

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIV.—NO. 3.

---

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE BATTLE OF FORT SUMTER: ITS MYSTERY AND MIRACLE—GOD'S MASTERY AND MERCY.

When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it.—Deut. 20 : 10, 12. Also, 2 Chron. 32 : 5-8; Ps. 22 : 7-9; Is. 25 : 11, 12; Num. 31 : 49; Is. 29 : 8, 4.

We have been called together to the sanctuary—the house of prayer, of promise, and of God's presence and powerful interposition—originally by the generally expressed sentiments of this community, and more recently by the unanimous voice of our Southern Congress, and the proclamation of the President of the Confederate States, and our own Government. Never was there a louder appeal, and never a more imperious necessity. We have been coerced into a war. It is a religious, and yet an irreligious and anti-Christian, war. We have crossed swords with the Northern confederacy over the Bible. We have met each other face to face at the same altar, invoked fire from heaven on each other, and appealed to the God of battles, to whom belongeth vengeance, to avenge us against our adversaries. The fearful guilt and amenability to the righteous judg-

VOL. XIV., NO. III.—47

The usurpation of Lincoln, Scott & Co.—the arbitrary, unconstitutional, tyrannous, unnatural, inhuman, and diabolical course pursued by them—the barbarities perpetrated, the blood of patriot martyrs murdered, the curses of outraged women, the wailing of widows, the tears of orphans, houses burned, cities subjugated, fields devastated, *all decency and civilization set at defiance by unlicensed lynx-eyed generals and soldiers*—ARE THERE, AND WE APPEAL TO THEM.

May the Lord hear us in this day of trouble, and the name of the God of Jacob defend us, send us help from His sanctuary, and strengthen us out of Zion. We will rejoice in His salvation, and in the name of our God we will set up our banners.

Thus saith the Lord God of our fathers, I will deliver thee and this city out of the hands of your enemy, AND THIS THAT HE HAS DONE SHALL BE A SIGN UNTO THEE, FROM THE LORD, THAT THE LORD WILL DO THIS THING THAT HE HAS SPOKEN.

---

ARTICLE II.

THE WALDENSES AND INFANT BAPTISM.

It is proposed in this article to show that the rite of infant baptism has always been practiced by the Waldensian Church. The antiquity of the body of Christians known by this name is conceded by ecclesiastical historians of every party. All Protestant writers agree in ascribing to them great purity of doctrine and of life, in a time of abounding corruption in both. Deriving the articles of their faith and their rules of conduct immediately from the Scriptures, and maintaining their right to do so against the authority of the papal hierarchy, to which the entire Christian world besides bowed in unquestioning servility,

their views and customs are regarded as having no ordinary weight in determining, on all controverted points, what the doctrines and usages of the primitive Church were. Hence, Prelatists have made anxious search among them for some trace of a diocesan episcopacy. Hence, too, our Baptist brethren have labored, with the zeal they are accustomed to bestow upon all subjects relating to the rite from which they take their name, to create the impression that they rejected the ordinance of infant baptism. The expression "Waldensian Baptists," has of late years become one of frequent recurrence in addresses and writings designed to promote the views of the anti-pedobaptists. An examination of the question at issue is justified by its importance, whether that importance be real, or merely factitious.

Preliminary to the direct testimony in support of our position, are two or three facts, of much presumptive value. One is, the fact that the Waldenses of the present day observe the rite. Some four or five years since, this was denied, or at least questioned, in certain quarters. But later investigations, directed to the point, have removed every pretext for doubt on the subject. The following is an extract from a letter of Dr. Revel to Dr. Robert Baird, which first appeared in the *New York Observer*, and was subsequently copied into various journals throughout the country. We insert the passage below, not only as setting forth the present practice of the Waldenses, but also for the light it throws upon other aspects of the matter in controversy, as we shall hereafter see. In order, however, that our readers may properly estimate the position of Dr. Revel, who here appears both as a witness and as an authority, they should bear in mind that he fills the highest office known in the polity of the Church to which he belongs—the Moderatorship of their Synod—an office held during life; and, further, that he is the President of their highest literary and theological institution. If any man

living may claim the right of speaking authoritatively on such a subject, it is he.

PASTOR REVEL TO REV. DR. BAIRD.

As to the questions which you have addressed to me touching the *mode of administering Baptism*, I hasten to answer them in the briefest and most precise manner possible. 1. The mode of baptizing in our Churches is *pedobaptism*, by the sprinkling of pure water on the forehead by the Minister, who pronounces solemnly the sacramental words, Matt. 28 : 19, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. 2. This practice has never varied in our Church, and we have never had, nor do we now have, any opposing or Baptist party. 3. Although the Waldenses of Piedmont have always been *pedobaptists*, we find enemies who accuse them not only of rejecting the baptism of children, but baptism in general! This accusation has apparently some foundation, inasmuch as in the middle ages it was brought against those who in the South of France were called *Waldenses*, but who were a portion of the *Cathari*. It is thus that the work of Rainerius, "*contra Waldenses*," sets forth and charges upon us the doctrines and practices of the *Cathari*. But you know that the *Cathari*, who for a long time existed in the South of France, derived their doctrines from the East, which they wrought up into a mixture of Gnostic, Manichean, and Paulician principles, with some of the truths of the Gospel, and that, according as there were more or less of the evangelical element, they professed a *dualism* absolute or relative. But all the *Cathari* were agreed in rejecting all that was traditional and external. They pretended to reestablish the primitive and apostolic simplicity, and this under a form corresponding to their own principles. They rejected *pedobaptism*, and, for the most part, baptism in general. The first class maintained even that John the Baptist was an agent of Satan, and that his baptism was a means of enrolling disciples. They pretended that in the New Testament *baptism* stands for *repentance*. The true baptism for them was made by the imposition of hands and the prayer which they called *consolamentum*, and the latter was of a double nature. They had one for the *credentes* (those who were just introduced into the sect), and another for those who were called *perfecti*, or *consolati*.

