

THE  
Facts in the Case.

---

*DR. WHITSITT'S DEFENSE  
EXAMINED.*

---

BY J. H. EATON.

## OUTLINE AND INDEX.

---

### I.

	PAGE.
Dr. Whitsitt's Unsoundness as a Baptist.....	4
(a) His Position that an Unimmersed Person may be a Baptist.....	4
(b) His Belief that a Wife should Join the Church of Her Husband, Because the Family Comes Before the Church .....	9

---

### II.

Dr. Whitsitt's Unfairness as a Historian, and His Hostility Towards the Baptists .....	12
(a) Suppression of Evidence .....	13
1. Supression of Edwards' Testimony .....	13
2. Suppression of Featley's Testimony .....	15
(b) Garbling of Testimony .....	17
1. Garbling and Fabrication of the "Jessey Church Records," and the "So-called Kif- fin Manuscript" .....	17
2. Garbling of A. R.'s Testimony.....	25
3. Garbling of Muller's Testimony.....	26
4. Garbling of Stanford's and Benedict's Testi- mony .....	27
5. Garbling of Hague's Testimony.....	28
Conclusion.....	29

# THE FACTS IN THE CASE.

---

## DR. WHITSITT'S DEFENSE EXAMINED.

---

WHEN I replied, in "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case," to a personal attack upon me which a committee of five of Dr. Whitsitt's supporters in this city had published and widely disseminated, I hoped that it would not be necessary for me to write anything further upon this subject. But a self-appointed committee of twenty met in Nashville and published a statement in which they declared that Dr. Whitsitt had been "greatly misrepresented." They do not mention my name; but since, in the circular of Dr. Whitsitt which was prepared at their request and sent out as a part of their paper, he follows closely "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case," mentioning no charges except those brought in that brief pamphlet, it is evident that I am accused of "greatly misrepresenting" him. I have not "greatly misrepresented" him, nor have I misrepresented him at all, and as I am not willing to rest quietly under the charge of these sponsors of his circular, I am forced, in my own defense, to write again.

I do the more cheerfully answer for myself because many of the twenty members of this committee are honorable and intelligent men, who would not have sent out Dr. Whitsitt's circular under the ægis of their reputations, if they had read it or the pamphlet to which it is an answer. For these gentlemen say that Dr. Whitsitt "has simply expressed his opinion about a matter of history." Now, had they read his circular, or the pamphlet to which it is an answer, they would have known that the issues are

not all historical, and they would not have signed their names to the statement that Dr. Whitsitt "has simply expressed his opinion about a matter of history."

THE GREAT ISSUES INVOLVED IN THIS CASE ARE NOT HISTORICAL. I shall, therefore, discuss none of the historical questions involved; but I shall merely endeavor to substantiate the charges, which were made in my pamphlet, that Dr. Whitsitt is neither a sound Baptist nor a friend to the Baptists; and that he is not, to use a mild term, sufficiently "fair-minded" to occupy the position he now holds.

## I.

### DR. WHITSITT'S UNSOUNDNESS AS A BAPTIST.

#### (a) HIS POSITION THAT AN UNIMMERSED PERSON MAY BE A BAPTIST.

In his editorials in the *Independent*, in his article in Johnson's *Cyclopædia*, and in his article in the *Examiner* of April 23, 1896, that is, for a period of sixteen years, Dr. Whitsitt uniformly called "Baptists" persons who had never been immersed, but had been sprinkled or poured upon for baptism. If an unimmersed person can be a Baptist, then one of two things must be true: either immersion is not essential to baptism, or baptism is not essential to church fellowship. For if immersion be essential to baptism, and baptism be essential to church fellowship, then a man can not have true church fellowship, can not be a member of a Baptist church, without immersion. So that when Dr. Whitsitt declared that a man could be a Baptist though he had not been immersed, he declared either that immersion is not essential to baptism or that baptism is not essential to church fellowship. Let him choose which horn of the dilemma he will, he is unsound as a Baptist.

In his circular, he endeavors to vindicate himself from the charge of unsoundness by impeaching his own intelligence. His

defense is that when he said "Baptists" he did not mean "Baptists;" but that he meant Anabaptists who shortly became Baptists. He says:

"All that I intended was to affirm that these Baptists had been Anabaptists up to the year 1641."

And, in regard to what he alleges to be a similar use of the word in one of the Crosby Collection of Manuscripts, he says:

"These parties were, strictly speaking, Anabaptists, but inasmuch as they shortly became Baptists, they are here spoken of as Baptists."

He endeavors to defend himself, therefore, by contending that his words are not to bear their plain, obvious and necessary meaning; that they are not to be understood in the only sense in which it is possible to take them. In short, he defends his orthodoxy at the expense of his intellect, and sets up to the charge of heresy the defense that he is incapable of giving clear expression to his thoughts. This is certainly a strange defense for a man who occupies the position of President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. But he makes it in vain. His *Independent* editorial of June 24, 1880, is as follows:

"Studies in the History of Baptism have become very popular of late among the Baptists. An excellent work on the subject has been published by Mr. Burrage, of Maine. Dr. Cathcart, of Philadelphia, has likewise given us a volume entitled 'Baptism of the Ages and Nations.' And now comes the Rev. Daniel C. Potter, with an illustrated lecture before the delegates at the recent Baptist Anniversaries in Saratoga, on 'The Verdict of Antiquity in Favor of Immersion as the True Mode of Baptism.' It is singular that these gentlemen all alike ignore the circumstance that the verdict of antiquity among the Baptists is in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the true mode of baptism. It is strange if they are not all aware of the fact, which no respectable authority has yet had the temerity to call in question, that prior to the comparatively recent date of 1641, none of the people who are known as Baptists were immersed. John Smith was baptized by sprinkling; as also were John Spillsbury, William Kiffin, Roger Williams and the First Baptist Church of Providence, and John Clarke and his church in Newport. The English Baptists never dreamed of the possibility of immersing *an adult person* as a religious ceremony before the year 1641, and there is good ground to conclude that the American Baptists never thought of such a thing before the year 1644."

