

This Thesis is satisfactory.

If it should ever be given to the press I should specify that the First Chapter be omitted. It would excite unnecessary opposition.

W. H. W.

A  
QUERY  
IN  
BAPTIST HISTORY.  
THE  
PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION,  
WAS  
IT IN ITS ORGANIZATION  
AND  
EARLY HISTORY  
STRICTLY CALVINISTIC?  
BY  
WESTON BRUNER.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY  
2325 LEXINGTON ROAD  
LOUISVILLE, KY.

72

1.

THE PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION, WAS IT IS<sup>N</sup> ITS ORGANIZATION AND  
EARLY HISTORY STRICTLY CALVINISTIC?

INTRODUCTION-

It is a matter of great gratification to the friends of Historical investigation, to note such <sup>marks</sup> (evidence) of an increased interest in the fruitful subject of American Church History. Evidence of this increased interest may be found in our Theological Schools and Universities, and especially in the Religious Press. The American Church History Series now being issued by the Christian Literature Publishing Company, indicates, it is believed, a new and brighter era (along this line). This Series is calculated not simply to give each reader a fit and ample knowledge as to the peculiar history of his own Denomination, - a thing generally needed and certainly much to be desired - but it will afford as well a vast amount of information as to the distinctive teaching and history of all the other Denominations; - a thing of the highest value to American Christendom (of today).

This great awakening in the investigation and (earnest) study of American Church History, will bring to light, no doubt, many facts and truths not generally known hitherto. It may also cause men to question some things heretofore fully accepted as Historical verities.

The query now <sup>advanced</sup> (called forth) as to the Philadelphia Association has never been raised before, so far as we are aware, (by either friend or foe). It thus becomes quite necessary to be clearly understood at the outset.

Remember the question is not sprung because of any undue sympathy

RESTRICTED  
AREA

466  
THESES  
Th.D.  
B835ag

with General Baptist views; for in the main point at issue the Particular Baptists certainly hold the scriptural view. Calvinism is scriptural, if any great doctrine is.

Neither is this inquiry made because of any doubt as to the Philadelphia Association being now strictly Calvinistic. The fact is fully recognized that for more than one hundred and fifty years, it has been the (great) bulwark of American Baptist orthodoxy, especially on the doctrine of election. Great indeed have been its services in moulding (and developing) and maintaining Baptist tenets. To this Association the credit is (mainly) due and pretty generally conceded, for the fact that American Baptists are mostly Calvinists. Not a (whit) of glory should be taken from its great and valiant victories. And if it should be found after careful investigation, that in (the) organization and early history it was somewhat tainted with Arminianism, then it should receive the greater honor. The victory is thus a double one, for not only did it give the death-blow to Arminianism outside of its own bounds, but in its midst as well.

In this thesis, the desire is merely to enter into an (earnest and) careful examination of the early history of the Philadelphia Association, in the hope of reaching a correct answer to the question raised.

The facts in the case must of course decide the matter (under consideration); otherwise a satisfactory conclusion cannot be reached.

Whatever may be the outcome of this investigation, or whatever criticism it may call forth, we are willing to abide by the result reached if it is in full accord with the truth. "The truth, the whole truth,

and nothing but the truth," as far as it can be ascertained, is the desired goal.

CHAPTER I.

SOME CHANGES IN BAPTIST FAITH AND ORDER.

Perhaps no unprejudiced person who will investigate thoroughly, would <sup>now</sup> claim that Baptists have not changed their doctrine <sup>and practice</sup> in many things. Yet it has been confidently asserted by a few that Baptists of today are precisely what they have ever been, and that they have never varied one jot or tittle in doctrine or practice, (from the days of the Apostles to our own time.) They would take up the chain of Baptist succession and have it rattle all the way back to Judea and Galilee, and would find in this chain all the (essential) points contended for by Baptists now. This is certainly a most pleasing delusion in which one might well delight to revel; but the facts show (and they should certainly decide in historical as in other matters) that however pleasing or delightful it may appear, it is only a delusion (after all, resting on no absolutely sure foundation.

*perhaps change is inevitable*  
*from circumstances change passively.*

It is not necessary to go back to the Waldenses and examine their faith to find doctrines believed and earnestly contended for, which Baptists do not now hold. On the other hand, Baptists now believe <sup>and practice</sup> <sup>some</sup> things which they never <sup>previously maintained</sup> (so much as dreamed about).

*But it should noted that Baptists have assigned a different meaning for change.*

Nor need we go back to the Anabaptists of Switzerland, Germany, Holland and England to discover points of difference; such may be found nearer home and nearer our own time. It should ever be remembered that we have never had an infallible Church behind us, made powerful by the

4

Decisions, Decrees and Symbols of (the) great Ecumenical Councils (so-called, of the centuries); and guarded and guided by an infallible representative of Christ here on earth. Our tenets have been held by "men of like passions" and prejudices with ourselves, --men such as we see and know today, who made no claim to infallibility, but who held simply that the word of God alone is the (one) standard of authority and infallible guide. These heroes of faith sometimes possessed weakness with their zeal, and, while earnestly contending for the truth in many things, held to some ill-fated errors. So it may be seen that Baptist belief has varied widely, not only in different ages, but in different churches of the same age. It varies widely today. When our peculiarities are known, this need not be surprising. Indeed the marvel (of Christendom of today) is, that Baptists have held such a continuity of faith.