It being conceded, then, that the Waldenses practice infant baptism in the present day, it devolves upon those who deny that they have practiced it from the beginning, to show when and by what means the change in their views was effected. A revolution as important as this in the views of a whole Church in relation to one of the two sacraments which they hold to be of divine authority,

would surely have left some trace upon the page of history. We have not been able, after reading various accounts of them, from various sources, to find the slightest intimation of such an event. Jones, a Baptist historian of England, who has written largely concerning them, from their rise in the world to the end of the seventeenth century, whilst, as we shall show in the sequel, he endeavors to destroy, by suppressions and misquotations, their testimony in favor of the ordinance, does not pretend that any change had taken place in their practice up to the time when his history left them. It is simply impossible for the change to have taken place since that time, and yet no one have transmitted a record of it—no one, not even the Waldensians themselves, have known when and how it came about.

Another admitted fact, pertinent to our object, is, that at the Reformation, in the sixteenth century, under the labors of Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, and others, the Waldenses affiliated with these men, and with the Churches planted by their ministry. Salutations were interchanged between the parties by deputies and written correspondence. Subjects on which a difference of opinion existed, or were supposed to exist, were freely discussed. Yet, in all their conferences, that of infant baptism was not once alluded to as a matter to be adjusted. Here there was a perfect agreement, so far as appears from the extended records which have descended to our times, between all concerned, Waldensians, Lutherans, and Calvinians. Between Calvin and the Waldenses the most fraternal relations existed, from the time of his residence in Strasburg to the close of his life, as may be seen in his letters, recently published. The effect of this intercourse, developing so beautiful a harmony of views, was the rapid and unresisted absorption of the Waldensians into the Reformed Church, except that portion residing in the Valleys of Piedmont. Here, being more concentrated and strong, they have maintained to this day their distinctiveness as a

religious body, in intimate fellowship, however, with the evangelical Churches of the Calvinistic type contiguous to them. All this may be seen in detail in Adam Blair's elaborate history of the Waldensian Church; also in the "Israel of the Alps," the elegant work of Dr. Muston, Pastor of the Waldensian Church at Bordeaux, and son of the Muston who was for many years Moderator of the General Synod.

Soon after the Reformation began, the Anabaptists of Germany arose. Why did not the Waldenses seek fellowship with them, instead of the party of Luther and Calvin? This would have been their natural recourse if they had been Anabaptists. Murdock, the learned translator of Mosheim's Church History, says: "It is a well known historic fact, that in the sixteenth century the genuine descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites and Hussites, who were numerous in France, Belgium, England, Bohemia, Moravia, etc., readily united with the Lutheran and Reformed communities, and at length became absorbed in them, and that very few, if any, of them ever manifested a preference for the Mennonites, or for any of the anti-pedobaptist sects of the age; which is adverse to the supposition of a literal or legitimate descent of the Mennonites from the pure Waldensians." \*

Another consideration, of no small weight in connection with this, is, that there was much in the opinions and practices of the times when the Waldenses came into view as a distinct body of Christians, and for many centuries afterward, to force them into a position of antagonism to the ordinance of infant baptism. The rite was shamefully abused by the Papists. Its nature, design and offices were all perverted. A multitude of silly, superstitious ceremonies had accumulated around its administration, against which the clear spiritual perceptions of these Bible-taught

---

\* Mos., III., 229, Note.

Christians could but revolt. So that it would have been a matter of no great surprise if they had allowed their feelings of disgust to carry them to the extreme of rejecting the ordinance itself. But they wisely discriminated between the abuse and the legitimate use—between the rite as instituted by God, and as deformed by excrescences originating in human folly. Against the latter they protested in the most pointed terms, as will be shown in some extracts from their accredited writings, to be adduced hereafter; to the former—the ordinance itself—not a word of opposition has yet been produced from the formularies of their faith, or from any author acknowledged by them as an exponent of their views. Its rejection or omission by them, under so strong temptations to such a course, would make little or nothing against the institution, as historically attested; their adherence to it, is testimony of much value.

The three considerations now proposed would go far, in the absence of more direct proof, to demonstrate that the Waldenses were Pedobaptists. They are confirmed, however, by testimony that leaves no room for argument or doubts. Before proceeding to adduce that testimony, it is proper to exhibit the sources from which it is derived.

After the excitement attending the inauguration of the reform commenced by Luther had in some degree subsided, and the Protestant community had assumed a definite shape, the history of the remarkable people who, in much poverty and in despite of severe persecutions, had maintained a pure faith and worship, from a period extending many centuries back towards the days of the Apostles, began to engage the inquiries of leading minds in the Reformed Churches. Efforts were instituted for gathering all the existing monuments and relics of their origin and early years. It was known that they had manuscripts among them containing statements of their doctrines, and directions as to the order of their worship. Diligent search

was made for as many of these as might have survived the lapse of time and the calamities to which the people had been subjected by their enemies. In 1602 the Provincial Synod of Dauphiny, in France, lying adjacent to the region in which the Waldenses had their principal Churches, appointed "certain persons to collect all sorts of documents bearing on the history of the life, doctrines and persecutions of the Albigeois and Vaudois," or Waldenses. These papers were afterwards transferred to Jean Paul Perrin, a member of that Synod, and pastor of the Church at Nyons, (not Lyons, as is frequently represented,) which was situated near the borders of the Waldensian territory proper. Five years later, the National Synod of France, at Rochel, in which Perrin sat as a deputy from Dauphiny, passed an order in these words: "Monsieur Perrin is intreated to finish his begun history of the 'True Estate of the Albigenes and Waldenses;' and to help him in it, all persons having memoirs by them, either of the doctrines, discipline or persecutions of those poor saints of Christ, are charged to transmit them to him with all possible care and diligence." In 1609 the National Synod, held at St. Maixant, received a report from Perrin of his progress, with a rude draught of the work, which was approved by the body, and five of their ministers were requested by name to transmit to him "whatever memoirs they have found out, or can get, so that it (the book) may be published suddenly." The Synod at the same time engaged "to assist him with their bounty, to help to bear his great expenses in books, and for its impression." The work was presented to the National Synod, at Rivas, in 1612, and was put into the hands of five ministers, "who were ordered to bring in their opinion of it." In consideration of his charges, the "Synod ordered him (Perrin) the sum of three hundred livres." At a subsequent stage in the sessions of the same Synod, the committee to examine the work having reported, Perrin was desired to review it, and present it to the Synod

of Dauphiny, that it might be published. Again: two years later, the National Synod charges the Synod of Dauphiny to read over Perrin's book, "who is also required, as soon as it is printed, to send a copy to every one of the provinces." The Synod of Dauphiny, in 1617, reported to the National Synod, sitting at Vitré, that it had seen and perused the work, but that, for some reason, not stated, it had not been published or distributed. The National Synod then ordained, "That the said history shall be sent to our honored brethren, the pastors and professors in the Church and University of *Geneva*, who shall be desired by the Synod of Dauphiny to peruse it." The publication was made the next year, and in 1620 the National Synod, at Alez, "applauded and thanked" the author for his work, and being informed of the "numerousness of his family, and that he had a great charge of children," exhorted the Synod of Dauphiny "to take care of him and his family, according to the laws of Christian charity and the great merits of the said Monsieur Perrin."