Though this is the shortest of the *Independent* editorials, it is sufficient to absolutely destroy Dr. Whitstitt's defense.

Dr. Whitsitt said :

“It is singular that these gentlemen all alike ignore the circumstance that the verdict of antiquity *among the Baptists* is in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the true mode of baptism.”

Did he mean :

“It is singular that these gentlemen all alike ignore the circumstance that the verdict of antiquity among the *Anabaptists who shortly became Baptists*, is in favor of sprinkling or pouring as the true mode of baptism”?

He said :

“The English Baptists never dreamed of the possibility of immersing *an adult person* as a religious ceremony before the year 1641.”

Did he mean :

“The English Anabaptists who shortly became Baptists, never dreamed of the possibility of immersing *an adult person* as a religious ceremony before the year 1641”?

No. Dr. Whitsitt meant what he said in this editorial. His words are plain and clear, and are susceptible of but one meaning. I defy any man to make out of this editorial anything but an argument in favor of sprinkling, based upon the claim that the Baptists themselves once sprinkled. It is an argument that modern Baptists are ignorant and foolish in that they cling to immersion when the verdict of antiquity among their own people is in favor of sprinkling or pouring. Did a sound Baptist write that editorial? Did a friend of the Baptists write it?

Again, in the *Independent* editorial of September 9, 1880, Dr. Whitsitt said :

“The earliest Baptist Confessions of Faith all contemplate sprinkling or pouring as the act of baptism. . . . It was not until the year 1644, three years after the invention of immersion, that any Baptist Confession prescribes ‘dipping or plunging the body in water as the way and manner of dispensing this ordinance.’”

Did he mean—

“The earliest Anabaptist Confessions of Faith which shortly became Baptist Confessions of Faith all contemplate sprinkling or pouring as the act of baptism. . . . It was not until the year 1644, three years after the invention of immersion, that any Anabaptist Confession which shortly became a Baptist Confession prescribes ‘dipping or plunging the body in water as the way and manner of dispensing this ordinance’?”

Again, in the Cyclopædia article Dr. Whitsitt said :

“*The earliest organized Baptist Church* belongs to the year 1610 or 1611.”

In his circular he says he called this church a Baptist church, because it was an Anabaptist church which turned Baptist in 1641. If he had meant this he would not have called this church a Baptist church until it became such in fact. But, according to Dr. Whitsitt's own book, this was neither the “earliest” Anabaptist church in England, nor was it the first English church that introduced immersion. He says that immersion was first introduced by Blunt into Jessey's church, while he says that this “earliest organized Baptist church” was originally organized in Holland by Thomas Helwys and others. And he nowhere makes any reference to this church of Helwys ever adopting immersion. In fact, this “earliest organized Baptist church” totally disappears from view before 1641; so that there is no record of its ever becoming a Baptist church at all!! Dr. Whitsitt's explanation is one which does not explain.

In this connection there is one point to which I wish to call attention. On page 6 of this circular, Dr. Whitsitt says :

“In the year 1644 the name Baptist was applied to them, and they shortly were glad to disclaim the name Anabaptist. The Baptists who now proclaimed and practiced immersion were the very same organized body who a few years previously, under the name Anabaptist, had practiced and proclaimed sprinkling and pouring for baptism.”

It would be well for Dr. Whitsitt to take some lessons on Baptist church polity. In 1644 there were in and about London forty-six separate and independent churches, but the Baptists are not and never have been one "organized body."

Finally, on April 23, 1896, Dr. Whitsitt published in the New York *Examiner* an article in which he said :

"During the Autumn of 1877, shortly after I had been put in charge of the School of Church History at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, in preparing my lectures on Baptist History, I made the discovery that prior to the year 1641, our Baptist people in England were in the practice of sprinkling and pouring for baptism."

When Dr. Whitsitt said "our Baptist people," did he mean "our Anabaptist people"? If sprinklers are "our people," then sprinkling is "our baptism." Did a sound Baptist write that *Examiner* article?

Dr. Whitsitt also endeavors to justify himself by citing Crosby's example. Now, if Crosby were guilty of the charge Dr. Whitsitt brings against him, this would not prove Dr. Whitsitt innocent of the charges brought against him. But, as a matter of fact, Crosby called "Baptists" those who were convinced that infant baptism was wrong, that believers only should be baptized, that immersion was the only baptism; who believed in succession and were so superlatively anxious to get into the true line that they were willing to go to any trouble, even to the extent of sending to Europe, in order to secure an administrator whose claim of being in the true line was indisputable. Crosby called such people "Baptists." They were not only Baptists in belief, but they were Landmarkers of the strictest type.

Dr. Whitsitt says that there is nothing more objectionable in his statements than in Crosby's. Is there nothing more objectionable in Dr. Whitsitt's statement that the "origin of Baptist immersion" belongs to the year 1641, than in Crosby's calling "Baptists" men who were Baptists in belief and were earnestly hunting for some one in the succession to baptize them?

(b) DR. WHITSITT'S BELIEF THAT A WIFE SHOULD JOIN THE  
CHURCH OF HER HUSBAND, BECAUSE THE FAMILY  
COMES BEFORE THE CHURCH.

