrath descends, but a son of compassion ascends; a son of the devil descends, but a son of God ascends." (In John Evan. Ex. 3:5. Patrol. Lat., Vol. XCII., pp. 668, 669).

Alcuin tells of the baptism of Caedwalla, the king of the West Saxons, at Rome. He says:

"Whilst the happy king was deemed worthy to be immersed in the whirlpool of baptism." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CL, p. 1310).

The Council of Cealchythe, held under Wulfred, A. D. 816, says:

"Let presbyters also know, that when they administer baptism they ought not to pour the consecrated water upon the infants' heads, but let them always be immersed in the font; as the Son of God himself afforded as example unto all believers, when he was three times immersed in the river Jordan." (Hart's Eccl. Records, p. 197. Cambridge, 1846).

Collier, the English Church historian, says of this canon:

"By enjoining the priests not to sprinkle the infants in baptism shows the great regard they had for the primitive usage; that they did not look upon this as a dangerous rite, or at all impracticable in those northern climates; not that they thought this circumstance essential to the sacrament, but because it was the general practice of the primitive church, because it was a

lively instructive emblem of the death, burial and resurrection of our Saviour; for this reason they preferred it to sprinkling." (Collier's Eccl. Hist., Vol. I., p. 354).

Hastine, the Dane, A. D. 893, gave his two sons hostages to Alfred, king of England, with the understanding if "he wished he might imbue them with the sacraments of faith and baptism," and the boys soon afterwards were "regenerated in the sacred font." (Roger de Wendover's Flowers of History, p. 228).

Fridegod, a monk of Canterbury, about A. D. 900, says in his life of Wilfred:

"He showed that those to be saved should be immersed in the clear waters."

And elsewhere he says:

Common people seeking holy baptism are immersed." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CXXXIII., pp. 993, 1003).

The Constitution of the Synod of Amesbury, 977, was drawn up by Oswald and required:

"All children to be baptized in nine days after their birth."

Collier remarks upon this canon:

"It is plain, as will be shown further, by and by, that the English Church used the rite of immersion. It seems that they were not at all discouraged by the coldness of the climate, nor thought the primitive custom impracticable in the northern regions; and if an infant could be plunged into the water at nine days old without receiving any harm, how unreasonable must their scruples be who decline bringing their children to public baptism for fear of danger? How unreasonable, I say, must this scruple be when immersion is altered to sprinkling?" (Eccl. Hist., Vol. I., p. 474).

William Malmesbury, A. D. 979-1009, says of the baptism of king Ethelred:

"When the little boy was immersed in the font of baptism, the bishops standing round, the sacrament was marred by a sad accident which made St. Dunstan utter an unfavorable prophecy." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CLXXIX., p. 1131).

Roger Wendover gives an account of Sweyn, king of the Danes, and Anlaf, king of the Norwegians, coming against London in 994. They were repulsed but over-ran the provinces so that king Ethelred had to pay them a bounty.

Wendover continues:

"King Ethelred dispatched at this time Elfege, Bishop of Winchester, and Duke Athelwold to King Anlaf, whom they brought in peace to the royal vill where King Ethelred was, and at his request dipped him in the sacred font, after which he was confirmed by the bishop, the king adopting him as his son and honoring him with royal presents; and the following summer he returned to his own country in peace." (Flowers of History, p. 272).

Lanfranc, the thirty-fourth archbishop of Canterbury, 1005-1089, was born in Italy and came to England by way of Normandy. Commenting on Philippians iii:20 he says:

"For as Christ lay three days in the sepulcher, so in baptism let there be a trine immersion." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CL., P. 315).

Cardinal Pullus, 1144, was born in England, became a professor in Paris, and was highly honored of the Pope. In his book on Divinity he says:

"Whilst the candidate for baptism in water is immersed, the death of Christ is suggested; whilst immersed and covered with water, the burial of Christ is shown forth; whilst he is raised from the waters, the resurrection of Christ is proclaimed. The immersion is repeated three times, out of reverence for the Trinity and on account of the three days' burial of Christ. In the burial of the Lord the day follows the night three times; in baptism also trine emersion accompanies immersion." (Patrol. Lat., Vol. CLXXXVI., p. 843).

The Synod of Cashel, A. D. 1172, was held under Henry II.:

"It was ordained that children should be brought to the church and baptized in clear water, being thrice dipped therein, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Roger de Wendover's Annals, p. 352).

We have an account of the baptism of Arthur, the oldest son of Henry VII. He married Catherine of Aragon, who after his death became the wife of Henry VIII. Leland says of the baptism of Arthur:

*"The body of all the cathedral church of Westminster was hung with cloth of arras, and in the middle, beside the font of the said church, was ordained and prepared a solemn font in manner and form of a stage of seven steps, square or round like, an high cross covered with red worsted, and up in the midst a post made of iron to bear the font of silver gilt, which within side was well dressed with fine linen cloth, and near the same on the west side was a step, like a block, for the bishop to stand on, covered also with red saye; and over the font, of a good height, a rich canopy with a great gilt ball, lined and fringed without curtains. On the north side was ordained a traverse hung with cloth of arras, and upon the one side thereof, within side, another traverse of red scarsnet. There was fire without fumigations, ready against the prince's coming. And without, the steps of the said font were railed with good timber. * * * And Queen Elizabeth was in the church abiding the coming of the prince. * * * Incontinent after the prince was put into the font the officers at-large put on their coats, and all their torches were lighted." (Lelandi Collectanea, Vol. IV., pp. 204-206. London, 1774).*

Leland also gives a description at great length of the baptism of Margaret, the sister of Arthur, 1490, and of Queen Elizabeth, 1533. The royalty were all immersed.

Walker says of baptism during the reign of Edward VI. 1537-1553:

"Dipping was at this time the more usual, but sprinkling was sometimes used." (Doctrine of Baptism, Ch. X., p. 147. London, 1678).

The prayer book of Edward VI. provides:

"Then the priest shall take the child in his hands and ask the name; and naming the child shall dip it in the water thrice. First dipping the right side; second, the left side; the third time dipping the face toward the font; so it be wisely and discretely done; saying, I baptize, &c. And if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour upon it, saying the words." (Collier's Eccl. Hist., Vol. II., P. 256).

The Sarum or Saulsbury Liturgy, 1541, according to Collier, provides:

"Upon Saturday, Easter-even, is hallowed the font, which as it were vestigium, or a remembrance of baptism, that was used in the primitive church; at which time, and Pentecost, there was used in the church two solemn baptizings, and much concourse of people came into the same.

"The first was at Easter, because the mystery of baptism agrees well to the time. For like as Christ died and was buried, and rose again the third day, so by putting into the water is signified our death to sin, and the immersion betokens our burial and mortification to the same; and the rising again out of the water declares us to be risen to a new life, according to the doctrine of St. Paul. (Rom. vi.)

"And the second solemn baptizing, i. e., at Pentecost, was because there is celebrated the feast of the Holy Ghost, which is the worker of that spiritual regeneration we have in baptism. And therefore the churches used to hallow the font also at that time." (Eccl. Hist., Vol. II., p. 196).

We select a part of the ceremony omitting the explanations:

"Then follow the questions to the godfathers and godmothers, as representatives of the child. Forsakest thou the devil? Ans. I forsake him. All his works? Ans. I forsake them. And all his pomps and vanities? Ans. I forsake them. Satisfied with these, the minister then anoints the child with holy oil upon breast and betwixt the shoulders. Questions to ascertain the orthodoxy of the child- are propounded. Then follows another series: For example, to the child the minister says: What asketh thou? Ans. Baptism. Wilt thou be baptized? Ans. I will. Satisfied with these replies the minister calling the child by name, baptizes it in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost (putting it into the water of the font and taking it out again, or else pouring water upon it.) Hist., Vol. II., Pp. 192, 193. Note A.).

In 1553 instructions were given to the archdeacons as follows:

"Whether there be any who will not suffer the priest to dip the child three times in the font, being yet strong and able to abide and suffer it in the judgment and opinion of discreet and expert persons, but will needs have the child in the clothes, and only be sprinkled with a few drops of water." (Hart's Eccl. Records, p. 87).

Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, 1558, says:

"Though the old and ancient tradition of the Church hath from the beginning to dip the child three times, etc., yet that is not such necessity; but if he be once dipped in the water, it is sufficient. Yea, and in times of great peril and necessity, if the water be poured on his head, it will suffice." (Holsome and Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Seven-Sacraments, Pp. 22, 23. London, 1558).

The baptism of James I., King of England was by immersion. He was born in the Castle of Edinburgh, 1556. Of his baptism it is said:

"At convenient time you are to present her the font of gold, which we send with you. You may pleasantly say that it was made as soon as we heard of the prince's birth, and then it was big enough for him; but now he being grown, he is too big for it. Therefore it may be better used for the next child, provided it be christened before it outgrow the font." (Turner, Vol. IV., P. 86, note).

James refers to "the font wherein I was christened." (Works, London, 1616).

Bishop Horn, of England, in writing to Henry Bullinger, of Zurich, in 1575, says of baptism in England: "The minister examines them concerning their faith, and afterwards dips the infant in the water." (Zurich Letters, Second Series, Parker Society, P. 356).

The Greek lexicons used in England in the first half of the seventeenth century were Scapula, Stephens, Mincaeus, Pasor and Leigh. These all define baptizo as dipping or submerging.

Dr. Joseph Mede, 1586-1638, was a very learned English divine. He says:

"There was no such thing as sprinkling or rantism used in baptism in the Apostles' days, nor many ages after them." (Diatribes on Titus iii.2).

Henry Greenwood in 1628 published "A Joyful Tract of the most blessed Baptism that ever was solemnized." It is printed in black letter. When I first read it I was led to think that it was by an Anabaptist preacher, but after further examination I found that he was of the Episcopal Church. He says of the baptism of Jesus :

*"The place where he baptized Christ was in the River Jordan * * * A duplicate River, so-called, because it was composed of two Fountains, the one called Jor, the other Dan, and therefore the river hath this name Jordan: In which River Naaman was washed and cleansed from his leprosy 2 Kings, 5.14; which River Elijah and Elisha divided with their cloak, 2 Kings, 2:8,13. In this Jordan did John baptize our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (pp. 7, 8.)*

*Daniel Rogers, 1633, published **A Treatise of the two Sacraments of the Gospel Baptism and the Supper of the Lord**. He was an Episcopalian. He says:*

"Touching what I have said of Sacramental dipping to explain myself a little about it; I would not be understood as if schismatically I would instill a distaste of the Church into any weak minds, by the act of sprinkling water only. But this (under correction) I say: That it ought to be the churches part to cleave to the Institution, especially it being not left arbitrary by our Church to the discretion of the minister, but required to dip or dive the Infant more or less (except in cases of weakness), for which allowance in the church we have cause to be thankful; and suitably to consider that he betrays the Church (whose officer he is) to a disordered error, if he cleaves not to the institution; To dip the infant in water. And this I do so aver as thinking it exceeding material to the ordinance, and no slight thing: yea, which both Antiquity (though with some addition of a threefold dipping: for the preserving of the doctrine of the impugned Trinity entire) constantly and without exception of countries hot or cold, witnesseth unto: and especially the constant word of the Holy Ghost, first and last, approveth: as a learned Critique upon chap.3, verse ii, hath noted, that the Greek tongue wants not words to express any other act as well as dipping, if the institution could bear it." (p. 77. London, 1633).

It is a very significant fact that Daniel Rogers was quoted by the Baptists of 1641 as having upheld their opinion. This could not have been if the Baptists of that period had been in the practice of sprinkling.

Stephen Denson, 1634, says:

*"Bee Baptized. The word translated baptizing doth most properly signify dipping over head and ears, and indeed this was the most usual manner of baptizing in the primitive Church: especially in hot countries, and after this manner was Christ himself baptized by John. Mat. 3:16. For there is said of him, that when he was baptized he went out of the water; Which doth imply that in his baptizing he went under the water, and thus all those that were baptized in rivers they were not sprinkled but dipped." (**The Doctrine of Both Sacraments**, pp. 39, 40. London, 1634).*

Edward Elton, 1637, says:

"First, in sign and sacrament only, for the dipping of the party baptized in the water, and abiding under the water for a time, doth represent and seal unto us the burial of Christ, and his abiding in the grave; and of this all are partakers sacramentally." (An Exposition of the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Colossians, p. 293. London, 1637),

John Selden, 1584-1654, was regarded as the most learned Englishman of his time. He says: "The Jews took the baptism wherein the whole body was not baptized to be void." (De Jure Nat., C. 2).

Bishop Taylor, 1613-1677 says:

*"If you would attend to the proper signification of the word, baptism signifies plunging into water, or dipping with washing." (**Rule of Conscience**, I., 3, c. 4).*

The Rev. Thomas Blake, who lived in Tamworth, Staffordshire, A. D. 1644, says:

*"I have been an eye witness of many infants dipped, and I know it to have been the constant practice of many ministers in their places for many years together." (**The Birth Privilege**, p. 33. London, 1644).*

Alexander Balfour says:

*"Baptizing infants by dipping them in fonts was practiced in the Church of England (except in cases of sickness or weakness) until the Directory came out in the year 1644, which forbade the carrying of children to the font." (**Anti-PedoBaptism Baptism Unveiled**, p. 240. London, 1827).*

Wall is even more definite. He says of the Westminster Assembly of Divines:

"So (parallel to the rest of their reformations) they reformed the font into a basin. This learned Assembly could not remember that fonts to baptize in had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling as the common use of baptizing was really introduced (in France first, and then in other popish countries) in times of popery." (Hist. Inst. Bapt., Vol. II., p. 403). And in another place he remarks: "And for sprinkling, properly called, it seems that it was at 1645 just then

beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times of 1641." (*Hist. Inst. Bapt.*, Vol. II., p. 403).

Sir John Floyer, one of the most careful writers, says:

"I have now given what testimony I could find in our English authors, to prove the practice of immersion from the time the Britons and Saxons were baptized till King James' days; when the people grew peevish with all ancient ceremonies and through the love of novelty and the niceness of parents, and the pretense of modesty, they laid aside immersion, which never was abrogated by any canon, but is still recommended by the present rubric of our church, which orders the child to be dipped discreetly and warily." (*History of Cold Bathing*, p. 61).