We have presented these facts, gleaned from the acts, decisions and decrees of the National Synod of the Reformed Churches in France, as published in "Quick's Synodocon," inasmuch as a labored effort has been made to disparage the authority of Perrin, by some who feel that his history, if accredited, is fatal to their cause. Perhaps no book was ever written with more diligent and persevering efforts to render it trustworthy. But Perrin does not stand unsupported.

In 1669 Leger, "Pastor and Moderator of the Churches of the Valley," published his "History General of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, or Vaudois," in which he inserted various documents which were recognized as the authoritative exponents of the Waldensian faith, as far back as any such records could be found. In many passages Leger gives the original text of the papers in the Romance or Provençal language, in columns parallel

with his translation into his vernacular French. Perrin and Leger publish, for the most part, the same documents, and in the same words. A comparison of the two works, so far as the subject now in hand is concerned, has led to the detection of only one discrepancy, and that as to a word, merely, that does not materially affect the sense of the passage.

Leger and Perrin are sustained by Sir Samuel Morland, who was Oliver Cromwell's ambassador at the Court of Turin, and who, whilst in their country, made an extensive collection of their documents then extant, which he has inserted in his large history of the people. His position, as representative of the English Government, then sympathizing deeply with the persecuted Churches of Piedmont, afforded him rare facilities for gathering materials for his great work. The original manuscript copies of the documents which he obtained he deposited in the Library of Cambridge University, where they still exist. Morland gives the same documents that Perrin and Leger had given, with only such slight variations in their contents as naturally occur when copies are multiplied by transcription.

In the appendix to his history, Blair, already referred to, has published an English translation of the most important of the papers furnished by the three authors above named. In the extracts which we shall presently make, we shall use his work, having verified them by a comparison, severally, with the passages as found in the three older authors. With this explanation of what is meant by the writings of the Waldenses, and of the means by which they have been transmitted to us, we proceed to the testimony they afford on the subject of infant baptism.

I. Our first extract is made from the "*Spiritual Almanack*." This appears to be a summary of the faith of the Waldenses, compiled from other documents of authority among them. It is published by Perrin and Leger. The date is very ancient. Blair states that the writings com-

prised in it "are mentioned as existing in 1120; but the slight diversity of dialect suggests the probability that some of them, as the Discipline, might be earlier, or that they were composed at different times. At all events, the Waldenses and Albigenses have unanimously agreed that these declarations express their sentiments in regard to the doctrine, government, morality, and discipline of the Church; and demonstrate that Christianity was still preserved in the Valleys and in the South of France."\* Dr. Muston, in his "Bibliography of the Waldenses," appended to his work, whose title has already been given, mentions the "Spiritual Almanack," and says that its treatise on the sacraments, from which we are about to quote, is to be met with in a number of Vaudois works.†

The Almanack treats of baptism, as of other points of doctrine, and, after giving an exposition of its general design, holds this language: "And for this cause we present our children in baptism, ‡ which they ought to do to whom the children are nearest, as their parents; and they to whom God has given this charity." Nothing could be more explicit than this.

II. "*The Ancient Discipline of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of the Piedmont*," (published by Perrin, Leger, and Morland.) Perrin says this was the discipline under which the Waldenses and Albigenses lived. Morland states that it was extracted out of divers authentic manuscripts, written in their own language, several centuries before either Calvin or Luther lived. It received the express approbation of Luther, Melancthon and Bucer. Its great antiquity, to say nothing of its contents, renders it a document of rare interest. Our concern, however, is with its testimony bearing on the question of infant baptism. The ninth

---

\* Blair, I., 223, 224.

† *Ibid.*, II., 476.

‡ Et c'est pour cela qu'on presente les Enfans au Baptême.—Leger.

article relates to dancing, or balls, and condemns that species of amusement with a severity of language that we do not remember ever to have seen surpassed. Among the reasons assigned for its sinfulness, this is given: "They who thus dance break the agreement which they made with God at their baptism, when their God-fathers promised for them to renounce the devil and all his pomp." The promises here supposed to be broken by their dancing were made *for* them, not *by* them—a plain implication that they were baptized at an age when they were regarded as incapable of making promises for themselves.

III. In 1442, at Kuttensburg, was held a Synod of the Taborites, a branch of the Waldensian community, in which a full Confession of their Faith was made. The tenth article is in these words: "Baptism is the external sign of the internal washing from sin. Children can also be initiated, on condition, however, that having come to an advanced age, they make a public profession of their faith."\*

IV. In the latter part of the fifteenth century, the Bohemian Brethren, another and highly honored branch of the Waldensian family, having a respite from persecution, prepared a full system of rules for their government and discipline. Among the duties assigned to the deacons, was that of aiding the pastor, by instructing the children and catechumens; and it is added: "Being viewed as candidates for the ministry, they occasionally preached the Gospel in the villages, under the minister's inspection, and baptized children in his absence." Further on, in the same document, we have this statement: "At Baptism a text was the ground of a short discourse, to show that God's covenant extended to the issue of believers; prayer offered to God to cleanse the infant from corruption by the blood of Christ, to regenerate it by the Spirit, to give it the seal of grace

---

\* See the Confession, *in extenso*, quoted by Blair (Vol. II., 77) from *Lenfants*.

by baptism, and to place it among his chosen; the minister then named the child, and baptized it with pure water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."\*

V. The United Brethren of Bohemia, mentioned in the last paragraph, in 1508 presented to King Ladislaus and his Nobles an "Apology," in which they defended themselves against various charges brought against them by their enemies; also a "Confession of Faith," which was subsequently enlarged, and in 1535 was addressed by the Nobles and Barons of Bohemia to Ferdinand, King of the Romans and Bohemia. Both of these instruments are preserved by Perrin. Leger and Morland give an abridgement of the Confession. Here are extracts from both:

