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Editors’ Note

Different preachers use their own peculiar styles both in preaching and in writing. These differences have been maintained in this book rather than changing each to conform to one particular standard. We ask those who are greatly concerned by these differences to be forgiving of the editors.
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**Who Are the Baptists?**

Dan Cozart

Acts 2:41-47. “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.”

Several miracles occurred on the Day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit of the Triune God came upon the church to enable those believers to carry out Christ’s command to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every living creature. Again, a language miracle took place and the assembly began to speak in foreign languages to be understood by different nationalities from around the then known world which were present at Jerusalem. Moreover, an ignorant fisherman by the name of Peter, who had previously denied his Lord thrice, opened his mouth and began to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Finally, and perhaps the greatest of all miracles recorded in Acts 2 was the result of that Pentecostal sermon; namely, the conversion of some 3000 sinners. (1) They gladly received his word, (2) they were baptized, and (3) they were added to the church membership.
Now, what kind of church was this to which they were added? Was it a Catholic Church? Was it a Lutheran Church? Was it a Presbyterian Church? Was it an Episcopal Church? Was it a Baptist Church? We are today separated from that occasion at Pentecost by 2000 years, to discover that there are more different kinds of churches than the number of years which separate us. The Scripture is the biggest and best authority on the subject, and that coupled with history, has much to say about the matter.

**Baptists and Their Origin**

In the apostolic days and for a period thereafter, the churches remained reasonably free from false teaching. Even before the end of the first century, however, Satan began to sow evil seeds of discord. Such things as bishop authority and baptismal regeneration became a practice with some of the churches. Later it would develop into infant baptism or sprinkling. In 251 AD, the true local churches withdrew fellowship from those churches practicing such heresies. The excommunicated ones became the nucleus of the Roman Catholic Church. The others continued to uphold the Apostles’ Doctrine and the teachings of Christ. Though they were not known as Baptists as such, they did hold to various Baptist tenets. Some early groups were the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists. Later groups included the Petrobrusians, the Waldensees, and Anabaptists. Catholic historians call most of these groups “Anabaptists.” All of this happened before the Protestant Reformation of which Baptists do not derive their origin. Baptists are not Protestant, and they are not Reformed.

Joe Odle is correct when he says that New Testament Churches must have four things true concerning their origin and doctrine

1. They must have the right founder, namely Jesus Christ.

---
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2. They must have been founded in the right place, namely Palestine.
3. They must have been founded at the right time, namely during the earthly ministry of Jesus Christ.
4. They must be teaching the same doctrine which Christ gave his church.

Churches today that do not measure up to this must never be considered true churches, but rather false ones. The Roman Catholic Church was founded by Pope Leo in Rome in 440 AD. The Lutheran Church was founded by Martin Luther in Germany in 1520 AD. The Episcopal Church was founded by King Henry VIII in England in 1534 AD. The Presbyterian Church was founded by John Calvin in Switzerland in 1536 AD. The Methodist Church was founded by John Wesley in England in 1740 AD. The Church of Christ was founded by Alexander Campbell in the United States in 1827 AD. The Mormon Church was founded by Joseph Smith in the United States in 1830 AD.

Baptists have no founder but Christ. They are not products of the Reformation. They did not come out of Catholicism, but rather preceded Catholicism by hundreds of years.

John T. Christian (Baptist) says: “I have no question in my own mind that there has been a historical succession of Baptists from the days of Christ to the present time.” George W. McDaniel (Baptist) says: “Baptists are justly proud of their parentage, the New Testament. They have an ancient and scriptural origin. There is no personality this side of Jesus Christ who is a satisfactory explanation of their origin.” John C. Ridpath (Methodist) says: “I should not readily admit that there was a Baptist church as far back as A.D. 100, though without doubt, there were Baptists then, as all Christians were then Baptists.” Mosheim (the Lutheran Historian) says: “The first century was a history of the Baptists.”
Baptist Doctrine

A church is known not only by its history, but also by its doctrine. We believe that Baptist origins can be traced back to Christ. We thus should be able to identify the Lord’s churches by their doctrines. The Lord’s churches today will be teaching what his churches in the first century taught. What then are those distinguishing principles and doctrines which would define Baptist churches today? What are those truths which make Baptists distinctive? Frank Godsoe is very clear and dogmatic when he says:

“To me, the Bible is a Baptist book; written by Baptists, for Baptists, to Baptists, and to make Baptists. It was not always so. But from a small beginning, my conviction has grown with the passing of the years. I had to learn that Christ did not establish all the denominations which wear the name Christian. I came to believe that it was unreasonable to think that Christ would send out one group to teach salvation by grace, and another to teach salvation by works; one with democratic government, and another with ecclesiastical overlordship. I was forced to the conclusion that Christ is not the author of confusion. Christ did establish something during his personal ministry, and whatever He set up is somewhere on earth today. It was some kind of a Body. We believe it was a Baptist congregation, composed of Baptist material, teaching Baptist doctrines, with a Baptist democratic government, following a Baptist commission, and performing Baptist ordinances.”

Baptists and the Word of God: Baptists believe the Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice. It is the Scripture alone. Baptists do not accept the Apocrypha, the Book of Mormon, or any other form of extra-biblical revelation. Church
The commission of Christ runs: Go disciple! Go baptize! Go teach! But nowhere do we read—Go torture! Go rack! Go compel men to this faith! Nor do we find Scripture commanding: Go kill those who do not convert! Nowhere do we read: Come and rest or come and die! Nowhere are we taught to induce men by force, torture, intimidation, pain or any kind of compulsion, physical or psychological, to embrace the faith of Christ! Such ideas indicate great ignorance of Christ and the Gospel because he said:

“These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me.” John 16:1-4.

The woman in Revelation 17 is a persecutor of the saints and depicted as being drunk with the blood of the saints!

“And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I marveled with great admiration.” Revelation 17:6 (i.e., I marveled…) (Green).

These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

truth must be measured by the Bible, God’s Holy Word, and not by the Pope or traditions of men. The church is not governed by creeds, confessions and catechisms, but only by the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever. God does not give new truth and new revelation through men today. The Bible is God’s complete and final authority to his church.

Baptists and the Church: The church which Jesus founded is an assembly of voluntary, baptized believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, assembled for the purpose of carrying out the commands of Christ. It is neither universal nor invisible; it is rather local and visible. If it does not assemble, it is not a church. It began in the New Testament, and was started by Christ Himself. It is not to be confused with the universal kingdom of God, nor the family of God. The government of the church does not rest in the hands of the episcopate or presbytery, but independently in the hands of the congregation. It cannot be ruled over by conventions, fellowships, boards, headquarters or associations. There are only two ordinances in the church, namely, baptism and the Lord’s supper. These are not sacraments; they have no saving efficacy in them. They are ordinances. The washing of feet is not one of them.

Baptists and Baptism: Baptism is not essential to salvation, rather salvation is essential to baptism and church membership. As such, it embodies four essential qualifications: (1) A Scriptural subject; one who has been born again, and has trusted the Lord to save him. (2) A Scriptural mode; it must always be by immersion in water; it can never be sprinkling or pouring. (3) A Scriptural purpose; to picture Christ’s death, burial and resurrection for our pardon and justification, our own death to sin and resurrection to a new way of life, and to confess our discipleship. (4) A Scriptural administrator; it lies within the authority of the local New Testament Church. Davis Huckabee says: “the practice of pedobaptism (is) one of the most damnable practices ever foisted upon a gullible and unsuspecting Christianity.”
Baptists and Freedom: Baptists have always contended for the freedom that belongs to the Christian individual. Each believer has been made a priest, and has access to the Father without having to go through another believer. Each believer is personally answerable to God in matters of character and conduct. He is to “obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29). Moreover, Christ “hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen” (Revelation 1:6). Thus we have access to God and should “come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (Hebrews 4:16). Now in addition to this, every New Testament Church is independent and free. Since the church is a spiritual body, it is a free body. It is free from religion. There are no conventions, fellowships or associations that can exercise authority over the local church. The church is free also from religious leaders and potentates. This includes the Pope, the Bishop, the Cardinal, or even the pastor himself. And especially, the church is free from the state. A cardinal distinctive among Baptists is the separation of church and state. Because of this, Baptists have been among the most persecuted, if not the most persecuted people since the New Testament. It would even supercede the Jewish Holocaust of six million souls. The history pages of the Dark Ages are splattered with the blood of these hated Anabaptists. Baptists have ever stood for a free Assembly in a free State. Since Christ’s Assembly is spiritual, it cannot become a political factor. Its members engage in State matters only as individuals. The church cannot control the political vote of its members. Now it is this strong stand against the State and Religion that has brought about such persecution against the Baptists. Godsoe gives us the following historical data:

“There are many black pages in the history of our country. In Massachusetts, Connecticut and Virginia, Baptists were persecuted unto blood, stripes, prison and confiscation. Massachusetts whipped Obadiah Holmes, imprisoned Clark, and brought to trial, can this leader claim he had nothing to do with the murder and be cleared of the crime? Of course not. He is guilty. And so are the churches who persecuted others!

4. We put them to death to save their souls and this is the highest good!

This is another false principle. It is impossible to convert a man by compulsion! This is the method of Mohammed, not Jesus! The Roman Catholics are Arminian in theology and they claim the will of man is free, so free, in fact, that God Himself, cannot violate the will of man to save him! Yet they have proved they do not believe their own principles because they often gloated over those who recanted as the fire licked up their blood!