But dipping was not then left off, for Floyer further says:

"That I may further convince all of my countrymen that Immersion in Baptism was very lately left off in England, I will assure them that there are yet Persons living who were so immersed; for I am so informed by Mr. Berisford, minister of Stutton in Derbyshire, that his parents Immersed not only him but the rest of his family at his Baptism." (P. 182 London, 1722).

Walter Cardiac preached a sermon before the House of Commons at St. Margaret's, July 21, 1646. Among other things he said: "There is now among good people a great deal of strife about baptism; as for divers things, so for the point of dipping, though in some places in England they dip altogether." (P. 100).

From the testimony introduced above we reach the conclusion from the introduction of Christianity in Britain to 1650 immersion was common in England, and was the prevailing practice among all Christian denominations. It is manifest that dipping was the prescribed order of

1. *The Catholics.* The Catholic ritual in use in England in 1641 was not opposed to immersion. In fact, the Roman Church never has been opposed to immersion.
2. *The Episcopalians.* The Episcopal prayer book and ritual prescribed immersion as the ordinary act of baptism then as now. But there was the difference that immersion was often administered in the Episcopal Church of that day, as is not the case now.

3. *The Presbyterians. We have already seen that sprinkling, or rather pouring, was introduced in Scotland by John Knox and his followers from Calvin. But it did not prevail in England among Presbyterians until the Westminster Assembly excluded immersion by a vote of 25 to 24, Dr. Lightfoot, the president, casting the deciding vote. This was only done after the most heated debate. Dr. Lightfoot himself gives this account:*

Then we fell upon the work of the day, which was about baptizing "of the child, whether to dip him or to sprinkle." And this proposition, "It is lawful and sufficient to besprinkle the child," had been canvassed before our adjourning, and was ready now to vote; but I spoke against it, as being very unfit to vote; that it is lawful to sprinkle when every one grants it. Whereupon it was fallen upon, sprinkling being granted, whether dipping should be tolerated with it. And here fell we upon a large and long discourse, whether dipping were essential, or used in the first institution, or in the Jews' custom. Mr. Coleman went about, in a large discourse, to prove t'bilh to be dipping overhead. Which I answered at large. After a long dispute it was at last put to the question, whether the Directory should run thus, "The minister shall take water, and sprinkle or pour it with his hand upon the face or forehead of the child;" and it was voted so indifferently, that we were glad to count names twice; for so many were so unwilling to have dipping excluded that the votes came to an equality within one; for the one side were 24, the other 25, the 24 for the reserving of dipping and the 25 against it; and there grew a great heat upon it, and when we had done all, we concluded upon nothing in it, but the business was recommitted.

Aug. 8th. But as to the dispute itself about dipping, it was thought safe and most fit to let it alone, and to express it thus in our Directory: "He is to baptize the child with water, which, for the manner of doing is not only lawful, but also sufficient, and most expedient to be by pouring or sprinkling of water on the face of the child, without any other ceremony." But this lost a great deal of time about the wording of it. (Works, Vol. XIII., p. 299. London 1824).

Sir David Brewster is regarded as high authority. He says:

"In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted: 25 voted for sprinkling, and 24 for immersion; and even that small majority was obtained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that assembly." (Edinburgh Ency., Vol. III., p. 236).

All this took place three years after the alleged "invention" of immersion by the Baptists.

4. *The Baptists. In this connection I only wish to say that if the Baptists between 1509 and 1641, in England, were not in the practice of immersion, they hold the world's record for dissent. Here are all denominations who recognize and practice immersion and the Baptists alone standing out against them all. As soon as the other denominations adopt sprinkling as their custom, all of a sudden, the Baptists change their practice from sprinkling to immersion. There is no reason for all of this. For my part I do not believe any such charge, and, I think, the following pages will demonstrate, that they did no such thing.*

Chapter V

Anabaptist Dippings Before 1641

I will insert this chapter also from Dr. Christian's **Did They Dip?** Before considering Dr. Christian's comments let me quote from an unquestionable Pedobaptist, Dr. Featly:

Featly stated:

*They preach, and print, and practice their heretical impieties openly; they hold their conventicles weekly in our chief cities, and Suburbs thereof, and there prophesy by turns; and (that I may use the phrase of Tertullian) adificantur in ruinam, they build one another in the faith of their Sect, to the ruin of their souls; they flock in great multitudes to their Jordans, and both Sexes enter into the River, and are dipt after their manner with a kind of spell containing the heads of their erroneous tenants, and their engaging themselves in their schismaticall Covenants, and , (if I may so speak) combinations of separation. And as they defile our Rivers with their impure washings, and our Pulpits with their false prophecies and phanaticall enthusiasms, so the presses sweat and groan under the load of their blasphemies. For they print not only Anabaptism, from which they take their name; but many other most damnable doctrines. . . . Page 3 and 4 of The Epistle Dedicatory. **The Dippers Dipt. Or, The Anabaptists Ducked and Plunged over Head and Ears, at a Disputation in Southwark. London, 1645.***

The Anglicans defined baptism according to Anabaptist fashion as being dipt and dunked over head and ears. Both John Taylor, speaking of John Spilsbury's baptizing of Sam Eaton, used this terminology, as did Daniel Featley. Featly was good enough to define the act for us. Was this a new act for baptism? No, Featley stated again:

This venomous Serpent (vere solifuga) flying from, and shinning the light of God's Word, is the Anabaptist, who in these later times first showed his shinning head, and speckled skin, and

thrust out his sting near the place of my residence, for more than twenty years. Ibid., last page of The Epistle to the Reader.

If we had no other testimony Dr. Featly would illustrate the empty and false statements of Revisionism and Whitsittism. Dr. Featly had observed these Anabaptist dippings near his own home for over 20 years. He said that in 1645. Had there been no other Anabaptists in England who practiced dipping, this group alone would disprove Revisionism and Whitsittism. But, was this the only Anabaptist group who dipped? I think not, but please consider Dr. Christian's remarks and then draw your own conclusions.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ENGLISH BAPTISTS BEFORE 1641.

We have already seen that the Baptists before 1641, while numerous, suffered greatly from persecutions. They did not leave much literature, and so we must largely depend upon their enemies for references to them. We have enough proof, however, to show that they practiced dipping.

A book was published in 1523 by the Anabaptists in Holland, and translated and widely circulated in England, called the Sum of the Holy Scriptures. On baptism the author says:

"So we are dipped under as a sign that we are, as it were, dead and buried, as Paul writes, Rom. 6 and Col. 2. The life of man is a battle upon the earth, and in baptism we promise to strive like men. The pledge is given when we are plunged under the water. It is the same to God whether you are eighty years old when you are baptized, or twenty; for God does not consider how old you are, but with what purpose you receive baptism. He does not mind whether you are Jew or heathen, man or woman, nobleman or citizen, bishop or layman, but only he who with perfect faith and confidence comes to God, and struggles for eternal life, attains it as God has promised in the Gospel." (Armitage's History of the Baptists, P. 409).

The old English Church Historian Fuller, telling of November 24, 1538, declares the Anabaptists to be dippers. He says:

"A match being now made up, by the Lord Cromwell's contrivance, betwixt King Henry and Lady Anne of Cleves, Dutchmen flocked faster than formerly into England. Many of them had

active souls; so that, whilst their hands were busied about their manufactures, their heads were also beating about points of divinity. Hereof they had many rude notions, too ignorant to manage themselves and too proud to crave the direction of others. Their minds had a byestream of activity more than what sufficed to drive on their vocation; and this waste of their souls they employed in needless speculations, and soon after began to broach their strange opinions, being branded with the general name of Anabaptists. These Anabaptists, for the main, are but 'Donatists new dipped'; and this year their name first appears in our English Chronicles; for I read that four Anabaptists, three men and one woman, all Dutch, bare faggots at St. Paul's Cross, Nov. 24th, and three days after a man and a woman of their sect were burned in Smithfield." (Church History of Britain, Vol. II., p. 97).

In 1551 William Turner, "Doctor of Physick," devysed" "A Preservative or triacle, agaynst the poyson of Pelagius, lately renued, & Styrred up agayn, by the furious secte of the Anabaptistes." This book undoubtedly settles the question that the Anabaptists of England practiced immersion. He repeatedly calls them Catabaptists. (See pp. 19, 27, 28, 49). The Anabaptist in making his argument for believers' immersion is represented as saying:

"That such a lyke costome was once in our most holye relygyon, as was in colleges and in orders of relygyon, wher as none were admitted, before they had a year of probation, wher unto ye put this that they that came to be baptized, demanded, and desyred to be received to fellow ship of the Christians after dewe prooffe of unfayned repentance and thereby were called competentes. Yonge men, and wymen requyrynge baptysme: and then were taught the principles of the Christian faith and were fyrst called Catechumeni. And after those principles learned, were upon certayne solemne dayes, at two tymes of the yeare approved, therefore baptysed: which was upon Easter even, and Whit Sunday even: promysyng for themselves the observance of Gods law, with the renouncyng of the devell and the worlde in theys owne person without God-father or God-mother, seven score yeares longe: tyll Ignius, Bysshop of Rome ordered to baptysse an infante, a god-father and god-mother answeyryng for hym.

"Where as ye say the lyke maner was in our most holy religion, as the scolers and religious men had: that none should be admitted, until they had been proved a yeare, and first called competentes, and then catechumeni. I marvayl what religion ye meane of: whether ye meane of the Popes religion, or Christes religion, or of the Catabaptistes relygion, which is your religion indede." (Pp. 6, 7).

There are two very significant statements in these passages; (1)The Anabaptist quotes against his opponent the well known practice of immersing on the two days of Easter and Whit Sunday. (Schaff's Hist. Christian Church, Vol. II., p. 252). And (2) he says of the Anabaptist "of the

Catabaptistes [dippers] religion, which is your religion indede." This shows that they were certainly dippers,

The following is conclusive:

"And because baptism is a passive sacrament, & no man can baptise himselfe, but is baptised of another: & childe may be as wel dipped in to the water in ye name of Christ (which is the outward baptysm and as myche as one man can gyve another) even as olde folke: and when as they have the promise of salvation, as well as olde folkes & can receive the signe of the same as wel: there is no cause why that the baptyme of childe should be differed." (Pp. 39, 40).

Here he says that the "olde folke" that the Anabaptist baptized are dipped. This is certainly sufficient.

The Rev. John Fox, the distinguished author of the Book of Martyrs, was born in England, A. D. 1517, and died April 15, 1587. The first complete English edition appeared in 1563. There is no doubt as to his testimony. He says:

"There were some Anabaptists at this time in England, who came from Germany. Of these there were two sorts; the first only objected to the baptizing of children, and to the manner of it, by sprinkling instead of dipping. The other held many opinions, anciently condemned as heresies; they had raised a war in Germany, and had set up a new king at Munster; but all these were called Anabaptists, from their opposition to infant baptism, though it was one of the mildest opinions they held." (Alden Edition, P. 338).

John Penry, who was well known in England, became a Baptist preacher, in 1586. and had been a very acceptable preacher before this in both of the Colleges, at Cambridge and Oxford. The Welsh historian says of him:

He was noted for piety, ministerial gifts, and zeal for the welfare of his countrymen. He was a native of Brecknockshire, and the first who publicly preached the gospel among the Baptists in Wales, after the reformation; which implied that the gospel was, more or less privately preached among the Baptists, on the Welsh mountains, during the whole reign of popery. He also wrote and published two books. Mr. Anthony Wood, an Episcopalian Minister, says that John Penry was the worst enemy the Church of England had through the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth." (J. Davis' History of the Welsh Baptists, pp. 25, 26).

David Davies makes this statement:

*"The religious condition of Wales at this time was deplorable. The light which John Penry, the young Apostle of Wales in the sixteenth century, also a Baptist, who had been hanged like a criminal at Thomas-a-Watering, old Kent Road, on May 29th, 1593 at the early age of thirty-four, twenty-four years before the birth of Powell, had been almost extinguished, although traditions of his heroism lived on, as indeed they do to this day." (Vavasor Powell, *The Baptist Evangelist of Wales in the seventeenth century*, by David Davies, p. 14. London, 1896).*

Davies continues in a foot note:

*"Of John Penry the Rev. Joshua Thomas writes: 'Possibly he was the first that preached believers' baptism openly and publicly to his countrymen since the Reformation. I am strongly inclined to think that he was the first that administered that ordinance by immersion upon a profession of faith in and about Olchon.' He also adds: 'A word in Ath. Oxon. * * * speaks out plainly that Penry was a notorious Anabaptist, of which party he was the Corypheus. * * * Strype owns that Mr. Penry expressed a great concern for his native country, and yet charged him with Anabaptistry.'" (History of the Baptist Churches in Wales, p. 43, MS. copy in the Library of the Baptist College at Bristol).*

But this is not all the information we have in regard to Penry, though this would be sufficient for our purposes. Robert Some, 1589, says of him:

*"Master Penry, jumpeth with the Anabaptistical recusants in this Argument; his words are these. Where there is no true Christ whereunto men can be engrafted by Baptisme, there true Baptisme as touching the substance, cannot be gotten: for what baptisme is that, which is not ingraffing into the true Christ? but in Poperie there is no true Christ, whereunto men **may be ingraffed**, &c. I haue answered this and such like Arguments of Master Penries, Chap. 23 of my last Treatise: I rest in those answeres." (Chapter 12).*

Some goes on with details of the Anabaptists, of their churches in London, and of their connection with the universities.

When we consider together this testimony it is strong and striking. There were in 1589 Anabaptist English speaking churches, with graduates from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, with many members, in London and elsewhere. All of these details are associated with John Penry, who was an immersionist, and there is nothing to indicate any difference of

opinion on this subject between the churches and Penry; indeed, the proof all points to their practicing immersion.