In regard to the charge that he had stated that a wife should join the church of her husband because the family comes before the church, Dr. Whitsitt said, in his statement to the Trustees at Wilmington :

“Regarding the charge that I expressed a conviction that a kinswoman of mine ought to follow her husband into a Pedobaptist church, it was never my intention to indicate a belief that the family outranks the Church of God. I believe that obedience to God's commands is above every other human duty, and that people in every relation of life ought to obey God rather than man.”

• This statement of Dr. Whitsitt has been used by his supporters as a general denial of the charge that he has said that a wife should join the church of her husband because the family comes before the church. Now, I have in my possession the following certificate :

“I hereby certify that I have heard Dr. William H. Whitsitt, President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, say that a wife ought to join the church of her husband ; and I also certify that Dr. Whitsitt gave, as a reason for this duty on the part of the wife, that the family comes before the church.

(Signed)

“J. H. BURNETT,

“*Pastor of the Baptist Church, at Auburn, Ky.*

“B. J. DAVIS,

“*Pastor of the Baptist Church, at Bagdad, Ky.*

“WOODFORD M. HALL,

“*Moderator of the Clear Fork Baptist Association.*

“W. H. VAUGHAN,

“*Pastor of the Baptist Church, at Howell, Ky.*”

I have still other signatures to this certificate, which can be published if necessary. In all, I have statements representing six separate and distinct occasions upon which Dr. Whitsitt expressed this belief.

It can not be denied, therefore, that Dr. Whitsitt has stated that he believed that a wife should join the church of her hus-

band because the family comes before the church. AND DR. WHITSITT DOES NOT DENY THAT SUCH IS HIS BELIEF. In his statement he refers merely to the *single instance* of his "kinswoman;" while, as I have stated, I have statements representing six different occasions upon which he has expressed this belief. But he does not even deny that he expressed the conviction that this kinswoman "ought to follow her husband into a Pedobaptist church," for he merely says :

"It was never my intention to indicate a belief that the family outranks the Church of God."

And he makes no denial that he believes a Baptist wife should join the church of her Pedobaptist husband. Hence, when he used the words "Church of God" he meant to include all Christian denominations, the Pedobaptists as well as the Baptists, and to indicate that the Baptist denomination is but a branch of "the Church of God." For,—

*First.* Since he has said that a wife should join the church of her husband because the family comes before the church, and since he has likewise said that he does not believe the family outranks the "Church of God," he necessarily takes the position that "the Church of God" is made up of the various Christian denominations, each denomination forming a branch of the general "Church of God."

*Second.* When Dr. Whitsitt advises a Baptist in belief, who has nevertheless not actually joined a Baptist church and been immersed, to follow her husband into a Pedobaptist church, either he regards that church as a scriptural church, and sprinkling as a mode of baptism, or he deliberately and intentionally advises a converted woman to go through life without joining a scriptural church, without being truly baptized, and without partaking of the Lord's Supper. It is inconceivable that he should deliberately advise a converted woman—a Baptist in belief—to go through life without joining what *he* regards as a scriptural church, and with-

out receiving what *he* regards as scriptural baptism. It is thus again apparent that he regards Pedobaptist churches as scriptural churches, and that he intended to include them when he said "the Church of God."

*Third.* There are a multitude of "Baptist churches," but there is no such thing as "the Baptist church." There are many "Churches of God," but there is no organization which can be called "the Church of God." The phrase "the Church of God" can have but one meaning. It is used to refer to all Christians in general, to all regenerated persons. So that when Dr. Whitsitt speaks of "the Church of God," he can not refer to the Baptist denomination, but must include other denominations as well, regarding the Baptist denomination as but a single branch of "the Church of God."

In a word, Dr. Whitsitt's belief is that a Baptist wife should join the church of her Pedobaptist husband, but that she should not follow him into heathenism. He believes that the family outranks the Baptist denomination, or the Methodist, or the Presbyterian, but that it does not outrank the universal "Church of God," of which these, according to him, are but branches. He advises a Baptist wife to join the church of her Methodist husband, but he does not advise a Baptist wife to join the church of her Buddhist husband. While he would advise a Baptist to become a Methodist, he would not advise a Christian to become a heathen.

In his statement to the Trustees, therefore, Dr. Whitsitt took occasion to reiterate his belief in his branch church theory. And it is important to notice that his position that immersion is not prerequisite to church fellowship, is but a corollary to his branch church theory. For a church can not exist without church members: church members can not exist without church fellowship, for if they have not fellowship they are not members: church fellowship can not exist without those things which are prerequisite or essential to it. But, according to his branch church theory,

Dr. Whitsitt believes that a church may be a scriptural church, that is, that a church may exist, though its members neither believe in nor practice immersion; and that, therefore, immersion is not prerequisite to church fellowship.

Yet the fifteenth article of the Seminary Abstract of Principles is as follows :

“Baptism is an ordinance of the Lord Jesus, obligatory upon every believer, **wherein he is immersed in water** in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as a sign of his fellowship with the death and resurrection of Christ, of remission of sins, and of his giving himself up to God, to live and walk in newness of life. **It is prerequisite to church fellowship, and to participation in the Lord’s Supper.**”

It is impossible for any man, whose reason is not disordered, to hold the positions which Dr. Whitsitt has taken, and also to believe this article.

But this is not all. In that statement to the Board of Trustees, Dr. Whitsitt was ostensibly answering the charge that he believed that a Baptist wife should follow her Pedobaptist husband. What then shall be said about his hiding behind this veil and color of words, which make a show of denying when in reality they deny nothing? What shall be said about his attempt to create the impression that he denied the charge, when he was actually reaffirming his belief? Does such conduct show an ingenuous spirit? Do fair-minded men act in this manner? Has Dr. Whitsitt “simply expressed his opinion about a matter of history”?

