

The Real Issues in the Whitsitt Case.

BY J. H. EATON.

OUTLINE AND INDEX.

I.

| | |
|--|----|
| Dr. Whitsitt's Attitude in Regard to Baptism..... | 6 |
| (<i>a</i>) The Independent Editorials | 6 |
| (1) Editorial of June 24, 1880..... | 7 |
| (2) Editorial of September 2, 1880..... | 8 |
| (3) Editorial of September 9, 1880..... | 9 |
| (4) Editorial of October 7, 1880..... | 10 |
| (<i>b</i>) The Article in Johnson's Cyclopedia..... | 11 |
| (<i>c</i>) The Article in the Examiner, April 23d, 1896..... | 12 |

II.

| | |
|--|----|
| Dr. Whitsitt's Unfitness and Unfairness as a Historian, and His Hostility Towards the Baptists..... | 14 |
| (<i>a</i>) Contradictions in His Book | 14 |
| (<i>b</i>) His Use of Authorities | 15 |
| (1) Suppression of Evidence | 16 |
| 1. Suppression of Kiffin's Testimony..... | 16 |
| 2. Suppression of Edward's Testimony..... | 17 |
| (2) Garbling of Testimony | 17 |
| 1. Garbling of Featley's Testimony..... | 17 |
| 2. Garbling of Praise-God Barebone's Testimony | 20 |
| 3. Garbling of Barber's Testimony..... | 20 |
| 4. Suppression of Roger's Testimony..... | 21 |
| 5. Suppression of Bullinger's Testimony.... | 22 |
| 6. Garbling of Baillie's Testimony..... | 22 |
| 7. Garbling of the Broadmead Records..... | 23 |
| 8. Garbling of the "New Distemper" | 24 |
| 9. Garbling of R. J.'s Testimony.... | 25 |
| 10. Garbling of Saltmarsh's Testimony..... | 25 |
| 11. Garbling of Knutton's Testimony | 26 |

THE REAL ISSUES IN THE WHITSITT CASE.

The "committee" appointed by Dr. Whitsitt's supporters to investigate the authorship of the "W. N. M." article have published the result of their labors in a circular which they have scattered all over the country. They have made a distinct attempt to draw off attention from the main question by injecting a personal element into the discussion. It has also been repeatedly charged that there is no cause or ground for the opposition to Dr. Whitsitt, except a desire to establish a theory of church succession. This charge is not true. I have, therefore, decided to prepare this circular, in which I shall state, as briefly as is compatible with clearness, what I regard as some of the chief counts in the indictment against Dr. Whitsitt.

I wish to vindicate those who oppose Dr. Whitsitt from the charges which have been brought against them, and to show that Southern Baptists have abundant cause, apart from any question of succession, for their opposition to the President of their Seminary.

I will consider two grounds of objection:

First—Dr. Whitsitt's attitude in regard to baptism, as shown by his editorials in the *Independent*, his article in *Johnson's Cyclopedia*, and his article in the *Examiner* of April 23, 1896.

Second—His unfitness and unfairness as a historian, and his hostility towards the Baptists, as shown by his book, "A Question in Baptist History."

I.

DR. WHITSITT'S ATTITUDE IN REGARD TO BAPTISM.

Dr. Whitsitt's attitude in regard to baptism is shown conclusively by three of his writings:

- (a) The Independent editorials.
 - (b) His article on the Baptists in Johnson's Cyclopedia.
 - (c) His article in the Examiner of April 23, 1896.
-

(a) THE INDEPENDENT EDITORIALS.

Dr. Whitsitt has acknowledged that he wrote four of the fourteen editorials along the same line which appeared in the Independent in 1880 and 1881. The business manager of the Independent says that he was paid a "special price" for writing them. In his paper to the trustees at Wilmington Dr. Whitsitt said:

"In regard to the articles written as editorials for the Independent, I have long felt that it was a mistake, and the generous action of the Board of Trustees makes it easy for me to make this statement."

In another paragraph he said:

"On the historical questions involved, I find myself out of agreement with some honored historians, but what I have written is the outcome of patient and honest research, and I cannot do otherwise than to reaffirm my convictions and maintain my position."

In this paper to the trustees he also acknowledged that he wrote these editorials "from a Pedobaptist standpoint." Thus he thinks it was a mistake to have written the editorials, but he reasserts all his historical statements.