Other Denominations which are bound by elaborate Creeds and Symbols and Church Councils, look with admiring wonder at Baptist orthodoxy, seeing that they have no Council higher than the local Church and no authoritative Creed but the Bible. This could not be, did they not hold so tenaciously to what they believe is clearly set forth in the eternal and infallible word of God. Yet notwithstanding this fact, modifications in faith and practice have taken place in the last two hundred years, and it may be well to examine some of these.

(a) If the Anabaptists are included in the much-sought-for line of succession, it must be admitted that Baptists have not always practiced immersion. This point is made by all historians, and conceded by

6-

most of our own. (See Lectures by Dr. Whitsitt, Cathcart's Encyclopedia of Baptists.) Indeed it may be seriously questioned, judging from a comparison of the General Baptist Confession of Faith, put forth in 1611, with the other Creeds then held, whether the Baptists of that period practiced immersion. (See Schaff's Creeds of Christendom. Volumes II and III.) Certain it is that in the earliest Baptist Confession of Faith known, according to Dr. Armitage, (See Armitage's History of the Baptists, page 949.) called "The Seven Articles", there is not even an intimation that immersion is the mode of baptism; but today immersion alone is practiced. *This is a step toward N. Y. model.*

(b) The conduct of public worship has undergone many modifications in the last two centuries. These changes have, no doubt, added in many ways "elements of color, variety and richness to our worship, which were all so sadly wanting during the periods which were dominated so largely by the Puritanic forces in the religious world". (The) time was when a Baptist congregation would not engage in public singing; if a member was moved by the Spirit, he arose and sang whatever the Lord put in his mouth. If no one was thus moved a Baptist assembly in the middle of the eighteenth century was as silent in regard to singing as the Quakers. They argued with good effect, that if it was wrong to pray out of a book, it was likewise wrong to sing out of a book. The controversy about singing was a long and bitter one, and many churches were rent asunder, and some (utterly and) hopelessly ruined before it was finally settled. The famous Benj. Keach after a hard struggle, in 1690 introduced singing into his congregation; but his victory was won

at the cost of a division in his church, nine of the members withdrawing a little later and forming "a new anti-singing church." In 1726 John Comer introduced singing into his church at Newport. So it will be conceded that as to singing in public worship Baptists have changed. (See Comer's Diary, page 58, Dr. Broadus' Notes in Homiletics for 1892-3, Crosby Volume III, page 267, as well as Armitage's History.)

(c) Likewise the doctrine in regard to absolute predestination has been considerably modified. This question with us today is practically settled, but it was quite otherwise in the early part of the eighteenth century. Whether Calvinism and Arminianism have both been modified, each reacting on the other so that "between the latest statements of the two opposing systems, a critical student can discern little more than a difference of emphasis", as Mr. Vedder thinks; or from some other cause, the question has become practically settled. But when the Philadelphia Association was organized in 1707 and for years thereafter the Arminian Baptists are believed to have been in the majority; and had the issue been decided by a popular vote, Calvinistic Baptists would have suffered (overwhelming) defeat.

These are evident clear-cut marks of change in Baptist belief. In truth almost the only things about which they have not changed more or less since they became known as a denomination, are their views on religious liberty, the supreme authority of the Bible and believer's baptism. In 1770 Morgan Edwards claimed that the one distinctive peculiarity of Baptists was believer's baptism; and he made a strong plea for the union of all Baptist sects on this one basis of belief. (See

Morgan Edwards' History of Baptists in Pennsylvania.) Perhaps this may be considered by many the one great distinctive and distinguishing peculiarity now; but around this central truth are clustered many doctrines which we hold to be dear as life itself.

CHAPTER II.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GENERAL BAPTISTS.

It is not the aim of this chapter to treat at length General Baptist peculiarities, but simply to call attention to some well known marks by which they may be identified where-ever found. As a rule historians, both secular and ecclesiastical, in regard to the early period of American History, speak without discrimination of the General and Particular Baptists; hence it is thought well to mention some characteristics or distinguishing traits of the General Baptists. Of course in most doctrines they were in essential agreement with Calvinistic Baptists; about these it is not necessary to speak.

(a) In the settlement of America the General Baptists were known in some places as "Six-Principle Baptists", because they laid stress on the six principles enumerated in Hebrews 6: I-2; repentance, faith, baptism, laying on of hands, the resurrection and eternal life."Of these the fourth is the only one peculiar to this body; they lay hands on all after baptism as a token of the impartation of the Spirit ".(See H. C. Vedder's Short History of Baptists, page 148) The Calvinistic brethren were called "Five-Principle Baptists", because they did not hold to the fourth point in Hebrews 6:I-2, as absolutely binding, allowing that it might or might not be administered, according to the desire

of the candidate or the wish of the church.

(b) Another characteristic was their yearly and quarterly meetings, fashioned no doubt after the order of the Quakers. In fact they were in many ways closely allied to the Quakers. A learned Professor in Church History in one of our most noted Theological Schools, in substance said that where+ever you find a Quaker established, if you will look out sharply you will almost surely find a General Baptist in close proximity. This being true, it is highly probable that they derived this custom from their Quaker brethren. But it matters not whence the custom, it distinguishes them from Particular Baptists.

