

1857.

principles." I find the following in the Cyclo-
pedia of History &c. &c., page 66—A. D. 606.
Pope Boniface III. made supreme head of the
Church by Phocas. The title of Universal
Bishop assumed. The Waldenses refuse sub-
mission to Rome. Probably, Castigator will
tell us in the next Provincial Wesleyan that
the Waldenses were not in existence in A. D.
606, but "simply" refused submission to Rome.
He proceeds to say I ought to be ashamed, and
Baptists ought to be ashamed of me—that
"Children are not always as good as their pa-
rents"—that the Ana-Baptists "were an awful-
ly corrupt people"—and that your readers are
an "uninformed and ignorant people," who
never read the works, or heard the names of
the writers, to whom I appealed for proof of
the antiquity and purity of the Baptist Churches
&c. &c. For his kindness in giving us all
this valuable information, I tender him my
grateful acknowledgements, and hope for the
credit of his parents, that part of it at least is
true.

He also informs us that, at my recommenda-
tion he has read, Neander, Mosheim, Zwinglius,
and D'Aubigne, for proof of the antiquity of the
Baptist Churches, but can find no trace of it
previous to 1521. I must impute this, not to
willful blindness, in shutting his eyes to the
truth; but to the fact, that having only had
two weeks, in which to read the works of these
four authors, some of which are pretty volumi-
nous; his mind,—never very clear on these
points; became so confused, that he drew
just the contrary meaning from their statements,
which they intended to convey. He also al-
ludes to "that base production the Great Iron
Wheel." As that work was very severely criti-
cized in a Methodist Magazine, to which I
subscribed, I had my curiosity so much excited,
as to send to Boston for it. It does not treat
however of Wesleyan Methodism, but of Episco-
pal Methodism, and though I have no reason to
doubt its contents, I would not recommend it
to your readers, because it breathes a spirit too
similar to that of the piece now under review—
is too much in that peculiar style which has
characterized the Provincial Wesleyan—more
especially under its late Editor, for it is but
justice to the present Editor, to say that its tone
and temper are, in the main, far superior, to
what they then were, with the exception of
such injudicious, and uncharitable communica-
tions, as those of 'Obed' and 'Castigator',
which appeared in the same number. Castiga-
tor now revives the stale and oft repeated slan-
der, that the Baptists are descended from the
wild followers of Storch, Muncer, &c., and
gives D'Aubigne's account of that fanatical
sect, which he has the effrontery to tell the
readers of the Wesleyan applies to Mennonites
and Anabaptists. Allow me to give one ex-
tract from a Baptist author, all my other wit-
nesses shall be drawn from the ranks of our op-
ponents.

To clear away the mist which Podo-baptists
have thrown around this subject, I may state
that the followers of Storch and Muncer, were
called 'Ana-baptists,' because in common with
the "inoffensive and upright Ana-baptists,"
who Mosheim says were descended from the
Waldenses; they declared that "infant baptism
was valueless," &c. Podo-baptists taking ad-
vantage of this circumstance have endeavored to
confound the two sects. "For the last 200
years, our enemies, conjointly, have made one
continuous effort to depreciate the claims of
Baptists to an ancient origin. Like the animal
in the manger, who, not being able to eat the
hay himself, was determined the oxen should
not—so they, satisfied that they cannot claim an
origin prior to the days of Luther, seem deter-
mined that no one shall believe that Baptists
have a claim to a more ancient origin. They
allege that the madmen of Munster were Bap-
tists, and that Baptists, as such, were the au-
thors of the rebellion, and all the excesses of that
period; and they point us to Munster, when we
speak of our origin and history, and sneeringly
say, 'There was your origin, and there, your
early history.'—Prel. Ess. Orchard's History.
Castigator is another proof of the correctness of
the above extract, and tells us, in this the 19th
century, once more, that Baptists are descended
from Storch and Muncer, and endeavors to up-
hold it by an extract from Mosheim. But
though a Lutheran, and a decided bitter op-
ponent of the Baptists, Mosheim only says, in a
note, that some of those 'furious fanatics,'
adopted the doctrines and disciplines of Menno,
who gloried in having "conquered the ferocity,
and reformed the lives of SEVERAL members of
this pestiferous sect." If several Indians had
been converted by John Wesley in Georgia,
would it be honest to say that the Methodists
were descended from the Indians?