(a.) From the "*Apology*." The fourth reproach, which they say was cast upon them by their "adversaries, like angry, barking dogs," was, that they denied the baptism of infants; to which they replied in the words of the Spiritual Almanack: "The time and place of those who ought to be baptized is not ordained, but the charity of the Church and congregation ought to serve as the rule in it, etc. And, therefore, they to whom the children are nearest allied are under obligation to present the infants to be baptized; as are the parents, and those to whom God has given such a charity." This passage is important, as showing that the Spiritual Almanack was still held in repute as the authorized exponent of their doctrines, and also as showing their views up to the time immediately preceding the Reformation. On this article in the "*Apology*," Perrin makes a remark which serves to explain whatever seeming practical neglect of the rite, if any, existed among them, namely, that when the Waldensian pastors were absent from their own charges, in the service of the Church at large, the children were

---

\* Blair, II., 100, 107, quoting from Holmes, pp. 64-91, and "Account of the Bohemians," pp. 75-138.

long kept without baptism. In such cases, some parents allowed their children to receive the ordinance at the hands of the Romish Priests; others would not consent to this, in consequence of the superstitious ceremonies the Priests appended to its administration. Muston, Blair, and other writers on the affairs of this people, tell us that, the pastors being few, and the Churches widely dispersed, the former were accustomed to itinerate from Church to Church, occupying frequently one or two years in making their circuits. This accounts for their absences, as mentioned by Perrin.

(b.) From the "*Confession.*" Article on Baptism. "Likewise they teach that children are to be baptized unto salvation, and to be consecrated to Christ according to His Word: 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' etc.\* Our friends, therefore, depending upon these words, baptize children in the name of the Holy Trinity. Because the place is universal, 'Teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc. Nor do they henceforth rebaptize them, nor have they ever rebaptized."

We give another extract from this Confession, and ask that special attention may be directed to the clause put in *Italics*. It shows, not only that baptism was administered to those who were incapable of exercising personal faith, but, also, what class of persons were intended when personal faith was mentioned as a prerequisite to baptism. The subject of the Article from which we quote is the sacraments, Baptism and the Supper. After insisting upon a due attention to these institutions of the Gospel, the Confession proceeds thus: "The sacraments of themselves, or, as some say, *ex opere operato*, from the work wrought, do not confer grace upon those who are not first endowed with

---

\* Nous enseignons semblablement qu'il faut baptizer les Enfants a salut, et les consacrer Jesus Christ selon son commandement, etc.—Leger, Book I., 101.

good inclinations, and inwardly quickened by the Holy Spirit, nor bestow that justifying faith which renders the mind of man obedient, trusting and compliant to God in all things; for faith is necessary to precede—we speak of adults—which may vivify man by the Holy Ghost, and may inject good notions into the heart; for without faith, neither salvation nor righteousness exists, nor do sacraments do good to any one.”

If children were not subjects of baptism, the reference to adults, in the above, is unmeaning. Besides, unless children are an exception to the rule requiring personal faith in order to baptism, then the Brethren assert that they are incapable of salvation. It is the inevitable dilemma, “no baptism, no salvation.”

VI. In 1532, at a time when George Morel, who fills a large space in the Waldensian history, was a pastor in Piedmont, and wrote the memoirs of their Churches, states that above eight hundred thousand persons professed the religion of the Waldenses, the pastors and heads of families in the Valleys of Piedmont assembled at Angrogna, subscribed certain articles of faith, which, as they affirm, they “have sworn that they believe, and wish to hold themselves as acknowledging them conformed to the Holy Scriptures, and containing the summary of doctrine, which has been taught from father to son, according to the Word of God, as the faithful have done in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah.” The seventeenth Article reads thus: “That touching the matter of the sacraments, the Holy Scriptures determine that Jesus Christ has left us only two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, which we receive to show that we wish to continue in the Holy Communion in which we are entered by Holy Baptism, *being little infants*, and for the commemoration of the sufferings of Jesus Christ, who has washed us from our sins by his precious blood.”

This Confession is recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Blair states that the manuscript is preserved in the Library at Cambridge.

VII. In 1541-2, the Waldenses of Merindol presented to the Parliament of Aix, the King, and others, a "Confession of Faith," containing twenty-six sections. The seventeenth is on Baptism, and concludes with these emphatic words: "They, also, err egregiously, who remove children from Baptism." The heresy of Anabaptism had, not long before, arisen in Germany, and was spreading with the rapidity that usually attends the progress of fanaticism in times of high and general excitement in the popular mind. Hence the form of the deliverance on the subject of infant baptism.

This Confession is also recorded by Perrin, Leger, and Morland. Faber gives it in Latin, the expression above quoted being quite as decisive as it is in our English translation.

We have thus produced a series of extracts extending over four centuries, beginning with the earliest authentic records which history furnishes of the people, and ending about the time when the Waldenses, with an exception already noted, were merged into the Reformed Churches. It would be easy to produce evidence of their continuing to a much later date—indeed, to the present day—in the practice of the rite. But it is unnecessary, since the controversy concerns, not the modern, but the ancient, people of that name. Nor have we adduced all the testimony which their acknowledged documents supply. There are others, which, to our own mind, are not less decisive than those which have been cited; as, for example, a passage in their celebrated treatise styled "Antichrist," in which they inveigh so severely against the superstitious appendages with which the Romish Church had corrupted the ordinance—such as the sign of the cross on the infant's breast and forehead, the salt in its mouth, the spittle in its

ear, the plunging it three times in the water, with much else of the same character—against all which things they vehemently protest, yet not a word do they utter in denial or disparagement of the rite itself. If, however, what has been brought forward shall not be deemed satisfactory to any one of our readers, it is not probable that any number of passages from the same sources would suffice for his conviction.

We turn to evidence of another character—the expressed opinions of historians who have investigated the subjects. Passages might be cited from the pages of Perrin, Leger, and Morland, showing that they had no doubt as to the observance of the ordinance among the Waldenses from the rise of that community. And no one ever possessed greater facilities for obtaining correct information than they. It is needless, however, to occupy our space with quotations from their pages, giving their individual opinions, since it will occur to every reader that they could not have entertained a doubt on the subject without discrediting the very documents which they have published to the world as the genuine writings of the Waldensians, and the authoritative standards of their faith.