Persecution is usually found where the Persecutors are in the majority, or in control of the government and the greatest persecutions of Christians has been by those who had wedded their church to a secular government in unholy matrimony. From Constantine onward the national government was the dog that wagged the tail. Anyone who differed with the power learned what that power could do.

Secondly, even if it were possible to save a soul from Hell by compelling someone to say he believes something he does not believe, we have no command in the Word of God do it! To use the is to deny the work of the Holy Spirit and effectual calling! We are to preach the Word of God and leave the Spirit of God to make the application as he sees best.

“Thomas More maintained that Bilney,” (a heretic burned in Norwich, Aug 17, 1531) “had recanted and died a true Catholic and that his death proved the efficacy of burning” (Marius. 397).

No Baptist ever believed any such thing!
It was the 16th of June 1646 that she and the three men who were condemned with her suffered. She was an encouragement to those strong men to be faithful!

“For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” Mark 8:36-37.

Thus this young woman (she was but twenty five) set a mighty example of Christian endurance and constancy in the Faith! She loved not her life unto death!

**Defense of Persecution:** An important question seldom asked and even more seldom answered is what defense or ground was claimed for persecution? A few we have met with are given below.

1. *It was the spirit of the times which caused men to persecute others.*

   No! It was the spirit of the Devil who was a murderer that persecutors followed.

2. *These who were put to death were awful heretics—such as Servetus!*

   In some cases this was true, but that made no matter. Let both grow together, was the Word of the Master! The job of separation belongs to angels not men!

3. *It was not the churches who put these people to death, but the political powers.*

   If a band of thugs are following a leader and that leader specifically gives someone over to them for execution and he knows they are going to kill this person and purposes for them to do so, can he claim himself innocent of murder? When banished Roger Williams. In Ashfield, Connecticut, choice parts of farms and gardens of Baptists were sold to build meeting houses and pay the preachers of other denominations. In Virginia, Craig, Lunsford, Waller, and others, were imprisoned. Baptist produce was seized to support an Episcopal ministry given to cock fighting, horse racing and hard drinking. In England and Europe, Baptists were wronged, scourged, cruelly mocked, imprisoned, and died bloody deaths, at the hands of the State ecclesiastical organization…..Calvin burned Servetus at the stake. Luther persecuted bitterly the Baptists of his day. Holland persecuted the Baptists for conscience sake. John Knox of Scotland did the same. So did the Congregationalists in New England, and so did the Episcopalians in Virginia. Rhode Island was established by a Baptist, and *was the first government in the world to allow liberty of conscience.* Civil and religious liberty is the contribution of Baptists to the world….Baptists thus petitioned England for their colony. The petition was granted. The same provision was placed in the charter of Brown University. Today freedom of conscience is familiar, but it was not so in the days of our forefathers. *Pagans, papists, and Protestants ground this principle to powder, but Baptists died for it.*

**Baptists and the Gospel of Jesus Christ:** Baptists have always believed that Jesus Christ is Almighty God incarnate. He could never have been created, because he is the Eternal Son of God. He was miraculously conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and was brought forth from the Virgin Mary. He was a complete human being with a human body, soul and spirit. Though he was one person, he had two distinct natures: (1) He was human; (2) He was deity. He was and is the Godman. Though he was completely sinless, he took the sins of his
people upon Himself and died for them at Calvary, his substitutionary death was efficient for the elect, and sufficient to satisfy the holiness and justice of God throughout eternity. After his death, he was buried, and three days later arose bodily from the tomb. He ascended into Heaven and was seated at the Father’s right hand to be the believer’s advocate and refuge. This same Jesus one day will leave Heaven and return to this earth for his people. Until that glorious day, Baptists believe we are to go into all the world and spread the message of this saving Gospel. Sinners can be saved if they will repent of their sins, and turn by faith to receive the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. There is no other way for men to be saved apart from the grace which in found only in Jesus Christ.

Baptists have a glorious history. They have contributed some of the greatest theological minds in history, as well as some of the greatest preachers. These would include men such as John Gill, Charles Spurgeon, Alexander Carson, Benjamin Keach, Adnirom Judson, William Carey, John Clarke, Isaac Backus, John Leland, John Gano, J. P. Boyce, B. H. Carroll, A. W. Pink and John Dagg.

4. The obligation of vows of chastity
5. The expediency of private masses
6. King Henry left a large sum so that two priests should be paid to say masses at his grave in perpetuity!
7. The necessity of auricular confession (Foxe. 263)]

The penalty for disagreement with any one of these was burning at the stake. It was for refusing to believe some or all of these that sent Anne Askew to a martyr’s death.

*Her First Arrest:* Anne made several trips to London. She was arrested there the first time in March 1545. By some means she was released to her husband, but she soon either left him or he put her out of the house.

“He said she was the devoutest woman he had ever known, for she began to pray always at midnight, and continued for some hours in that exercise” (Brown. 271).

She was arrested again and sent to the Tower of London and there tortured to gain knowledge of others who believed as she did and to get her to recant. In the Tower she was harangued for months. Finally she was racked until she swooned and passed out. But she never gave them one name. She never once agreed to their doctrine but constantly demonstrated the grace of God in her and the truth of Scripture! And she did this with the certain knowledge that she would be burned for it! Her crime? Denial of the Mass and the repudiation of the Six Articles! Because they had racked her so severely she could not walk or stand; they had to carry her to the stake in a chair! At the stake she was offered a written pardon by the King upon condition she recant! She turned her eyes away from it and refused to even look at it and “told them that she came not there to deny her Lord and Master” (Brown. 280).
willingness to suffer death for what the Lord had revealed to her and in her. She was thoroughly versed in Scripture.

Anne’s older sister was betrothed to a Catholic man named Kyme. This sister died before the marriage and it is believed she was forced to marry Kyme as her sister’s replacement by her father in 1536. It is believed she had two children, whom she never mentions in her examinations. Possibly both of them died before she went to London.

Either she was put out of her home by her husband or she left him over her convictions concerning the teaching of Scripture. Apparently Anne never considered her marriage to Kyme as proper. Some suggest she first went to London to obtain an annulment. She never referred to herself as Anne Kyme but always as Anne Askew, her maiden name.

While in London she was engaged in circulating tracts and books concerning the gospel and against Catholicism. She apparently gained access to Queen Catherine Parr and others in the palace.

On one occasion, in her second examination before the council, they asked her about Master Kyme. Anne responded, “that my lord chancellor knew already my mind on that matter.” It was implied that the King himself was desirous to know the circumstances. Anne agreed to tell the King the truth of the matter personally but she refused to give such information to the council.

Here it is well to remind ourselves of the Six Articles of King Henry the VIII, which became law July 12, 1540. The summary of these laws is as follows:

1. The real presence of Christ in the Eucharist
2. The sufficiency of communion in one kind
3. The celibacy of the priests

Matthew 16:18. “And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

It is clear from this passage that Christ Himself built his ekklesia or church during his earthly ministry. It is also evident from Ephesians 3:21 that the ekklesia of Christ would continue to exist through the ages. Matthew 28:20 confirms this conclusion. What Christ was building during his earthly ministry must still exist in the world; otherwise, his promise was bogus. Holding to the authority and inerrancy of the sacred Scriptures, we believe the same kind of ekkelesia Christ instituted during his ministry still exists today, even as the same kind of marriage God instituted between one man and one woman continues to exist today despite attempts by men to institute new kinds of marriages. That other sorts of so-called churches exist does not mean Christ’s ekklesia has ever ceased to exist. While individual local churches do cease to exist, the ekklesia of Christ as an institution has ever existed somewhere in the world from the days of Christ until this very day.

The Nature of the Church: The church or ekklesia Jesus built was a local and visible institution, not a universal, visible church, as Rome claims, or a universal, invisible church as the Reformers affirm. Sometimes the word ekklesia is used in a generic sense, as in Ephesians 5:23. Sometimes it is used figuratively for all the redeemed, as J. M. Pendleton explains in his Church Manual Designed for the Use of Baptist Churches, p. 5. All of the redeemed are not the church, but they are like a church or ekklesia in that they are the called-out.
The Meaning of Church Perpetuity: “All that Baptists mean by church ‘succession,’ or Church perpetuity is: there has never been a day since the organization of the first New Testament church in which there was no genuine church of the New Testament existing on earth.” (Baptist Church Perpetuity, W. A. Jarrel, p. 3).

The Sources of History: Most of what we find written in history about the various groups of ancient Baptists was written by their enemies, although some of their own writings have survived to this day. The enemies of these ancient people misrepresented and calumniated them. They not only burnt and otherwise martyred them but burned their books as well. However, enough truth has survived even in the false accusations of their enemies to tell the story of these ancient Baptists.

The Name “Baptist:” Baptist denotes a baptizing or immersing church. The term anabaptist which is applied erroneously to all ancient Baptists refers to a church which ostensibly rebaptizes, hence; they are said by their enemies to be rebaptizers. This name was given to the ancient Baptists; they did not take it to themselves and always denied they rebaptized anyone.