(c) More-over they emphasize man's free-agency more than Calvinists; but it was a point of emphasis only, for in theory, there was essential agreement about man's will and its bondage to sin and Satan as a result of the fall of man. (See Orthodox Confession of Faith, Crosby, Volume III. Apendix 9.)

(d) Some of them also believed in apostasy or falling from grace, but this heresy was not generally adopted; indeed in the Orthodox Confession of 1691, they say: "Those who are effectually called according to God's eternal purpose, being purified by faith, do receive such a measure of the Holy unction from the Holy Spirit by which they shall certainly persevere unto eternal life. (See Article 36.) This savors very much of orthodoxy, and shows that some of them at this period did not believe in apostasy.

(e) Perhaps another characteristic was the custom of laying on of hands on all members received. The Orthodox Confession of Faith enjoins this

rite as a commandment of Christ. "Prayer with imposition of hands by the bishop or elder on baptised believers as such for the reception of the Holy promised Spirit of Christ, we <sup>il</sup> believe, is a principle of Christ's doctrine, and ought to be practiced and submitted to by every baptized believer in order to receive the promise of the spirit of the Father and Son." Article 32. (See <sup>also</sup> Taylor's General Baptist, Volume 1, page 132 and 225.) It is true that some of the Particular Baptists (sometimes) practiced this rite; but from what can be gathered it seems quite clear that they did not make it a test of church-fellowship. When Welch<sup>s</sup> Tract church settled with Pennepeck which was then Calvinistic, they found that Pennepeck had grown indifferent on this subject, but they being largely Arminian, held tenaciously to it. (See Morgan Edwards, Volume 1.) All the trouble <sup>that</sup> which (the immortal) John Comer had with his church which was Calvinistic, was on account of his preaching on the rite of laying on of hands. (See Diary of John Comer, page 57, especially note.) While it is true that laying on of hands was practiced more generally by the Arminians, yet it will not do to press this point too far, and claim that nearly all the Baptists in America at that early period belonged to this class, as Mr. Knight seems to have done in his History of the General Baptists.

(f) Their ~~last~~ <sup>have</sup> last peculiarity which is to be treated, is the doctrine of election and reprobation. They hold that "God before the foundation of the world hath predestinated that all who believe on him shall be saved; and that all who believe not shall be dammed; all of which he knew before. And this is the election and reprobation spoken of in the Scripture; not that God hath predestinated men to be wicked and so to

be damned; but that men being wicked shall be damned. For God would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of truth, and would have no man perish." (See Confession of Faith I6II, Taylor's History of the General Baptists, Volume I, page 386 and Crosby, Volume I, appendix A.)

Again concerning the extent of the atonement as stated in the Orthodox Confession of Faith, "Christ died for all men, and there is a sufficiency in his death and merits for the sins of the whole world. He hath appointed the gospel to be preached unto all men and hath sent forth his Spirit to accompany the word in order to beget repentance and faith. So if any perish it is not for want of the means of grace manifested by Christ unto them, but for the non-improvement of the grace of God freely offered to them through Christ in the gospel."

The Particular Baptists held that the number of the elect, of those persons predestinated to salvation, is "so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." (See Century Confession of Faith, also Philadelphia Confession of Faith.) Here was the great bone of contention between the General and Particular Baptists. Really this was the cardinal doctrine on which they divided, without which the other petty distinctions might have been ignored (entirely). One was called Particular because holding to particular atonement; the other General because holding to general atonement. The former said, Christ died simply and solely for a few, and that few the elect, predestinated unto salvation from before the foundation of the world; the latter said Christ died for all men, those who believe being predestinated unto

11  
salvation and therefore the elect. (Compare Confession of 1611, 1646 and 1691, with Confession of 1689 and Philadelphia Confession of 1742.) With these statements before us we may the more fitly enter into the question under consideration, for by keeping these peculiarities constantly in mind a General Baptist may usually be recognized wherever found.

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE POWER OF THE GENERAL BAPTISTS IN THE EARLY PART OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

*Firstly*  
(I) Let us briefly notice their power in England, for the English Baptists had great influence in planting churches in America which was at this time a colony of Great Britain. *ai* Mr. Benedict speaks as follows of the General Baptists in England: "This class of Baptists, although much the smallest now, claim priority of their more orthodox brethren, in the organization of their churches and in the diffusion of Baptist sentiment in the country. And it is quite clear that two centuries ago and for a long time after, they had the largest number of men of education and influence." (See Benedict's History of the Baptists, page 326) Benedict wrote about 1850; so "two centuries ago" with him, was about 1650; "and for a long time after", perhaps included the remaining part of the seventeenth century, possibly the first of the eighteenth. At least enough may be learned from Mr. Benedict's statement to show that when the first Baptist churches were being formed in the New World, the General<sup>v</sup> outweighed the others. Benedict was a Calvinist, which fact enhances the value of his testimony. The other side claim much more t

than this, but without sufficient proof it seems. (~~See Montgomery's~~ *Part in*  
~~History of the General Baptists.~~)

(II) Let us now turn homeward and pay our respects to their power in America. Here they were the first to organize; in this early period all were weak and few in number, which had a tendency no doubt to cause Baptists to unite in the formation of their churches. Providence and Newport furnish examples of this. In 1652, a number of the members of Mr. William's church withdrew because of their Arminian sentiment, and organized the first General Baptist church in America. The formation of the General Baptist church at Newport had a similar history.