## II.

### DR. WHITSITT’S UNFAIRNESS AS A HISTORIAN AND HIS HOSTILITY TOWARDS THE BAPTISTS.

In “The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case,” numerous contradictions in Dr. Whitsitt’s book were pointed out as proofs of his incompetence. Neither he nor his sponsors have anything to say

in defense of these contradictions. Unless a competent historian repeatedly contradicts himself, the charge of incompetence may, therefore, be taken as confessed.

It is for historians to show that Dr. Whitsitt is mistaken in his historical statements. My present aim is to show that I have not misrepresented him; and that even if he were entirely correct in his claim that immersion was invented in the year 1641, he has nevertheless so suppressed and garbled testimony as to prove him, to speak mildly, not the fair-minded historian and lover of the Baptists, whom we ought to have at the head of the Seminary. Any man of ordinary intelligence, though he have little or no education, can judge whether Dr. Whitsitt has made a fair use of documents.

(a) SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE.

In order to afford more space for the consideration of Dr. Whitsitt's garbling, I will here give but a few examples of suppression, all of which occur in authors referred to in "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case," and in authors which Dr. Whitsitt expressly admits that he has read.

1. Suppression of Edwards' Testimony.

The charge of suppression of Edwards' testimony, which I made in "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case," was a mistake, and I am always glad to rectify mistakes as soon as possible. I quoted accurately from Ivimey a sentence from Edwards' *Gangraena*, in which was the date 1640. Dr. Whitsitt has read the *Gangraena*, and learned that date was wrong. It was Ivimey's addition and not in Edwards. The date ought to have been 1645, or possibly 1644. Dr. Whitsitt has cleared himself from *that* instance of suppression.

I had supposed Ivimey was trustworthy, though the fact that Dr. Whitsitt endorses him should have aroused my suspicion. So soon as Ivimey's quotation was questioned, I lost no

time in getting a copy of the *Gangraena*, printed in 1646, to learn the truth. Henceforth I shall never take another quotation from Ivimey without verifying it in the original. Dr. Whitsitt would stand higher to-day if he had pursued this course in regard to the quotations of Dr. Dexter.

But while Dr. Whitsitt was making a statement to his brethren of what he found in the *Gangraena* which contradicted something favorable to the Baptists, why did he not give the things which favor them?

On page 138, of the Third Part, Edwards expresses great indignation because some one called the Anabaptists the "harmless" Anabaptists,—

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

And he goes on to tell the harm they have done, and among other things says :

"Who kill tender young persons and ancient with **dipping them all over in Rivers**, in the depth of Winter."

Dr. Whitsitt suppresses this testimony in his book. And then, as a competent historian dealing fairly with the Baptists, ought he not, in his circular, to have mentioned these statements of Edwards, which favor the Baptists, when he was correcting Ivimey?

In my former pamphlet it was pointed out how Dr. Whitsitt had found it necessary to suppress and garble evidence in order to prove his statement that—

"The annals of English literature will be searched in vain for a volume that precedes it [*i. e.* Barbers, printed in 1641] in date, and yet maintains that nothing else is true baptism but immersion."—  
(A Question in Baptist History, p. 115.)

Now, Leonard Busher, in his *Religious Peace*, printed in 1614, insists on believers' baptism by dipping. For this book to have been printed in England, however, would upset Dr. Whitsitt's

theory about Barber's book. Accordingly, on page 69, of "A Question in Baptist History," Dr. Whitsitt claims that it is impossible to tell whether or not Busher's book was printed in England or Holland.

Now, Dr. Whitsitt read in Edwards' *Gangraena* of Edwards' wrath against Master Bachiler, who was the Licenser of Books. Edwards complained that Bachiler "licensed unlicensed books printed before he was born." On page 103 of the Third Part of the *Gangraena*, Edwards mentions, as among the number of such books :

"A Pamphlet entituled *Religious Peace*, made by one *Leonard Busher*, and printed in 1614, wherein there is a pleading for a Toleration of Papists, Jewes, every person or persons differing in Religion."

Edwards devotes a page to Busher's book, making a quotation found on page 19 of the old (1614) edition, and on page 23 of the new (1646).

This statement of Edwards proves conclusively that the annals of English literature will not be searched in vain for a volume that precedes Barber's in date, and yet maintains that nothing else is true baptism but immersion.

Not only did Dr. Whitsitt, in "A Question in Baptist History," suppress the testimony of Edwards, which I have here given, but when, in his circular, he was correcting a mistake in regard to Edwards favorable to the Baptists, he again suppresses this favorable testimony. Would a competent and fair-minded historian have done this?

## 2. Suppression of Featley's Testimony.

In "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case," I exposed the manner in which Dr. Whitsitt garbled Featley's testimony in order to prove that Featley's Dippers Dipt—

"Stands among the books of the period that are most distinct in asserting that immersion was a splinter new practice in England in the year 1644, when it first came from the press." (*A Question in Baptist History*, p. 70.)

There is no need to again go over this ground, and I will here only give a few of the statements it was necessary for Dr. Whitsitt to suppress in order to establish his claim. It will be noticed that Dr. Whitsitt alleges that Featley asserts that immersion—not merely the immersion of believers, but immersion generally—“was a splinter new practice in England in the year 1644.”

Now, as stated in “The Real Issues,” Featley was an Episcopalian, and believed in sprinkling for baptism, but was willing to accept immersion also. He merely believed that immersion was not essential to baptism. On page 36, Featley says that—

“Though Dipping may be used in Baptisme; and if the childe be strong, and the weather and climate temperate, it is very fit to be used, **and the Church of England both alloweth it, and practiseth it;** yet it is no way necessary, or essential to Baptism.”

Featley believed in infant baptism, and that sprinkling was a valid mode of baptism; but does he assert that *immersion* was “splinter new” in 1644? I would suggest that Dr. Whitsitt and his sponsors get together and make some more explanations.