The Prominent Issue in Church History: Ancient Baptists are always recognized by the fact they always immersed believers, not infants. The immersion of believers only on the profession of their faith has always characterized true Baptists. We must remember that many orthodox teachings were held at first by the apostate Church of Rome. Little by little, the apostate or false church exchanged these orthodox beliefs for novel ones. The Nicene Council established new doctrines which differed from those held by the original New Testament Churches. All Baptists have held a Biblical theology and their practices have been consistent with that theology. If we as Baptists hold to the same Biblical truths today as the early New Testament churches held, then we will expect to find churches adhering to these same doctrines and practices in every century between the bread is ‘the body’ of Christ in memorial, so is also the blood of Christ a memorial” (gameo).

These views of Hubmaier on Baptism and the Supper are pure Baptist doctrine!

Anne Askew

Anne was executed by the Roman Catholics. Most of what we know of Anne Askew is taken from her Examinations, which are records she wrote while in prison describing her two accounts of what was done to her and how she answered. These were smuggled out by friends and published by John Foxe and John Bale.

Anne Askew, or Ayscough, was born in the county of Lincolnshire, which is in the east of England in 1521. Her father Sir William Askew was a wealthy land owner and a member of King Henry’s court. Her mother died when she was very young. She was raised by her step mother Elizabeth Hutton Hansard and her father. There were four other children, including an older sister. Foxe reports the bishop of London said of her during her first examination that she came of worshipful stock (Foxe, 302).

Anne had a good education which was probably gained from her brother’s tutors and this shines through the examinations in which she is able to dumbfound her examiners.

Her conversion: We do not know when she was converted. It is possible she came to know Christ before she was married at 15. If not, it was sometime during the first years of her marriage.

She manifests she had had an experience in grace by her devotedness to Christ, her understanding of Scripture and her
Three days later Elsbeth was put in a sack and thrown from the bridge over the Danube with large stone tied about her neck.

“On the day after Hubmaier’s death, Fabri (a Roman Catholic) finished a book The Reason Why the Champion and Originator of the Anabaptists, Doctor Balthasar Hubmaier, Has Been Burned to Death in Vienna on March 10, 1528….According to Fabri Hubmaier was executed because of his heretical views concerning infant baptism and the Lord’s Supper” (Bergsten. 379).

Hubmaier and his wife were executed by the Roman Catholics of Austria.

Hubmaier’s Doctrine: From his A Dialogue, 1525-1526 we have this:

“No element or external thing in this world can purify the soul, but faith purifies men’s hearts. It follows that baptism cannot wash away sin. If it is not to change, but rather is of God, it must be an outward witness of inward faith and an external pledge of a new life to be administered according to Christ’s word as God gives grace. The wine must always be in the cellar before the sign or the circlet is displayed, or it is a deception. So one must first believe before one displays the sign of belief, or it will also be hypocrisy” (Bergsten. 396).

In a book of devotions he shows, “that the breaking, distribution, and eating of the bread is not the breaking, distribution, and eating of the body of Christ, who is in heaven seated at the Father’s right hand, but that it is a memorial of his body, an eating in the faith that He suffered for us. And as the first and the twenty-first. We do in fact find in every century groups of believers and churches known by different names who were Baptists, i.e. they practiced the immersion of believers only.

While every group of ancient Baptists may not have agreed with one another, or with us on every issue, let us remember that various fellowships of modern-day Baptists do not always agree in all their doctrines and practices. The independency of each church and liberty of conscience among believers accounts for such differences.

The Montanists About A.D. 156-180

Perhaps no other group has been more maligned and falsely accused of heterodox views than the Montanists. The Montanists get their name from one Montanus who was accused of believing he was the Holy Spirit by the Lutheran historian, John Lawrence Mosheim. This slander was corrected by Mosheim’s translator in a footnote (Ecclesiastical History, John Lawrence Mosheim, Vol. 1, p. 65). Schaff wrote of Montanus, “His adversaries wrongly inferred from the use of the first person for the Holy Spirit in his oracles, that he made himself directly the Paraclete, or, according to Epiphanius, even God the Father.” (History of the Christian Church, Philip Schaff, Vol. 2, p. 418). The Montanists have been vindicated of many false accusations against them by other historians such as Augustus Neander as well as Philip Schaff. Schaff cites a work by Wernsdorf Theoph entitled Commentatio de Montanistis Saeculi II, golgo creditis hoereticis which is “A vindication of Montanism as being essentially agreed with the doctrines of the primitive church and unjustly condemned.” Montanus’ aim was to maintain or to restore the scriptural simplicity, nature and character of the religion of the New Testament with a constant reliance on the promise of the Holy Spirit (Jarrel, p. 70).
Thomas Armitage wrote of the Montanists, “Both the opposition of Tertullian, and the open denial of the Montanists that baptism is the channel of grace, renders it unlikely that they adopted this practice [infant baptism]. They insisted so radically on the efficacy of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, that to have immersed unconscious babes would have nullified their basic doctrine of the direct agency of the Spirit, and have thwarted their attempts at reform, in the most practical manner.” (A History of the Baptists, Thomas Armitage, Vol.1, p. 177). Armitage also said of the Montanists, “The one prime idea held by the Montanists in common with Baptists, and in distinction to the Churches of the third century was, that membership in the Churches should be confined to purely regenerate persons; and that a spiritual life and discipline should be maintained without any affiliation with the authority of the State” (Armitage, p. 175). Jarrel concludes that “when Montanism arose, no essential departure from the faith in the action, the subjects of baptism, church government or doctrine. The Montanists, on these points, were Baptists.” (Jarrel, p. 69)

The Novatians About A.D. 250

This group of ancient Baptists was called Novatians after the name of Novatian. The Novatians are linked with the Montanists in that they renewed the moral protests of Montanus (Jarrel, p. 77). Many of Novatians followers united with the Montanists (Schaff, Vol. 2, p. 197). When a division occurred in 251 A.D. in the church at Rome over the election of a pastor, the conservative element of the church sided with Novatian against a more liberal group which elected Cornelius as pastor. The issue was a lax discipline on the part of Cornelius and the church at Rome toward those who had denied their faith because of persecution. The liberal party was for receiving them back into their fellowship; the conservative party opposed it. The conservative and minority group withdrew from the liberal majority and elected Novatian as their pastor. Thus, the Novatians stood for the purity of the church in both doctrine and times—broke him literally. He had to agree to leave Zurich. He was released and went to Nickolsburg in Moravia. But his sorrow of recanting never left him. In his Twelve Articles he closed with this prayer:

“And although I be forced away from it [his faith] by human fear or timidity, by tyranny, torture, sword, fire or water, I appeal to Thee my merciful Father, sustain me again with the grace of thy Holy Spirit and let me not depart in death without this faith” (Bergsten. 308).

In south Germany, Austria and Moravia, Hubmaier preached with other Anabaptists and he had great success. Thousands were baptized.

He was arrested the second time by order of the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria and taken to Vienna sometime in late June or July of 1527. His wife Elsbeth was also arrested and sent to the Kreuzenstein castle. In those days if one was arrested, his execution was almost certain, especially if arrested the second time. Hubmaier was condemned to be burned to death. The sentence was carried out March 10, 1528.

On the day he was burned he spoke words of comfort to himself by reciting Bible verses. When he arrived at the scaffold, accompanied by a great crowd of people and followed by an armed company, he raised his voice and cried out in the Swiss dialect, “O my gracious God, grant me grace in my great suffering!”

Turning to the people he asked pardon if he had offended anyone, and pardoned his enemies. When the wood was already in flames, he cried out, “O my heavenly Father! O my gracious God!” and with his hair and beard burning, he cried “O Jesus!” Thus with Jesus in his heart and on his burning lips he died sealing his faith with his blood!
Hubmaier’s light shines forth in some quotations: “I believe and know that Christendom shall not receive its rising aright, unless baptism and the Lord’s supper are brought to their original purity” (Cramp. Hist. 157).

His motto was, “The truth is immortal” (www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/H8358.html).

He contended that truth may suffer temporary setbacks: “The truth occasionally lets itself be captured, yea lashed, crowned, crucified, and buried, but on the third day it will rise victorious, and reign in triumph” (http://www.gameo.org/encyclopedia/contents/H8358.html).

Hubmaier differed with most other Anabaptists in that he was not a pacifist. He and his followers were known as Schwertler (people of the sword) vs. Stablern (people of the staff) (Bergsten. 383-4).

In the Zurich council meeting, October 26-28, 1523, Hubmaier expressed himself sharply in opposition to the abuses in the Mass and the worship of images. He declared that the Bible alone must decide such questions.

On January 17, 1525, the well-known debate was held in Zürich to settle the question about infant baptism. The Zurich council decided against the Anabaptists, but they won new converts from this discussion. A few months after this debate Hubmaier was baptized on Easter 1525 by Wilhelm Reublin and openly joined the Anabaptists.