About this time there arose a widespread religious "cold wave" which struck a large part of the Protestant world; it was quite severe in this country, and all Denominations suffered more or less in the fall of religious temperature, the Baptists not excepted. The Calvinistic Baptists suffered more severely than the General who seemed pretty well to have recovered their normal temperature by the beginning of the eighteenth century, and by their warm zeal, fervent spirit and persistent good works they had about divided power with the Calvinistic Baptists. But by the time of the great Yearly Meeting of 1729, they had almost doubled in the number of churches, and far more than doubled in point of membership. This was a wonderful growth in twenty-nine years. Much may be gleaned from the Diary of John Comer, who is by far the most reliable witness for this period of American Baptist history. Comer was a young man of learning and promise who died in the thirtieth year of his age, but not before he had made himself immortal. When con-

verted he joined the Particular Baptists and became pastor at Newport; but he offended his church by publicly advocating the rite of laying on of hands, and soon afterwards left them to join the General Baptists, who were far more zealous. Indeed the Particular Baptists seemed to be slowly but surely dying out, and had it not been for the great influence of the Whitefield-Edwards Revival a few years later, they might have been known in history only, if known at all.

Let us notice more minutely now, the great strength of the General Baptists in 1729, drawing largely from the Diary of John Comer, an original and no doubt the most important document on this subject. Here are the individual churches according to Comer: Providence, Newport, New York, Groton, Dartmouth, New London, South Kingston, one in Providence "under the care of Mr. Peter Place", and one in Scituate, Swanzy, Warwick and North Kingston each. To make a net gain of 100% in twenty-nine years is no little progress, and shows that they were wide-awake. In truth, as has been stated by an eminent and learned Professor in Church History, "The General Baptists were about to take the country", while the Particular brethren were sitting with folded hands and drooping heads making no conquests and winning no victories for their Master.

During this period the most talented and aggressive Baptist preachers in the country belonged to the General Baptist ranks. Valentine Wightman was par excellence the Baptist preacher of his day. Then there were Nicholas Eyres, Daniel Wightman, John Clark, Timothy Brooks, Jonathan Sprague, John Mason, etc. This body formed a brilliant array, and were loyal and valiant soldiers for the Lord and His Christ. They went about

over the country every-where, preaching and baptizing, strengthening and organizing churches. If history does not write their names high on the roll of fame, and posterity fails to honor their heroic services, the Lord of the harvest will not forget them when the time comes for rewarding His servants..

Another evidence of their great power was the Yearly Meeting of 1729. Nothing like it had ever been witnessed among the American Colonies.

"'Tis supposed there were two hundred and fifty communicants and one thousand auditors"-Diary of John Comer,- certainly a remarkable gathering for this early period, and indicated to some extent at least that the General Baptists in America were by no means asleep. The General Association of Kentucky, representing more than one hundred and sixty thousand communicants, would not call forth perhaps a larger assemblage at its annual meeting. The churches represented at this meeting in 1729 were out and out Arminian, but they did not include all the Arminian membership in the country. Many churches like the first which were formed, contained a mixed membership, and could hardly be regarded as either Calvinistic or Arminian, without some misgivings.

Let us now draw nearer our goal and examine the religious status in and around the Quaker City. Did Arminian influence extend to this section of the country, or were the Baptists of Pennsylvania all Calvinists?

(a) PHILADELPHIA, the City of Brotherly Love, was founded by Quakers. Pennsylvania itself was named after the great Quaker leader. Perhaps no city or country has ever had a greater Quaker influence exerted in it,

or was more fully permeated by their teachings. The Quakers were admittedly Arminians (on the subject of election and the extent of the atonement of Christ.) The dominant influence of Quakers always meant the presence of Arminian sentiment. We might expect to find such sentiment among the Baptists of Pennsylvania, even if none of the Quakers had become Baptists; but before the formation of the Philadelphia Association, George Keith with quite a large following, withdrew from the Quakers, and many of these became Baptists most of whom joined the churches in this Association. (See Mr. Edwards' History of the Baptists in Pennsylvania, under the head of Keithian Quakers.)

(b) THE MENNONITES. There were a great many Mennonites in Pennsylvania during the early years of the Association. They were not in full sympathy with the British Baptists, but had no doubt, considerable influence. They were the followers of Simon Menno, and held to the Waterland Confession of Faith; as to the extent of the atonement they were Arminian.

(c) THE TUNKERS as they were called had quite a membership in the early history of Pennsylvania. "It is very hard", says Morgan Edwards, "to give a true account of the principles of these Tunkers, as they have not published any system or creed except what two individuals have put forth which have not been publicly avowed. However, I may assert the following things concerning them from my own knowledge; they are General Baptists in the sense which that phrase bears in Great Britain, ect. (Volume I page 66.)