John Smyth was associated with John Norcott on the subject of baptism on March 24th, 1609. This baptism was certainly by immersion, for we find Norcott writing a book to substantiate dipping. This book of Norcott was edited and reprinted by Chas. H. Spurgeon. I give a portion of Chapter IV.:

"1. The Greek word Baptizo means to plunge, to overwhelm. Thus Christ was plunged in water, Matt. 3. 16. Thus he was plunged or overwhelmed in his sufferings, Luke 12. 50. 'I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straightened till it be accomplished.'

"2. The Dutch Translation reads, In those days came John the Dipper, Matt. 3. 1. And in John 3. 23, that version reads, John was dipping in AEnon because there was much water there. What need much water were it not for dipping?

3. They did baptize in rivers. They came to John, and were baptized in Jordan, Matt. 3, 6. John was baptizing in AEnon because there was much water there, John 3. 23. Why need it be in a river, and where there was much water? Would not a little water in a Bason serve to Sprinkle the Face?

"4. Baptism signifies the Burial of Christ. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, Rom. 6. 4. Buried with him in Baptism, Col. 2. 12. Now we do not recon a man buried when a little earth is sprinkled on his Face, but he is buried when covered; thus you are buried in Baptism.

"5. Christ's sufferings are called a Baptism, Luke 12. 50. I have a Baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straightened till it be accomplished! When Christ suffered he was plunged into pains. Did his sufferings lie only on his Head or on his Forehead? No, no; there was not one part free; he was from head to foot in pain; his head was crowned with piercing Thorns, his hands and feet were nailed to the Cross; and his whole person was so stretched out on the Cross that a man might have told all his bones, Ps. 22. 17. There was not one part free. Man hath sinned, Body, Soul and Spirit, and therefore the whole Christ must suffer for sin. Christ was baptized into pain, plunged into sorrow, not any part free: this he called his Baptism. Thus one baptized is plunged under water, to show how Christ was plunged into sorrow for our sakes.

"6. Baptism is a putting on Christ. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, Gal, 3. 27. The text means that as a servant wears his Lord's Livery, a Garment which demonstrates him to be a Servant to such a great Personage, so in Baptism we put on our Lord's Livery, and he himself clothes us from head to foot. It is thus that by Baptism we put on Christ.

"7. When Christ was baptized, he came up out of the Water, Matt. 3. 16. Was his baptism performed by having a little Water thrown on his Face? Then he had not been in the Water, and could not have come out of it; but because he was baptized in the Water, therefore being baptized he came up out of the Water. Philip and the Eunuch went down both into the Water, (and being there in the Water) Philip baptized the Eunuch. Both of them came up out of the Water, Acts 8. 39; but to what End had they gone down if Philip did merely Sprinkle the Eunuch, or Pour water upon his head ?

"Thus you see the place where these various persons were baptized was a River, or a certain water; their Action was on this wise—they went down into the Water, then, being in the Water, they were baptized. This was done in places where there was much water. The end was to show forth Christ's Burial; now if there be not a Burial under water to show Christ's Burial, the great end of the Ordinance is lost: but Burial is well set forth by Dipping under Water." (Baptism Discovered Plainly and Faithfully, according to the Word of God. Pp. 28-31. London, 1885).

Then there follow some questions and answers to show that sprinkling is "strange fire "on the altar of God.

Edmond Jessop had been an Anabaptist, and had departed from the faith. In 1623 he published "A Discovery of the Errors of the English Anabaptists." This book was on infant baptism, but in referring to the position of the Anabaptists he mentions their use of Rom. 6. While dipping is not mentioned it is plain that Jessop assumes it in relation to the Anabaptists. Jessop says:

"In which words (I say) he setteth downe expresly that the baptisme which saueth, the baptisme whereby we put on Christ, the baptisme whereby our hearts are purged and sanctified, and the sinnes of our flesh done away, whereby we are buried with Christ, and doe rise with him, euen that which is through the faith and operation of the Spirit, is one and the same, with the circumcision of the heart, which he therefore calleth, the circumcision made withou thands, the circumcision of Christ, whereby also it appeareth clearly, and beyond all contradiction, that the circumcision, or the cutting of the foreskin of the flesh, was a signe and a true representation of the doing away of their sinnes, of the cleansing of the heart by faith (as the now doing away of the filth of the flesh with the baptism of water is); for which vse and end, it was also given to Abraham at the first, as this Apostle also declareth in another place," etc. (P. 62).

Vavasor Powell is a brilliant instance of a man baptized by immersion upon a profession of his faith before 1641. Davis says of him:

"He was inclined to suffer affliction with the people of God rather than to proceed in the ways of sin and folly. Soon afterwards he was baptized on a profession of his faith, and became a very popular preacher among the Baptists in Wales in the year of our Lord in 1636. He was one of the most zealous and useful preachers in the Principality. He often preached throughout Wales and in many parts of England. Being a man of liberal education, he was remarkably fluent in both languages." (History of the Welsh Baptists, p. 28. Pittsburg, 1835).

Powell himself is very clear upon the act of baptism. He says:

"Water baptism is a solemn, significant dipping into, or washing with water the body in (or into) the name of the Father, &c. (Matt. 28, 19). It signifies the death, the burial and resurrection of Christ, also the spiritual cleansing and washing of justification and regeneration or sanctification." (Life, Pp. 35-41).

Edward Barber refers to the Independents in these words:

"Again, others who pretend to come neerest in that way in separating, yet hold the baptisme they there received though on no ground; for if they were truly baptised into that Church I conceive with submission to better judgments, they ought to continue, and to separate for corruptions, as is clearly proved by B. Hall, in his Apology against the Brownists, shewing that either they must goe forward to baptisme, or come backe again to the Bishops and Church." (A Small Treatise of Baptisme, Preface, sec. 6. London, 1641).

The work of Bishop Hall to which reference is here made is called: "A common apologie of the Church of England against the unjust challenges of the over just sect commonly called Brownists." The title page shows that this book was written in 1610. Barber always understood baptism to be an immersion, and quotes Bishop Hall in support of his position that the Brownists must go back to Episcopacy or forward to baptism. Barber would not have quoted Hall as sustaining his immersion views unless he had strong reasons for so doing. This reference will carry the practice of immersion back among Baptists till 1610, at any rate. Indeed, there is no doubt about the concession of Bishop Hall, for I find in the work of A. R., 1642, the first part of "The Vanity of Childish Baptism," P. 34, a very striking passage from Bishop Hall. The Bishop called the Anabaptists Catabaptists, or dippers. I quote from A. R.:

"Yea and much lesse in the judgment of Bishop Hall, who in this point expresses himselfe in these words (viz) I am for my heart so confident of the Divine Institution of the majority of Bishops above Presbyters, that I dare boldly say, that there are weighty points of faith which have not so strong evidence in holy Scripture, (and there be instanceth in two particulars). The power by sacred orders given to the ministers alone for the Consecration and distribution of the holy Eucharist, and the receiving of Infants to holy Baptisme, which (saith he) is a matter of so high consequence, that we justly brand the Catabaptists with heresie for denying it, yet let me with good assurance, say, that the evidences of this truth come farre short of that which the Scriptures have afforded us for the superiority of some Church Governor even those who otherwise indeed, in a sole respect of their Ministerial Function, are equall; and then he shuts up the point in these very words (viz) He therefore that would upon pretence of want of Scripture quarrell at the Divine institution of Bishops might with much better colour cavill at these blessed Ordinances of God." (P. 35).

Here is undoubted contemporaneous evidence in 1610 that the Baptists were immersionists.

Chapter VII

The Kiffen Manuscript and Particular Baptist Succession

Chapter Introduction: In the mid 1950s I read John T. Christian's **Baptist History Vindicated** along with D. R. Ray's **Baptist Succession**. During these times, while still in my mid teens, I also read J. R. Graves' works. My grand parents preserved a large Baptist history library in our family home. They received these from my grandmother's father, Joseph Solomon Moore, a Missionary Baptist minister who held to the **Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith**. This started me searching for all the known Baptist Historian writings I could obtain. In the nearly 50 years that have followed I have studied almost all the known Baptist historical works and theories about Baptist Origins. Many of these I have covered in my **Critical Lectures on Baptist Succession**.

The main concepts are that the English Particular Baptists either began baptism *de-novo*, that is took it up as unbaptized churches from an unbaptized administrator, or they went over to Holland for a true administrator. The **Kiffen Manuscript** presents the events of Richard Blount's going over to Holland to the Mennonite-Anabaptist Collegians for a proper administration of baptism.

That there was a Reliable Kiffen Manuscript

Under the direction of Whitely, the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland researched into **Kiffen Manuscript** and published their findings in their trustworthy **Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society**, in the first four volumes. I generally agree with their conclusions though I may and have differed on some of the fine points. Most, if not all, of the facts I present in this chapter come from the **Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society**.

No De Novo Baptisms

It is certain that English and Welsh Particular Baptists did not take up baptism *de facto*. The Kiffen Manuscript details how one church, which produced three other churches, solved this problem. They resorted to the Collegians in Holland. The origin and rise of the earlier Particular Baptist Churches, ministers and members is not covered in the Kiffen Manuscript. When we first meet with the early London Particular Baptists we find that John Spilsbury and the church at Wapping are examples of these earlier churches. The Wapping church is not the only Particular Baptist Church that predated 1641, but also the Church in the Hop Garden, and the Hill Cliffe Church, William Kiffen's and Paul Hobson's churches did also. In Wales the ancient church in Olchon went back several centuries into the Dark Ages. These were what would be called Particular Baptist Churches today. I have been in correspondence with the present Pastor of the old Church that John Spilsbury ministered unto. They are still loyal to the First London Confession of Faith.

Corruptions of the Kiffen Manuscript

As we continue looking to the historical links connecting some of the English Particular Baptists to the old Waldenses and Anabaptists, we must not overlook the Kiffen Manuscript even though it points us in a different direction, to Holland. The KM connects some of the London Particular Baptists with the Collegians in Holland. D'Anvers well covers the Collegians in his remarkable history. However, there are many difficult problems dealing with the KM. Let me show some of these.

The Major Extremes

First, there are two extreme views regarding the KM. The first arose in the mid 1850s, when George Gould of Norwich, England and his personal secretary recopied it and somewhat changed or enlarged it. We now have a third hand copy of the Kiffen Manuscript. This adding of a statement in a place or two is what has given rise to Whitsittism. The Whitsittites take the Gould altered edition and use it to try to prove no one in England dipped until 1641 when Richard

Blount returned from the Waldenses or Anabaptists with their baptism and commission to baptize and constitute churches.

The second major extreme is found in John T. Christian's writings such as **Baptist History Vindicated**. Reacting against Whitsittism, Christian seemed to throw out the baby with the dirty bath water. That is, he denied altogether that there was a real and true Kiffen Manuscript and even a Richard Blount. Later, he was forced to admit that there was a Richard Blount, but he was a General Baptist. Christian did not document this General Baptist connection. Richard Blount did exist and he was not a General, but a Particular Baptist. Gangrena Edwards, in his **Gangrena**, London; 1646, deals with Blount and others. This is why Christian, for all his well-documented history and studies, never did quite figure out the truth about the English Particular Baptists and their origins. However, his Baptist History in two volumes, in my opinion, is the best general Baptist history that has yet been written. He corrected many of his extreme errors presented earlier in his **Baptist History Vindicated**. Dr. Christian's **Did they Dip** is a masterpiece. He settled the entire issue in **Did they Dip**, published in 1896.

The History and Backgrounds of the Kiffen Manuscripts

In English Baptist History, what is known as the Kiffen Manuscript explains how the second and third great gatherings of the Seven Particular Baptist Churches in London had their rise. The KM (The Kiffen Manuscript) is interwoven with what is called The Jessey Church Records. These Records trace the history of Jacob's Pedobaptist Church, which Henry Jessey later pastored, from its origin in the late 1500s, up to the time when several of the London Particular Baptists came out as they became aware of the Biblical teachings about the subjects of baptism, 1633-1641. The first lasting Particular Baptist Church, that with John Spilsbury, is not covered at all. W. T. Whitely in his **Baptist Bibliography**, London, 1916, Volume 1, page 18, states: *Manuscript account of the rise of Particular Baptists in London, 1633-1644. Printed from a third-hand copy in the Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, Vol. 1, page 230.*

Here is a brief history of the Kiffen Manuscript in distinction from the entire Jessey Church Records:

1. William Kiffen preserved it as a part of the Devonshire Square Records (This is the church Mr. Kiffen gathered in 1638);
2. Upon Mr. Kiffen's death his co pastor, Mr. Richard Adams, passed it to Mr. Benjamin Stennett;
3. Mr. Stennett gave it to his brother in law, Mr. Thomas Crosby, who presented it to Mr. Daniel Neal, the author of **The History of the Puritans**;

4. Mr. Crosby retrieved it back from Mr. Neal because of Neal's ignoring the facts therein, and later Mr. Crosby wrote his **The History of the English Baptists** and based much of his volume 1 on the KM.
5. The KM surfaced again in unfriendly hands in the 1850s, when George Gould and his personal secretary again copied it and made several additions. Whitsittism has arisen from this Gould edition. The Gould edition contains a statement that they added claiming that no one in England practiced adult baptism by dipping in 1641.
6. The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland gives much information on the Kiffen Manuscript in volumes 1-4 of their **Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society**. I gleaned these facts from them.

In this history, there are two notable epics that account for the confusion surrounding the Kiffen Manuscript. They are:

1. Mr. Benjamin Stennett's treatment of these old records. Stennett was Benjamin Keach's brother in law, and had no real interest in showing the clear separation between the Particular and General Baptists. The Baptist Union historians note Stennett's unscientific treatment of these two separate groups by trying to merge them into one in his writings. This followed over when Stennett's brother in law, Thomas Crosby took them over and wrote his History of the English Baptists. But, even more, the Baptist Union historians show that Stennett was very careless and indifferent about many different things in his writings. They affirm that Stennett recopied these old records and then presented Crosby with a copy of a copy. Of course, with Stennett's careless ways, no telling what has been altered and what had not been.
2. Mr. Gould of Norwich and his private secretary made yet another copy of these old records. This made matters even worse. John T. Christian tried to undo this corruption. He gives us two copies of the Kiffen Manuscript. By comparing them we find that many of the difficult statements are not in the first copy, only in the second copy.