Having admitted that he made a mistake in writing from a Pedobaptist standpoint, it would be ungenerous to quote against him such assertions as, "Happily for us, etc.," which

were written because suitable to the standpoint he was occupying ; but he still maintains his historical positions, and therefore these can be quoted to show his present position.

A single extract from a single one of these editorials is sufficient to show Dr. Whitsitt's position in regard to baptism, but I will consider all four of them in the order of their publication.

(1) *Editorial of June 24, 1880.*

In this editorial Dr. Whitsitt makes the following statements, and, since they are historical statements, he reaffirmed them at Wilmington:

“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.”

Dr. Whitsitt put the words “*among the Baptists*” in italics, thereby indicating that, though others may have practiced immersion, Baptists had not. Would it have been possible for him to have stated in more emphatic terms that a man can be a Baptist without believing in immersion? Would not this extract alone be sufficient to show his position?

Again, in this same editorial :

“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.”

Dr. Whitsitt put the words “*an adult person*” in italics, thereby indicating that these Baptists of his had dreamed of the possibility of immersing infants. *Baptists who not only had never dreamed of the possibility of believers' immersion, but were familiar with infant baptism.* BAPTISTS WHO HAD NEVER THOUGHT OF SUCH A THING AS IMMERSION ! BAPTISTS

WHO HAD NEVER BEEN BAPTIZED!! •Dr. Whitsitt says such people are Baptists. Does not this editorial, without anything more, sufficiently show his position?

(2) *Editorial of September 2, 1880.*

In this editorial Dr. Whitsitt again states his position in clear and unambiguous language. He says :

“The baptism of Roger Williams is affirmed by Governor Winthrop to have taken place in March, 1639. This, however, was at least two years prior to the introduction of the practice of immersion among the Baptists. Up to the year 1641 all Baptists employed sprinkling and pouring as the mode of baptism. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that Mr. Williams, in joining the Baptists, should have made use of a form of baptism which they had never practiced or thought of?”

Baptists who employed sprinkling and pouring as the mode of baptism!! Baptists who had never practiced or thought of immersion!! Dr. Whitsitt says such people are Baptists!! Again, in regard to Roger Williams' baptism, he says :

“We assume, as a matter of course, that sprinkling or pouring was the method, since no other was at that time in use among the Baptists.”

No other method of baptism but sprinkling or pouring in use — where? among the Methodists? Presbyterians? No, **AMONG THE BAPTISTS!!!**

And yet again :

“We are inclined to believe that no case of immersion took place among the American Baptists before the year 1644.”

They were Baptists, says Dr. Whitsitt, though they did not immerse. He continues :

“It seems likely that Roger Williams, on his return from England in that year, brought the first reliable news concerning the change which had taken place in the practice of the English Baptists three years before, and then it was that the American Baptists first resolved to accept the innovation.”

What change was this which had taken place in the practice of the English Baptists? Why, they changed from sprinkling to immersion, but Dr. Whitsitt says they were Baptists all the time; as well when they sprinkled as when they immersed. Dr. Whitsitt reaffirmed all this at Wilmington. Is it possible to doubt his position?

(3) *Editorial of September 9, 1880.*

In this editorial, Dr. Whitsitt says:

“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.”

Dr. Whitsitt says that confessions of faith which prescribe sprinkling are nevertheless Baptist confessions. Does not this alone show his position? Again, referring to the manner in which Baptist historians have been accustomed to answer an assertion of Featley's, he says:

“Happily for us, however, the above assertion is confirmed by the authority of Edward Barber, the founder of the rite of immersion among the Baptists.”

Since Dr. Whitsitt has confessed that he wrote these editorials “from a Pedobaptist standpoint,” and has said that his doing so was “a mistake,” we will overlook the phrase “happily for us,” but the rest of the sentence is historical, and was therefore reaffirmed by Dr. Whitsitt at Wilmington in May, 1897.

If immersion is an ordinance of our Lord, then He was its founder. If Edward Barber was the founder of the rite of immersion among the Baptists, then Jesus Christ was not the founder of it. If Edward Barber was the founder of the rite of immersion among the Baptists, then the Baptists “teach for doctrines the commandments of men.”