But Mosheim further says, "The true origin
of that sect, which acquired the denomination
of Ana-baptists * * * and that of Mennonites
from the famous man to whom they owe
the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid-
den in the REMOTE DEPTHS OF ANTIQUITY." "The
Mennonites are not entirely in error when they
boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petro-
bruscians, and other ancient sects, who are
usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in
the times of general darkness and superstition."
Cent. xvi. sect. 3. pt. 2. ch. 3.—Zwinglius the
Swiss reformer, to whom I also appealed, was
contemporary with Luther, Muncer and Storch.
He says, "The institution of Ana-baptism is no
novelty, but for 1300 years has caused great dis-
turbance in the church [of Rome] and has ac-
quired such a strength, that the attempt in this
age, to contend with it, appeared futile for a
time." This carries our history back to A. D.
225. But does D'Aubigne give any counten-
ance to the meaning Castigator endeavors to fix
upon the quotation given us? Let him answer,
"On one point it seems necessary to guard
against misapprehension. Some persons imag-
ine that the Ana-baptists of the time of the
Reformation [the followers of Storch, &c.,] and
the Baptists of our day are the same. But they
are as different as possible." Again, "It is but
justice to observe that the Baptists of Holland,
England and the United States are essentially
distinct from those seditions and fanatical indi-
viduals above mentioned."—Hist. Ref. Pref. p.
10.

Another author says, "If the reader has time
to make himself acquainted with the history of
the numerous body of Christians, which appeared
at different periods, while Popery was dominant
in Europe, he will find that there were many
MYRIADS OF PERSONS, who for several centuries
before the Reformation, lifted up their voice
against that spiritual domination, and that these
several sects held the distinctive principles of the
Baptists given above [adult baptism on profes-
sion of faith]. Such was the avowed sentiment
of the followers of Gundulphus in Italy, of the
Berengarians in France, of the Paterines in the
Duchy of Milan, of the Petrobruscians and Henri-
cians, in Languedoc and Provence, and of the
followers of Arnold of Brescia. All these are
some times included in the general name of
Waldenses."—Pen. S. G. pp. 82, & 3. And
President Edwards, says, "Some of the Popish
writers own that that people never submitted to
the Church of Rome. One says 'the heresy of
the Waldenses is the oldest heresy in the world.'
It is supposed that this people betook themselves
to this secret place among the mountains, to
hide themselves from the severity of the heathen
persecutions which were before Constantine the
great. And thus the woman fled into the wil-
derness from the face of the serpent.—Rev. xii.
6, 14."—Hist. Redemp. Period 111. Pt. ii. 1.
Read also Jones's History of this people, Vol. 2.
pp. 49, 50, 70., 2 Ed., and then say what you
think of Castigator's "bold and groundless as-
sertion" that "the Baptists have descended from
the Mennonites, and the Mennonites from the
Ana-baptists, and the Ana-baptists took their
rise in Munster, in Germany, about the year
1521. That there was no such thing as a Bap-
tist Society before that period on any part of
our earth, [read the 9th Commandment,] that
the Ana-baptists were the most fanatical and
diabolical people that ever disgraced the Chris-
tian Church, &c., &c." The most charitable
construction I can put on such statements is,
that they are occasioned by "sheer ignorance."

He is not acquainted with the origin of his
own church, which is only 127 years old, at the
outside, and how can we expect him to be ac-
quainted with that of a Denomination which
has existed for more than 1800 years. The
learned Mosheim, (Chancellor of the University
of Gottingen,) acknowledged its true origin was
"hidden in the remote depths of Antiquity," and
no reader of Castigator's production, will for one
instant dream of comparing him with that ac-
curate historian. It would make this article
too long to give any more extracts from Podo-
baptist writers on this point. The above are
sufficient to convince any candid mind of the
truth of my assertions in your journal of Jan.
14th. We can not suspect our opponents of being
biassed in our favor, hence their testimony bears
double weight, when it proves any thing in our
favor.