Since Gould, those who follow him try to show that Mr. Spilsbury wasn't a rigid Baptist and that the Particular Baptists simply evolved into being Baptist Churches from about 1638-1644. The final stages of evolution were supposed to come about in 1643 when Kiffen finally reached the Baptist position. He is supposed to have become dissatisfied with Spilsbury and broke away and gathered a new church. This is all untrue. This is just as untrue as saying that centuries later J. R. Graves and J. M. Pendleton broke fellowship because Dr. Pendleton renounced his earlier *Old Landmarkism*. Dr. Graves was a Southerner and Dr. Pendleton was a Northerner during the American Civil War. That is why they ceased company. They never broke fellowship nor did Dr. Pendleton renounce his *Old Landmark* views. He confirmed this in his **Reminiscences of a Long Life** that he completed just a few months before his death. Neither did John Spilsbury and William Kiffen break fellowship. John Spilsbury remained the object of severe persecution

during his time in London. To escape this, and to serve a newly gathered church, John Spilsbury left London about 1651. The union and fellowship between Spilsbury and Kiffen remained intact, never to break until death.

In 1738 Mr. John Lewis wrote his **A Brief History of the Rise and Progress of Anabaptism in England**. In the same year Mr. Thomas Crosby followed with his **A Brief Reply**. I do not have Crosby's work, but do have his large history that I helped reprint, and will start making plans to secure it. It seems to be separate from his larger **History of the Baptists**.

The Battle over Kiffen Manuscript and Results

In the early part of the 1700s, Richard Adams, co-pastor with William Kiffen, passed the Kiffen Manuscript to Benjamin Stennett shortly following Mr. Kiffen's death. Mr. Stennett was supposed to be preparing a history of the English Baptists. For some reason Mr. Stennett did not proceed with this project, but passed them over to his brother in law, Mr. Thomas Crosby. Mr. Stennett and Mr. Crosby held much the same attitude, that is, that the division between the Particular and the General Baptists was unnecessary. Because of this, they had a very lax attitude in their historical treatment of different subjects. Crosby's work is greatly hampered because of this failure. He failed to identify the true causes of separation between the two Baptist groups and their separate origins. This is why he did not understand fully the intent of the Kiffen Manuscript.

In the mid 1800s, George Gould pastored the old closed communion Particular Baptist Church in Norwich, England. His son later became Principal Gould of Bristol Baptist College. Principal Gould also was a very influential leader in the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland and its historical publications during the late 1800s and early 1900s. With these considerations in mind let us note these following facts and see how they have colored Baptist history with some various interpretations that have come from the early Particular Baptists.

1. Gould was an open communionist. In fact, he may not have even believed that baptism was necessary for membership in a gospel church. When he became pastor of the old church at Norwich, it was still closed communion.
2. In time Gould's open communion influence soon corrupted the Norwich church. It became an open communion church.
3. As a result of this, the closed communion Baptists, led by Joseph Ivey, started legal actions against Gould and the church there. The title deeds to the meeting house and church property were such that if the church left its original position, it would lose its privileges to the meeting house and property.

4. A long lawsuit developed, and in the end the judge ruled against Gould and the open communion church.
5. In the course of the lawsuit, Gould prepared many notes about the origin and rise of the Particular Baptists in London. He did this in order to try to prove his open communion position in his case in court. He was very successful, but did not win the case. What he did do was draw a large amount of attention to himself and his cause and became a martyr. He drew many young *want to be* Baptist historians to his views. Since then the established views about the Particular Baptists and their origins in general and John Spilsbury in particular have followed the concepts Gould presented in this court case.
6. Gould published his court notes and arguments under the title of *Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich*, 1860. I have this work and have studied it carefully. I have never seen a work that is filled with so many falsehoods on every page. I would be hard pressed to find even one page that was entirely accurate in all its contents.
7. Shortly following its publication, Gould sent copies of this work into America, into the hands of Thomas Armitage in the North and Norman Fox, of William Jewell College, in Missouri. One of Fox's prize pupils, William Whitsitt, joined this document with the researches of Henry Dexter, Congregationalist historian of the post Civil War era, and developed his thesis which has spread forth under the title of Whitsittism.
8. Whitsitt's thesis is that before 1641 the English Baptists did not immerse. Most of the Anabaptists in Europe forsook immersion also in the late 1500s and early 1600s. Therefore, there has not been an unbroken succession of true baptism and true churches since the days of Christ and His apostles. It then follows that Baptist Churches are not of divine origin and have not an unbroken succession since Christ's time. They are only one of the many Protestant groups, merely another part of the universal, invisible church.
9. The foundation for Gould's thesis was that John Spilsbury was an open communion Baptist and pastored a mixed communion church. William Kiffen joined that mixed communion Baptist church. Spilsbury and his church is supposed to have received dipping sometime in the mid 1640s. Later, because Spilsbury wanted to continue his fellowship with unbaptized persons, Kiffen and Spilsbury split and formed separate churches. This is supposed to have happened before 1651. John Spilsbury is regarded as living and dying as a mixed communion Baptist minister. In addition to this, Gould maintained that Kiffen was the only closed communion Baptist living in the 1600s, with the possible exception of Benjamin Cox. He was forced to include Cox because Cox's rejection from a living in the Anglican Church was too well known in church history. Cox became a close communion Anglican even before he became a Baptist. He opposed offering communion to the ungodly. His Bishop, Martian Blake, published **The Great Question Answered**, London, about 1644. In this, Blake included Cox's work on the Lord's Supper. Because Cox would not leave Closed Communion views, Blake excommunicated him. Later Cox became a Particular Baptist and signed the 1646 Confession of Faith. He was also involved in several

public debates defending Baptist principles and writing several works and was strong in gospel reach, helping establish new Particular Baptist Churches and some entire Associations of these churches. We have most of these in modern print now.

10. Both Gould and the Closed Communion defender, Ivimey, the Baptist historian, made the same basic mistakes in arguing their case. Neither of them came close to stating the truth about John Spilsbury and his doctrinal position. Both blundered greatly about even who the Particular Baptists were in the 1640s. Both included General Baptist leaders, Thomas Lamb and Edward Barber as Particular Baptists. This is why volume 2 in Ivimey is such a mess. Volumes 1, 3 and 4 are fairly reliable, but Volume 2 is full of such false conclusions and improper facts that it would almost take a work as large to sort out all the mistakes. The sad result is, both Gould and Ivimey did have access to the original works, but neither resorted to them. The signers of the First London Confession are clear and easily read on each of the editions of 1644, 1646, 1651 and 1652. Neither man took the trouble to go to and find out the originals and the men who made up those churches and signed their confessions. This is only one example of their terrible mistakes.
11. By making Spilsbury, and most of the other Particular Baptists, into open communion and mixed membership Baptists, Gould sought to isolate William Kiffen from the main line of Baptist thought and practice. Ivimey was so determined to fight Gould that he did not research into the original works and make a factual case before the court. Since the Norwich Court Case, all the establishment Baptist writers have taken the conclusions of Gould and his work. The established Baptists writers are those of the Baptist Union and the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions. Even some of the Strict and Particular Baptist historians like, S. F. Paul, in his **Historical Sketch of the Gospel Standard Baptists**, London; 1954, 1961, adopted their conclusions. In America, later such men as William L. Lumpkin in his **Baptist Confessions of Faith**, The Judson Press; Philadelphia: 1959, followed this thesis completely. So did H. C. Vedder, Albert Henry Newman and all their followers, the infamous host of modern revisionist Baptists historians in America and England today. See my section on these historians in my **Critical Lectures on Baptist Succession**.

Conclusions about the Kiffen Manuscript

We must keep in mind that the Kiffen Manuscript has been corrupted. We must deal with a third hand copy. Now we have at least two known versions of the Kiffen Manuscript. Add to that, that most historians do not distinguish between the Kiffen Manuscript and the Jessey Church Records and the matters become almost impossible to understand. The objectionable parts do not seem to be in the original or oldest version. According to the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, in their remarkable studies on the Kiffen Manuscript, in the first four volumes of their Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society, George Gould and his private secretary corrupted the Kiffen Manuscript during the middle of the 1800s.

Therefore, while we received the general theme of the Kiffen Manuscript, we do not receive all the particular statements which relate to there being no known dipping of adult believers in England before 1641. The lone statement *that no one then knew of adult dipping in England*, seems to have been one of George Gould's additions. He seems to have wanted to justify his version of the cause of the Blount Mission, or explain why the brethren did what they did in 1641. In either case Gould, if it was Gould, did not understand the issue.

The only reliable Kiffin Manuscript is found in either Stennett's writings or Crosby's **History of the English Baptists**. This is the pre-Gould version and has not been corrupted that we know about. It is distinct from the Jessey Church Records. It shows that those went over to Holland KNEW NOT ABOUT THE DIPPERS OF ADULT BELIEVERS IN ENGLAND, and says nothing about the ordinance being lost.

CHAPTER IX

THE FRENCH CONNECTION

TAKING A DIFFERENT BUT OLD DIRECTION

The French Connection is an old concept. In the 1700s, Mr. Able Morgan, a Particular Baptist with a Welsh background, in the Philadelphia Baptist Association, wrote his work on **Anti-Pedobaptism**. Able Morgan made very good usage of *Stennett's Answer to Russen*. In his historical treatment of the origin of the Particular Baptists, Morgan tied them to the Albigenses-Waldenses of Southern France. His date for their connection was between the 12th and 15th centuries. He certainly saw no problem with using the name of Waldenses for those whom Stennett called the Albigenses. They were one people though in differing locations and having different origins.

Near a century before these writers, another Baptist historian, Henry D'Anvers, wrote much about the French Connection in his **A Treatise of Baptism**, London, 1675.

The Succession of the Particular Baptists is from the French Albigenses-Waldenses

The main point here is: *both these men traced the Particular Baptist Succession to the Albigenses-Waldenses in Southern France*. They considered these as their spiritual forefathers along with several other groups under various and different names in other parts of Europe. In

addition, there is no indication that any Baptists restored dipping in England in the 1641 era. *The Particular Baptists in England did restore the dipping of adult believers but not in the 1641 era.* These men both had a common knowledge about their historic roots. They traced them back to the Dark Ages groups and were not ashamed to identify with them. D'Anvers did the same in his remarkable history.

Of course, they understood and showed that the Papists and Protestants had misinformed people about the beliefs and practices of the old Dark Ages groups. Many creditable writers have cleared both the Waldenses and the Albigenses from the terrible charges the Papists and Protestants have made against them.

These remarks show us the missing links between the Dark Ages Groups and the English and Welsh Particular Baptists. At long last we are able to trace further back our historic roots and find them among a true and valid people suffering for the cause of Jesus Christ during those terrible times known as the Dark Ages.

Dr. John Von Lawrence Mosheim, highly regarded Lutheran Historian from the 1700s stated:

The origin of the sect, who from their repetition of baptism received in other communities, are called Anabaptists, but who are also denominated Mennonites, from the celebrated man to whom they owe a large share of their present prosperity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity. For they suddenly started up, in various countries of Europe, under the influence of leaders of dissimilar character and views; and at a time when the first contests with the Catholics so engrossed the attention of all, that they scarcely noticed any other passing occurrences. The modern Mennonites affirm, that their predecessors were the descendants of those Waldenses, who were oppressed by the tyranny of the Papists; and that they were of a most pure offspring, and most averse from any inclinations towards sedition, as well as all fanatical views.

In the first place I believe the Mennonites are not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from these Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled witnesses for the truth before Luther. Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, very many persons in those minds were deeply rooted that principle which the Waldenses, Wyclifites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly and others more openly; namely, that the kingdom which Christ set upon on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of holy persons; and ought therefore to be entirely free from not only ungodly persons and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation which was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the Mennonites; and the greatest part of their singular

opinions, as is well attested, were approved some centuries before Luther's time, by those who had such views of the Church of Christ. **Institutes of Ecclesiastical History**, Vol. 3, page 200.

For some reason Dr. Moshier did not include the Southern Anabaptists in this statement. Perhaps he was not familiar with the brethren in Italy, Spain and France. My first distinction came from William's **The Radical Reformation**. As I studied further this connection, a statement from the Introduction to the 1646 edition of **The First London Confession**, came to mind. Here it is:

Subscribed by us in the behalf of seven congregations or churches of Christ in London. And also by a French congregation of the same judgment.

In my researches I have found that the Particular Baptists in Scotland issued the **First London Confession**, edition of 1653, from Leigh. It differs from the 1652 edition only in the Title Page and the Introduction. Now I will begin my researches into the French nation and their publications.

I will now investigate an old concept that the older Particular Baptist writers presented in their writings. I call this **The French Connection**. These older Particular Baptist writers did not favor anyone going over into Holland, but rather, they tied their connection to Believer's baptism back to the French Waldenses, called Albigenses. This happened well before 1641, even back into the 1400s.

Arising from these older works I have turned my researches away from the Holland connection, true enough for one of the churches, to the older Particular Baptists and their origins. I have presented some of the fruits of my investigations in these pages. Later I hope to have further facts and evidences to establish even closer and plainer the French Connection with the London Particular Baptist Churches. The evidence appears to be so plain, but like the person, who cannot see the trees for the forest, we have overlooked it for many, many years.

I believe we need to investigate further the French Huguenots and the Petty France settlement in London. Herein we should find much valuable information about the Particular Baptist roots. Soon I hope to restudy the Huguenots and their history. Here is further confirmation of this new direction I have taken. It is from the introduction to the **First London Confession of Faith**, edition of 1646. I have know of this for years, but failed to see the importance of it until I considered both Stennett and Morgan. Here is the Introduction to the Second Edition in full:

(PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION)

To the judicious and impartial Reader.