(4) *Editorial of October 7, 1880.*

In this editorial, Dr. Whitsitt says:

“Zion’s Advocate is not satisfied with our proofs that immersion was introduced among the Baptists in the year 1641, and inclines, upon the authority of Barclay and Dr. Dexter, to accept the 12th of September, 1633, as the proper date of that occurrence. In the present state of information on the subject of Baptist history, these are the only dates that can come under consideration with reference to the origin of immersion.”

If 1633 and 1641 “are the only dates that can come under consideration with reference to the origin of immersion,” then immersion was not practiced by the Apostles. Dr. Whitsitt reaffirmed this at Wilmington. Is anything more needed to show his position?

Again,

“The question at issue is: Was this ‘new baptism’ a sprinkling or affusion, or was it an immersion? We affirm that it was a new sprinkling. Zion’s Advocate, Dr. Dexter and Barclay affirm that it was an immersion. If they are correct, we shall have to place the origin of Baptist immersion in 1633. If we are correct, it belongs in 1641.”

Origin of BAPTIST IMMERSION. ! ! !

And in conclusion,

“If immersion was introduced, as we suppose, in 1641, then it is clear that John Spillsbury, who became a Baptist in 1633, was sprinkled or poured upon; likewise, Mr. Kiffin, who became a Baptist in 1638; likewise, Roger Williams and his church at Providence, who joined the Baptists in 1639; likewise, Mr. Clark and the church at Newport, who, we must believe, joined the Baptists very shortly after Mr. Williams.”

If John Spillsbury, in 1633, became a Baptist by being sprinkled or poured upon, then sprinkling would make him a Baptist to-day. If sprinkling made a Baptist of Mr. Kiffin in

1638, then sprinkling would make him a Baptist to-day. If Roger Williams and his church at Providence, and Mr. Clark and his church at Newport, joined the Baptists in 1639 by being sprinkled upon, then they could join the Baptists in the same manner to-day. If sprinkling is baptism, then there is no need or excuse for the separate existence of the Baptist denomination.

Had Dr. Whitsitt written but a single one of these editorials, had he written but a single one of the extracts made from them above, it would be sufficient to show his attitude in regard to baptism. In each editorial, in each paragraph, in each sentence, he but reiterates, restates and emphasizes his position that a man can be a Baptist though he has not been immersed, but has been sprinkled or poured upon. Can his position be doubted?

(b) THE CYCLOPEDIA ARTICLE.

If Dr. Whitsitt had never written a line outside of this article, it would be sufficient to show his position. In this article he says, and puts his words in italics:

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

And in this same article he says that in the year 1641 immersion was “substituted” by the Baptists “in the place of sprinkling and pouring.” If the “earliest organized Baptist church belongs to the year 1610 or 1611,” and yet immersion was not introduced until the year 1641, then for at least thirty years there were Baptists who did not believe in immersion.

If “the earliest organized Baptist church belongs to the year 1610 or 1611” and immersion was “substituted” in the place of sprinkling and pouring not until the year 1641, then there was a time when Baptists practiced sprinkling. If “the earliest organized Baptist church belongs to the year 1610 or

1611," then the claim of the Baptists that their churches are according to the Apostolic model, is empty and vain.

Again, in this article, he says of the Particular or Calvinistic Baptists under Spillsbury:

"They all submitted to adult baptism, apparently by sprinkling."

And in regard to the baptism of Roger Williams, he says:

"The ceremony was most likely performed by sprinkling; the Baptists of England had not yet adopted immersion, and there is no reason which renders it probable that Williams was in advance of them in that regard."

When he wrote the Cyclopedia article over his own signature, he still called "Baptists" those who sprinkled, thus taking the ground that sprinkling is baptism. No wonder that the *Herald and Presbyterian*, the Presbyterian paper of Cincinnati, said of his statement to the Trustees:

"Rev. Dr. Whitsitt, of the Louisville Seminary, tells his brethren that he is sorry he has said anything that offended them, but he adheres to the statements made as historically correct, that up to a comparatively modern date the Baptists baptized by sprinkling. Of course he could not recede from this position. Those who sprinkle are the real, Scriptural, historical Baptists."

(c) THE EXAMINER ARTICLE.

On April 23, 1896, Dr. Whitsitt published an article in the *New York Examiner*. He was then President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and wrote over his own signature. In this article 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.”