A writer in a late number of the Pros. Wit-
ness, while endeavoring to overthrow our claim,
says, that "The Waldensian church was Apos-
tolic in Doctrine, Government, and Worship." We
could ask nothing stronger. No other sect
occupies the same high vantage ground as ours,
in battling against the errors of the Church of
Rome. To Protestants of all other names, Rome
says, "You are heretics and schismatics, who

have left your mother Church, within a com-
paratively recent period, and who while you
deny my infallibility, acknowledge it in practice,
by retaining many things which were ordered
on my sole authority, and for which you find no
sanction in the Bible, such as Infant Sprinkling,
&c., &c."—But we can prove that we "never
symbolized with her;" that numerous churches,
—holding our distinctive principles—governed
after the same manner—in a word BAPTIST in
all but the mere name—existed before Popery
arose, and from its very first inception, protest-
ed, against the errors and corruptions, that
successively crept into the dominant Church;
sealing their testimony with their blood, in
myriads of cases.

Castigator misquotes my remarks about the
mode of baptism, omitting my appeal to the for-
mer practice of the Church of England, and
says, "The reader will please observe that per-
sons of other religious persuasions, are not called
brethren, but friends, because they are not in the
'Apostolic succession.' The heedlessness and
recklessness of C. H. H. are astonishing; he
never could have read the authors just named,
or would not have referred his heretic friends, to
their writings in order to sustain the Baptist
hypothesis of dipping." Had I been writing to
Christians only, in other persuasions, I should
most certainly have used the term brethren. I
meant just what I said. I meant all who went
by the name of Presbyterians, Methodists, &c.,
and not merely the communicants of those
churches, who are but a third or fourth of the
whole in any evangelical sects. We are told
the Episcopal Rubric does not teach that
dipping is the proper mode when it states the
child shall be dipped in water, discreetly and
warily, but if the parents certify that the child
is weak, pouring shall suffice. Has the English
language any fixed meaning? or does it mean
just what each one chooses? We shall see pre-
sently what interpretation John Wesley, no
mean authority with Methodists, puts upon that
passage. In my former article I referred to Dr.
Wall, the author of that famous work, "The
History of Infant Baptism." The satisfaction
it gave was so great, that in a General Convoca-
tion of the Episcopal Clergy, held February 9th,
1706, it was ordered.

"That the thanks of this house be given to
Mr. Wall, Vicar of Shoreham, in Kent, for the
learned and excellent book he has lately written
concerning Infant Baptism." His work is con-
sidered to this day the ablest defence of Infant
Sprinkling, which has ever been written. He
explored all the writers of antiquity in search
of evidence, and his testimony when in favor
of Baptist views, must be allowed to have great
weight. "The offices or liturgies,—did ALL
ALONG enjoin dipping, without any mention of
pouring or sprinkling." The exception for
weak children, first appeared A. D. 1549.—
Sprinkling to prevail about A. D. 1550, and
"within the time of half a century, from A. D.
1550 to 1600, prevailed to be the more general, as
it is now almost the only way of baptizing."
—Hist. Inf. Bap. Pt. 11. Ch. 9. Sec. 2. In
the Catechism the youth is instructed to say,
"Water wherein the person is baptized."
"Anciently those who were baptized, were
immersed and buried in the water, &c. &c."—
Archbishop Tillotson, Vol. 1. Sermon. 7. p. 179.
"Burying, as it were, the person baptized in
the water, and raising him out again, without
question, was anciently the more usual method."
&c. &c.—Archbishop Secker's, Lectures on
Catechism, Lect. 35. Whitty author of a
commentary on the New Testament, and more
than 40 other learned works, says, "It being so
expressly declared here, and in Col. ii. 12, that
we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being
buried under water, * * * and this im-
mersion being religiously observed by ALL CHRIS-
TIAN FOR THIRTEEN CENTURIES, * * * it
were to be wished that this custom might be
again of general use, and aspersion only per-
mitted as of old, in present danger of death."
—Note on Rom. vi. 4. "But enough," writes
the celebrated Podo-Baptist scholar and linguist,
Professor Stuart, "it is, as says Augusti, a
thing made out, i. e., the ancient practice, of
immersion. So, indeed, all writers who have
thoroughly investigated this subject conclude.
I know of no one usage of ancient times which
seems to me more "clearly and certainly made
out. I can not see how it is possible for any
candid man who examines the subject, to deny
this."—page 359.