Dr. Gilly, a clergyman of the Established Church of England, who has published “*Researches among the Vaudois*,” the result of two or more “*Excursions*” into the Valleys of the Piedmont, to whom that people, says Dr. Muston, are indebted for the establishment of the College over which Dr. Revel now presides, and who, as the same writer remarks, is “one of the most voluminous, learned and interesting of all modern authors who have written on the subject of the Vaudois”—Dr. Gilly says: “Nothing can be more false than the calumny that the Vaudois object to infant baptism,” and adduces passages from their ancient writings in support of his assertion.\*

---

\* See Preface to Jones' Church History, fifth English edition, where Jones makes a feint of answering Gilly.

Dr. Wall, whose candor is only equalled by his learning and vast research, devotes a considerable space in his "History of Infant Baptism" to the question now before us. The result of his investigations is, that whilst there were probably some small and short-lived sects, sometimes confounded with the Waldenses, in the fifteenth century, that rejected infant baptism, "for the main body of the Waldenses, there is no probability at all" that they rejected it.\* The reader, by turning back to Dr. Revel's letter to Dr. Baird, may learn something of the sects here referred to.

Allix, an English clergyman, published in 1690 his "Remarks on the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont," a work on which we have seen high encomiums bestowed by writers in the interest of our Baptist brethren. From the favor with which Jones and others of his party seem to regard Allix, we supposed, until we examined his book, that it contained evidence of some kind which they could make available to their cause. But not a sentence tending in that direction did a careful scrutiny of his pages bring to view; on the contrary, much of another tenor. One passage must suffice in this place. Allix is assigning reasons why the Patarines, a sect of the eleventh century, "were, for the most part, of the same opinions that were afterward asserted by the Waldenses," and he mentions as the sixth: "Because we find the Berengarians" (who, he states, were of the same stamp with the Patarines) "exposed to the same calumnies which were afterwards imputed to the Patarines and Waldenses. This is evident from the discourse of Guimondus, Bishop of Avasa, † where he accuseth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful marriages and the baptism of infants." ‡ From this it is manifest that Allix regarded the charge that the Waldenses denied infant baptism as a

---

\* Vol. II., pp. 273, 266, 267.

† Lib. I., *contra*, Bereng.

‡ Allix, pp. 134, 135.

calumny. The passage shows another thing—that the denial of the ordinance of infant baptism, and the denial of the lawfulness of the marriage union, were coupled together—a significant fact, which one often encounters in traversing the dreary wastes through which the history of that age leads him, but a fact which one who knows what the Manichean heresy was, and knows to what extent it was then prevailing, even in the West, will have no difficulty in accounting for.

The list of authorities might be extended almost indefinitely, including such names as Archbishop Usher, Richard Baxter, Milner, Faber, Murdock, (translator of Mosheim,) Blair, Muston, Rev. T. Sims, of England, (who has examined the question particularly, and decides that the “Waldenses have, *to a certainty, always* approved and practiced the baptism of infants,”) and, to mention no others, the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, Gieseler, Professor in Göttingen, whose immense learning and rigid impartiality have placed him in the highest rank of authorities. The passage to be given is contained in a letter addressed by Gieseler to Dr. Muston, and may be seen in “The Israel of the Alps,” Vol. I., page 3. Gieseler denies that Peter de Bruys, (the father of the Petrobrusian sect,) was one of the Vaudois. “For,” he adds, “in the first place, he taught many things contrary to the doctrine of the Vaudois. He denied that infants ought to be baptized and that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was celebrated after its celebration by Christ himself.”

In view of this overwhelming array of testimony and authorities, our readers will be surprised that a fact thus established by every species of evidence of which a historical event is capable, should ever have been called in question. They will be curious to know on what pretence it has been denied. We propose to gratify them in this very natural desire.

As far as we are authorized to speak on the subjects, by an investigation in which no little time has been employed, and a large number of books has been consulted, there are only two writers in the department of ecclesiastical history, whose researches have led them to examine the original sources of information, and whose success in their labors has caused their works to survive the authors, that venture to deny the prevalence of the rite amongst the Waldenses, before or since the Reformation, viz: Robert Robinson and William Jones, both of England. They were both Baptists, but this circumstance ought not to prejudice their credibility, if they had not made an unfair use of the authorities on which they rely for their statements.

Robinson, a man of brilliant parts and varied accomplishments, after attaining a high position among the Baptist ministers of England, adopted Socinian views, without, however, renouncing the dogmas of his former brethren in relation to the proper mode and subjects of baptism. Subsequently to the change of his faith, he wrote his "Ecclesiastical Researches," in which his effort throughout is to show that all the ancient Christians, who are worthy of the name, were Socinians, immersionists, and anti-pedobaptists. The intense sectarianism of his book, the bitter spirit pervading it, and its frequent palpable perversions of the established truths of history, have prevented it from acquiring any extensive credit or circulation, and it is seldom referred to by other writers, unless it be to find in Robinson support for opinions which all respectable historians contradict. The reader who may be able to command patience sufficient to carry him through one-third of the book, will be prepared to assent to every word of the following estimate of Robinson, from the pen of Professor Moses Stuart, of Andover Seminary, (a man from whom our Baptist brethren are very fond of quoting on certain points,) in a letter to his colleague, Dr. Leonard Woods, and published by the

latter in his "Infant Baptism." \* Professor Stuart here speaks of another work of Robinson, that on Baptism, but his strictures are equally applicable to the work before us. "Having so often heard the book spoken highly of, and knowing something of Mr. Robinson's talents and character, I had a great curiosity to see it. I have examined it on various topics, and confess myself to be greatly disappointed, and not a little disgusted. There is every where in it an air of almost *profane levity*, which at times breaks forth into the most gross and *palpable indecency*. \* \* \* Withal, there is such a gross and palpable unfairness in Robinson's examination of the testimony of the Christian Fathers, and such a shallow criticism, both on them and on the New Testament, that one may well wonder that this book should meet with encouragement among men of sobriety and good sense. There is, indeed, an appearance of a kind of learning in the author; but it is merely that of a literary *gourmand*, who has read every thing curious and entertaining, and but very little that is solid, and has reasoned and reflected still less on what he has read." Dr. Miller, of Princeton, has somewhere published an opinion of Robinson, concurring with that of Professor Stuart and Dr. Woods.