Those who sprinkled and poured, and among whom immersion was unknown, were “OUR BAPTIST PEOPLE!” Is not this article alone sufficient to show his position? Would not this article show his attitude in regard to baptism, even if he had never written the Independent editorials or the Cyclopedia article?

II.

DR. WHITSITT'S UNFITNESS AND UNFAIRNESS AS A HISTORIAN, AND HIS HOSTILITY TOWARDS THE BAPTISTS, AS SHOWN BY HIS BOOK.

And now we come to the consideration of Dr. Whitsitt's book, "*A Question in Baptist History*."

If he had never written a word previously, this book condemns him both as a Baptist and as a historian. He contradicts himself, as no able historian would do; he does not show the fairness of a true historian; and, so far from treating the Baptists, his own people, with even common fairness, he manifests towards them an animus such as few Pedobaptist historians have shown. In some cases he altogether suppresses testimony favorable to the Baptists. In other cases, he takes testimony favorable to the Baptists and so doctors it as to make it unfavorable to them.

I will point out a few of the many contradictions in his book, before discussing his suppressions and garbling of testimony.

(a) CONTRADICTIONS.

On page 15, Dr. Whitsitt says that—

"Immersion was first introduced into England in 1641."

And on page 23 he says :

"In the earliest times immersion prevailed in England as elsewhere."

On page 145 he says that the—

"Immersion of believers was introduced into England in 1641."

The immediate context, as Dr. J. B. Thomas pointed out, fairly implying that this was the first appearance, while on page 144 he says that—

“Believers’ immersion, after it had been some time disused, was introduced into England again in 1641.”

On page 118 he says that—

“Believers’ baptism and dipping had both been too long extinct in England to be restored on the spur of the moment.”

While on page 137 he insists :

“This ‘*new baptism*’ could not have been believers’ baptism, for the sprinkling of believers was among the Anabaptists already a very old baptism.”

On page 73, Dr. Whitsitt states that William Kiffin joined the Baptists in the year 1641, while in his Independent editorial of October 7, 1880, he affirms that Mr. Kiffin became a Baptist in 1638. Dr. Whitsitt reaffirms and maintains his historical position. Which position ?

In the Independent editorial of October 7, 1880, Dr. Whitsitt says that Richard Blunt went to Holland in 1644, on page 61 of his book he says that Blunt went in 1641, and on page 89 he argues from the “Jessey record” that the date was 1640.

Dr. Whitsitt reaffirms his position. Which position ? Competent scholars who understand the use of language do not contradict themselves in any such way. Which position does Dr. Whitsitt reaffirm and maintain in each of these cases of contradictory assertions ?

(b) DR. WHITSITT’S USE OF AUTHORITIES.

In Dr. Whitsitt’s use of authorities he manifests great unfairness as a historian, and great bitterness towards the Baptists.

He not only entirely suppresses favorable testimony, of whose existence he is bound to know; but he goes even further, takes testimony favorable to the Baptists, as originally written, and so misquotes and garbles it as to make it unfavorable.

(1) *Suppression of Evidence.*

Under this head alone a volume could be written, but since I wish to lay special stress upon the garbling of which Dr. Whitsitt has been guilty, I will here give but two examples of suppression. Indeed, these alone would be sufficient to show his feeling toward the Baptists. And other examples of suppression will appear in connection with the consideration of his garbling.

1. Suppression of Kiffin's Testimony.

William Kiffin was the greatest of the Baptist leaders of those days. Dr. Whitsitt calls him "their most prominent preacher and leader." His name stands first in the signatures to the Confession of Faith of 1643, which gives no uncertain sound on the subject of immersion. Mr. Poole addressed some queries to William Kiffin, finding fault with the Baptists for not uniting with others, but setting up their "new framed congregations." In a book, entitled "A Brief Remonstrance, etc.," published in 1645, William Kiffin makes this reply :

"It is well-known to many, and especially to ourselves, that our congregations were erected and framed, according to the rule of Christ **before we heard of any Reformation**, even at that time when Episcopacie was at the height of its vanishing glory." (Answer to Querie Second.)

This is a book of Kiffin's whose authorship is unquestionable. Why did Dr. Whitsitt suppress the testimony of the greatest Baptist of those days? Did he do it because he loved the Baptists?