Again, a writer by the name of Alstidius divided the Anabaptists into fourteen different sorts. Featley replied that there were only three, that the first appeared in the year 250, the second in the year 380, and the third in the year 1525. Featley asserted that Stock was the father of the last, and he threw Stock and the date 1525 at the Baptists of his day as persistently as Dr. Whitsitt and the Pedobaptists throw Barber and the date 1641 at us. Featley not only insisted that the two old sects of Anabaptists sprinkled and poured as well as dipped, but that “they all allowed and practiced the Baptism of Infants” (page 31). But he says the new sort, the “third and worst” sort, **began in 1525 with Stock**, and the first two errors which he mentions as peculiar to their sect are:

“**First, that none are rightly baptized, but those who are dipt.**

“**Secondly, that no children ought to be baptized.**”—  
(Featley's Dippers Dipt, p. 36.)

Is it true that Featley asserts that immersion was a "splinter new" practice in 1644? Does he even assert that the immersion of believers was new in 1644? Are not some more explanations needed from Dr. Whitsitt and the twenty gentlemen who stood godfathers to his circular?

(b) GARBLING OF TESTIMONY.

Under this head I shall discuss instances of the misuse of testimony which surpass in flagrancy any of the examples set forth in "The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case." When the evidence to support Dr. Whitsitt's theories does not exist, he boldly manufactures it. He has not only garbled and suppressed evidence, but he has actually fabricated it.

1. Garbling and Fabrication of the "Jessey Church Records" and the "So-called Kiffin Manuscript."

In the discussion of the manner in which Dr. Whitsitt has constructed what he calls the "Jessey Church Records" and the "So-called Kiffin Manuscript," I shall allow the facts to speak for themselves, with no further comments of my own than are necessary to elucidate the subject.

On page 80 of "A Question in Baptist History," Dr. Whitsitt says:

"I recently undertook some researches in this field which were rewarded by finding a still earlier manuscript on the same subject. It was rescued by Rev. George Gould from amongst the manuscripts of Mr. H. Jessey, . . . . Mr. Gould prints only 'certain entries' found in them (Introduction, p. cxxii), and these do not quite cover all the ground occupied by the so-called Kiffin manuscript. To facilitate comparison both documents will be found printed in parallel columns below, the one under the title of Jessey Church Records and the other as the so-called Kiffin manuscript."

Again, on page 87, he says:

"The general result of our investigation is that these two documents complement and mutually support each other."

Here are the documents, printed in parallel columns as in Dr. Whitsitt's book :

## JESSEY CHURCH RECORDS.

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

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

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

Others Joyned to them.

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

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

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

## SO-CALLED KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT.

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

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

*In the year 1638, Mr. William Kiffin, Mr. Thomas Wilson, and others being of the same judgment, were, upon their request, dismissed to the said Mr. Spilsbury's congregation.*

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

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

(3)

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

(2)

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

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

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

***For in the year 1640, this church became two by consent; just half, says the manuscript, being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Henry Jessey.***

(4)

Crosby, vol. 3, p. 41.

Several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregations of the dissenters about London were convinced that believers were the only proper subjects of baptism, and that it ought to be administered by immersion or dipping the whole body into the water, in resemblance of a burial and resurrection according to Colos. II., 12, and Rom. VI., 4. That they often met together to pray and confer about this matter, and to consult what methods they should take to enjoy this ordinance in its primitive purity: That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England, to begin this practice; because tho' some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not as they knew of revived the ancient custom of immersion: But hearing that some in the Netherlands practiced it, they agreed to send over one Mr. Richard Blunt, who understood the Dutch language: That he went accordingly, carrying letters of recommendation with him and was kindly received both by the church there and Mr. John Batten, their teacher.

(5)

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

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

I have printed the documents in different styles of type to indicate the various sources from which Dr. Whitsitt secured the material out of which he manufactured this evidence. The parts printed in different styles of type were derived from different documents; the parts printed in the same style of type were derived from the same document. And for convenience of reference, I have also indicated the various parts by numbered brackets.

*First.* The so-called "Jessey Church Records." When Dr. Whitsitt wrote his book, all that he knew about these "Jessey Records" he got from Gould's "Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich." He expressly refers to Gould for all of his information concerning them. On page 81, he says :

"These singularly valuable records, which must be still in existence since Gould had them in his possession in 1860 (Open Communion, Introduction, p. cxxiii), ought by all means to be published in *fac simile*, and whoever accomplishes that task will render an important service to Baptist history."

George Gould says that the paragraphs dated 1633 and 1638, which are printed in heavy type, and are included in bracket (1), were from H. Jessey's manuscripts. If these paragraphs were indeed a manuscript of Henry Jessey, the great scholar and godly man, they are unimpeachable. But the paragraphs dated 1640 and 1641, printed in plain type, and included in bracket (2), were not found among Mr. Jessey's manuscripts, and Gould does not say that they were. On the contrary, Gould says that these paragraphs were from a manuscript "said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin." Gould introduces these paragraphs with the following words :

"Crosby appeals for confirmation of Hutchinson's account to 'an ancient manuscript, said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin,' of which he proceeds to give the substance. **As I have the same document now lying before me, I shall allow the writer to tell his own tale.**" (Gould, page cxxiii.)

Then Gould gives these two paragraphs included in bracket (2), and printed in plain type.