(d) EMIGRANTS from the different churches in Europe, who incorporated

with the churches in this section of the country, formed the fourth Arminian element. But this point is reserved for fuller consideration in the closing chapter, so it will not be discussed here. Considering what has been said in this chapter, it will be readily seen that General Baptists were to be found in almost every place where there was Baptist sentiment; and their power in America at the close of the seventeenth century, and the opening of the eighteenth was neither small nor insignificant.

This chapter was considered expedient because many well informed persons seem to forget that the General Baptists in America ever had any respectable power, or ever did any valuable work. Indeed it was stated by one of the most learned Divines of this age, that there were no General Baptists in America prior to the days of Mr. Randal who in the latter part of the eighteenth century, organized the Free Will Baptist movement. (See Schaff's Creeds of Christendom.)

This may help to explain the general belief that there were none but Calvinists among the membership of the churches which constituted the Philadelphia Association in 1707.

We are now ready to enter more fully into the discussion, hoping to reach a satisfactory answer to the question raised in this thesis.

CHAPTER IV.

PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF THE  
PRECEDING CHAPTERS AND OTHER FACTS.

After the treatment of Chapters II and III concerning some of the peculiarities of the General Baptists and their great power, especially

15  
about the beginning of the eighteenth century; we may now more fully and more profitably, as well as with greater satisfaction, enter into a minute examination of the Philadelphia Association in the light of all the facts which have been, and shall be presented. We frankly admit that after all a perfectly satisfactory conclusion may not be reached. Perhaps the result here will be, as in many questions of a historical character, uncertain - a question of mere probability. This being true, we must accept the highly probable as correct, even though it cannot be proved such beyond question. Whatever may be the conclusion, let us accept it cheerfully and heartily, if it accords with the known data.

The Philadelphia Association being the oldest by many years in America, has an early history of the highest interest and importance to the Baptist brotherhood generally. It originated in what was then "called General, or Yearly Meetings". "These meetings were instituted," says Dr. Samuel Jones, "as early as 1688, and met alternately in May and September, at Lower Dublin, Philadelphia, Salem, Cohansey, Chester and Burlington, at which places there were members, though no churches were constituted except Lower Dublin and Cohansey. +++++But in the year 1707 they seemed to have taken more properly the form of an association for then they had delegates from several churches and attended to their general concerns. We therefore date our beginning as an association from that time, though we might with little impropriety extend it back some years."

Dr. Samuel Jones (was one of the most learned Baptist preachers of his age, (and) was (most) certainly in a position to know as to the facts about

18

which he wrote. He became pastor of Lower Dublin church in 1763, and for more than half a century his name may be found in the Philadelphia Association minutes. In 1807 he preached the centenary sermon of the Association, and was in different ways identified with many Baptist interests. It will be seen from this statement of Mr. Jones that the Philadelphia Association originated in 1707, out of a yearly meeting which had been in existence for nineteen years, or since 1688. Morgan Edwards makes substantially the same statement in his treatise on Baptists in Pennsylvania, Volume I. Note another extract from Mr. Jones. "They were at this time but a feeble band, though a band of faithful brothers, consisting of but five churches; vis. Lower Dublin, Piscataway, Middletown, Cohansey and Welch Tract". Lower Dublin was but another name for Pennepeck, and included at that time and for thirty-nine years thereafter, the first church of Philadelphia. Just here it might be well to examine somewhat briefly each church in detail, which entered into the organization of the Philadelphia Association in 1707, for an association necessarily partakes quite largely of the character of the churches forming it.

(a) LOWER DUBLIN OR PENNEPECK.

This church was founded in January 1688, and had Elias Keach, son of the famous Benjamin Keach of London, as their first pastor. He ministered to them for two years with marked success, baptizing persons into their fellowship at the Falls, Cold Spring, Burlington, Cohansey, Salem,

In its organization it was beyond question Calvinistic, as we may learn from a statement of Morgan Edwards. (Volume I, section on Penne-

19.

peck.) Mr. Keach was succeeded by Mr. John Watts, who came to this country from Lydd, England, in 1686, and became pastor of Lower Dublin in 1691. (See Cathcart's Encyclopedia of Baptists.)

Was John Watts a Calvinist or an Arminian? On this point let us submit a statement from a letter from Mr. Keach to Mr. Watts, under the date of December-20-1693. "I bless God for the light I have received since I came hither. O brother, I never saw clearly into the glorious gospel till I came to London this last time. Gospel light hath broke forth here more of late in three or four years than, I believe, since the apostasy. Arminianism and Socinianism begin to gasp for life. Universal redemption and falling from grace are almost heart-sick. Blessed be God for the clear revelation of his grace in the everlasting covenant. O brother, I am afraid lest you should be in the dark about the covenant of grace, and want light into the eternal compact between the father and son. Pray, read, weigh and take in those precious plain truths in my book." (See Edwards Volume I, page 112.)