COURTEOUS READER;

It is no wonder if it seem strange to thee, that we should publish a confession of our faith, who are frequently termed to be heretics and schismatics, and what not, though unjustly; neither is it any discouragement unto us, though this sect (as they call the **Anabaptists**) is everywhere spoken against, **Acts xxviii. 22**; and in that we are charged (for Christ's name sake) with the same things our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles were accused of. It is a mercy, an honor, and a comfort unto us, rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you. **Matt. v. 11,12**. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord; it is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? **Matt. x. 24,25**. If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you: if ye were of the world, the world would love her own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore, the world hateth you. The servant is not greater than the Lord: if they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you, & c. All these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me; yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution: but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. **John xv. 18, 19, 20, 21**; see **Acts xxi. 28, 30, 31**; and **xiv. 22**; **2 Tim. iii. 12**; **I Pet. iv. 13**.

Our Lord Jesus was accused to be a seditious and mutinous fellow; **Luke xxiii. 25**. Paul was called a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition, and a ringleader of the sect of Nazarenes, **Acts xxiv. 1,5,6,8**; **xviii. 13**; saying, Away with such a fellow, for it is not fit he should live; saying, This fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law. And our Lord Jesus Christ was accused of perverting the people, and forbidding to give tribute to Ceaser; and that He and His disciples did teach novelties, and brake the traditions of the elders. **Luke xxiii. 2,14**; **Matt. xv. 1-9**. Christ was accused to have a devil, and to be mad; saying to the people, Why do ye hear him? **John x. 20**. Paul was esteemed to be mad: also they said, What will this babler say and that he taught a new doctrine, **Acts xxvi. 24, 25**; **xvii.18,19**. And Christ was accused to speak blasphemy, and they all condemned him to be guilty of death, **Mark xiv. 64**. So some are offended at us for meeting in houses to preach, and would have us punished for it; notwithstanding, it was Christ's and His apostles' practice to do so, whose example we are to follow. Christ taught upon a mountain, and in a ship. Paul preached from house to house. Also the church met together in an upper room, where Peter preached; and Paul preached, and

converted Lydia by the river side; the disciples met together in the night in an upper room; Paul preached two years in an hired house, and received all that came unto him. **Matt. v. 1, 2; and xiii. 2; Acts xx.20; i.13,15,16; ii.2; xvi. 13, 14; xx. 7,8,9; xxviii. 30,31.** If he had lived in these days and done so, it is to be feared some would have petitioned against him. So some accuse us to be disturbers of the peace of the commonwealth; yet all that know us can testify for us, that we meet together and depart in a peaceable manner. And from Acts xvii. 5,6,7, it will appear, what person they were that disturbed the public peace; it is fit such persons should be taken notice of and accordingly punished.

So we are blamed, because we frequent not their temples. We dare not trust in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these. We know the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; and that we are the temple of the living God; and that our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost; and that Christ's church is not built with dead stones. **Acts vii. 48; xvii.24,25; I Cor. iii. 16; vi. 3, 19; I Pet. ii. 4,5; John iv. 20, &c.** And because there are but a few of us, some conceive we are in an error, and that the least number should yield to the greater; then it seems, if the number of the papists or atheists exceed the number of the protestants, they must forsake their religion. God in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways; and there was but one true prophet to four hundred false. **Acts xiv. 16; Exod. xxiii.2; King xxii. 6,7, &c.** After three years' preaching and working miracles by Christ, there was but a small number. Christ calls His, a little flock: the scripture declares the greatest number followed after the beast. **Acts i. 14, 15; Luke xii. 32; Matt. vii. 13, 14; Rev. xiii. 7, 16, 17.** Also those that preach amongst us are esteemed, as the apostles were, to be unlearned and ignorant men. Apollos was instructed more perfectly in the way of God by Aquila, a tradesman, and Priscilla his wife; **Acts iv. 13; xviii. 1, 2, 3, 26.** But the scripture saith; As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. **I Pet. iv.10, 11; see I Cor. xiv. 3, 26, 31.** Also some say of us, that we be of several sects, and that we cannot agree among ourselves. Pilate and Herod agreed together to crucify Christ; we dare not agree as the Jews did, that if any did confess that Jesus was the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. **Luke xxiii. 12; John ix. 22; see I Cor. i. 10, 11.** The union Christ prayed for, we desire: for such an agreement as agreeth not with the truth, we may not agree unto; therefore we desire it not. **John xvii. 21; Eph. iv.3-17.** Yet the paedobaptists differ more among themselves than we do, and if this their reason have any strength in it, it is against themselves: the several sects of paedobaptists be papists, Arians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Donatists, Eutychians, Grecians, Lutherans, Arminians, Episcopalians, Nicolaites, Calvinists, Zuinglians, Hussites, and above twenty other several sects, which are all baptizers of infants: and notwithstanding, for other points, are all asunder, and have all rent one from another; therefore we send them to follow the counsel of Christ. **Matt. vii. 3, 4, 5.**

As the watchman dealt with the spouse of Christ, in her seeking her beloved, so they deal with us. **Song iii. 2, 5; v. 7.** They finding us out of that common and broad way themselves walk in, they smite us, and take away our veil, and veil us with reproaches and odious names: to incense

all, both good and bad, against us, that we may appear vile in the eyes and ears of all that behold us, or shall hear of us, Acts xvi. 19. Which they endeavor to do, both in pulpit and print, not fearing to charge us with holding free-will, falling from grace, denying election, original sin, children's salvation, the Old Testament, and men's property in their estates, and censuring all to be damned that are not of our judgment and practice; all which we disclaim, because they are untrue. And as for the other things where of we are accused, we refer those who desire further satisfaction to the answers of them. (In a small treatise, entitled, **Briefe Considerations on Dr. Featley's Book, entitled, The Dipper Dipt**, by Samuel Richardson. (4 to. London, 1645.) Yet by reason of the many accusations that are cast upon us, although they cannot prove the things where of we are accused, yet the generality of the people are incensed against us, and are encouraged, and set on by such, to seek out the peace of our meetings, which are the more private, not because they are private, but because we have not any more public places; but if any shall please to procure us more larger places to meet in, we are willing to embrace them with thankfulness and joy, although no man should speak for us to those in authority, from whom one word were enough to protect us from the violence we should be subject unto. But as it was then, Acts xvii. 5,6,7, so it is now; yet must we bear all the blame. But our God will in His time clear our innocency, although now many stand looking upon us as a people (holding such things) not worthy to live, and are in danger by the rude multitude gathering together to stone us. And had it been against our persons only, we would have held our peace, and committed our cause to God; but considering it is the truth that we profess that suffers, we may not, nor dare not be neuters in matters of so high a nature, but come in and speak to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Therefore, to free ourselves and the truth we profess from such unjust aspersions, that it may be at liberty, though we be in bonds, we have published a brief confession of our faith (which we conceive most void of contention in these sad and troublesome times). The thoughts of our hearts as in the presence of God we here declare, that it may appear to the consciences of them that fear God, what wrong we suffer from some who have ability to cast mists, and dark clouds, which overshadow the glory of the truth, and them that profess it. **Jude, 14, 15**. And although they acknowledge with us that the truth is not fully discovered, yet they will tie all future discovery to a former light, and conceive they do well in so doing. But God will by His truth show their error, and exalt Jesus Christ, the chief cornerstone, which the builders so much reject. And lest this should be thought to be the judgment of some particular persons, this is done by the consent and appointment of seven congregations or churches in London, with the names of some of each of them subscribed in the behalf of the whole. And although we be distinct in our meetings, for convenience; yet are we one in faith, fellowship, and communion, holding Jesus Christ for our head and lawgiver, under whose rule and government we desire to walk, and to follow the Lamb wheresoever he goeth, that when our Lord and King shall call us to account, we may be found ready and worthy to be received into our Master's joy. Until which time we desire to spend these few days we have here to remain, to the glory of God, the honor of the gospel, the saints' comfort, and our country's good, to our own account at the great day when Christ shall come in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. **2 Thess. i. 8**.

**Subscribed by us in the behalf of seven congregations or churches of Christ in London.
And also by a French congregation of the same judgment.**

THOMAS GUNNE, THOMAS MUNDEN,

JOHN MABBIT, GEORGE TIPPING,

JOHN SPILSBERY, WILLIAM KIFFEN,

SAMUEL RICHARDSON, THOMAS PATIENT,

PAUL HOBSON, HANSERD KNOLLYS,

THOMAS GOARE, THOMAS HOLMS,

BENJAMIN COCKES, DENIS LE BARBIER,

THOMAS KILIKOP, CHRISTOPH LE DURET.

Now I will begin my researches into the French Connection and their publications.

Stennett's Testimony

I will quote from Stennett starting with page 79. On these pages Stennett discussed the practice of infant baptism and communion. Let me make these points about these early practices:

1. In early church history infants embraced all the barns or those under the age of legal maturity. The term infant was not simply limited to the newly born.
2. The age for legal maturity differed from country to country. However, because the baptism of those under the legal age became an accepted practice the next was to have sponsors, gossips and godparents.

3. Infant baptism, in the early church age is not the same as newborn baptism, but simply the baptisms of those under legal age.

Stennett states:

Suicerus tells us, "This custom which was anciently received, afterwards prevailed so far, especially in the Time of Charles the Great, that the Eucharist was given to Infants, not only in the public assembly of the church after baptism, or at other times when the church was wont to come together to the Holy Communion; but some of the Bread of the Lord's Supper was received, to be given such infants were sick, as well as to adult persons. Ansegate, an Abbot of Liege, who recites a Canon of the said Charles (in the first Book of the Laws of the Franks, chap. CLV.) published on this account, gives us a very full Testimony of it. For the Words of the Canon are these, Let a Presbyter have the Eucharist always ready, that when any Man is sick, or Infant is weak, he may immediately give it him, that he may not die without the Communion.

Nay this Custom it seems has continued down to this very age in the Greek Church. Vansich, a Dominican Friar, in his History of the Church of Alexandria, speaking of their Baptism, says "They communicate Persons immediately after it; and if they are Infants, the Priest dips his finger in the venerable Blood of our Lord, and putting it to the Child's Mouth, makes him suck it."

Here again I observe, that those who admitted Infants to the Lord's Supper, acted very consistently with their own Opinion of the right of Infants to Baptism. For supposing infants have a right to baptism, it seems very natural to conclude, they have a like right to the Supper of the Lord. If it be objected, that a Discernment of the Lord's Body, I Cor. 11:28,29; and a previous examination of a man's self, be required to precede the latter: the belief of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and dependence on him for salvation, Romans 6:2-14, an assimilation to him by a death to sin and life of holiness, and the answer of a good conscience towards God, are prerequired to the former, and an infant is as capable of the one as of the other. They had reason to think that all who ought to be baptized, might after their baptism be admitted to the Lord's Table, but had no good foundation for the admission of infants to the former, and therefor none for their admission to the latter. Those Christians who are against the administration of the Lord's Supper to infants, are so far in the right; but then they seem inconsistent with themselves in admitting them to baptism; for if they may be allowed to come to this ordinance, what good reason is there to refuse them the other? So that those ancient and our modern Pedobaptists seem to have been both in the right in some respects, though both in the wrong in others. The former (I say) concluded well, that all who were duly baptized, had a right to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; and the latter say as truly, that none who are in a State of Infancy ought to be admitted to the Lord's Supper. From both which principles, if put together, it

will evidently result, that no infants are duly baptized. If the promises are good, and I believe they are, this conclusion is not to be denied.

And since Mr. R. lays so great a stress on the ancient practice of infant-baptism, I desire he would give a reason why the practice of communicating infants at the Lord's Table, which appears to be of like antiquity, should not be continued as well as that? For if he can show a good reason for the discontinuance of the one, I doubt not but it will be of the same force for the discontinuance of the other.

To all that has been already said, in opposition to what Mr. R. advocates, concerning the universal practice of the Church, I shall add some testimonies concerning the sentiments and practices of the ancient Vaudois and Albigeois, as to this matter, and the rather because he particularly mentions these as being for infant-baptism, page 17.

*Chassanion, in his **History of the Albigeois** has these words: "Some writers have affirmed that the Albigeois approved not of the baptism of infants; others that they entirely slighted this Holy Sacrament, as if it was of no use either to great or small. "The same has been said of the Vaudois, though some affirm that they have always baptized their children, this difference of Authors kept me for some time in suspense, before I could come to the resolved, which side the truth lay. At last considering what St. Bernard says of this matter, in his 66th Homily, on the second chapter of the Song of Songs, and the reasons he brings to refute this error, and also what he wrote ad hildersonfun comitem Sancti Egidii, I cannot deny that the Albigeois for the greatest part were of that opinion. And that which confirms me yet more in the belief of it, is, that the History of the City of Treves, there were some who denied that the Sacrament of baptism was available to the salvation of infants. And one Catherine Saube, who was burnt at Montpellier in the year 1417, for being of the Mind of the Albigeois, in not believing the Traditions of the Romish Church, had the same thoughts concerning infant-baptism; as it is recorded in the register of the Townhouse of the said City of Montpelier, of which we shall speak at the end of the fourth Book. The truth is, they did not reject this Sacrament, or say it was useless, but only counted it unnecessary to infants, because they are not of age to believe, or capable of giving evidence of their Faith. That which induced them (as I suppose) to entertain this Opinion, is what our Lord says, that He who believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be damned.*

This author afterwards tells us, he thinks they erred in this matter, but endeavors to excuse them, by alleging that they were not the first who were of this Opinion, seeing Tertullian was for deferring baptism till persons came to the years of discretion. And He gives divers instances of the Practice of the Ancients to the same purpose, to make this supposed Error appear tolerable. That which I observe is, that this Historian, who was a Pedobaptist, and who says he collected

his History from two ancient Manuscripts, one of which was written in the Languedoc Tongue, and the other in old French, declares himself convinced that the greatest part of the Albigeois were against Infant-Baptism.

Cassander, in a Preface prefixed to his Book of Infant-Baptism, imputes the denial of this Principle to Peter de Bruis, and his disciple, Henry, from whom the Petrobrussians and Henricians took their name. Speaking of their pretended hereby, has these words: "Which heretics first openly condemned infant baptism, firstly, asserted that baptism was fit only for the adult, which they both verbally taught, and really practiced in their administration of baptism."