I ask these godfathers of Dr. Whitsitt's circular, as honorable men, was it right to represent Gould as putting these documents together, and thus giving to the anonymous one the shelter of Jessey's great name, when Gould did no such thing? Gould says that parts (1) and (2) are from different manuscripts, part (1) being written by a great scholar, and part (2) being anonymous; Dr. Whitsitt alleges that Gould says that both parts are from the same manuscript, and that both were written by the great scholar. Is it any excuse for this treatment of Gould that Dr. Whitsitt *thought* the manuscripts *referred* to the same church? Dr. P. S. Henson wrote an account of the Baptist Congress in Chicago. Would it be right for me to add to that account an anonymous one from some paper, with the statement that both were written by Dr. Henson, on the ground that I *knew* they referred to the same congress? If a lawyer, in a brief, were to so treat authorities, how long would he be allowed to practice at the bar?

*Second.* The "So-called Kiffin Manuscript." Dr. Whitsitt has done exactly the same thing with what he gives in the other column as the Kiffin manuscript. Crosby gives first, in vol. 1, pp. 101 and 102, the paragraph beginning "Several sober and pious persons," included in bracket (5), and does not in any way indicate any date for Blunt's going to Holland or for any of the other events referred to. But Crosby lent his manuscript to Neal, and Neal testifies that the manuscript said Blunt went in 1644. (Neal, Toulmin's edition, vol. 1, p. 497). Neal is not always accurate in his conclusions; but no one has ever accused the great Puritan writer of deliberate falsehood in saying that a manuscript said what it did not say. But one thing is certain, Crosby does not indicate the date. (Where Dr. Whitsitt got the part beginning, "For in the year 1640," by which he supplied the date, will be pointed out later.) And Crosby says of this paragraph that it is from :

"An antient manuscript, said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin."

And he proceeds to give the substance of it ; not quoting verbatim, but introducing his quotation with the words, "This relates that," which words Dr. Whitsitt suppresses. Crosby quotes this paragraph as the substance of an anonymous document ; Dr. Whitsitt quotes Crosby's words as the original "So-called Kiffin Manuscript."

It will also be noticed that Dr. Whitsitt put brackets around the words, "whose names are in the manuscript to the number of fifty-three." He was pretending to quote the original manuscript. It would never do, therefore, for his quotation of this most important part of the document to expressly refer to "the manuscript," because such a reference would prove that the quotation itself was not "the manuscript." So Dr. Whitsitt put these words in brackets, thereby indicating that they were an interpolation of his or of Crosby's. Crosby put no brackets around these words because he was giving only the substance of the manuscript. Dr. Whitsitt quotes Crosby's words as if they were the original manuscript ; and cuts off the words "This relates that," and puts in these brackets, in order to cover up the trick.

Afterwards, forty-seven pages away from the part included in bracket (5), Crosby gives (vol. 1, pp. 148, 149) the part included in bracket (3). The authorship of this is unquestionable. Crosby says it was an account collected from a manuscript of William Kiffin, and he puts it in quotation marks, which he did not do with the part included in bracket (5), thus indicating that he was quoting verbatim. **This part**, included in bracket (3), comes to us with the authority of William Kiffin's great name, and is unimpeachable.

I ask the sponsors of Dr. Whitsitt, as honorable men, to characterize Dr. Whitsitt's conduct in putting these two documents together in the manner he has done. Crosby says, one (bracket 3) was taken from Kiffin's manuscript ; and many pages before he gives the other (bracket 5) as the substance of a manuscript "said

to be written" by Kiffin. Dr. Whitsitt represents that these two parts were the same document, and that they were taken from the same manuscript!! Would not a "fair-minded" historian have indicated the difference which Crosby makes?

But this is not all. The paragraph beginning, "For in the year 1640," included in bracket (4), is given by Crosby in his THIRD volume, AND IS NOT QUOTED FROM NOR ATTRIBUTED TO WILLIAM KIFFIN. Ivimey (Vol. I, page 156), and Evans (Vol. II, page 110), say that the manuscript referred to the church of which Canne had been pastor, and which was founded by Hubbard. This may be true, but one thing is beyond question: The manuscript (bracket 4) may refer to the same church, may go over the same period, as the church referred to and the period gone over in Kiffin's account in the part included in bracket (3), BUT IT WAS NOT A PART OF THE SAME MANUSCRIPT. The first manuscript, (bracket 3), says: "Their minister was Mr. John Spilsbury," while Crosby says of the other manuscript, (bracket 4), "**who was their pastor the manuscript does not say.**"

Thus, in the "Kiffin Manuscript," Dr. Whitsitt repeats his performance with the Gould documents, putting together this time three instead of two, and leaving off from the first part (bracket 3) the quotation marks which showed that Crosby was quoting verbatim. Do fair-minded historians manufacture evidence in this manner?

It has been shown how Dr. Whitsitt made one document out of two, and another out of three. Even worse, if possible, is his making two out of one and confirming one by the other. Crosby, in the part beginning, "Several sober and pious persons," (bracket 5), gives the substance of the ancient manuscript. It will be remembered that Gould introduces the paragraphs beginning "1640" and "1641" (bracket 2), by saying:

"Crosby appeals for confirmation of Hutchinson's account to 'an ancient manuscript, said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin,' of which he proceeds to give the substance. As I have the same document now lying before me I shall allow the writer to tell his own tale."

Dr. Whitsitt puts the ancient anonymous manuscript in one column (bracket 2), under the heading "Jessey Church Records;" then puts the substance of the same ancient anonymous manuscript in the parallel column (bracket 5) under the heading "So-called Kiffin Manuscript;" says that "these two documents complement and mutually support each other;" and calls them (page 89) "the two most important and valuable documents, all things considered, that are connected with our history"! Will the committee of twenty kindly supply a name for this conduct?

The "Jessey Church Records" and the "So-called Kiffin Manuscript," as Dr. Whitsitt has constructed them, constitute the bed-rock of his argument. He constantly refers to them, and proves and substantiates everything else by them. It is upon such a combination of fabricated and garbled evidence that Dr. Whitsitt practically rests his case.