Robinson labors with great diligence to evade the testimony in favor of infant baptism among the Waldensians and other dissidents from the Romish Church. After one and another captious objection, which he seems conscious his readers will not regard as of any weight, he boldly asserts that neither the term "Infant," nor the term "Baptize," as used in the middle ages, is sufficiently definite and precise to enable us to determine positively that the one means a child of a few months or a few years old, or the other means the rite known in the Christian Church by that name. His words are: "The words 'Infant,' and

---

\* Second edition, p. 140.

‘Baptism,’ either alone or in conjunction, prove nothing, unless they be accompanied with explanatory circumstances.”\* Again, he says: “In the time of Claude (ninth century) baptism was got down to children—not to natural infants, but to such as had begun to speak. The word infant, in this district, as in every other, was used in a vague sense for a minor.”† In proof of this assertion he quotes the inscriptions on monuments over the remains of young persons of different ages, as two, thirteen, eighteen, and so on. Yet not one of the inscriptions contains the word *infant*, but all, the word *innocent*. This substitution of the one term for the other, the language being foreign, would easily mislead the careless or the unlearned reader, and on that account is the more disingenuous and culpable a ruse on the part of the author. When, in the times of which he is writing, infants are mentioned as the subjects of baptism, Robinson would have us believe that they were persons “who had begun to speak,” and might have been of any age between two and eighteen or twenty-one, if that was the point at which they ceased to be minors; all which is contradicted by the very etymology of the word itself, (*in*, not, and *for*, I speak,) and to its use among all nations who have derived it from the Latin language, as denoting those who, whatever the exact number of their months or years, are not capable of speaking and acting for themselves.

For a Baptist, maintaining that immersion, and nothing else, is baptism, it is a strange admission that Robinson makes, when he says that the word baptism means nothing when alone, or when in conjunction with the word infant, unless there be some other circumstance to fix the meaning. He not only makes the concession, however, but adduces proof of its correctness, citing a passage from the code of King Liutprand, in which the guardian of a child

---

\* Ec. Res., p. 385.

† *Ibid.*, p. 469.

is allowed to *baptize* it—that is, to *chastise it with the rod or lash*. “Here,” he adds, “is an infant baptism performed with a switch, without water.”\* The conclusion which Robinson reaches, and to which he would conduct his readers, is, that when the baptism of infants is spoken of in the times and countries in which the Waldenses lived, nothing definite can be inferred from the use of the terms; they may mean simply that the good people had their children flogged. Our readers will now understand what Professor Stuart intended by the author’s “*profane levity*.”

Yet Robinson, in another place, yields a point, which, in his own view, seems decisive of the question in hand. We ask special attention to his words, which, in spite of his adroit qualifications, imply all that we could desire: “There is one general clue to the history of the baptism of babes, but how far it leads into the history of the practice of baptism among the Vaudois, must be left to each reader to imagine. Baptism is a relative institute, and all Christians consider it so. Some think it is an institute connected with a profession of Christianity, and of course it is related only to temporal Church fellowship. This is the opinion of the Baptists. Others suppose it is connected with sanctification and the pardon of sin, and related to the future state, and, consequently, that it is necessary to salvation. *If, therefore, the Vaudois held the doctrine of original sin, as it should seem they did, baptism was as necessary to their dying babes as it was to those of the Catholicks.* This is a mere conjecture, founded on theory, and such conjectures ought to have little weight, because few men reduce all parts of their own theories to practice.” It is very evident that, after all his desperate expedients to overthrow the historical proofs of the rite, Robinson either was fully persuaded, or strongly suspected, that it was practiced among the Vaudois.

---

\* Ec. Res., p. 386.

Jones, however, is more confidently relied on as an authority for the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses than Robinson. Indeed, his work seems to be held in the highest consideration by our Baptist brethren, as is evinced by the facts, severally, that, after going through five editions in England, it was republished in America; that it has been commended by distinguished names in their communion; and that it is the source from which their controversial writers draw the most of their statements and extracts touching the subject before us. In the body of his work, Jones does not assert, in direct terms, that the Waldenses rejected infant baptism—at least, such a declaration, if made, has escaped our notice. He does, however, what is equivalent in effect, and is even more discreditable to him as a historian—he suppresses the evidence by which the contrary might have been demonstrated. In the preface to the fifth edition of his book, issued twelve years after the first, having grown bolder, as we may presume, from the toleration of his literary crime, he vauntingly proclaims that the people of whom he wrote were anti-pedobaptists, and makes a feeble effort to substantiate his position. We shall see to what expedients he has recourse in order to make this impression.

In the treatise called “Antichrist,” to which a reference has already been made, and whose antiquity and authority as an exposition of the Waldensian doctrine Jones admits, as do Perrin, Leger, Morland, and all who have duly investigated the subject, we find a protest against certain specified errors of the Romish Church. Jones quotes this document at considerable length, acknowledging himself indebted to Perrin for the copy he used. Here is a passage as found in Perrin, certain parts of which we *Italicize*: “The third work of ‘Antichrist’ is, that he *attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit to the dead outward work, baptizing children in that faith,* and teaching that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had; and therein he confers

and bestows orders and other sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit."\* And here is the same passage, as found in Jones, professing, too, to quote from Perrin: "*He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration; thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows orders, and, indeed, grounds all his Christianity.*"† The careful reader, by examining the two versions of the passage, will be at no loss to perceive the vital difference between them, nor to surmise the purpose of Jones in the variations he has made. The former version makes the Waldensians protest against the perversion of infant baptism, as practiced among the Papists; the latter makes them protest against the ordinance itself. The one, by necessary implication, sanctions the rite; the other condemns it. Yet Jones not only had the temerity to alter the passage, when citing it in his original work, but the audacity, twelve years afterwards, to appeal to his own corrupt version in support of the error he sought to propagate.

It may be proper to state, here, that the treatise, "Anti-christ," is given by Leger and Morland, as well as Perrin, and that they give the passage above cited in the same form, with a variation of a word, only, that does not affect the sense. The original of the clause, "baptizing children in that faith," is, "*bapteia le enfant en aquella fe*"—*aquella* being a demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with *fe*, and requiring the phrase to be translated *that faith*, and not admitting of Jones' rendering, *the faith*. But Jones was compelled to mistranslate the words, in order to conceal the fact that he had omitted the preceding and the governing part of the sentence. Dr. Wall, in his "History of

---

\* Perrin, Book III., ch. VIII.