I referred Wesleyans to Burkit's notes, on
the New Testament, because they are endorsed
and published by the Methodist Book Concern,
and I have seen the work in none but Methodist
families.
Now for a burst of "oratorical logic." We
know not which is the most astonishing the

sheer ignorance of C. H. H. in referring us to
the writings of John Wesley, for proof that
dipping is the only mode of baptism, or the
bare-faced impudence of some Baptist preach-
ers, who in the pulpit, or from the tanks of
their Jordans, assert that the founder of Me-
thodism wrote in favor of their dipping hypo-
thesis." What courteous, logical, and brotherly
language! What a pity it is not more in ac-
cordance with facts! I shall leave Baptist
preachers to settle their part of the account
themselves, with the wish that I were as well
able to fulfil my part of the work. Where, I
may ask, will you find in Nova Scotia, in any
Denomination, men superior to the Hardings,
Mannings, Crandalls, Dimocks, &c. &c.—So
abundant in labors, so self-denying, so filled
with love to God and man, so successful in
saving sinners. Though other men have enter-
ed into their labors, their works do follow them
—being dead they yet speak—to all ministers
of the cross, to be faithful and zealous in the
work of the Lord. "There were giants in those
days."

In Wesley's Journal I find the following,—
"Saturday, Feb. 21, 1736.—Mary Welch, aged
11, was baptized according to the custom of the
russ church, and the rule of the Church of
England; by immersion. The child was ill
then, but recovered from that very hour."
Observe here, "the rule of the Church of Eng-
land," and the "miracle" which followed
the immersion. Another entry reads, "Wed-
nesday, May 5th.—I was asked to baptize a
child of Mr. Parker's, second Bailiff of Savan-
nah, but Mrs. Parker told me, 'Neither Mr.
Parker nor myself will consent to its being
dipped.' I answered, 'if you certify that your
child is weak, it will suffice,' (the Rubric says)
to pour water upon it." She replied, 'Nay
the child is not weak, but I am resolved it shall
not be dipped.' This argument I could not
confute, so I went home, and the child was
baptized by another person." The above shows
what Mr. Wesley understood the Rubric to mean,
and also that he was so convinced that dipping
was the only proper mode, except in cases of
sickness, that he preferred incurring the dis-
pleasure of a person high in rank, rather than
baptize by pouring.

"When Mr. Wesley baptized adults, profess-
ing faith in Christ, he chose to do it by trine
immersion, if the persons would submit to it,
in doing this to be the Apostolic method of bap-
tizing.

Oct. 26, he says, "I baptized Mr. Wigginton,
in the river by Baptist Mills, and went on my
way rejoicing to French Hay."—Life of Wesley,
by H. Moore, Vol. 1., p. 425, published for the
Methodist Episcopal Church, 1824. Moore was
the only surviving trustee of Mr. Wesley's
MSS.

"Buried with him, alluding to the ancient
manner of baptizing by immersion."—Wesley's
note on Rom. vi. 4. I hope we shall hear no
more about the "Barefaced impudence of Bap-
tist preachers," after this.

I am astonished that the Editor of the Wes-
leyan, was so "heedless" as to insert the ex-
tracts given us from Wesley and Adam Clark
on baptism—they are anything but creditable
to the scholarship of those really learned men,
in the present advanced state of biblical know-
ledge, besides being another evidence of the in-
consistencies learned Podo-Baptists are betrayed
into, whenever they attempt to uphold pouring
or sprinkling in the place of baptism. We are
told "the jailor and all his house were bap-
tized in the prison." The New Testament does
not tell us so. It tells us the jailor brought
Paul and Silas out of the prison, and after the
baptism he brought them into his house. The
baptism could not then have taken place either
in the house or in the prison. It was adminis-
tered probably in some of the numerous public
baths, which in Philippi, a city on "the Place
of Fountains," "so called from its numerous
streams." We are also told that Peter convert-
ed and baptized 3000 at one time, and 5000 at
another, "at Jerusalem where they had none
but the gentle waters of Siloam" (!!!) This is
news probably to most baptists, although on the
authority of John Wesley. Were neither Cas-
tigator or the Editor of the Provincial Wesleyan
aware of the large number of pools, ponds, and
reservoirs in Jerusalem, sufficient for the im-
mersion of 50,000, let alone 5,000. Let us men-
tion a few of the principal public pools. The
Pool of Bethesda—The king's or Solomon's
Pool—The Pool of Siloam—The Upper Pool,
in the highway of the Fuller's Field—The Low-
er Pool of Gihon—The Pool of Hezekiah—&c.
&c. &c. For the description, dimensions, &c.
of these and other pools in Jerusalem, we refer
to the work of the learned Podo-Baptist, Dr.
Robinson—as to the story about the Mills, we