This was after Mr. Keach had returned to London; and the latter part of this extract seems to indicate that he did not regard Mr. Watts as a Calvinist throughout. He had some fear lest he (Mr. Watts) "should be in the dark about the covenant of grace" and lest he should "want light into the eternal compact between the father and son". Expressions like these show us in what light Mr. Keach regarded Mr. Watts on the subject of election. Again a certain John Watts in England was a prominent General Baptist. (See Taylor's General Baptist, Volume I page 131, also Crosby's Baptists, Volume III, page 78f.) Was this John Watts the fath-

er of our John Watts? I can find no satisfactory answer, and must leave the question also in doubt as to whether John Watts of America was a General or Particular Baptist. In 1702 he died of Smallpox and his successor was Mr. Evan Morgan who was among the number that, with George Keith as leader, in 1691 separated from the Quakers. Nothing about his views on election can be found but as he came from the Quakers, who hold tenaciously to general atonement, it is hardly probable that he was a strong Calvinist. It might also be noted that Pennepeck received many members from the Keithian Quakers. (See Edwards Volume 1 section on Pennepeck, also on Keithian Quakers, and note in connection Benedict's History of the Baptists page 600.) This together with another statement from Mr. Edwards, leads to the conclusion that, while Pennepeck was Calvinistic "at the beginning and during the administration of Mr. Keach", at the formation of the Philadelphia Association it had many members of Arminian sentiment. This statement of Mr. Edwards will receive careful consideration further on in this chapter.

(b) MIDDLETOWN.

This church was planted in 1688 according to Benedict, but in 1690 according to others. Little is known of its early history and there is nothing decisive in the available documents to show that it was either strongly Calvinistic or tinged with Arminianism. In its early history there was a division in the church and in order to heal it the members were advised by counseling brethren to subscribe to Mr. Keach's Confession of Faith; but 26 out of a membership of 68 refused to sign. Now this might signify that they were divided on doctrinal grounds, but

we do not know with certainty what reasons the minority had for their refusal. It was well known that Mr. Keach was a strong Calvinist, but it is not stated that this induced the minority to withhold their names. Nothing has been found which shows decisively that Arminian members were in this church, and it is highly probable that it had wholly a Calvinistic membership.

(c) PISCATAWAY.

This church was constituted in 1689 by the assistance of Thomas Killingsworth and was the second church in the state of New Jersey. Nothing definite is known as to <sup>its</sup> ~~the~~ faith <sup>put</sup> ~~of this church~~. The only thing which indicates in the least Arminian sentiment, is the fact that they admitted to their ministry Rev. Henry Loveall, and ordained him as Mr. Drake's assistant. He proved to be an impostor, but he was armed with genuine letters of recommendations from the New England brethren connected with the General Baptists. (See Diary of John Comer, page 92) But <sup>this</sup> ~~there is nothing~~ <sup>put in</sup> ~~very significant in this~~, and ~~we admit~~ <sup>put in</sup> ~~that there~~ is nothing to show definitely what this church believed in regard to the atonement of Christ.

(d) COHANZEY.

Cohanzey was the fourth church which entered into the organization of the Philadelphia Association in 1707. It was established in 1690. The church records are lost, consequently it is very hard to learn anything positive as to their early history; but it is probable that this church was pretty strongly Calvinistic at first. This is inferred from a statement in Benedict's History of the Baptists, page

584. Located here was the famous Timothy Brooks, an Arminian Baptist, who with a number of others had emigrated "from Swansea Massachusetts before the church was formed", and had kept for many years a separate society "on account of difference of opinion relative to predestination, singing of Psalms, laying on of hands, etc." (See Benedict's History of the Baptists, page 584.) But in 1709 two years after the formation of the Philadelphia Association, Timothy Brooks became pastor of this church and brought his Arminian members into it. (See Benedict as above)

(e) WELCH TRACT was the fifth church in point of age. It emigrated as a church militant from Wales, and first settled with Pennepeck in 1701. But they did not find things just according to their notion, so after two years they removed to Welch Tract <sup>Delaware</sup> (New Jersey.)

A careful examination of all the evidence in regard to this church leads to the following conclusion: When they came to Pennepeck they had an Arminian membership sufficiently strong when joined to a similar element already existing in the church at Pennepeck, to cause a great turmoil and even divisions which are to be noticed later. So in 1703 they removed to <sup>Delaware</sup> (New Jersey) and settled on a piece of land which they called Welch Tract, leaving many of their Arminian members behind and taking some of the stronger Calvinists of Pennepeck with them; this then was the first church in the Philadelphia Association to adopt a Calvinistic Confession of Faith, being induced to do this by Mr. Abel Morgan in 1716. (See Morgan Edwards, Volume I section on Pennepeck.) Morgan came to this country ~~in~~ from Blaene Gerent in South Wales; he was a strong Calvinist and a man of great personal power. Perhaps he

was more largely instrumental in winning the victory for Calvinism than any other man in the Association.

(f) THE FIRST CHURCH OF PHILADELPHIA is the only other to be considered in this connection; this church really belonged to the Association at the beginning, but was included in Pennepeck, not having formerly separated from the mother church until 1746. It was strongly Calvinistic at its formation in 1698. John Farmer and his wife, two of the charter members, were Calvinists; likewise were some of the others. But by the additions from the Keithian Quakers who were Arminian, and by the incorporation with them of emigrants from Europe, there arose an Arminian element of some strength. (See Edwards, Volume I.) Moreover there can be but little doubt that this church was more or less influenced by the great number of Quakers who did not become members with them. ~~All of these things are to be considered a little further on in this chapter.~~

It can be seen readily from this brief examination of the individual churches forming the Philadelphia Association originally, that, while the dominant sentiment was no doubt Calvinistic, there was a considerable Arminian influence in several of the prominent churches.