† Jones, Am. ed., p. 338; also Pref. to fifth English ed.

Infant Baptism,"\* quotes this passage in the form in which it appears in the three authors above named. Yet in a recent work by Dr. Curtis, Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, styled "The Progress of Baptist Principles," it is cited in the mutilated form in which Jones presents it, a note being appended in these words: "Jones' Church History, page 338, whose quotations I have followed, he having gone over the whole ground carefully, with Wall and Perrin before him." We have met with the passage in the same dismembered form in other writers of that school, all of whom, we charitably suppose, received it from Jones, without an examination of its authenticity. It is thus that errors are transmitted from one writer and from one generation to another, the wrong and the shame being divided between the author who originated it, and his too credulous followers.

One other instance of similar speculation on the part of Jones, and we dismiss him. He is giving an account of the faith and practices of the Waldenses in the time of Louis XII., of France, as ascertained by special inquiry, made under the instructions of that monarch. Among other things, he states that it was reported to Louis that "they kept the Sabbath day, *observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive Church*, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."† For this incident, and the manifesto of the Waldensian doctrines and customs, Jones refers to Perrin as his authority. Turning to Perrin, we find the passage in these words: "They kept the Sabbath duly, *caused their children to be baptized according to the primitive Church*, taught them the articles of the Christian faith, and the commandments of God."‡ Here, also, the Italics are ours. Let the reader compare the two places so designated in the two extracts. He will understand how it is that

---

\* Vol. II., p. 242.

† Page 348.

‡ Book I., ch. V.

Jones, and those who in their investigations go no farther back than to his history, can find no evidence that the Waldenses baptized their children.

But it may be asked, how does Jones dispose of the several passages which have been extracted, in the former part of this article, from the Confessions, and similar papers of the people? He simply omits them, in some instances quoting nearly the entire documents, except their testimony on this one subject. It is painful to speak in such terms of an author whom any portion of the Christian world are disposed to consider respectable. But much is due to the truth of history, and it is better that the reputation of one man should suffer, than that a whole community of Christian people, and they among the worthiest that ever existed on the earth, should lie under what they themselves pronounced a grievous calumny.

Here and there, in the writings of those who treat of the Waldenses, occur incidental remarks, which, considered apart from their connection with the particular topics to which they belong, might be construed as favoring the views of our Baptist brethren on the question at issue. The most important of these remarks is one from "Limborch's History of the Inquisition," Vol. I., ch. VIII. Jones quotes it; so does Dr. Curtis; and so, also, others of the same party. Jones, as usual, mutilates the passage. We shall, therefore, cite Dr. Curtis' more full and accurate version of it, thus: "To speak my own mind freely, the Albigenses and Waldenses appear to me to have been two distinct sects, and they were entirely ignorant of many tenets now ascribed to them. Particularly, the Waldenses appear to have been plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, and if their opinions and customs were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that, among all the modern sects of Christians, they bear the greatest resemblance to that of the Mennonites." Dr. Curtis tells us that the Mennonites are the "Modern Dutch Baptists."

It will not fail to occur to our readers that evidence of the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses must be in much request, when such as this passage affords—so meagre is it at best, and reached by so wide and toilsome a circuit—is passed down from one generation to another of controversial writers. That it really imports nothing as to the matter under discussion, we should not deem it worth the space it occupies on our pages to show, were it not that our opponents appeal to it with a confidence that stands in an exact ratio, but, as it happens, inversely, to the value of the testimony. (1.) Limborch simply offers his opinion, and this is done with an air of timidity, which implies that he was aware that the preponderance of respectable authorities was against him. (2.) He does not state, nor intimate in the most indirect terms, that the resemblance which he supposed to exist between the Waldenses and Mennonites, had any respect to infant baptism. Not a word on that subject occurs in his book, within ten pages of the passage cited from him. There are many particulars in which the two sects may have agreed, and yet infant baptism not have been included. (3.) An application of the ordinary canons of criticism would suggest to the ingenuous reader that the resemblance which he refers to, lay in the general characteristics of the parties, as plain men, unskilful and inexperienced, rather than in an agreement in any one specific article of faith or practice. And (4.) in the very chapter from which the passage is extracted, Limborch expressly exonerates the Waldenses from the charge of denying baptism to infants. In accordance with his purpose throughout the chapter, which is, to prove that the Albigenses and Waldenses were distinct sects, he classifies the opinions which he says “were common to them both,” in which list nothing is said of infant baptism, and then the opinions held by the Albigenses, but not by the Waldenses. Under this latter division, he states that it was reported of the Albigenses: “That they condemned the

baptism of water, saying 'that a man was to be saved by their laying on of hands upon those that believed them, and that their sins were to be remitted without confession and satisfaction; that no baptism availed any thing; no, not their own.'" "We read, also," continues Limborch, "in the sentence of Petrus Raymundus Dominicus de Borno, that he heard Peter Auterii, (a famous doctor among the Albigenses,) teaching, among other things, 'That the baptism of water, made by the Church, was of no avail to children; because they were so far from consenting to it, that they wept.'" In connection with their views rejecting all baptism by water, Limborch enumerates various other errors, such as the sinfulness of marriage, the denial of the human nature of Christ, of the resurrection of the body, etc., in all which they betrayed their Manichean origin, and then adds this emphatic declaration: "These opinions of the Albigenses are not one of them ascribed to the Waldenses, who had quite different tenets, which are never mentioned in the sentences of the Albigenses.\* Here is Limborch's testimony as a historian. It is positive as to the opinions of the Waldenses on the subject before us, and his name may be added to the long list of authors of the highest repute, confirming our views. Or, if the passage quoted by Dr. Curtis from his pages is to be still used as implying a resemblance between the Waldenses and the Mennonites in relation to infant baptism, we oppose to it the authority of Jones himself, who says: "An impartial review of the doctrinal sentiments maintained by the Waldenses, the discipline, order, and worship of their Churches, as well as their general deportment and manner

---

\* The Albigenses of whom Limborch speaks were not the people usually associated with the Waldenses, but a family of the Cathari, mentioned by Dr. Revel in his letter to Dr. Baird. Limborch did not make the necessary distinction between parties which it suited the purposes of Papal writers to confound together under a common name, in order that they might be subjected to a common odium.

of life, not to mention their determined and uniform opposition to the Church of Rome, affords abundant evidence of the similarity of their views and practices to those held by Luther, Calvin, and the other illustrious characters, whose labors, in the sixteenth century, contributed so eminently to effect the glorious Reformation. Most of the Catholic writers who lived about the time of the Reformation, and the age which succeeded it, clearly saw this coincidence between the principles of the Waldenses and those of the Reformers, and remarked it in their works.\* If it shall be said that the matter of baptism is to be excepted in Jones' "similarity" and "coincidence," we shall claim that it be excepted, also, in Limborch's "resemblance."