Hubmaier was active in Waldshut, Schaffhausen, Augsburg and Nikolsburg in Moravia. But it was in Zurich where he was arrested the first time by Zwingli’s directions. He was imprisoned and tortured until he recanted. There (These prisons were so bad the dead rotted next to the living), he became sick and this with the torturing—he was racked on the wheel three times. Neander says, “The controversy with the Novatian party turned upon two general points:—1. What are the principles of penitence? 2. What constitutes the idea and essence of a true church?” (General History of the Christian Religion and Church, Augustus Neander, Vol. 1, p. 339). Neander further quotes Novatian as saying, “We ought doubtless to take care of those who have thus fallen, but nothing can be done for them beyond exhorting them to repent, and commending them to the mercy of God. . . . they must not be received to the communion; they should only be exhorted to repentance—the forgiveness of their sins must be left to that God who alone has power to forgive sin.” (Neander, pp. 339, 40). It is not surprising to learn that the Novatians were the first to be called the cathari or pure. J. M. Cramps concludes, “We may safely infer that they [the Novatian churches] abstained from compliance with innovation [infant baptism], and that the Novatian churches were what are now called Baptist churches, adhering to the Apostolic and primitive practice” (Baptist History, J. M. Cramp, p. 45.).
The Donatists About A.D. 311

The Donatists were given this name by their adversaries because of their leader, Donatus. The Donatists were much like the Novatians (Neander, Vol. 3, p. 258). Schaff links the Donatists with both the Montanists and Novatians (Schaff, Vol. 3, p. 360). It is obvious, that they, like the two aforementioned groups, held to the purity of the church. Armitage quotes Merivale as saying of the Donatists: “They represented the broad principle of the Montanists and Novatians, that the true Church of Christ is the assembly of really pious persons only, and admits of no merely nominal membership.” (Armitage, p. 200). Henry Danvers quotes Crispin’s French History as saying, “We put the Donatists and Novatians together, because they did so well agree in Principle” (A Treatise of Baptism, Henry Danvers, p. 225). They considered their own churches pure and denounced the Catholics as the schismatics. Mosheim wrote, “The doctrine of the Donatists was conformable to that of the church, as even their adversaries confess. . .The crime, therefore of the Donatists lay properly in the following things: in their declaring the church of Africa, which adhered to Cae- cillianus, fallen from the dignity and privileges of a true church and deprived of the gifts of the Holy Ghost...” (Mosheim, Vol. 1, pp. 109,110).

Bohringer, a biographer of Augustine is quoted by Jarrel as saying, “Infant baptism is the only point of difference between Augustine and the Donatists, and this grew out of the Donatist notion of the church.” (Jarrel, p. 96). That the Donatists rejected infant baptism is obvious from the fact that Austin’s controversy with them was over this issue (Danvers, p. 107). David Benedict in his History of the Donatists concludes that the Donatists were “thorough-going antipedobaptists” (p. 134).

The Donatists believed in the independency of the local church. Jarrel quotes W. W. Everts, Jr., of whom he wrote, prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, And say, if we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets.”

Mr. & Mrs. Balthasar Hubmeyer

The date of his birth is not precisely known, but he was born in Freiberg (about 5 miles east of Augsburg) in Bavaria about the year 1480, and this would have made him about the same age as Luther, Zwingli and John Eck. He was of short and of swarthy complexion. In 1524, Hubmeyer married Elsbeth Hügline of Reichenau.

Hubmeyer was a Roman Catholic priest but he broke from the hold of Catholicism and became an important Anabaptist preacher. He studied under John Eck and was the most educated of the Anabaptist theologians. Loserth, a Catholic Professor of history (died in 1936) said,

“Hubmaier is certainly the most prominent personality among the Swiss Anabaptists, far excelling Zwingli in both learning and acuteness of intellect” (Bergsten. 31).

Among some eighteen publications a few of the more important writings are appended:

1. On Free Will (Hubmaier opposed Luther’s Bondage of the Will, which he had probably read. Cf. Bergsten. 353).
5. His last work published, June 24, 1527 was On The Sword.
The council sided with Zwingli in this disputation and Mantz, Grebel, Blaurock, and others were baptized shortly after. Mantz set out to spread the newly formed faith to others around Basel, St. Gall, Schaffhausen, and the territory around Zurich until he was captured and sentenced to life in prison in 1526. He was committed to the Tower of Wallenberg. He escaped.

Shortly after his escape he was recaptured and on Dec. 16, 1526 was sentenced to death by drowning. Drowning, Zwingli and the leaders of Zurich felt, was a fitting punishment for rebaptizers and some men of that day dubbed the penalty the third baptism. Schaff says of this method of execution: “He who dips, shall be dipped, --a cruel irony” (Schaff. 82).

On Jan. 5, 1527, the day of his execution, Felix saw his mother across the river waving to him. With her stood some of his brothers. They shouted encouragement. His final words were “Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit!” They dropped him over the side of the boat into the cold water of the Limmat and he laid down his life for Christ!

It was the Protestants of Zurich, Switzerland who put Mantz to death. He was the first Anabaptist martyr in Zurich. There is an extraordinary recantation of the Evangelical Reformed Church in Zurich.

“The Evangelical-Reformed Church of the Canton of Zurich on June 26, 2004 issued a historic invitation to Anabaptist descendants to attend a “reconciliation” conference. The event included the unveiling of a historical marker for Felix Mantz” (mcusa).

The resonance of this confession calls to mind the words of our Lord in Matt 23:29-31, “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the

“perhaps, no one in America has a better knowledge of church history” (p. 96) as saying, “We clearly trace among them the polity of the apostolic and Baptist church. Independence of the hierarchy was universally maintained, and no higher authority than the local church was acknowledged.” (Jarrel, p. 98). That the Donatists believed in a local, not a hierarchal church is evident from the fact that at the Council of Carthage 279 Donatists bishops were present. At another time 410 Donatist bishops assembled together. In a hierarchal church, only a few bishops are necessary for the largest country, but the bishops among the Donatists were obviously pastors of local, independent, and individual churches.

Jarrel quotes Prof. Heman Lincoln, Professor of Church History in Newton Theological Seminary as writing: “The Donatists held . . many of the principles which are regarded as axioms by modern Baptists. They maintained absolute freedom of conscience, the divorce of church [and state], and a regenerate church membership. These principles, coupled with their uniform practice of immersion, bring them into close affinity with Baptists.” (Jarrel, p. 105). It is clear, then, that the Donatist churches consisted of regenerate members who were baptized by immersion. Because they were falsely called Anabaptists, it is obvious they baptized those who came to them from the Catholic party.

The Paulicians About A.D. 611

The Paulicians were given their name by their enemies because of their adherence to the teachings of the Apostle Paul. Like Baptists today, they strictly adhered to New Testament order in their faith and practice. They are linked with the Montanists, the Novatians, and the Donatists in doctrine and practice. As we shall see later, they are also linked with the Albigenses and known as Bogomiles, Patereni, and Cathari. They received the New Testament as their inspired guide. Because they did not use the Old Testament as their rule of faith and
practice, they were falsely accused of rejecting the Old Testament. They had a high regard for Scripture. Neander says, "it is evident, even from the manner in which their teachers write to the members of the sect, and from the order and denominations of their ecclesiastical officers, that they designed and strove to derive their doctrines from the New Testament; and particularly from the writings of the Apostle Paul." (Neander, Vol. 5, p. 339).

The Paulicians are falsely called Manichaeists or dualists, a system of belief that claims there are two basic and opposing principles of good and evil. Men derive the elements of goodness in the world from the former and badness from the latter. Neander wrote, "We find nothing at all, however, in the doctrines of the Paulicians, which would lead us to presume that they were an offshoot from Manichaeism; on the other hand, we find much which contradicts such a supposition." (Neander, Vol. 5, pp. 337,338).

Jarrel writes, "In these churches of the Paulicians, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper they held to be peculiar to the communion of the faithful; i.e. restricted to believers" (Jarrel, p. 115). He then gave this summation of the Paulicians: “While I have more testimony to prove the Paulicians were Baptists as to the ordinances, I conclude this point with these as amply sufficient: (1.) They did administer the ordinances. (2.) Only to believers. (3.) They recognized the scriptural truth, that only immersion is baptism. (4.) As they baptized only believers they believed in a regenerate church membership.” (Jarrel, p. 119).

George Stanley Faber vindicated the Paulicians of all the calumnies their enemies brought against them concerning the orthodox faith. He wrote, “They held the allied doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation: but they renounced the worship of the Cross and of the Virgin and of the Saints; while they evidently disbelieved that material presence of the Lord’s body

In December of 1524, Mantz wrote an article against Infant Baptism entitled \textit{A Protestation and Defense Against Infant Baptism} and sent it to the leaders of Zurich. Among other things Mantz maintained:

1. In some cases in the NT faith preceded baptism (John the Baptist required it; Cornelius Acts 10; and Paul Acts 22.
2. Infant baptism was instituted by the pope not Christ.

Up until Jan. 17, 1525, these Bible meetings were permitted and some were held in Gross muenster (Great Minster). This building still stands. After the debate on January 21, 1525, such meetings were forbidden by the Council.

Bullinger, in his \textit{History of The Reformation}, gives the following statement of the defense of believers’ baptism by Grebel, Mantz, and Blaurock on this occasion:

“Infants cannot believe nor can they understand the meaning of baptism. Baptism should be administered to believers to whom the Gospel has been preached, who have understood it and of their own accord desire baptism and who are willing to mortify the old man and lead a new life. Of all this the infants know nothing whatever, therefore baptism is not intended for them. Here they cited the Scriptures on baptism from the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles and showed that the apostles did not baptize infants, but only those who had come to an age of understanding; therefore the same should not be done. And infant baptism, being not in accord with Scripture, was invalid and it was necessary to be baptized anew” (http://www.apostolicchristianchurch.org/Pages/Library-Anabaptist\%20History,\%20Rise.htm).
quainted with other Reformers and leaders of the Swiss Reformation.