Just here it will be in order to submit a statement from Mr. Edwards, the historian of his day, which fully justifies the conclusion previously stated. Let the reader keep constantly in mind the important fact that he is the highest authority on this subject; his is the oldest document, and behind the document is a man of acknowledged ability and integrity. Speaking of the church at Pennepeck, he relates the following: "Thus for some time continued their Zion with lengthened cords,

till the brethren in remote parts set about forming themselves into distinct churches, which began in 1699. By these detachments, it was reduced to narrow bounds, but continued among the churches as a mother in the midst of many daughters. At their settlement and during the administration of Mr. Keach, they were the same as they are now with respect to faith and order; but when their members increased and emigrants from the different churches in Europe incorporated with them, divisions began to take place about various things, such as absolute predestination, laying on of hands, distributing the elements, singing Psalms, seventh day Sabbath, etc., which threw the body ecclesiastic into a fever." (See Edwards, Volume I, section on Pennepeck.)

This is indeed a statement of the highest importance and when closely examined it will throw light on some points before obscure or at least uncertain.

1. We learn that Pennepeck was the leader among the churches forming the Philadelphia Association, and even after other churches had been organized, it had great influence, for it "continued among them as a mother in the midst of many daughters."

2. We learn that there was a period in which harmony as to "faith and order" prevailed, followed by a period of disastrous strife and divisions. "At their settlement and during the ministration of Mr. Keach, they were the same as they are now with respect to faith and order, etc" Mr. Edwards wrote about 1770 when Pennepeck and the entire Association was avowedly Calvinistic, as the Philadelphia Confession of Faith amply proves. But Mr. Keach, it will be remembered, returned to England in

1692, and it was not until after his return that a change of sentiment seemed to take place, which caused such terrific disorder and dissention<sup>s</sup>

3. Let us now examine the occasions of this disunion of belief.

(a) Absolute predestination.

It may be judged with some degree of assurance that this was the great bone of contention, because it was placed at the head of the list by Mr. Edwards. Now this strife about "absolute predestination" was in Pennepeck and her daughters among whom was the first church of Philadelphia. It was no small affair either, for it threw "the body ecclesiastic into a fever"; evidently there was an Arminian element here which was quite strong, otherwise it could not have made such disruption.

Let us remember also that Mr. Edwards was a vigorous Calvinist and surely would not have exaggerated on making such a declaration. It is like Pedo-baptist testimony as to immersion being the original mode of baptism; if it were true, why would such testimony be given?

(b) Laying on of hands was the next cause of strife. In Chapter II on the characteristics of General Baptists, it was clearly pointed out that this rite was regarded as one of the highest importance and made by many a test of fellowship, but there is nothing to show that the Particular Baptists ever regarded it so highly. There were members here no doubt who demanded that each candidate for membership should have this rite administered, but others claimed that it should not be made a test of church fellowship; hence the contention and division among them.

The fact that absolute predestination and laying on of hands were occasions of strife, shows the presence of Arminian church members; if

this be true, our question is answered in the negative, the Philadelphia Association was not in its organization strictly Calvinistic.

(c) Seventh day Sabbath was another cause of trouble. Mr. Edwards, speaking of the Seventh-day Baptists, says: "The character of General and Particular divide them in this province, few as they are. They originated from the Keithian Baptists in 1700, as has been observed before, who were general in their sentiments touching the redemption of Christ." (See Volume I, page 60.)

(d) Singing Psalms is the last that we shall notice as a cause of discord. This alone would give us very little light, but when taken in connection with the others, gives additional weight to the view that we have advanced. It is well known that the General Baptists were more bitterly opposed to singing in public worship than the Calvinistic Baptists. This was due no doubt to the close proximity of the latter to the Quakers.

From the above considerations the conclusion is reached that there was in the Philadelphia Association at its organization and during its early history, a considerable Arminian heresy which it took years to eradicate.

But some one may ask did not Mr. Edwards say in the introduction of his treatise on The Baptists in Pennsylvania, Volume I, that "they are independent with respect to church government, and Calvinistic with respect to doctrine; and this last, I may add, so universally, that the distinction of General and Particular have no place among them." (See Volume I, page 6.) This does seem on first observation to controvert

the above conclusion, for Mr. Edwards is the most important witness examined, and it is largely due to his testimony that the conclusion was reached. A witness divided against himself cannot stand. But it must be remembered that this statement is in the introduction to his treatise of the British Baptists in Pennsylvania, and had reference to the condition of belief at the time of his writing which was in the year 1770, sixty-three years after the formation of the Philadelphia Association. It is freely admitted that it was then and had been for more than thirty years out and out Calvinistic, so that at the time of his writing no one could question the position of the Association. This remark of Mr. Edwards does not in the least interfere with the conclusion we have expressed.

It is desired in concluding this thesis to present the fact that if the Association was strictly Calvinistic at the beginning and during its early years of existence, there are some difficulties which can hardly be removed or overcome; while on the other hand, if we grant the presence of a considerable element of Arminians, all these difficulties vanish away.

A brief survey of the situation amply shows the truthfulness of this assertion.