Prateolus speaking of the same Peter de Bruis, says: "He asserted that Baptism was useless to children, who wanted the exercise of reason, because infants who want the use of reason, cannot have faith so as to believe the Word of God when preached to them, which he asserted to be absolutely necessary to every one who submitted to baptism; so that if any one should be baptized without previous faith, he said his baptism would be of no use to him." This author charges the same opinion on Henricus, the disciple of Peter de Bruis.

These persons lived in the 12th century after Christ. Many from them and their followers who kept clear of many gross errors which the Romish Church was so deeply corrupted in that dark time, was this among other Truths transmitted down to the ancient Vaudois and Albigeois, long before the Reformation made in the time of Luther and Calvin.

*And whosoever will take the pains to peruse the learned Dr. Allix in **his Remarks upon the Ancient Church of Piedmont** will find divers Passages that may confirm what has been said. This will make it appear that Infant Baptism was opposed by perhaps the purest church were then in the world some hundreds of years before the time Mr. R. assigns for the first rise of the Anabaptists. I shall relate only one passage after the Dr. concerning Gundupious and his followers in Italy, divers of whom Gerald, bishop of Cambray and Arras, interrogated upon several heads in the year 1025. Among other things that Bishop mentions the following reason which they gave against infant-baptism. Because to an infant that neither wills nor runs, that knows nothing of faith, is ignorant of its own salvation and welfare, in whom there can be no desire of regeneration or confession of faith, the will, faith and confession of another man, seems not in the last to appertain. Pages 81-85.*

Points from Stennett

From Stennett I note the following:

The practice of baptism of believers is the true and ancient practice;

The various Dark Ages groups in general and the Albigenses in particular, in the main opposed Infant Baptism;

There is no mention in any way that the Particular Baptists restored adult baptism back into England during the 1640 era.

Able Morgan's Testimony

Able Morgan informs us about baptism from the old Waldenses. Here are his remarks:

*Our author will not allow the Waldenses to put in for the subjects of our Lord's Promise, in that dark Time, and good reason why, lest he should countenance any thing against infant-baptism; but by his leave, that the Waldenses and others I mentioned before, being opposers of infant-baptism, and in the Practice of Adult-baptism, is not such a Figment, as our Author in Page 11th would have it to be; as appears by the Testimonies produced by Mr. Stennett against Russen, page 81-84, which I should have transcribed, but my Bounds will not permit. AND THAT THE FIRST THAT REVIVED THE ANCIENT PRACTICE OF ADULT BAPTISM IN ENGLAND HAD IT FROM THEM, IS NO MORE UNLIKELY, THAN FOR THE PRESBYTERIANS TO HAVE THEIR DISCIPLINE FROM GENEVA; FOR THE ENGLISH HAD POSSESSION OF THOSE PARTS OF FRANCE WHERE THE WALDENSES WERE MOSTLY CONTENANCED, FROM THE YEAR 1152 TO THE YEAR 1452, WHICH WAS LONG ENOUGH FOR MANY PERSONS TO BECOME ACQUANITED WITH THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACITICES OF THOSE GOLDY PEOPLE, BY SUCH INTRERCOURSE, AND FROM THEIR EXAMPLE, TO ENDEAVOUR A REFORMATION IN ENGLAND, though with no great success for a while: Our author will find it difficult to fix on any subject of that promise, in the Western Parts of the world; lest (if the Waldenses were not) during a good part of that period; nor can he prove the united practice of Infant-Baptism during the said Period, while the said Waldenses and others have opposed it, and practiced otherwise, within the said Term; and if he could, it would be but a Scriptureless practice still. Able Morgan, **Anti-Paedo-Rantism**; Philadelphia; 1757: pages 172-173.*

Please note when those in England became acquainted with the principles and practices of the Godly people in Southern France, between 1152-1452. He further notes that those first revived adult dipping in England, in modern times, revived the ancient practice of adult baptism from those in Southern France. He points out that their efforts in this revived practice met with no great results for a while. This testimony shows that the London Particular Baptists secured their

baptism from the already existing Albigensian-Waldensian churches in Southern France, not in Holland.

Please note this:

1. There is no mention here of going to Holland for Baptism, but rather to Southern France;
2. There is no tie with the Mennonites, but with the Albigenses-Waldenses;
3. This was done before the time of the Reformation, not in 1641;
4. The London Particular Baptists still maintained fellowship with a French Congregation of the same judgment in 1646 when they issued their second edition of the **First London Confession**.

From both Stennett and Morgan

By studying both these ancient writers I gather the following:

1. The forefathers of the English Particular Baptists, those whom Stennett elsewhere calls the *Modern Anabaptists*, are to be found in general among the earlier Petrobrussians and Henricians, and later they were called the Albigenses-Waldenses.
2. The link between the English and Welsh Particular Baptists and the ancient Dark Ages groups is through the Albigenses.
3. Stennett identifies them as the Albigenses and Morgan identifies them as the Waldenses.
4. Neither of these older Particular Baptists had any problems with the ancient Albigenses-Waldenses.

IFurther Researches about the French Connection

From: Paul A. Little <lpaul@surewest.net>
To: <Pat4809@primus.ca>
Subject: ... the Huguenot Durets fled to England...
Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2003 9:16 PM

Dear Brother Pound,

This appears to be either the same or similar material. And is on the mark about what we are looking for.

**saved by GOD's grace alone,
Paul A. Little**

<http://www.jenforum.net/durrett/messages/137.html>

**Re: Bartholomew Durrett VA 1730-60
Posted by: Sue Date: December 13, 1999 at 20:08:16
In Reply to: Re: Bartholomew Durrett VA 1730-60 by Tibbie Robertson/Austin Adams of 376**

**Hello fellow Durrett,
heres some of what I have.....**

According to the Woods-McAfee Memorial, the Durrett family descends from Louis Duret, the Physician of Henry III. After the massacre of St Bartholomew, the Huguenot Durets fled to England where gradually the name was spelled as it was pronounced and was written Durrett. In 1644, Christopher Duret was prominently connected with the Baptist in London. Phillip Duret or Durette was a subscriber to and Treasurer of the Virginia Company, May 23, 1609; died in Virginia in 1665, as stated by Brown's Genesis of the United States, and by Henning's Statutes of Virginia (1-84)

Richard and Bartholomew Durrett, came from England and settled in Spotsylvania County. John, Richard and Bartholomew Durrett are on record as living in Spotsylvania County, Virginia, before 1737.

The records of Hanover County, Virginia having been destroyed during the Civil War, the record of Bartholomew Durrett's will are not available; but notes kept by the family and passed on from one generation to another we get the following information.

If you want the rest let me know I'll be checking back to this site. Sue

From: Mark Thomas <oldbaptist@yahoo.com>
To: <old-school-baptist@yahoogroups.com>
Subject: [old-school-baptist] Hardshell to Debtor on Durrett

Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2003 5:58 PM

Dear Brother Pound,

I believe this is the material you desired reposted. Hope this is of help. I remain, interested in our history, Mark Thomas

Dear Beloved Brother in Christ, thank you also for this very important post. The material in this is priceless to Baptist historians. Thanks again dear brother, debtor.

----- Original Message -----

From: Mark Thomas <oldbaptist@yahoo.com>

To: <old-school-baptist@yahoogroups.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2003 2:25 PM

Subject: [old-school-baptist] (unknown)

Dear Brother Pound and other interested Brethren,

You wrote:

"Another mystery of 1646 is the "French Congregation of the same judgment," served by Denis Le Barbier and Christophle Duret. I have found out nothing as to the origin and following history of this church. This French Church is one of the Huguenot churches in London during those times."

Doing a bit of searching on the name Christopher Duret yielded the following:

"The Durrett family is of remote French descent. The original spelling was du Rette, pronounced du Ray, Changed to Duret. It had numerous distinguished members in France in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. Louis Duret (1527 - 1586) was Professor of Medicine at Royal College of France, was physician to Henry III and wrote various Latin books noted for their Eloquence. His son, Jean Duret (1563-1629), also a Professor at the College of France, was ostracized by Henry IV, but was first physician to Catherine de Medici. Another Jean Duret was a noted lawyer and author (1540-1600). Other noted Durets have been writers, and astronomer and two sculptors." (From LaCrousse's Dictionary). According to the Woods-McAfee Memorial, the Durrett family descends from Louis Duret, the physician of Henry III.

After the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Huguenot Durets fled to England where gradually the name was spelled as it was pronounced as was written Durrett. In 1644 Christopher Duret was prominently connected with Baptists in London. Philip Duret or Durette was a subscriber to and Treasurer of the Virginia Company, May 23, 1609; died

in Virginia in 1665, as stated by Brown's Genesis of the United States, and by Henning's Statutes of Virginia (1-84).

The Durrettts are of French origin, the name having been originally spelt Duret. The family traditions extend back to Louis Duret, an eminent physician who flourished in France during the last half of the sixteenth century. Some curious old books, published by him and his descendants, have been preserved all these years in the family, and are now in the possession of the subject of this sketch. Early in the seventeenth century some of the Durets of the Protestant faith, smarting under the effects of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, crossed the channel and established themselves in England. In 1644 Christopher Duret was prominently connected with the Baptist Church in London, and his name appears to the address accompanying the Confession of Faith put forth that year. In England the French sound of the letters making Duret as if written Duray, was lost, and the name pronounced as it was spelled. In the course of time this pronunciation was emphasized, by doubling the "r" and the "t", thus making the name Durrett, as we have it now. Excerpted from the entry, Reuben T. Durrett, KY in: Kentucky: A History of the State, Perrin, Battle, Kniffin, 8th ed., 1888, Jefferson Co.

The Huguenot massacre on the eve of St. Bartholomew occurred in 1572. For further information on the massacre see the article by Spurgeon at:

http://www.spurgeon.org/s_and_t/stbarts.htm

It would indeed be interesting to discover the name of the Huguenot congregation in London served by Duret and the roots of that Church.

I remain,

Yours in my Master's Service,

Mark Thomas

From: M. Maynard <receptus@sprynet.com>

To: <old-school-baptist@yahoogroups.com>

Subject: [old-school-baptist] rough transl. of French note

Date: Wednesday, November 26, 2003 11:04 PM

Here is a rough translation of the French message.

Bro. Maynard

réponse #137 du 13 décembre 1999. Le message a été laissé par Sue qui Response 137 of Dec. 13, '99. The message has been left by Sue who répondait à Tibbie Robertson/Austin Adams. replied to Tibbie Robertson/ Austin Adam.

Traduction et note de Marc Durette. Translation and note from Mark Durette "Selon le "Woods-Mcfée memorial", la famille Durrett descend de Louis Duret, According to the

"Woods-Mcfee Memorial" the family Durette descends from Louis Duret, il était le médecin d'Henry III. Après le massacre de St-Batholomew he was the physician of Henry III. After the St. Bartholomew Massacre (St-Barthélemy, 1572), les Duret de religion Huguenot émigra en Angleterre. (St. Bartholomew, 1572) the Durets of the Huguenot religion emigrated to England.

Graduellement la prononciation anglaise modifia l'épellation pour s'écrire Gradually the English pronunciation changed the spelling by writing it Durrett. Durrett. En 1644, Christopher Duret était un personnage éminent de la religion. In 1644, Christopher Duret was an eminent person of the Baptist denomination in London. Baptiste de Londre. Phillip Duret ou Durette était l'un des souscripteurs et Phillip Duret or Durette was one of the subscribers and treasurers of the Virginia company. trésoriers de la "Viginia company". Il est inscrit dans le "Brown's Genesis of the United-States", He is listed in the "Brown's Genesis of the U.S." et dans le "Hennings's statutes of Virginia (1-84)". and in "Henning's statutes of Virginia (1-84). Richard et Bartholomew Durrett sont venu d'Angleterre et s'établire dans le Richard and Bartholomew Durrett have come from England and settled in the comté de Spotsylvania, Virginie. John, Richard et Bartholomew Durrett ont county of Spotsylvania, Va. John, Richard and Bartholomew Durrett été recensé avant 1737 dans le comté Spotsylvania, Virginie. have been registerd before 1737 in the county Spotsylvania, Va. Les registres du comté de Hanover, Virginie ont été détruits durant la The census records of the county of Hanover, Va. have been destroyed during the guerre civil. Les registres sur Batholomew n'ont pas été retrouvés; mais les civil war. The census records of Bartholomew have not been rediscovered, but the notes "JEOT" sur la famille ont été passées d'une génération à une autre notes "JEOT" on the family have been passed on from one generation to another. jusqu'à nos jours." until our times.

© Tous droits réservés 1999-2000, Marc Durette, Matane (Québec)
All rights reserved...

From: zoe_lithoi <zoe_lithoi@yahoo.com>
To: <old-school-baptist@yahooogroups.com>
Subject: [old-school-baptist] the French Connection
Date: Monday, November 24, 2003 3:21 PM

Greetings Brers,

I have read, with interest, Elder Pound's paper, forwarded to us By Mark Fenison, called 'the French Connection' in which Elder Pound quotes 'Able Morgan' (the younger or older is yet to be determined) who makes reference in a general way, to the idea the English Baptists were 'restarted' somewhere between the 1200's and the 1500's. Please consider a more specific French-English connection (in that it actually has names) from my pastor, covering this time period:

=====

1290-1349 Life of Dr. Thomas Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury, born in Hereford County, near Valley of Olchon, family later moved to Chichester. Believed to have attended services at the old Olchon Church, a Welsh Baptist congregation. In his famous work, *The Cause of God Against Pelagius*, He denies the doctrine of free will and affirms the sovereign grace of God, a position essentially the same as that of the later Midlands Confession of 1655.

1315.1322 Waller Reynard (sometimes referred to as Walter Lollard), German anabaptist preacher of great renown among the Waldenses, lives in England. It is known that Reynard knew of the existence of the Welsh Baptists in the Olchon valley before arriving in Wales, and it is known that he traveled and lived in Wales, although it cannot be proved that he actually visited Olchon Church. Upon returning to Europe, he was captured and burned at the stake in Cologne in 1322. His visit and acceptance by the Welsh Baptists strengthens the view that the European Anabaptists and the Welsh Baptists shared a common origin.