Another recourse of those who would establish the anti-pedobaptism of the Waldenses, is, to charges preferred against them by Papal writers, and that in the days when these evangelical Christians were the objects of unremitting persecutions on account of their dissent from Papal doctrines and opposition to Papal rule. As far back as the times of Richard Baxter, and down to the present day, declarations proceeding from such a source, and originating in just such motives as the circumstances would naturally imply—declarations which the people they concern have themselves pronounced calumnious—are found bespangling the pages of our opponents in this controversy. The space which it would be proper for us to occupy will not permit the citation and review of all these precious *morceaux*. We shall confine ourselves to the examination of one, and it shall be that on which the most stress seems to be laid, if we may judge from the frequency with which it is employed. Allix mentions that Rayner, or Reinerus, a Dominican, in exposing the errors of the Waldensians, says: "Some of them hold that baptism is of no avail to infants, because they can not actually believe." Allix does not

---

\* Jones' History, p. 357.

quote the charge as endorsing it, for, as we have seen, he held the contrary view. The sentence occurs in a long extract, covering some eight pages, in which a great many things are said by Rayner respecting the people of whom he writes, some of which were doubtless true, and others are manifestly false.

Who was this Rayner? An apostate—not from the Waldensian Church, as is sometimes asserted—but from the sect of the Cathari, with whom he had lived for seventeen years, according to his own account—“*conversatus sum cum eis.*”<sup>\*</sup> Abandoning his original faith, he became a Papist, a Friar, and an Inquisitor. It was his office to search out the heresies that lurked among his former brethren, and we may reasonably suppose that he was not lacking in the zeal which usually distinguishes proselytes. He could but understand that the greater the energy he displayed in his appointed work, the kindlier would be the smiles which would cheer him from the high places of the hierarchy he served, and the more rapid his promotion. This Rayner, with such antecedents and such prospects, wrote a book; concerning whom? It seems difficult to decide. Dr. Wall, who appears to have examined the book with special care, says that he mentions the name of the Waldenses but once, and whom he means by it, Wall avers that he does not know.<sup>†</sup> Robinson says that he does not once mention the Valleys of the Piedmont, unless he meant to include them in a general description, when he said that Leonists were in all the cities of Lombardy, and had spread themselves into all countries.<sup>‡</sup> The title of his book is “*Summa de Catharis et Leonistis.*” Now, the Cathari differed from the Waldenses more widely than the latter differed from the Papists. They revived, or else inherited, the ancient ab-

---

\* Gieseler C. His., III., p. 395. Neander, do., IV., p. 579.

† Vol. II., pp. 254, 257.

‡ Ec. His., p. 446.

surdities and abominations of Eastern Gnosticism.\* Allix says they were a sect of the Manicheans, and, further, that "Manicheism is the most wild heresy that the devil could ever suggest." The Leonistes, or Poor Men of Lyons, were nearly affiliated to the Waldenses, so much so as to be often mentioned as the same people. But Rayner makes no distinction between the Cathari and the Leonistes. He wished to extirpate both, and it favored his scheme to confound them, so that he could charge upon the latter all the monstrous heresies of which he knew the former to be guilty. Thus, he accuses them—both sects alike—of holding that "marriage was nothing but sworn fornication," with other sentiments too offensive to decency to be named. We know that some of the charges are utterly, foully false, as it respects the one party; and if some are false—so acknowledged by Jones, Robinson, and all writers—why may not that concerning infant baptism be false also?

In justice to Rayner, however, it should be mentioned that he does not say that the sects of which he wrote did, all of them, or the majority of them, deny infant baptism, but "*quidam eorum*," some of them. No one has ever questioned that there were in that age some small and transient sects who were liable to the charge; such, for example, as the Manichean Cathari, who renounced all water baptism; the followers of Gundulphus, who held it useless, both for infants and adults; and, a little later, the Petrobrusians, who maintained that infants, being incapable of salvation, were also incapable of baptism. Our discussion has no reference to these sects, but to the Waldensians, who held no ecclesiastical or fraternal relations to such errorists.

We conclude this article, already unduly extended, with an extract from Richard Baxter's treatise on Baptism, in which he gives utterance to his sense of the injustice done to the Waldenses by arraigning them on charges preferred

---

\* See Neander, or any standard Church History.

by their Papal enemies. Having referred to the testimony afforded in their own writings, that they observed the rite of infant baptism, and to the accusations of such writers as Rayner, which had been recently revived by a certain Mr. Tombes, a Baptist minister in his vicinity, the good, the saintly Baxter, exclaims: "Now, after all these clear vindications of these godly men (the Waldenses) from the malicious accusations of the Monks and Friars, who would have thought that such a man as Mr. Tombes, or any other Protestant that hath any profession of conscientiousness, should ever dare so openly to make the world believe that the malicious Papists speak truth in accusing these men; and that all our divines' vindication of them is false? Yea, and their own vindication of their own faith is false? And all this, to have somewhat to say for his own cause!! What a cause is that, that must be thus defended! Why may not Mr. Tombes as well strike in with Cope's and others' testimony against our 'Book of Martyrs,' or with the Papists in their foul lies against Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, etc., as he doth here? Nay, would not this make the world believe that all other of the Papists' slanders of the Waldenses (as to be Arians, Manichees, Witches, Buggerers, etc.,) were true, as well as this? For, if the Papists' testimonies be better than ours, yea, or the men's own, in one thing, why not in another? \* \* \* He that will dare to do thus, what will he not dare? And what testimony will he not think valid, that will lean on such as these? And how small a matter will satisfy him that will lean on this! \* \* \* I pray God convince him; for bare evidence, and reason, and Scripture, will never do it, while such reasoning as this seems satisfactory or honest."\*

---

\* London edition, 1653, p. 159.