I. In the formation of many churches of this early period, Arminian and Particular Baptists united. If there were no members of Arminian sentiment here, it was quite different from what it was elsewhere; this can hardly be believed, knowing that many of the churches were made up largely of the same people.

2. Another point of difficulty is in regard to the adoption of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. This Confession of Faith according to Morgan Edwards and others was adopted in the year 1742. True Dr. Sewall S. Cutting says in his Historical Vindications, that the Confession of Faith was adopted prior to the year 1742, and adduces in proof of this assertion a statement in the minutes, or supposed minutes rather, of the Association for the year 1724. This statement has been examined with considerable care and the conclusion reached is that the so-called minutes were either made out from memory or from some general statement given in some of the church records; for according to Mr. Benedict, the minutes were not printed till a few years prior to 1768. So we cannot let the statement made in this book of the minutes of the Association 1707-1807, and compiled by a committee appointed in 1843, the one hundred and thirty-sixth anniversary of the Association, outweigh the plain statement of Mr. Edwards to the contrary. (See Volume I, page 5.) Dr. A. D. Gillette, the chairman of the committee appointed for the purpose of compilation, stated to the Association in its annual meeting in 1846, "that through the kindness of Mrs. Harris, daughter of Samuel Jones, D.D., Thomas Shields, and others, we have obtained minutes of various sessions entire, as early as 1729." (See Minutes of the Philadelphia Association 1707-1807, introduction.)

So it is plain that we cannot rely with the utmost confidence on the statement in the minutes of 1724, and these minutes so-called only imply that the Confession of Faith had already been adopted. "In the year 1724, a query concerning the fourth commandment, whether changed, alter-

ed or diminished. We refer to the Confession of Faith set forth by the elders and brethren met in London 1689, and owned by us, Chapter 22, section 7-8." (See Minutes of Philadelphia Association 1707-1807.) If one did not know that the committee had no minutes prior to 1729, this would seem rather formidable even against the plain assertion of Morgan Edwards, who says: "The faith and order of these people may be seen in the Confession, Catechism and treatise of discipline which they adopted in their Association held at Philadelphia in the year 1742." Mr. John Hart who was present when it was adopted makes a similar statement. These witnesses together with the minutes of 1742 present conclusive evidence that the commonly received year is the one in which the Confession of Faith was adopted. If it was not adopted until the aforesaid year, a very interesting question arises. Why was it not adopted sooner? If the Association was strictly Calvinistic from the beginning, what good reason can be given for this delay? None it seems. But if there was a considerable number of the members of the different churches who were General Baptists in sentiment, then the delay is easily accounted for. The Association could not have adopted such a Confession without disunion and perhaps utter ruin. No one can claim that the Association was in ignorance of the Confession of 1689, known as the Century Confession, which was adopted, with the addition of two articles, in 1742.

The Welch Tract church early in its history, 1716, adopted this Confession. (See Edwards, Volume I, page 20.) Many of the members of this church for two years resided at Pennepeck and Philadelphia, and these were the leading churches in the Association in this early period.

But it may be asked how can you account for this sudden change of sentiment and bold stand for Calvinism in 1742, if there were so many Arminian members prior to that time? Easily enough; it was due very largely to the influence of George Whitefield. He came to America in 1739, and soon set the entire continent on fire by his eloquent and wonderful preaching. He was an ardent Calvinist, and visited far and wide, and was a living example to show that a Calvinist may have religion as well as other people. The Philadelphia Association caught his spirit, and a-flame with his zeal set about to work for their Master as never before. The influence of George Whitefield directly and indirectly together, it is fully believed, saved the country from the complete dominion of Arminianism among the Baptists; and the adoption of the Confession of Faith in 1742 was largely due to his influence. It seems rather singular to attribute our preponderance of Calvinism to a Methodist, yet it is no doubt rightly attributed.

On the supposition that there were Arminian members in the churches the adoption of the Confession of Faith as late as 1742, can be easily accounted for, otherwise the difficulty is almost insuperable.

3. Lastly, on the supposition that there were no Arminians in the different churches, the statement of Morgan Edwards presents a difficulty insurmountable. He plainly says that there was great commotion about "absolute predestination, etc., ++++ which threw the body ecclesiastic into a fever." If there were no Arminians, this language can hardly have any meaning; if there were, this difficulty vanishes, away most completely.)

In the great commotions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in which men and nations changed their creeds both politically and religiously; and kings and kingdoms lost their influence on the masses of the people; and on the ruins of dead empires arose mighty republics; and the great natural freedom of man was emphasized by the voice and pen of many brave and true men - in this sublime struggle for political and religious liberty, it was but natural that Calvinism and Arminianism should meet in mortal combat. This they did in the Philadelphia Association; but error retreated before the power of truth, and the Association became the greatest champion and defender of orthodoxy in the American Republic.

Very truly,

Weston Bruner.

April 10th, 1894.

*This copy of this thesis was returned by Dr. Whitcomb to the author, Weston Bruner, at the time of its acceptance. Dr. Bruner kept it for 50 years and in 1944 his son, Ben Bruner, gave it to the library in exchange for a recently typed and bound copy.*

*Leo J. Brunson  
Nov. 30, 1944.*