In 1522, he began to have doubts about infant baptism. He discussed these questions with Zwingli, and Zwingli at first agreed with him that infants should not be baptized. Later he backed away from this position and contended strongly for infant baptism and used the secular powers to persecute those who did not agree. Mantz followed the Scriptures. He gave up infant baptism and became an Anabaptist. He believed the secular power had nothing to do with the church whereas Zwingli thought it had everything to do with it!

Felix Mantz, Conrad Grebel, George Blaurock and others had a public disputation with Zwingli regarding whether or not infant baptism was Scriptural before the council of Zurich.

“Bullinger says further that they came to Zwingli often to protest against the “lukewarmness” and contrast between his former teaching and current practices in the church. They felt that the continued observance of the Mass, with Zwingli's consent, was a grave offense. They indicated that God's Word was violated and denied by following the Council's decisions. Grebel and his associates showed that, in plain fact, the authority of the Council had replaced the authority of Scripture!” (Library-Anabaptist).

“According to Zwingli, they even tried to persuade him to become the leader in a thoroughly New Testament style church movement. In his last book against the Anabaptists, entitled *Elenchus*, Zwingli says: You have asserted oftener than I can say that all would be well if I would join you.” (Library-Anabaptist).

and blood in the consecrated elements which finally received the name of transubstantiation. The God-denying speculation, which explains away the doctrine of the Trinity and which asserts Christ to be a mere man, they abhorred.” (*The History of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses*, George Stanley Faber, p. 54).

**The Albigenses About A.D. 900**

The Albigenses get their name from *Albiga* or *Albi* in southern France. They were both numerous and influential there for many years. In fact, it is said they filled and molded France and Italy with their pure lives, affecting in a lesser degree other parts of Europe as well. Coming from Asia where they had been known as Paulicians, they came also to be known as Albigenses. Jarrel quotes a Dr. Carl Schmidt, an eminent German authority of Strasburg, speaking of their being called Albigenses, saying: “Before that time the sect was spoken of as Publicants or Publicani, probably a corruption of the name Paulicians, which the Crusaders had brought back to Western Europe” (Jarrel, pp. 124, 125).

Like the Paulicians, the Albigenses were falsely called Manichaeans, a charge that Faber literally destroys in 131 pages of his excellent work. Since they are linked with the Paulicians, they are also linked with the Donatists, the Novatians, and the Montanists. They were also known and Paterines and Cathari.

The Albigenses denied marriage was a sacrament but did not reject marriage, as they are falsely accused. They rejected both infant baptism and baptismal regeneration (Armitage, pp. 278, 280). They also had a very simple ecclesiastical organization. The Albigenses are one and the same people with the Waldenses.
The Waldenses About A.D. 1100

The Waldenses received their name from a valley of the Pyrenees Mountains, not from Peter Waldo. They have been called the Valdenses, Vaudois, Vallenses, as well as the Waldenses. As it is with Baptists today, there were different groups or fellowships of Waldenses. They believed in a professedly regenerate church membership, practiced immersion, rejected baptismal regeneration, held to the authority of Scripture, and believed in salvation by grace and election (Jarrel, pp. 161-166). They issued a Confession of Faith in 1120 A.D. They were persecuted mercilessly by the agents of Rome. Many of them later became Protestants and practiced infant baptism, though there are still some Waldenses who hold to the true and Apostolic faith.

The Lollards About A.D. 1315

The Lollards were given this name by their enemies for their leader, Walter Lollard, a German preacher of renown among the Waldenses who came to England. The Lollards are known best for John Wycliffe, the great translator of the Bible, of whom Danvers wrote, “Of whose opinions and doctrines so well agreeing with the Waldenses of old, we have an account, as from his own writings, so from many authors that have collected the same from them” (Danvers, p. 278). That Wycliffe was a Baptist is evident from 29 tenants he held as listed by Danvers (Danvers, pp. 279-287). The Lollards were among the forerunners of the English Baptists. Obviously they were linked with the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Paulicians, the Donatists, the Novatians, and the Montanists.

We have thus seen the perpetuity of the church Jesus built! Running like a pure mountain stream from its source, the church has continued, though at times unseen because of being underground, to this very day. It has been called by various names but is known for its uncompromising stand for the faith

Revelation 17:6. “And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.”

The Scripture term martyr has no specific reference to death but rather to being a witness. The word occurs thirty-four times in the New Testament and is only translated martyr in three places. By unknown means the word came to mean those who died for the faith (BDT). In this message we use the term in its derived meaning.

We discuss four martyrs from the 1600s, Felix Mantz, Mr. & Mrs. Balthasar Hubmaier and Anne Askew. We seek to answer these questions: who killed them; why were they put to death, and by what means were they executed?

Baptist means one who is immersed after he is saved by faith in Christ. Some claim these discussed in this message were not Baptists. Others assert they were. We do not debate that issue in this message.

Felix Mantz

Felix Mantz was born about 1498. Very little is known about his family but he was an illegitimate son of a Zurich priest. He is considered the co-founder of the Anabaptist movement in Zurich. We don’t know when he was converted, but we know he was baptized January 21, 1525.

Mantz was well educated. In 1519, he studied Hebrew with Zwingli under the tutorship of Carlstadt. He was ac-
glecting our opportunities? Listen to McCoy’s last words to his wife: “Tell the brethren never to let the Indian mission decline.” Near the end of his life, Judson lamented, “It is my growing conviction that the Baptist churches in America are behind the age in missionary spirit. …The Baptist missions will probably pass into the hands of other denominations…and those who have occupied the van will fall back into the rear.” O may God speak to us, convict us, and re-energize our sluggish hearts!

Our text says that those who preach the gospel have beautiful feet in the estimation of their hearers. Carey’s feet were beautiful to some in India. Judson’s feet were beautiful to some in Burma. McCoy’s feet were beautiful to some in North America. Do your feet look beautiful to anyone?

once delivered to the saints. Existing today because of Christ’s promise and the fidelity of its members, the church will continue into the ages of the ages. Will we who are privileged to be members of the Lord’s churches continue to be faithful and willing instruments whom the Holy Spirit uses to perpetuate the Church of Jesus Christ?
I know of no scripture that better introduces my subject than Hebrews 11:35b-38. The faith and sufferings of the Waldenses mirror that of the Old Testament saints.

In pre-reformation church history, perhaps no name is more familiar than that of the Waldenses. For over a thousand years they were, as their famous motto states, a light shining in the darkness. Their name became a synonym for New Testament Christianity. They rightly deserve to be remembered and honored.

In 1861, C.H. Spurgeon, in a sermon entitled, *The True Apostolical Succession*, said:

“...we, known among men, in all ages, by various names, such as Donatists, Novatians, Paulicians, Petrobrussians, Cathari, Arnoldists, Hussites, Waldenses, Lollards, and Anabaptists, have always contended for the purity of the Church, and her distinctness and separation from human government. Our fathers were men injured to hardships, and unused to ease. They present to us, their children, an unbroken line which comes legitimately from the apostles, not through the filth of Rome...”

Most everyone claims the Waldenses as their ancestors, including Protestants, Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists. Even some Romanists in ages past claimed them when it was expedient to gloss over their numbers and influence.

They were full of unstoppable determination and desire. They understood the importance of their work, and were fully committed to it. They understood God uses means to accomplish his eternally-laid plans. They were patient under trial and persevered, knowing their labors would not be in vain. They kept a long-term perspective. They expected God to work, and were willing to sacrifice everything and suffer anything to get to be involved in it. McCoy said,

“Missions to the Indians are unpopular things, and he who does not possess resources within himself to work alone, or with few associates, to sow much and reap little, to work hard without the reward of worldly honor or money, to remain poor all his life for the sake of making the almost friendless Indians rich, and to wait for his pay until he shall get to heaven, had better not enter upon any mission to the Indian.”

Now it is for us to examine our hearts. Are we really missionary Baptists? We must be more than missionary in our creeds, songs and prayers. We must be missionary in labors, otherwise we are practical hyper-Calvinists. Are we not guilty of much criminal neglect in the work God has given us to do? Let us be missionaries in our “Jerusalem” as well as in the uttermost part of the earth. Our options are simple: go, send, or disobey. We must be at one end or another of the missionary rope!

Young men, consider your gifts and your desires. Consider the need of a lost world. Consider the worthiness of God’s name to be known. At least pray that God would show you what He would have you do in your short life on earth.

Carey said, “Not to have the heart to improve the prize of a God-given opportunity is to deserve the epithet of fool.” Friends, will future generations rise up and call us fools for ne-
And what shall I more say? This unsung hero deserves much more of a song than I have sung. But God has kept all the records. More importantly, it is for us to sing our Savior’s praise! One of the hymns McCoy sang at baptisms was:

Hail, exalted mighty Savior!
Push thy glorious conquests on,
Help us, who enjoy thy favor,
Sing the victories thou hast won.
We would praise thee,
For what sovereign grace hath done.

A Few Concluding Observations on These Missionaries

One disclaimer: All three whom we have mentioned were influential in starting missionary societies. Though we cannot condone these extra-biblical organizations, we should not deny all that God accomplished in spite of them.

On a more positive note, I have found some common elements in the life and ministry of these three heroes. They were all evangelists at home before they ever set off for their far-off fields of labor. They were all men who sensed a distinct call to their work and were compelled to it. They took the great commission seriously and personally, and not as a suggestion or an option. In a message on Matt. 28:20, Carey insisted, “To neglect His commission is to forfeit His benediction.”