There is just one more point to which I wish to call attention. I have now lying before me a manuscript copy of the anonymous manuscript "said to be written by Mr. William Kiffin." This copy was sent and certified by Prof. George P. Gould, son of the Rev. George Gould, from whose book Dr. Whitsitt secured the material out of which he manufactured the "Jessey Church Records." In Gould's book, in the "substance" of this manuscript given in Crosby, and in the copy of the manuscript sent by Prof. Gould, the name of the Baptist in the Netherlands, who sent a letter to England by Richard Blunt, is given as "Batte." Dr. Whitsitt added a letter to the name both in Gould and in Crosby. Barclay says he found a Batten in the Netherlands; and Dr. Whitsitt desired to support his fabricated evidence by identifying this man Batten with the events recited in his "Jessey Church Records" and in his "Kiffin Manuscript." He therefore attached an "n" to the name, and said :

"The other leading item is that Mr. Blunt was sent to Holland in 1640 to obtain immersion; that he went to **John Batten, well known as a teacher among the Collegiants**, and, receiving the rite at his hands, returned to England." (A Question in Baptist History, p. 88.)

Would a fair-minded historian have done this?

I have endeavored to present the essential facts of the case as clearly and briefly as possible. The fraud is composed of so many elements, however, and is so many-sided, that an exhaustive discussion of it would require more space than can be spared in this pamphlet. But if the reader will attentively examine and carefully consider the documents, bearing in mind the various sources whence they were derived, new phases of fraud will continually appear to him, and the extent of the trick which has been practiced will become more and more manifest to him.

## 2. Garbling of A. R.'s Testimony.

On page 14 of his circular, Dr. Whitsitt says that chapter X of his book, pp. 134-146, "gives such citations from Dr. Dexter as I had not seen elsewhere." So the other citations which he makes from Dexter he has seen elsewhere, and is therefore just as much responsible for the garbling contained in them as if he himself had originally mutilated them. On page 119, Dr. Whitsitt says:

"The work of A. R. which comes under notice in this place is entitled: *The Second Part of the Vanity and Childishness of Infants Baptisme*, London, 1642. On page 29 of *this Second part*, Dr. Dexter has found the following quotation which demonstrates that A. R. did not take immersion for granted: 'If any shall thinke it strange and unlikely that all the godliest Divines and best Churches should be thus deceived on this point of Baptisme for so many yeares together [**i. e., as never before to know that true baptism is dipping and dipping alone true baptism**]: let them consider that all Christendome (except here and there one, or some few, or no considerable number) was swallowed up in grosse Popery for many hundred yeares before Luther's time, which was not until about 100 yeares agone.' (Dexter, *True Story*, p. 49.)"

Dr. Whitsitt prints the words "*of this Second Part*" in italics, thereby emphasizing the fact that it is this Part that contains the citation. Now A. R. has nothing of the kind, nor anything in the faintest degree resembling this quotation, in his Second Part. In his First Part, *an entirely different book*, this quotation occurs,

*except the sentence included in brackets*, which I have printed in heavy type. A. R. was not speaking of dipping at all, but only of infant baptism, with no reference to the mode. The sentence in brackets was put in by Drs. Dexter and Whitsitt. Will the illustrious godfathers of Dr. Whitsitt's circular kindly name this performance?

### 3. Garbling of Muller's Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt says that if John Smyth or his followers had declared in favor of immersion they could not have expected to be received by the Mennonites, who sprinkled. Four of the English of Smyth's party, who were received by the Mennonites, had never been baptized, and were baptized on their reception. The others were received on the strength of their previous baptism, without being again baptized. Dr. Whitsitt, on page 55, quotes from Evans a quotation from Muller :

"It appears to me that the persons mentioned in the memorial, who were not yet baptized, were admitted to the Waterlanders by the baptism not of immersion, but of sprinkling. \*This mode of baptizing was, from the days of Menno, the only usual mode amongst them, and it is still amongst us. The Waterlanders, nor any other of the various parties of the Netherland Doopsgezinden, practiced at any time baptism by immersion.\* Had they made an exception, in that use, on behalf of the English, who in their country had not yet received baptism, it is more than probable that the memorial would have mentioned that alteration. But they cared only for the *very nature* of the baptism, and **were therefore willing to admit even those who were baptized by a mode differing from theirs, just as we are wonted to do now-a-days.**"

Dr. Whitsitt quotes only that part included between the stars. Sprinklers to this day will receive those who have been "baptized by a mode differing from theirs"—they will take in Baptists without sprinkling them. Would not a fair-minded historian have finished the quotation from Muller, which shows conclusively that Muller believed Smyth's people had been immersed? For if the Mennonites sprinkled, and Smyth and his followers were baptized by a mode differing from sprinkling, then they were immersed.

## 4. Garbling of Stanford's and Benedict's Testimony.

In attempting to prove that Roger Williams became a Baptist by being sprinkled upon, Dr. Whitsitt contends that certain historians have endeavored "to dodge the question" by using the non-committal word "baptize." His argument is that, had these historians believed that Williams was immersed, they would have said so, and would not have hidden behind the word "baptize."

On page 163, Dr. Whitsitt says:

"Rev. John Stanford, in the records of the First Baptist Church of Providence, which were prepared in 1775, **does not mention immersion.** At any rate, Benedict, who claims to have followed these records closely (History, New York, 1856. p. 457), employs the word baptize, **and says nothing about immersion.** (History, Boston, 1813, vol. 1, p. 475; cf. History, New York, 1856, p. 450)."