2. Suppression of Edward's Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt has read Ivimey's History of the English Baptists, because he refers to it on page 9 of his book, and says, "it is a praiseworthy performance, and has always been received with favor." Ivimey makes the following quotation from Edward's Gangreena :

"On the 12th of Nov. last [1640] there met a matter of 80 Aanbaptists (many of them belonging to the Church of one Barber) in a great house in Bishops-gate Street and had a love feast, where five new members lately dipped were present."

This proves immersion before 1641. Ought not a fair-minded historian, even if he were not a Baptist, to have quoted that ? Why did Dr. Whitsitt suppress that testimony ? Was it because he loved the Baptists ?

• (2) *Garbling of Testimony.*

To fair-minded men of all denominations, this is the most serious offence of which Dr. Whitsitt has been guilty. He can find thousands of honorable and upright men of other denominations who will heartily subscribe to everything he has said in regard to baptism, but he will search in vain for a fair-minded man who will not condemn such use of testimony as he has made.

1. Garbling of Featley's Testimony.

On page 70, Dr. Whitsitt states 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." To prove this he makes two extracts from Featley. Featley is discussing the fortieth article of the Baptist confession of faith, which prescribes dipping as the only baptism, and says :

“ This article is wholly sowed with the new leaven of Anabaptisme: I say the *new leaven*, for it cannot be proved that any of the antient Anabaptists maintained any such position, there being three wayes of baptizing, either by dipping, or washing, or sprinkling, to which the Scripture alludeth in sundry places: the Sacrament is rightly administered by any of the three; and whatsoever is here alleged for dipping, we approve of, so farre as it excludeth not the other two. Dipping may be, and hath been used, in some places, *trina immersio*, a three fold dipping; but there is no necessity of it; it is not essentiall to baptisme, neither do the texts in the margent conclude any such thing, etc.” (P. 182.)

Dr. Whitsitt omits what is printed in heavy-faced type, stops his quotation at a comma in the middle of a sentence, indicates by a period that the sentence ends where it does not end, and begins his next sentence where a sentence does not begin. He leaves out what flatly contradicts the very proposition he is endeavoring to prove by quoting the passage. Is that the way fair-minded historians quote? Does Featley assert that immersion was a “splinter new” practice in England? Would a friend of the Baptists have made that omission?

Dr. Featley says in this book, on page 28, that some writer made fourteen kinds of Anabaptists “yet there are but three to whom the name properly appertaineth.” He says that there were two of these ancient and one new; that the first broached their doctrine in the year 250, the second broached theirs in the year 380, and the third theirs in 1525. Why did Dr. Whitsitt, with Featley’s book before him, suppress that testimony as to the beginning of the new Anabaptists?

The other quotation which Dr. Whitsitt makes from Featley in order to prove immersion a “splinter new” practice in 1644, is garbled by the suppression of the first sentence. Featley begins his new Anabaptists in Germany with Stock as their father, and plays on the name Stock. He says that—

“ The name of the father of the Anabaptists signifieth in English a senseless piece of wood or block, and a very blockhead was he; yet out of this block were cut those chips that kindled such a fire in Germany, Halsatia, and Suevia, that could not be fully quenched, no not

with the blood of 150,000 of them killed in war, or put to death in several places by the magistrates. This fire in the reigns of Q. Elizabeth, and K. James, and our gracious sovereign, till now, was covered in England under the ashes, or if it brake out at any time, by the care of the Ecclesiasticall and Civill Magistrate, it was soon put out. But of late since the unhappy distractions which our sins have brought upon us, the Temporall Sword being other ways employed, and the Spirituall locked up fast in the scabberd, this sect, among others, hath so far presumed upon the patience of the state, that it hath held weekly conventicles, rebaptized hundreds of men and women together in the twilight in Rivelets, and some arms of the Thames, and elsewhere, dipping them over head and ears. It hath printed divers pamphlets in defence of their Heresie, yea and challenged some of our preachers to disputation." (Preface to Reader.)

Dr. Whitsitt quotes only that which comes after the part printed in heavy-faced type, suppressing from the beginning down to the words "But of late."