They were men of deep personal piety. They were steeped in the grace of humility. Carey, at the beginning of his work said, “If God uses me, none need despair.” In the midst of his work he wrote to Fuller, “None stands more in need than I of the prayers of God’s people.” At the end of his work he said to a friend, “When I am gone, say nothing about Dr. Carey–speak about Dr. Carey’s Savior.”

Historians disagree on many of the specifics concerning the Waldenses. Even the Baptist histories are far from uniform. The enigma of the Waldenses is probably solved by understanding that the name came to describe a variety of people at various stages of doctrinal and practical development over a lengthy period of time. The fact that many of their own writings did not survive, while the false and malicious accusations of their enemies did survive, further complicates our task. We must be honest with history and avoid revisionist history from either enemies or friends of the Waldenses.

In all fairness, we ought not to imagine that all our spiritual ancestors were just like us in every detail. We must be content to find enough agreement in the basics of the Christian faith to be considered their heirs—and that is exactly what we do find!

Their Origin, Name and Location

Modern historians say that the Waldenses (or Waldensians) originated with and derived their name from Peter Waldo, a merchant from Lyons (France) who became a Christian in 1160. He was certainly a godly and influential man. He was committed to translating and distributing the Bible. He gave all he had to the poor. After separating from Romanism, he and his followers fled for their lives. Some of them moved into the valleys occupied by the Waldenses and exerted some influence on them, but there is no certainty that Waldo himself ever lived there. Even if the name came from Peter Waldo, he did not introduce New Testament Christianity to the region. The giraffe was a giraffe before Adam gave it the name!–and the Waldenses were biblical Christians before Waldo appeared. It may well be that he received his name, Waldo, from associating with the Waldenses, and not vice versa.

The name Waldensian was most certainly derived from the location where these people lived. The Latin word for val-
ley is valles or valdes, and thus the Italian term Waldensian simply means a valley-dweller. (The French term vaudois derives from the same Latin root.) The valleys in view are in the southwestern Alps, running through the region of Italy called Piedmont, that form the natural boundary between Italy and France and Switzerland. They are rich fertile valleys, well-fed by rivers, described by Orchard as “an earthly Eden”. Many writers, including Jonathan Edwards (Congregationalist), take these valleys to be the provision spoken of in Revelation 12:6, a place in the wilderness prepared by God where his people should feed. Andrew Fuller and others also identify the Waldenses and the Albigenses as the two witnesses of Revelation 11.

Biblical Christianity is known to have flourished in this region from the early days of church history. During the pre-Constantinian Roman persecutions, Christians fled to the mountains of the Alps and Pyrenees to survive. The Waldenses themselves said their ancestors had been in the valleys since the days of the apostles. Presbyterian historian Robert Baird says, “the Waldensian churches never belonged to Rome” (Introduction to Perrin’s History, p. vi). Edwards says they “never submitted to the church of Rome” and “in every age of this dark time, there appeared particular persons in all parts of Christendom, who bore a testimony against the corruptions and tyranny of the church of Rome…God was pleased to maintain an uninterrupted succession of many witnesses through the whole time” (vol. 2, p. 596-597). Muston (Israel of the Alps) affirms that “it is not they who separated from Catholicism; but Catholicism which separated from them, in modifying the primitive worship.” In 1819, two historians appointed by the King of the Netherlands reported to him, “We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has
mercy of God protected and preserved Judson. When the British went to war with Burma, all foreigners were assumed to be spies. Judson was imprisoned for 18 months, surviving unspeakable tortures. He was even tempted by suicidal thoughts. Only his wife’s diligent efforts with uncaring authorities saved his life. But her own health was irrevocably injured thereby, and she died at the age of 36. A few years later, Judson buried his second wife. Furthermore the climate of the Orient claimed in death most all of his children in the first year or two of life. His third wife outlived him.

When Judson returned to America for a few months in 1845, he was a sensation. The many fruits of his labors were well known. But he disappointed audiences who hoped to hear thrilling tales of exotic places. Instead, he preached the gospel, insisting that he “had nothing better to tell than the wondrous story of Jesus’ dying love.” In 1850, he took a voyage seeking good healthy sea air in hopes of prolonging the life of his weakened frame, but it was not to be. He was buried at sea not far from Burma.

Isaac McCoy is an unsung hero who deserves to be sung! He was an American who lived 1784 to 1846. Converted at 16 after a godly upbringing, McCoy was inspired by the labors of William Carey, and later named one of his stations in Michigan “Carey Mission.” He was ordained to the gospel ministry at 26. During the War of 1812, in which Indians fought for both sides, he was in his own words “stirred in heart” for the Indians. Public sentiment was very strong against the Indians, from Washington D.C. on down. They were viewed as incorrigible cases not worth the effort to teach. After a useful ministry among whites, McCoy begin in 1817 to serve the cause of evangelizing these unwanted tribes on the frontier of Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, and Indian Territory. He was, for the remaining 30 years of his life, “the apostle to the Indians.” He was a man obsessed with his calling. He continually grieved at the reticence of his own denomination to evangelize the Indians.
of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrussians and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth in times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wycliffites and Hussites had maintained…” [i.e. concerning the purity of the church, or regenerate membership] (quoted in Hassell, p. 470).

William Wordsworth (1770-1850) wrote in his Ecclesiastical Sonnet XII:

But whence came they who for the Savior Lord
Have long borne witness as the Scriptures teach?
Ages ere Waldo raised his voice to preach
In Gallic ears the unadulterated Word,
Their fugitive progenitors explored
Subalpine vales, in quest of safe retreats
Where that pure church survives, though summer heats
Open a passage to the Romish sword,
Far as it dares to follow. Herbs self-sown
And fruitage gathered from the chestnut wood,
Nourish the sufferers then; and mists that brood
O’er chasms, with new-fallen obstacles bestrown,
Protect them; and the eternal snow that daunts Aliens, is God’s good winter for the haunts.

We may truly say that the Waldenses never needed reformation.

him who left his heavenly home, and died for her and for you; for the sake of perishing, immortal souls; for the sake of Zion, and the glory of God? Can you consent to all this, in hope of soon meeting your daughter in the world of glory, with the crown of righteousness, brightened with the acclamations of praise which shall redound to her Savior from heathens saved, through her means, from eternal woe and despair?”

John Hasseltine let his daughter, Anne, decide. She said yes. Still in their early 20’s, Mr. and Mrs. Judson left the shores of America in 1812 as the first American overseas missionaries. They spent the remainder of their lives in Burma (except for a short visit to their homeland on separate journeys, both for the sake of their health). On the long voyage, Judson, a Congregationalist, studied his Bible and became convinced of believer’s baptism. Anne was but a step behind him in her own convictions. Shortly after arriving in India they submitted to baptism at the hands of one of Carey’s associates, William Ward. The other missionaries who had accompanied them on the voyage had to separate from them. But one, Luther Rice, also became a Baptist and returned to the USA to seek help and funding from the Baptists. The Baptists in America rose to the challenge. But Judson did not learn about it for two years. (Imagine the anxiety of not knowing who, if any, were holding the rope!)

Burma was a very dangerous and unpredictable place, especially for an uninvited foreigner. But the determined Judson got a foothold and never let go. He learned the language and began translating the Bible. After six fruitless years the first convert finally came. Buddhism enjoyed special privilege with the people and the king, who ruled by capricious whims. After much local opposition in Rangoon, Judson sought royal approval from the ruthless tyrant. He was refused. From then on, he was an open target, living on a precarious edge. The Burmese Christians were in even greater danger. Only the
missions” requested that the following lines and nothing more be inscribed on his monument:

A wretched, poor and helpless worm,  
On Thy kind arms I fall. (Watts)

Adoniram Judson experienced a dramatic conversion at the age of 20 in 1808 in Massachusetts. A printed sermon by an Anglican minister stirred his heart for the work of missions. A book by a British army officer describing Burma implanted in his mind the great need of that remote and backward nation. He was gripped in a way that he never got over. He said,

“It was during a solitary walk in the woods behind the college [Andover], while meditating and praying on the subject, and feeling half inclined to give it up, that the command of Christ, “Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature,” was presented to my mind with such clearness and power, that I came to a full decision, and though great difficulties appeared in my way, resolved to obey the command at all events.

“While making preparations to go, he fell in love with a young woman who shared his commitment to the Savior. In a letter asking her father for her hand in marriage, Judson wrote: I have now to ask, whether you can consent to part with your daughter early next spring, to see her no more in this world; whether you can consent to her departure, and her subjection to the hardships and sufferings of a missionary life; whether you can consent to her exposure to the dangers of the ocean; to the fatal influence of the southern climate of India; to every kind of want and distress; to degradation, insult, persecution, and perhaps a violent death. Can you consent of all this, for the sake of

The Waldenses

Their Beliefs and Practices

In the core of their beliefs the Waldenses were one with the Novatians, Donatists and other primitive Christians. The two oldest documents that testify to their beliefs date from the early 1100’s. Both are included in Morland’s history. (I will be glad to furnish a copy to anyone interested.) First is the Confession of Faith of 1120. Though some have challenged the accuracy of its date, we should not brush off lightly the fact that Morland himself, who was commissioned by Cromwell, was convinced of its authenticity. Second is the Noble Lesson, something of a history of the faith from the beginning of time to about 1100.