1330-1384 Life of John Wycliffe. First man to translate the Bible into English. In 1371, lives near Olchon -possible that Wycliffe receives much light from the writings of Bradwardine and conversation with Walter Brute, pastor of Olchon Church; Wycliffe begins to sow the seeds of reformation about this time. After his death, his followers become known as Lollards.

1357 Oldest legible tombstone inscriptions in the graveyard of Hillcliffe Baptist Church in Warrington, near Liverpool in Lancashire County. Hillcliffe Church has been continuously in existence from before then until the present.

1377-1399 Reign of King Richard II. Richard sends a letter to the nobility and gentry, charging all to persecute Waller Brute, pastor of Olchon Church, on charges of heresy and conducting unauthorized religious meetings.

1378-1417 Life of Sir John Oldcastle, "The Good Lord Cobham," English Lollard leader. He had a country home named Olchon Court, and anabaptists sometimes met there and Oldcastle would preach. After the death of his childhood friend, King Henry IV, he was vigorously persecuted by Archbishop Arundel of Canterbury for his "Lollardism." He was tried and convicted of heresy and imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1413. He escaped and fled to Wales, where he evaded capture for four years. In 1417, he was arrested at Olchon Court, taken to London, and condemned to death. He was hung by chains over an open fire and slowly roasted to death, continuing as long as he had life to praise God and commend his soul to His Divine keeping.

1494-1536 Life of William Tyndale. Famous translator of the Bible into English, The King James translators retained over 80% of Tyndale's phraseology. Lives his early years not far from the valley of Olchon. A nonconformist, Tyndale espoused many of the beliefs shared by the Welsh Baptists, and some historians believe he was much influenced

by them, noting that the Tyndale family name was associated with the Baptists around Olchon.

1593 John Perry, executed. A contemporary of Perry's, an A. Wood, charged Perry with being "a notorious Anabaptist." Another contemporary, a Mr. Stype, charged him with practicing anabaptism. He lived near the valley of Olchon, and was executed for dissenting activities.

1612 Edward Wightman. the pastor of Burton Church (one of the 7 churches writing the Midland Confession in 1655) is burned at the stake in Lichfield, for the heresy of being an anabaptist.

1633 Howell Vaughn noted as pastor of Olchon Church.

1645-1699 Thomas Perry and John Reese Howell are pastors of Olchon Church. During the reign of Charles II (1649-85), Olchon Church was persecuted relentlessly, frequently being forced to hide in the woods and the clefts of the Black Mountain, and to meet secretly.

a zoe lithoi,
TOby

From: Paul A. Little <lpaul@surewest.net>
To: <pat4809@primus.ca>
Subject: "Durrett Family Genealogy Forum"
Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2003 9:10 PM

Dear Brother Pound,

Out on the internet... I found an interesting note from a discussion page... but it is in French. Although I don't speak French... I CAN guess my way through some very interesting words about the family being Huguenot, immigrating to England. And Christopher Duret a Baptist in London.

?? It almost makes me wonder if we should look in France and not England. ?? Do you speak French??

saved by GOD's grace alone,
Paul A. Little

http://iquebec.ifrance.com/duretttem1/3_2.html

Durrett originaire de Virginie

Source: le site GenForum "Durrett Family Genealogy Forum"
réponse #137 du 13 décembre 1999. Le message a été laissé par Sue qui répondait à Tibbie Robertson/Austin Adams. Traduction et note de Marc Durette.

"Selon le "Woods-Mcfée memorial", la famille Durrett descend de Louis Duret, il était le médecin d'Henry III. Après le massacre de St-Batholomew (St-Barthélemy, 1572), les Duret de religion Huguenot émigra en Angleterre. Graduellement la prononciation anglaise modifia l'épellation pour s'écrire Durrett.

En 1644, Christopher Duret était un personnage éminent de la religion Baptiste de Londres. Phillip Duret ou Durette était l'un des souscripteurs et trésoriers de la "Virginia company". Il est inscrit dans le "Brown's Genesis of the United-States", et dans le "Hennings's statutes of Virginia (1-84)".

Richard et Bartholomew Durrett sont venus d'Angleterre et s'établirent dans le comté de Spotsylvania, Virginie. John, Richard et Bartholomew Durrett ont été recensés avant 1737 dans le comté Spotsylvania, Virginie.

Les registres du comté de Hanover, Virginie ont été détruits durant la guerre civile. Les registres sur Batholomew n'ont pas été retrouvés; mais les notes "JEOT" sur la famille ont été passées d'une génération à une autre jusqu'à nos jours."

Haut de page Retour page d'accueil

© Tous droits réservés 1999-2000, Marc Durette, Matane (Québec)

From: M. Maynard <receptus@sprynet.com>
To: <old-school-baptist@yahogroups.com>
Subject: [old-school-baptist] rough transl. of French note
Date: Wednesday, November 26, 2003 11:04 PM

Here is a rough translation of the French message.

-Bro. Maynard

réponse #137 du 13 décembre 1999. Le message a été laissé par Sue qui Response 137 of Dec. 13, '99. The message has been left by Sue who répondait à Tibbie Robertson/Austin Adams. replied to Tibbie Robertson/ Austin Adam.

Traduction et note de Marc Durette. Translation and note from Mark Durette

"Selon le "Woods-Mcfée memorial", la famille Durrett descend de Louis Duret, According to the "Woods-Mcfée Memorial" the family Durette descends from Louis Duret,

il était le médecin d'Henry III. Après le massacre de St-Batholomew he was the physician of Henry III. After the St. Bartholomew Massacre (St-Barthélemy, 1572), les Duret de religion Huguenot émigra enAngleterre. (St. Bartholomew, 1572) the Durets of the Huguenot religion emigrated to England.

Graduellement la prononciation anglaise modifia l'épellation pour s'écrire Gradually the English pronunciation changed the spelling by writing it Durrett.

Durrett. En 1644, Christopher Duret était un personnage éminent de la religion In 1644, Christopher Duret was an eminent person of the Baptist denomination in London. Baptiste de Londre. Phillip Duret ou Durette était l'un des souscripteurs et Phillip Duret or Durette was one of the subscribers and treasurers of the Virginia company. trésoriers de la "Viginia company". Il est inscrit dans le "Brown's Genesis of the United-States", He is listed in the "Brown's Genesis of the U.S." et dans le "Hennings's statutes of Virginia (1-84)". and in "Henning's statutes of Virginia (1-84).

Richard et Bartholomew Durrett sont venu d'Angleterre et s'établire dansle Richard and Bartholomew Durrett have come from England and settled in the comté de Spotsylvania, Virginie. John, Richard et Bartholomew Durrett ont county of Spotsylvania, Va. John, Richard and Bartholomew Durrett été recensé avant 1737 dans le comté Spotsylvania, Virginie. have been registerd before 1737 in the county Spotsylvania, Va. Les registres du comté de Hanover, Virginie ont été détruits durant la The census records of the county of Hanover, Va. have been destroyed during the guerre civil. Les registres sur Batholomew n'ont pas été retrouvés; mais les civil war. The census records of Bartholomew have not been rediscovered, butthe notes "JEOT" sur la famille ont été passées d'une génération à une autre notes "JEOT" on the family have been passed on from one generation to another. jusqu'à nos jours." until our times.

Haut de page Retour page d'accueil top of page to return to home page

© Tous droits réservés 1999-2000, Marc Durette, Matane (Québec) All rights reserved...

From: Paul A. Little <lpaul@surewest.net>

To: <Pat4809@primus.ca>

Subject: The Church in the Desert, or Huguenot Heroes and Martyrs

Date: Friday, May 14, 2004 10:40 PM

<http://www.baptistpillar.com/bd0530.htm>

The Church in the Desert, or Huguenot Heroes and Martyrs

By W. H. Withrow, M.A., 1812

Editor's Note: Some believe the Huguenots were Anabaptist, whether they were or not, they suffered like Anabaptists.

In the south-eastern part of France is a stern mountain region of volcanic origin. Its high bleak uplands are clothed with stunted junipers or scanty fields of rye, and in winter the snow lies long and deep. In sheltered valleys the olive, chestnut, and mulberry flourish, but on the sterile heights only a few flocks of mountain sheep crop the meager herbage. This is the "Desert" of the Cévennes, inhospitable and forbidding in aspect, but made memorable forever by one of the noblest struggles for religious liberty the world has ever seen. The sublime faith and patience and undaunted daring of the persecuted Church in the Desert are a legacy to every age, and the thrilling story of its heroes and martyrs still stirs the deepest pulses of our hearts.

By the Edict of Nantes the gallant Henri Quatre, in 1599, gave the Huguenots full toleration after nearly a century of persecution. In ten years he fell beneath the dagger of the fanatical monk, Ravaiillac, and the Huguenots lost their powerful protector. Renewed oppressions led to revolt, which Cardinal Richelieu crushed with a ruthless hand. In the heroic defence of Rochelle against his troops, the Huguenot population was reduced in fifteen months from 27,000 to 5,000 persons. Cardinal Mazarin, the political minister for twenty years of Louis XIV., anxious to retain the alliance of Cromwell, the champion of Protestant liberties throughout the world, tolerated the Huguenots.

On the death of Mazarin, the dissolute monarch, like another Herod, "stretched forth his hands to vex the Church." Instigated by the Jesuits and by his bigot mistress, De Maintenon, herself an apostate Protestant, he sought to atone for the crimes of his youth by persecuting the saints of God. The Huguenots were excluded from public life, from the universities, from the liberal professions, from the more honorable arts and industries, and they were compelled to wear a distinctive dress. Many emigrated to England, Germany, and Holland, till emigration was prohibited. Edict followed edict with increasing severity, with penalties graded from a fine to imprisonment, to the galleys, and to death. Then followed the infamous "dragonades." A brutal soldiery were quartered on the "heretics," and, records a historian of the period, they inflicted "devastation, pillage, torture—there was nothing at which they recoiled. Indeed, they gave such loose rein to their passions that their frightful excesses would have shamed a horde of brigands." (Benoit, in his " Histoire del' Edit de Nantes," has filled five quarto volumes with accounts of these outrages.)

To complete the extirpation of his noblest subjects, Louis XIV., on the 17th of October, 1685, by his own despotic will, annulled forever all the solemn pledges of his royal ancestor, Henry IV., to which he himself had also sworn, and signed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—an event of tragical significance in history. The Huguenots were absolutely forbidden the exercise of their religion—that dearest right of man—their churches were ordered to be levelled to the ground, and their ministers to quit the realm in fifteen days. The Huguenot flocks were forbidden to follow them under penalty of the galleys, and their children were required to be baptized forthwith by Catholic priests, and

trained up in the Romish faith. The Jesuits were in ecstasy. "Heresy is no more," exclaimed Bossuet: "God alone could have worked this marvel." "Nuuc dimittis," chanted the Chancellor Le Tellier, in blasphemous triumph, as he affixed the seal of the realm to the infamous document. The dragoons found congenial employment in torture and pillage. The mob were delighted with the task of sacking and destroying the Protestant churches. "I have this morning condemned seventy-six of these wretches," records the Lieutenant of Languedoc. "It is not at all dull," writes the vivacious Madame Sévegué, "hanging is quite a refreshment to me. They have just taken twenty-six or thirty of these men, and are going to throw them off."

Everybody seemed pleased—except the Huguenots. Multitudes of these, in spite of cordons of soldiers stationed along the frontier to dragoon them back to the galleys or to prison, forsaking home and country and substance, escaped into exile; England, Switzerland, Holland, Prussia, Denmark, Sweden, giving them welcome and succour. Thus it is estimated France lost half a million of her best artizans and most pious subjects. Thousands of emigrants perished of hunger, cold, fatigue, or were slain or wounded in attempting their escape. Thousands were captured and thrust into noisome dungeons, and driven in gangs fettered with murderers and the vilest of felons across the kingdom, that the spectacle might strike with terror their coreligionists. Some of the pastors went into exile, among them most of these faithful shepherds of a persecuted flock refused to abandon their charge, and continued by stealth to minister to their scattered congregations, with a price upon their heads and exposed to the penalty of death.

No Protestant might engage in any trade or profession. Even Protestant washerwomen were excluded from the public washing-places on the river. All Protestant books that could be found were burned. And dead Protestants, denied Christian burial, were dragged through the streets and thrown into a ditch or on a dunghill. (Such was the fate of M. Chenevix, Councillor of Metz, an old man of eighty, an ancestor of the archbishop of Dublin.)

Brutal soldiers were despatched to the infected provinces to convert obstinate heretics by torture and outrage. They set about their congenial work with malignant ingenuity. The feet of their victims were placed in boiling oil. They were made to sit beneath water dropping on their heads, till many died of madness. They were tortured with burning coals, the boot, the rack, the thumbscrew, or were broken on the wheel. (Pastor Homel, after his bones were broken with an iron bar, lingered forty hours upon the wheel. "Farewell, beloved spouse," he said to his weeping wife, "though you see my bones broken to shivers, yet is my soul filled with inexpressible joy.") And other modes of conversion were employed, too horrible to record, those who would not be converted the prisons were kept full. Without fire, without light, without straw, and almost without food, they languished in horrible dungeons, and as rapidly as they died their places were filled by others.

Those who under such stern persuasion professed conversion, were driven in gangs to the churches, penned up like lepers, treated scarce less harshly than the obstinate heretics.

Many of them escaped from France, and in exile abjured with bitter tears their apostasy. Some of the pastors who had escaped, of remorse at what they thought their cowardice, returned to share the perils and to cheer the hearts of their persecuted brethren, who still worshipped God in dens and caves of earth. One of these, Claude Brousson, said to his weeping wife, "I must go and strengthen my brethren, groaning under their oppressions. If God lets His soldiers die, they will preach louder from their graves than during their lives." With nine companions, he returned from the security of fair Lausanne, to the perils of the bleak mountains of the Cévennes. Though pursued like a wild beast, he stole by night to the Desert assemblies. With a price upon his head, he hid in hollow trees and rocky caves. He carried a small board on which, placed on his knees, he wrote his sermons. Seventeen of these he sent to His Most Christian Majesty Louis XIV., as a proof that he preached only the pure Word of God. These sermons were afterwards published in Amsterdam, and breathe only words of charity and love.