He actually accuses Dr. Armitage of omitting the note of time, and says this "indicates the exact period at which dipping commenced." Featley does indicate his belief as to the exact time the Anabaptists came into England, and he says that time was in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, near one hundred years before 1641; but he does not indicate any belief as to the period when dipping commenced. For he emphatically declares that dipping is one of the three ways of baptism to which the Scriptures allude. Featley was a Church of England man, an Episcopalian, and he believed in sprinkling for baptism, though he was willing to accept immersion also. The Episcopalians of to-day fully agree with Featley in regard to dipping for baptism, and unite with him in saying: "The sacrament is rightly administered by any of the three; and whatsoever is here alleged for dipping, we approve of, so farre as it excludeth not the other two.....it is not essential to baptisme."

I ask all candid persons to say if Featley "asserts that immersion was a splinter new practice in England in 1644?" Does he not assert directly the contrary? Why did Dr. Whitsitt so garble the quotation? Was it because he loved the Baptists?

Again, Featley in speaking of the drowning of the Anabaptists in Zurich and Vienna says:

“They who prophaned baptism by a second dipping, rue it by a third immersion.”

Why did not Dr. Whitsitt quote that?

2. Garbling of Praise-God Barebone's Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt, on page 103, introduces a long quotation from Praise-God Barebone by saying that he was an unexceptionable witness who contended that “there was no kind of propriety in introducing this new baptism by dipping.” He says he cites from his manuscript copy taken by himself in the British Museum. The quotation covers two pages of the book. In it there is one omission indicated by dots. In what is omitted Barebone says:

“The Romanists, some of them, and some of the poor ignorant Welsh, **do use dipping.**” (P. 14.)

Dr. Whitsitt was quoting Barebone in order to prove that there was no dipping in England prior to 1641; and so he suppresses the sentence in which Barebone says there was dipping. WHY WAS THAT SENTENCE CUT OUT? Would a fair minded historian have cut it out? Would a man who loved the Baptists have cut it out?

3. Garbling of Barber's Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt says that Edward Barber was the “founder of the rite of immersion among the Baptists.” He also says that immersion was “introduced” in 1641. Therefore, his position is, that Edward Barber founded immersion in the year 1641. In order to prove this, it is absolutely necessary for him to show that no one before Edward Barber had advocated immersion. On page 112, he quotes Edward Barber as saying it seemed strange—

“That the Lord should raise up mee, a poore Tradesman, to divulge this glorious Truth to the World's censuring.”

Now, what Edward Barber actually said was that it seemed strange—

“That the Lord should, *amongst some others*, raise up mee, a poore Tradesman, to divulge this glorious Truth to the World’s censuring.” (Preface, P. 1.)

Dr. Whitsitt leaves out the words “*amongst some others*.” In order to prove that Edward Barber was the first to advocate immersion, Dr. Whitsitt leaves out the words in which Edward Barber says he was not the first. Would a fair-minded historian have done this? Did Dr. Whitsitt do this because he loved the Baptists?

4. Suppression of Roger’s Testimony.

On page 115, Dr. Whitsitt says in regard to Barber’s book:

“The annals of English literature will be searched in vain for a volume that precedes this in date and yet maintains that nothing else is true baptism but immersion.”

It will be remembered that, in order to prevent Barber himself from contradicting this statement, Dr. Whitsitt strikes out the words “*amongst some others*.” But Barber, not content with simply referring in general terms to others who had advocated immersion, specifically mentions “*Master Rogers in his Treatise of Baptism*,” the third edition of which was published in 1635. Rogers’ book is not confined to the British Museum. Two copies of it are in Louisville, one of this very third edition. In this book Rogers says that the nature of the ordinance of baptism is to dip, and adds :

“And this I so averre, as thinking it exceeding material to the ordinance, yea which both antiquitie (though with some additions 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 Matth. chap 3, verse 11, hath noted that the Greeke tongue wants not words to express any other act as well as dipping, if the institution could bear it.”

So that in order to prove that Edward Barber was the founder of the rite of immersion, Dr. Whitsitt strikes out the words "amongst some others," suppresses the testimony of Rogers, *to which Barber himself refers*, and boldly declares: "The annals of English literature will be searched in vain for a volume that precedes it [Barber's] in date and yet maintains that nothing else is true baptism but immersion." Did Dr. Whitsitt do this because he loved the Baptists?