The most basic foundation of their beliefs was the authority and sufficiency of Scripture. No bishop or council or tradition could trump the Holy Scripture. Many Waldenses memorized the four gospels and the epistles, as well as large portions of the Old Testament. Christian says that some memorized the whole Bible! (vol. 2, p. 76).

What Bible did they memorize? Brother Max Nunley wrote a scholarly article about the origins of the Waldensian Bible, showing it was the Italic Old Latin, from the traditional text or Textus Receptus. (I would be happy to furnish a copy to anyone interested.)

The two old documents mentioned above prove without a doubt that the Waldenses were sound in the doctrine of the Trinity, and in the gospel. They held tenaciously to the necessity of regeneration before baptism and church membership. They held that Roman Bishop Sylvester, under Emperor Constantine, opened the floodgates of worldliness into Christianity. They nicknamed him Heresiarch (Christian, vol. 1, p. 73). They opposed all the superstitions that Rome had added. Pope Lucius III formally anathematized them in 1184.
J.M. Cramp describes their distance from Rome (p. 79-80):

“They held the Pope to be Antichrist, and they regarded the Church of Rome as the mystical ‘Babylon’ spoken of in the Book of the Revelation, ‘the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.’ They maintained that the true Church consists only of believers. They pleaded for the translation of the Scriptures into all modern languages, that men might read “in their own tongues the wonderful works of God.” They decried the ceremonies of Romish worship—the holy water, the incense, the bowing and kneeling, the ringing of bells, &c.—and taught that God is to be worshipped with ‘pious affections.’ They read and studied the Divine Word continually, so that many of them could repeat large portions of it from memory, and all were skilful in illustrating and defending their sentiments by appropriate quotations from Holy Writ. They denied the authority of bishops, the validity of the numerous distinctions of rank among the clergy, and the lawfulness of ecclesiastical titles. They denounced tithes. They declared against donations and legacies to churches or monasteries. They rejected councils. They abhorred image-worship and the reverence paid to relics. They did not believe in transubstantiation. They would not confess to the priests, saying that confession was to be made to God only. They laughed at dedications, consecrations, exorcisms, blessing of salt, spices, and candles, and other superstitious rites, regarding them as fitter themes for ridicule than for reasoning. They would not pray to any saints. They held purgatory to be a fable, and they knew that it was a profitable one to the

Carey arrived in India in 1793 and never returned to England. He had set his hand to the plow and he never looked back, though the ground was dry and unyielding. He labored for 40 years in India, enduring one great trial after another. His life reads like the list of perils Paul endured. For two years, there was no communication from home. About that time his wife lost her sanity and lived a deranged and dangerous woman until her death 12 years later. He was harassed by the Englishmen of the East India Company, who wanted no missionaries interfering with their business in India. Carey eventually found refuge under the Danish flag at Serampore, not far from Calcutta. All his years in India he supported himself financially by one means or another. Seven years passed until his first Indian convert was baptized. Progress was painfully slow. In 1812, a great fire destroyed the literary work of many years. As more missionaries came, painful divisions needlessly developed that even spilled over into the churches back in England. He outlived a second wife and several children. But in the face of all these and many other sore trials, Carey’s determination never wavered. He later said, “I can plod and persevere. That is my only genius. I can persevere in any definite pursuit. To this I owe everything.” One who worked with him said he did not have half an hour a month to relax from hardest labor. He wrote to one of his sons, who had also become a missionary, “The conversion of one soul is worth the labor of a life” (S.P. Carey, p. 270).

God truly did great things through the attempts of Carey. He eventually translated the Bible or parts of it into 40 languages. He is recognized as one of the greatest linguists of all time. He was often asked how he had been able to learn so many languages. He would answer, “No one knows what he can do until he tries.” Many churches were established. To this day his name is a household word in India, because of his varied influence on the social order, especially in linguistics, breaking down the caste system and putting a stop to sati (widow-burning). This one we know as “the father of modern
and for the souls of men grew and never stopped growing. In spite of being certain that he had no aptitude for preaching, a small congregation insisted that he preach just once. He preached. They insisted again, and he preached again, and again. He eventually cast his lot with the Baptists. Though uneducated, he taught himself the classic languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin while repairing shoes and pastoring small churches. Thus his gift for languages began to emerge.

He read the log-books of Captain James Cook’s recent voyages to the south seas and could only think of the lost souls that Cook described. Cook was the match that lit the torch in Carey’s heart. He began to gather information about all the nations and peoples of the earth. His handmade globe became a second Bible to him. He also taught school to supplement his small pastoral stipends. “His pupils saw sometimes a strange sight, when their master would be moved to tears over a geography lesson. As he pointed to continents, islands, and peoples, he would cry, ‘And these are pagans, pagans!’”

The biographies of Eliot and Brainerd also gripped him. Not all his fellow Baptists appreciated his concern for the heathen. As he talked, wrote and preached about the need of souls in far away places, some insulted him by calling him Arminian. But with a few, notably Andrew Fuller, he found one heart and soul in the work of missions. Carey’s now-legendary “deathless sermon” consisted of two parts: First, expect great things from God; second, attempt great things for God. Though you may not appreciate it, it was in all honesty his postmillennialism that made him first expect great things, and that expectation, in turn, moved him to attempt great things. With a persistent William Carey, a handful of English pastors agreed with fear and trembling to send out the first Baptist missionary to go to the other side of the globe. They were charting new waters literally and figuratively! It was as if Carey were descending the depths of an unexplored mine, and Fuller and the others promised to hold the rope and never let go.

According to Perrin, Bishop Vesembecius (late 1400s) before resorting to violence against the Waldenses sent a monk to convince them of their errors.

“But the priest withdrew in confusion, saying, he had never in the whole course of his life made such progress in the holy scriptures, as he had done in those few days that he had conferred with the Waldenses.”

So the Bishop sent a whole group of doctors to confound them with hard questions.

“But one of them upon his retreat openly acknowledged, he had learned more doctrine necessary to salvation by hearing the answers of the little children of the Waldenses in their catechism, than by all the theological disputes which he had ever had in Paris.” (p. 35)

Some debate has arisen over the question of infant baptism among the Waldenses. This confusion is due to (1) the fact that some who remained in the established church to avoid persecution were in their own minds sympathetic to the believers-only position of the Waldenses; and (2) the fact that the post-reformation Waldenses began to adopt the practice of infant baptism due to Protestant influence, and later Protestant historians assumed that it had always been the case. However, many careful historians have proven that the Waldenses immersed believers only. (For example, see William Jones’ The History of the Waldenses.)
of the Christian Church; W.A. Jarrel’s Baptist Church Perpetuity.) Their most ancient documents, as well as their fierce Roman opponents, speak with clarity on this issue. There is no real debate at all!

In soteriology (the doctrine of salvation), some writers, such as Hassell, claim that the Waldenses were of the free-will bent (i.e. Arminian). However, there is much evidence to show that they had some concept of sovereign grace. Article 7 of the 1120 Confession states that Christ “died for the salvation of all those that believe”, wording which no freewiller ever used! The Noble Lesson concludes with these lines:

May it please the Lord which formed the World,
That we may be of the number of his Elect to
dwell in his Court for ever.
Praised be God. Amen.

Brakel, a Dutch Reformed theologian in the 1600’s, refers to the Romanists who declared that “prior to the time of Zwingli and Luther there had been very many who adhered to the same doctrine—which they refer to as heresy—and that Zwingli, Luther and Calvin had by renewal brought this doctrine to light.” (vol. 2, p. 39) Jones quotes Lindanus, a Catholic bishop in the mid-1500’s, who accused Calvin of being “the inheritor of the doctrine of the Waldenses” (vol. 2, p. 90). Jarrel quotes A.A. Hodge saying, “The Lollards, another name for the Waldenses, the followers of Wickliffe, in the fourteenth century, were all of the general school of St. Augustine” (p. 166). James Durham (Scottish Presbyterian, 1658, Exposition of Revelation, p. 634) shows that the Romanists claimed that “the Calvinists now are the same called Waldenses before”. Obviously, we should not hastily write off the Waldensians as Arminians!

In some non-essentials, the Waldenses held some peculiar ideas. (Of course, they might think some of ours peculiar!) whether these words were actually spoken, Carey himself said that he was strongly rebuked more than once for his “enthusiasm.”

Our Arminian friends would say that those of us who are missionary-hearted are so in spite of our theology. But I believe we are missionary-hearted because of our theology! We of all people have the privilege to know more of the glory of a great God, who is worthy of being known. We know that God’s almighty arm is able to save even the chiefest of sinners. We know that God most certainly will save a great number for his honor and fame. We understand the place that means occupies in God’s scheme—He has ordained not only the end but also the steps by which that end comes to pass. We know that we are fishing in a pond stocked by God before the foundation of the world!

It is noteworthy that the whole phenomenon known as the “modern missions movement” was commenced exclusively by men holding Calvinistic theology. This includes the three I am about to mention. Far from being a hindrance, sovereign grace truth is the impetus for biblical evangelism and missions. When God told Paul, “I have much people in this city,” Paul did not relax—he labored all the more. So must we!

Carey, Judson and McCoy

Let me briefly sketch the portraits of these great Baptist missionaries, who were contemporaries for 46 years.