Now, as a matter of fact, Benedict, in the edition and volume referred to by Dr. Whitsitt, and on the very page named by Dr. Whitsitt, says:

"Being settled in this place, which, from the kindness of God to them, they called PROVIDENCE, Mr. Williams and those with him considered the importance of Gospel Union, and were desirous of forming themselves into a church, but met with considerable obstruction; **they were convinced of the nature and design of believer's baptism by immersion;** but, from a variety of circumstances, had hitherto been prevented from submission. To obtain a suitable administrator was a matter of consequence: at length, the candidates for communion nominated and appointed Mr. Ezekiel Holliman, a man of gifts and piety, to baptize Mr. Williams; and who, in turn, baptized Mr. Holliman and the other ten."

Now, not only are these the words of Benedict, but they are also the words of Stanford, for Benedict quotes Stanford's records verbatim. Is it true that Stanford "does not mention immersion"? Is it true that Benedict "says nothing about immersion"?

To say that Dr. Whitsitt has garbled these two authors, is not strictly accurate; for he does not pretend to quote directly from them. He has, with a full knowledge of what these authors actually said, stated that they said the direct contrary. I respectfully ask the godfathers of his circular to characterize this per-

formance. Has Dr. Whitsitt "simply expressed his opinion about a matter of history"?

### 5. Garbling of Hague's Testimony.

On page 163, the very same page on which he misrepresents Stanford and Benedict, Dr. Whitsitt says that—

"Rev. William Hague, in his *Historical Discourse*, Boston, 1839, p. 30, occupies the position of the Providence Church Records, **making no allusion to immersion.**"

Dr. Hague, in his *Historical Discourse*, devotes considerable space to the discussion of Roger Williams' baptism. On page 26, in regard to Roger Williams' baptism, Dr. Hague says:

"As to the mode of it, his knowledge of the force of language would lead him to unite with the whole Greek church, when they say of the sprinkling or pouring practiced in Western Europe, 'it is no baptism.'"

On the next page, speaking of the same subject, Dr. Hague says:

"The difficulty which immediately arose, however, was the want of a proper administrator, for at that time no ordained minister could be found in America, who had been immersed on a profession of faith."

Does Dr. Hague "dodge the question"? Would a fair-minded historian quote Dr. Hague as "making no allusion to immersion"? Has Dr. Whitsitt "simply expressed his opinion about a matter of history"?

On page 14 of his circular, Dr. Whitsitt says:

"In turning away from this discussion I desire to enter a positive and unconditional denial of the charges of garbling testimony or suppressing evidence. I have done nothing of the kind."

As the charges that Dr. Whitsitt has garbled testimony and suppressed evidence, can not be proved by the mere general assertion that he has done so; neither can they be disproved by any "positive and unconditional denial." His guilt or innocence must be determined by the facts, and the facts must be allowed

to speak for themselves. I leave it to the reader to judge, in the light of the facts, whether or not Dr. Whitsitt has garbled testimony, and whether or not he has both suppressed and fabricated evidence.

#### CONCLUSION.

Dr. Whitsitt's determination that the facts shall be as he thinks they should be, and not as they really are, is now sufficiently apparent. He displays an equal determination to manufacture law to suit himself. He regards himself as master of both facts and law. The Trustees of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary are the legal owners of the Institution. In the eyes of the law the Trustees are the Seminary. The Faculty are not recognized by the law at all, but are regarded as the employees, the mere creatures, of the Trustees. The Trustees, being the owners of the Seminary, are legally and morally responsible for the management and welfare of the Institution. And this responsibility is not one which each Trustee bears merely jointly with his colleagues. It is a liability both joint and several. Each individual Trustee is under the most solemn obligations to look to the welfare of the Seminary, and to prevent any misappropriation of the funds contributed for its benefit. It is the duty of each Trustee to keep himself fully informed as to the condition and management of the Institution. In order to enable the Trustees to fulfill their duties, certain books are kept by the Faculty. These books are kept under the instruction of the Trustees, and each Trustee has, at all times, the legal right of freely inspecting them. The rights and privileges of the Trustees are commensurate with their duties. As it is the duty of each Trustee to keep himself informed as to the condition of the great interests committed to his care, so it is his right and privilege to freely examine at all times the books of the Institution, from which alone can its condition be determined, and from which alone can be secured the information which will

enable him to discharge the duties which the law places upon him. But Dr. Whitsitt boldly overrides the law of the land, arrogates to himself an authority which the law does not give, and refuses to allow a Trustee to examine even the list of the students. He refuses to allow a Trustee to examine the books of the Seminary, though these books are kept for the purpose of enabling the Trustees, who alone are responsible for the management of the Institution, to discharge those duties which the law and honor place upon them. Why is it that Dr. Whitsitt will not allow a Trustee to inspect the books of the Seminary, and investigate the management of the Institution? What do the books contain that Dr. Whitsitt is unwilling for the Trustees to know? Doubtless he is willing to tell them what he is willing for them to know. But the fact remains that he has assumed an illegal authority. He attempts to deal with law as he deals with history. He feels that as he has manufactured history to suit his theories, he can manufacture law to suit his wishes.

I think I have proved, that I have not misrepresented Dr. Whitsitt; and that, aside from all questions of succession and history, Southern Baptists have abundant reason for objecting to him as President of their Seminary. If he is wrong in his historical discovery, such a mistake, in the circumstances, shows he is not a competent historian. If he is entirely right, and 1641 was the date of "the origin of Baptist immersion," the facts I have adduced show that he is neither sound enough as a Baptist, nor, to use the mild term to which I have endeavored to adhere, sufficiently "fair-minded" to be the President of our Seminary.

One remark more. If Southern Baptists are willing to retain Dr. Whitsitt as President of their Seminary, then he is just the sort of a man they deserve to have at the head of their Seminary.

J. H. EATON.

LOUISVILLE, KY., March 1st., 1898.