5. Suppression of Bullinger's Testimony.

A little further search in the annals of English literature would have found "Bullinger's Decades," translated out of the Latin and published in English in London in 1577. On page 1041 are these words:

"Again the reverend fathers of the fourth Council held at Toledo, do allow but one dipping in Baptism, and then add immediately this reason, and lest any should doubt of the mystery of this sacrament, why we allow but one dipping. he may see therein our death and resurrection. For the dipping into the water is, as it were, the going down into the grave, and the coming up again out of the water is the rising again out of the grave."

6. Garbling of Baillie's Testimony.

Robert Baillie was a Scotch Presbyterian. On page 129, Dr. Whitsitt quotes from Robert Baillie as follows:

"Among the old Anabaptists, or those over the sea, to this day so far as I can learn by their writings or any relation that yet has come to my ears, the question of dipping or sprinkling never came upon the Table. As I take it they dip none, but all whom they baptize they sprinkle in the same manner as is our custome."

As stated above, Baillie was a Presbyterian. In his second chapter on the "Tenets of the Old Anabaptists," Baillie says:

"Unto their new gathered churches of rebaptized and dipped saints they did ascribe very ample privileges."
(Page 30.)

He speaks again of the "*Mennonite dippers*," and again he says of all who carry the name of Anabaptism that though some of the sect would deny many of the tenets which he had ascribed to them there were two which they would all acknowledge as their own—Antipedobaptism and *dipping*.

Thus Baillie flatly contradicts himself and is therefore worthless as a witness for either side. But why did Dr. Whitsitt quote what he said *against the Baptists* and suppress what he said *favorable to them*? Does not this show hostility to the Baptists?

7. Garbling of the Broadmead Records.

In the Broadmead Records it is stated that Mr. Canne, a baptized man, was allowed to preach in the church in the morning, but was not allowed entrance in the afternoon, on account of the prejudice existing in the city of Bristol, and a certain woman—

"Hearing that he was a baptized man, by them called and Anabaptist, which was to some sufficient cause of prejudice; because the truth of believers' baptism had been for a long time buried, yea for a long time by popish inventions, and their sprinkling brought in the room thereof." (Page 19.)

Dr. Whitsitt stops the quotation just there, suppressing the next sentence, in which the Baptists give the following as a reason for the prejudice against them in Bristol:

"About a hundred years before, some beyond the sea in Germany, that held the truth of believers' baptism, did in some way do some very irregular actions, of whom we can have no true account what they are but by their enemies; for none but such in any history have made any relation or narrative of them."

In the city of Bristol, till the Baptist church was founded in 1640, believers' baptism had been buried and sprinkling brought in, but these Baptists distinctly claim that the Anabaptists beyond the sea had clung to believers' baptism for one hundred years back. Why did Dr. Whitsitt stop his

quotation just there? Was it because he loved the Baptists? No wonder Dr. H. M. King says of his book, "Sentences omitted from Featley and other authors not only destroy the force of the sentences quoted, but array the entire documents against Dr. Whitsitt's position. His quotations are terminated sometimes where they need to be in order to serve and not defeat his purpose."

8. Garbling of "The New Distemper."

There is much garbling in Dr. Whitsitt's book for which Dr. Dexter was originally responsible. But as this garbling was pointed out months ago by different writers, and Dr. Whitsitt has had sufficient time to have heard from the British Museum, and to have acknowledged that he had been misled by Dexter, and he has made no such acknowledgement, he is rightly held responsible also for this garbling.

The following instances are of this sort.

In 1644 a tract was published in London called the "New Distemper." Dr. Whitsitt says :

"Dipping being for the author a '*new distemper*,' it is manifest that he did not take it for granted, but was perfectly aware of the change from pouring or sprinkling to immersion which took place in the year 1641."

Now, this book does not refer to dipping at all. The author was an Episcopalian, and wrote upon the subject of church government and reforming the Liturgie. He tells what the "New Distemper" was as follows :

"The disease of our distempered church (God be praised) hath not as yet taken her principal parts; her doctrine of faith is sound. This distemper onely lyes in her Discipline and Government."

He says nothing whatever of dipping and only mentions the Anabaptists once when he regrets that the church has not the power to punish the Brownists, Anabaptists and Separatists.

Comment is unnecessary.

9. Garbling of R. J.'s Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt says of R. J., a Baptist who published a pamphlet in London in 1645 :

" On page four of that pamphlet, this Baptist writer speaks of the 'new Ordinance of Dipping,' showing that he did not take immersion for granted, and that he was perfectly aware of the change that had occurred in the year 1641."