After four years' ministry in the Desert, during which seldom slept beneath a roof, Brousson returned, a physical wreck to Lausanne. When restored to health he was appointed pastor, with a liberal stipend, at the Hague. But the cry of his brethren entered his soul, and leaving ease and comfort, wife and friends disguised as a wool-comber, with a pack upon his shoulders, he again crossed the frontier. The persecution was very bitter, and Brousson, to escape capture, had to take refuge in a well. A soldier descended to explore its depths, but in the darkness failed to find him. At last he was taken, but might have escaped had he not promised not to attempt it. He was condemned to be broken on the wheel. His last act was a benediction on the multitude who came to see him die.

An army of 40,000 men was sent into the Cévennes to convert these obstinate heretics. For fifteen years these unarmed peasants had endured with heroic patience their cruel persecution. They now burst out into open revolt. Pierre Seguier, stung by that "oppression which maketh a wise man mad," declared that he had a call from God to deliver the people. The peasants rallied at his summons, and with pikes and scythes attacked a chateau filled with arms. Seguier was soon captured and burned to death. But another hero, Laporte, took his place, and led the peasants against their foe. Chanting Marot's version of the sixty-eighth psalm, "Let God arise, let His enemies be scattered"—the "Marseillaise" of the Camisards (Que Dieu se montre seulement

Et l'on verra dans un moment
Abandonner la place ;
Le camp des ennemis epars,
Epouvante de toutes parts,
Fuira devant sa face.

While chanting this sacred war-song, each man became a lion. It was the pas de charge in many a hard-fought fight. The name Camisards, given them by their enemies, was probably derived from the common blouse or camisole they wore—their only uniform. They called themselves no other name than "The Children of God"—Enfants de Dieu.)—they charged against the veteran warriors of France. Laporte was surprised at a field-

meeting and slain. His nephew Roland, a neatherd, took up the fallen brand. The peasant warriors gathered. They converted the mountain caves into hospitals, arsenals, and powder-factories, and guarded the narrow passes. Again and again the royal troops were defeated by a few hundred cowherds and wool-carders. More troops, including an Irish brigade, were sent to the Cévennes. Sixty thousand godless ruffians ravaged the country, burned to ashes five hundred villages, and slew all the inhabitants, except a few who escaped. Three hundred Camisards, besieged in a tower, were burned to death, singing the psalms of Marot with their last breath.

Cavalier, a Camisard leader, retaliated, by harrying the Catholic villages. He encountered the Royalists, six to one, and utterly routed them. For three years of bloodshed and rapine the Camisard revolt lasted, when it was crushed by overwhelming force. Cavalier entered the English service and reached the rank of Major-General. The Huguenots were seemingly exterminated. The King had medals struck announcing the "extinction of heresy." But the Desert assemblies still met in wild and lonely gorges. Often surprised by the soldiery, many were slain, and the living sent to the dungeons or the galleys.

Of the latter dreadful punishment we have a vivid account in the autobiography of Jean Marteilhe, a galley slave, which, after lying for a hundred years in an old trunk, was published in Paris in 1868. (*Memoires d'un Protestant Condamne aux Galeres de France pour cause de Religion ecrits, par lui meme.* A book of more tragic and thrilling nterest we have never read.) Attempting to escape to the Netherlands, he was arrested and condemned to the galleys. He was thrown into a dungeon so dark that he could not see to drive away the rats, which stole his bread. Several of his fellow-prisoners were horribly bastinadoed that they died. He was made to march with a chain of prisoners, in the winter of 1712, across the whole breadth of France, from Havre to Marseilles. Over four hundred men were chained together in pairs, with a long thick chain running the entire length of the gang, each prisoner bearing a weight of a hundred and fifty pounds of fetters. Many of these were murderers and the vilest of felons, but the Huguenots were distinguished by red jackets, as deserving of special opprobrium.

At Paris they were confined in the dungeon of La Tournay chained to beams so that they could neither sit, lie, nor stand. At Charenton they were made to strip in an open courtyard during a hard frost, that their clothes might be searched, and all money, knives, or files taken away. They were so benumbed that during the night eighteen of them died. They slept in stables or on dung heaps, in mud, rain, or snow. Often parched with thirst, they stretched their wooden cups for a drop of water to the villagers as they passed. But even the women spurned their appeal with the jeer, "Away! You are going where you will have water enough!"

The punishment of the galleys was almost worse than the chain. The royal galley was 150 feet long and 40 broad. It had 50 benches for rowers, 25 on each side. The oars were 50 feet long, 37 feet outside of the ship and 13 inside. Six men tugged at each oar, all chained to the same bench. They had to row in unison, or they would be heavily struck by the oars before or behind them. Beside the 300 rowers, the galley carried 200 officers and

soldiers. A slave-driver scourged the rowers to their task by a long whip. "To enable his strokes to tell, the men sat naked while they rowed." At night the galley-slave slept where he sat. He never quitted his bench except for the hospital or the grave. Yet some of the Huguenots lingered on in this living death for thirty or forty years.

"During all these years," says Smiles, "they toiled in their chains in a hell of foul and disgusting utterance, for they were mixed up with thieves and the worst of criminals. They ate the bread and drank the waters of bitterness. Their keepers lashed them to make them row harder, lashed them to make them sit up, lashed them to make them lie down." "Go and refresh the backs of those Huguenots with a salad of strokes from the whip," the captain of Martielhe's galley used to say, for he hated them worse than the thieves and murderers. And yet at any moment a word spoken would have made these heroic confessors free. If they would only recant their heresy their chains would fall off, and they would be restored to life, to friends, to liberty. Yet very rarely did one give up his religion. They preferred to remain galley-slaves for life.

For nearly two years the illustrious Scottish Reformer, John Knox, was chained to the oar of the galley "Nostre Dame." The felon's fare, the heavy toil, exposure to the wintry elements, undermined his health, but could not break his intrepid spirit. One day an image of the Virgin was presented him to kiss. He refused, when the officer pressed it to his lips. Snatching the image he threw it into the sea, with the words:—

"Lat our ladie now save herself; sche is lycht enoughe, lat hir leirne to swime."

These galleys swarmed in the harbors of Dunkirk, Brest, Bordeaux, Toulon, and Marseilles. They scoured the Mediterranean to protect French commerce from Moorish pirates. In the British channel they lay in wait for Dutch or English merchant ships, or engaged in actual sea fight. The oarsmen often had to row all night, and loaded cannon commanded the benches so as to shoot them down in case of revolt. During action they were the special objects of attack—just as the boiler or screw of a war sloop is now—in order to disable the ship.

Martielhe records an adventure which well-nigh cost him his life. His galley—La Palme—attacked an English frigate convoying a merchant fleet. The English captain, by a dexterous maneuver, collided with the galley, broke off all its oars on one side, and held it firmly with grappling irons. His cannon, loaded with grape-shot and scrap-iron, were discharged into the writhing mass of galley-slaves, and great carnage ensued. A shower of hand-grenades was also rained down upon them. Martielhe's bench was just opposite a loaded gun, which he could touch with his hand. He saw the gunner approach with lighted match, and lifted up his heart to God. In a moment he was hurled, desperately wounded, the length of his chain, and his five fellow-slaves were mangled to death. He lay unconscious in the darkness—for night had fallen—while the soldiers threw the dead into the sea. Being roughly seized for the same purpose, the pain of his wound caused him to wince, and he was spared for further sufferings. For three days his wounds were undressed and became gangrened. Then the wounded were hauled up by pulleys and

ropes like cattle, and sent to the hospital. "In three months," says Martielhe, "I was as sleek and fat as a monk," although three-fourths of the wounded had died, and he was sent back to the galleys. Unable to row, he was made a sort of steward in the store-room.

The Reformed in Holland and Switzerland tried to mitigate the sufferings of these galley-slaves by gifts of money secretly conveyed to them, and Martielhe records the generous fidelity of a Turkish slave, who for four years became the medium of conveying this money—a service of much danger—and resolutely refused any reward. The war between France and England was terminated by the peace of "Utrecht, and Queen Anne demanded the liberation of the Huguenots in the galleys. After much evasion and shuffling on the part of the Most Christian King, a considerable number, among whom was Martielhe, were released. Landing at Nice, they found their way through the Vaudois valleys and over the Alps to Geneva—which they reached "with a joy which can only be compared with that of the Israelites at the sight of the land of Canaan." The people, many of whom were exiles with friends on the galleys, came forth to meet them with joyous cries of recognition—" Oh, my husband! my son my brother!" Some proceeded to Holland and England—sanctuaries of the oppressed Huguenots—and had the honor of kissing Queen Anne's hand, and of interceding for their brethren still in captivity—an intercession which led at length to their release.

Under such cruel persecutions, continued for long years, Huguenotism seemed to languish. But beneath the ashes the fire burned. When the worn-out voluptuary, Louis XIV., lay upon his death-couch, Antoine Court, a young Huguenot preacher, began to reorganize the long-oppressed Church in the Desert. Clad in various disguises, and traversing by night the lonely mountain passes, he preached with zeal throughout the Cévennes. He held in the old quarry at Nismes, where almost every stone was stained with martyrs' blood, an assembly of the Desert pastors. A "school of the prophets" was formed for training candidates for the pastor's perilous office. The synods met in mountain caves. The students followed their teachers in their midnight wanderings, and studied, preached, and prayed with the sentence of the galleys or the scaffold hanging over their heads. For listening to their sermons a number of Huguenots were transported to the colony of New Orleans, on the Mississippi. Boys of twelve were sent to the galleys for life for attending "the preaching."

Meanwhile "the chase," as it was called, continued. The hanging of the pastors was never suffered to flag." "What an honor for me, O my God!" exclaimed Pierre Dorteat upon the scaffold, "to suffer for the truth." Often the dead bodies of the martyrs were dragged through the streets. On the death of Court, Paul Rabout became his successor. "For more than thirty years," says his biographer, "caverns and huts, whence he was unearthed like a wild beast, were his only habitation." For a long time he hid beneath a pile of stones and thorn bushes. "Yet this hut of piled stones," says Smiles, "was the centre of Protestantism in France."

And all the weary while Louis Le Dien Aimé was rioting amid the orgies of the Petit Trianon and the Parc aux Cerfs. While millions were lavished in wantonness and vice, the

people starved. When they clamored for bread, the King bade them "eat grass." But a terrible retribution was pending. The red spectre of the Revolution, which was soon to overturn both throne and altar in the dust, avenged the persecution of the saints. Strangely enough, the arch-skeptic of Europe was the instrument, more than any other, to procure the toleration of Huguenots. The last executions of the Reformed took place in 1762. Jean Galas, an old man smitten with paralysis, was broken on the wheel at Toulouse, on pretence of the murder of his son, but really on account of his religion. Voltaire was no friend to the Huguenots, but he hated injustice. He took up case of Galas, and made all Europe ring with his denunciations of this judicial murder. So intense was public indignation that the court which condemned Galas to death pronounced him innocent, and awarded 36,000 francs to his widow. Twenty years later Voltaire was received with enthusiasm in Paris. "Who is that man whom the crowd follow?" asked a passer-by. "Ne savez vous pas," was the answer, "que c'est le sauveur Galas!" No more Protestants were hanged in France for their religion.

The cynical skeptic had somewhere a spark of good in his soul. He interceded for the release of the Huguenots from the galleys. Among those released were old men who had been chained to the oar for twenty-five, twenty-eight, and thirty years! The doors of the prison, too, were thrown open. One of the most dreadful of these was the Tour de Constance, amid the malarious marshes of Aiguesmortes. This was a dismal dungeon with walls eighteen feet thick, in which Huguenot women of rank were confined. Sixteen prisoners immured here in 1688, died in five months. Over the gates were written the words which Dante says are written on the gates of hell:—

"Lasciate ogni speranza vol che 'ntrate."

When the doors were opened fourteen women were found, the youngest of whom was over fifty and had been buried in this living grave for two and forty years.

In 1789, Rabaut Saint-Etienne, son of Rabaut, the persecuted Pastor of the Desert, as a member of the Constituent Assembly of France, demanded for the Huguenots, not toleration, but liberty. "Toleration!" he exclaimed, "I demand that toleration be prescribed in its turn, and deemed an iniquitous word, dealing with us Protestants as criminals to whom pardon is to be granted." His bold demand was granted, and thenceforth all restraints were removed from French Protestantism. (The names of Guizot, Michelet, and Waddington, distinguished Protestant statesmen, illustrate this fact.) But Rabaut refused to vote for the death of Louis XIV., and, the Revolution devouring its own children, he was condemned to the guillotine.

To this day the Protestants of the Cévennes often hold memorial services in the glens and quarries where their ancestors were wont to worship God. Nowhere in France is the Reformed religion a more potent force. The Methodists, Moravians, and even the Quakers, have numerous congregations in that Desert, made, by the blood of the saints, to bloom like the garden of the Lord.

The persecution of the Huguenots brought upon France a heavy retribution. She lost by their exile 500,000 of her best subjects and skilled handicraftsmen. She lost, too, 60,000,000 francs in specie, and her most flourishing manufactures; while 400,000 lives paid the forfeit of the long dark reign of terror. "Trade," says St. Simon, "was ruined." "Whole villages," says Sismondi, "were deserted, hundreds of factories were closed, and vast districts became depopulated." "The Huguenots," says Lamartine, "repaid the generous hospitality of those peoples with whom they found a home, by contributing the riches of their cunning labor, by the example of their faith, by the integrity of their lives." "If they are bad Catholics they are good traders," said the Intendant of France; "the most skilled workmen and richest merchants belong to the Reformed." Switzerland, Holland, England, Germany—even the new colonies in America—were enriched by their labours, and many of the most illustrious names in science, art, and literature, are those of Huguenots. (The venerable mother of the late General Garfield was of Huguenot descent, and doubtless transmitted much of the high and heroic character of her ancestry to her illustrious son.) Their expulsion was to France almost a national suicide. Their strength and steadfastness of character would doubtless have largely counterpoised the fickleness and frequent political revolutions of her checkered career. Their sublime endurance, their lofty faith, their heroic courage, are forever the heritage, not of France, but of all mankind.