According to Dr. Whitsitt, therefore, R. J. says that immersion was a "new ordinance" in 1645. Now, R. J. is arguing the old and ever new question in regard to baptism coming in the room of circumcision, and says :

" For as much as he [the Apostle Paul] never once declareth either to Jews or Gentiles how circumcision was an old Seal of the same Covenant of Grace, which is now opened unto all, and **abolished only by the introduction of dipping**, a new ordinance instituted by **Christ** for to confirm the new Covenant unto believers."

The "ordinance of dipping" was instituted by Christ, and was "new" in the days of the Apostles, is the assertion of R. J. Was there ever a more flagrant misuse of authorities ?

10. Garbling of Saltmarsh's Testimony.

Dr. Whitsitt quotes as follows from J. Saltmarsh's "The Smoke in the Temple," published in London in 1645 :

" Mr. Saltmarsh here, pp. 15, 16, speakes of 'the dipping them in the water.....as the new baptism,' showing that he was entirely aware of the recent change from pouring and sprinkling to immersion."

Mr. Saltmarsh was a Quaker, and objected to the words used in baptizing. He said :

" That the form by which they baptize, viz., I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is a form of man's devising, a tradition of man, a mere consequence drawn from supposition and probability, and not the form left by Christ to say over them at the dipping them in the water."

Not once does Saltmarsh use the words, "the new baptism" in this connection, on pages 15 and 16, from which the quotation is taken. Are there any courteous words with which to characterize such an addition to a writer's language? Did Dr. Whitsitt do this because he loved the Baptists?

11. Garbling of Knutton's Testimony.

In the year 1644, a Mr. Emanuel Knutton published a book defending infant baptism. Dr. Whitsitt, on page 123, quotes from him as follows :

"This opinion [of rebaptizing by dipping] being but new and upstart, there is good reason they should disclaime it and be humbled for it."

Now, Knutton was talking of infant baptism, he made no allusion to immersion, and this is what he actually said :

"Now, if there be neither example nor precept against paedobaptism, then such as oppose it do ill, for they follow those pestilent heretics called Anabaptists in Germany who sprung up there (when the light of the gospel first began to shine) not very long since, about Luther's time, this their opinion being but new and upstart, there is good reason they should disclaim it and be humbled for it."

Was ever evidence more grossly garbled? Was ever a writer more grossly misrepresented than is Knutton by Dr. Whitsitt? Knutton was talking about *opposition to infant baptism* : Dr. Whitsitt represents that he was talking about *immersion*. Knutton referred to *Luther's time*, at least 100 years before 1644 : Dr. Whitsitt represents that he referred to 1644. Knutton actually said that *anti-pedobaptism* was new "about Luther's time." Dr. Whitsitt represents that Knutton said that *immersion* was new in 1644. Is it possible to imagine a more flagrant misuse of authorities? Did Dr. Whitsitt do this from love to the Baptists?

These are fair samples of the manner in which Dr. Whitsitt deals with the authors he quotes. His book contains many other glaring instances of garbling, but to expose them all would take more time and space than can be spared. One instance is enough to demonstrate the hostility of the man to

his own people and to show that Southern Baptists have abundant reason, distinct from any question of succession, for their opposition to Dr. Whitsitt.

By his method of using testimony it would be possible to prove any proposition from any book. To use a celebrated illustration, it would be possible to prove from the Bible itself that there is no God. For, we read in the Psalms, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." By following Dr. Whitsitt's method, we could suppress the first part of the sentence "The fool hath said in his heart," and then declare that the Bible says, "There is no God."

It is bad enough to misuse authorities in a righteous cause; but what shall be said of a man's garbling and misquoting against his own people?

The great majority of Southern Baptists object, and think they have a right to object, to such utterances and to such a use of documents on the part of the President of *their* Seminary.

It has been from no unkind feeling toward Dr. Whitsitt, nor from any desire to injure him personally, that I have written. It is with the President of our Seminary and not the man that I have dealt. I have written in the interest of truth, of the Baptists of the South, and of the Seminary.

The action of Dr. Whitsitt's committee, in publishing and scattering broadcast their circular against me, shifting and obscuring the real issues, has put me under the painful necessity of writing what I have written.

J. H. EATON.

Louisville, Ky.