William Carey was born in a small village in England in 1761, and died in India in 1834. He was poor, did not even finish high school before going to work as a cobbler’s apprentice, and possessed very ordinary gifts. But God filled him with extraordinary grace! From a nominal Anglican background, he experienced a radical conversion at the age of 17, through the unrelenting witness of a fellow-worker. His love for the Savior
wording that could be improved, he was far from “the greatest
enemy the church of God ever had” as William Gadsby called
him (*Spurgeon vs. Hyper-Calvinism*, Iain Murray, p. 51).

Like Fuller in the 1700’s, Bernard Honeysett in the
1900’s spent many years among a group of English Baptists
who never fully preached the gospel. He writes,

> “By claiming that the promise of salvation in Christ cannot be addressed to all men, Hyper-Calvinism has to present another means by which individuals may know that the promise is addressed to them. This it does by encouraging preachers to describe feelings and experiences by which an individual, looking at himself, may discover if God has begun a work in his life. Thus there developed the type of “experimental preaching” favored in these circles, the purpose of which was to help individuals to discover a life-giving work of the Spirit in their hearts before they believe they are able to rest on the promises of the Gospel. The effect of this is to reverse the way in which sinners are to be brought to peace” (*The Sound of His Name*, p. 85-86).

Such an approach is obviously death to missionary out-
reach, both at home and abroad.

When William Carey first asked his fellow Baptist pas-
tors “whether the command given to the apostles to teach all
nations was not binding on all succeeding ministers to the end
of the world, seeing that the accompanying promise was of
equal extent,” he met with accusations of “enthusiasm” (a.k.a.
Arminian zeal) and was told scoffingly, “When God pleases to
convert the heathen, He’ll do it without consulting you or me.
Besides, there must first be another pentecostal gift of
tongues” (S. P. Carey, p. 47). Though some have questioned

For example, they abstained from all manner of oaths, refusing
even to say “in truth” or “for certain”. Perhaps they overreacted
to the false swearing of Romanists and nominal Christians. We
should at least appreciate their commitment to truthfulness and
the letter of the Sermon on the Mount!

In practice, the Waldenses were eminently holy. Their
bitterest enemies bore witness to their piety (cp. Reynerius
quoted above). But these enemies often charged them with the
grossest of evils, knowing these accusations were false, in
hopes of stirring up local opposition and keeping others from
joining their ranks. Of course they could not substantiate these
outlandish charges. The Waldenses held one another to a high
standard and exercised church discipline when necessary, espe-
cially against pastors who fell into sin. Luther said he at first
hated the Waldenses, until he understood the piety of their faith
(Perrin, p. 38).

**Their Outreach**

The Waldenses were committed to the Great Commiss-
ion. Their influence stretched all over Europe. They eagerly
circulated Bibles and read them to the illiterate. Reynerius, their
friend-turned-enemy, described the typical Waldensian peddler
who after selling articles to ladies in splendid homes, tells them
about a richer jewel—the word of God—which he would open
and read as occasion permitted! The business of these traveling
merchants was undertaken only to make known the teaching of
the Bible. (See Cathcart’s *Baptist Encyclopedia*, p. 1201.) Their
enemies charged them with “going up and down the world
preaching” (Allix, p. 297). Today one can visit the old stone
building in the Valley of Angrogna known as the College of the
Barbes, where many of these missionaries were prepared, espe-
cially in memorizing scripture and sermons. They were sent out
in pairs, an older experienced missionary training a younger
one. Some of them reached as far as Oxford, England. Some
were discovered and martyred on their first journey.
The success of their labors speaks for itself in the large numbers of converts and in the drastic measures taken by the Romanists to stop them.

**Their Suffering**

The Waldenses suffered deprivation, often living in poor conditions and worshiping in caves to avoid persecution. And persecution repeatedly came from the powers subjected to Rome. Some of the persecutions shortly before and after the Reformation were especially cruel.

For example, in the inquisition of the 1200s, false accusers were encouraged to come forward, being promised one third of the property of anyone they implicated who was convicted of the crime. Knowing that justice would never be done and that some of the accused would even be denied a trial, these accusers took evil advantage and their false accusations ran rampant. For example, prostitutes made false accusations, and enriched themselves thereby. So vicious was the rage against the believers, anyone giving them even a drink of water was subject to arrest.

Moreland’s history includes graphic illustrations of some of the physical violence against the Waldenses in the massacre of 1655. Only those with a strong constitution should look at that section! Samuel Miller (Recommendatory Letter to Perrin’s History, p. 6) states that the vicious measures against the Waldenses “really almost transcend belief” but are true and “attested by so many unimpeachable witnesses”. “If all the demons of the pit had been let loose upon the valleys of Piedmont, we could scarcely have expected the perpetration of greater enormities than were now exhibited by the emissaries of Rome.” John Milton (1608-1674) wrote of that barbarian butchery:

(92%) of which were Particular or Calvinistic. The expanding nation gave opportunity to Baptists, and they took advantage of it.

It must be said that Baptist polity lends itself to missionary work, with only local control (no denominational hierarchy), and no formal education required for ministers. Thus Baptists have led the way in missionary work.

**The Influence of Sovereign Grace Theology in Baptist Missions**

Does our theology hinder us from being missionary-minded? In most instances, the answer is no. In some instances, the answer is yes. Even today some good men and churches seem hindered, fettered, by their Calvinism. Is their theology over-developed? Have they gone too far? No! I maintain that their Calvinism is immature and under-developed. It is a full-grown, robust Calvinism that can freely offer Christ to every sinner without exception. Just as the Arminian forgets that while many are called few are chosen, the hyper-Calvinist forgets that while few are chosen many are called! Spurgeon reminds us that the truth of God’s sovereignty and the truth of man’s responsibility “are believed to be inconsistent and contradictory, but they are not. The fault is in our weak judgment” (The Early Years, p. 174.).

The truth is, the gospel is good news—and it is good news to all who hear it, whether they believe it or not. The promises of Christ can be addressed to all men, and must be!

From time to time, some Baptists seem to have become lopsided in this regard. As I interpret our history, I hail Andrew Fuller as a hero, not a villain, for detecting a deficiency in his fellow-Baptists in England in the late 1700’s, and making an effort to deliver them to a more biblical position. Even though his The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation may contain some
the zeal of the Waldenses, especially after some of the followers of Peter Waldo had joined them around 1170. They sent out men who had been well instructed, full of Scripture and sermons in their hearts. They went as traveling merchants to avoid detection from hostile authorities. Their influence spread far and wide.

The proliferation of Baptists throughout church history is perhaps the best testimony to their missionary spirit. Unlike some of our Protestant friends, we have been so busy doing the work that we have had little time to write about it and document it. Non-Baptist historians have neglected to give credit to the labors, influence and sacrifice of Baptists. For example, the great majority of martyrs at the hands of Bloody Mary were Baptists, but you would never know it from John Foxe! (See Peter Masters’ comments on *Looking for our Spiritual Roots*.)

Baptists have been more interested in quality than quantity, but God has seen fit to give a good measure of both, usually in a gradual and unnoticed way, in many smaller congregations. But there have been occasional large increases, such as during the Great Awakening. Whitefield lamented that in America most of his chickens became ducks (i.e. his converts became Baptists)! On the other hand, during the iron curtain years, Baptists in the Soviet Union continued steadfast, working secretly, doing what they could to spread the gospel, and God honored their labors.

In 1982, David Fountain wrote that of the approximately 50 churches in Great Britain that have continuously preached the gospel for the past 300 years, nearly all are Baptists and all are Calvinists. The staying power of these churches is a testament to their missionary character in their own “Jerusalem.”

Asplund’s Register of Baptists in America, published in 1791, shows there were at that time 867 Baptist churches, 795

Sonnet XVIII: On the Late Massacre in Piemont

Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughter’d saints, whose bones
Lie scatter’d on the Alpine mountains cold,
Ev’n them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshipp’d stocks and stones;
Forget not: in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piemontese that roll’d
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoub’ld to the hills, and they
To Heav’n. Their martyr’d blood and ashes sow
O’er all th’ Italian fields where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred-fold, who having learnt thy way
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.

Only eternity will reveal the vast number who sealed their faith with their blood. Of the 50 million religious martyrs of the Dark Ages (mentioned by Plumer and Carroll), at least tens of thousands were of Waldensian stock. But like the bush that Moses saw burning, they were not consumed. God always preserved his seven thousand in Israel that did not bow to Baal!

**Their Corruption**

Those who wear the name of Waldenses today are a far cry from their faithful and courageous ancestors. They are a mere shell of what once was. What happened? On the eve of the Reformation, they were greatly reduced and weakened by persecutions. The majority joined with the German Anabaptists. Those who remained in the valleys assimilated into the Reformation. In 1531 they asked for advice from Bucer and Ecolampadius in Basel, who influenced them to embrace infant baptism and church-state ecclesiology. About 1560 they began receiving aid from Calvin and Beza. What gains they may have
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made in soteriology were offset by losses in ecclesiology. The loss was irrevocable.

Over time, the Waldenses compromised step by step and became what their forefathers would have repudiated. As Orchard put it, “Alas! how is the gold become dim!” It is with the pre-reformation Waldenses that we identify!

We can say with the Psalmist, “thou hast given me the heritage of those that fear thy name” (Ps. 61:5). We are heirs to a rich spiritual legacy! We should learn much from these pre-reformation giants.

1. Let us be unbending in our loyalty to the Word of God. Let us truly be people of the Book, both in doctrinal fidelity and in practical obedience.

2. Let us like the Waldenses give ourselves to the propagating of true religion “up and down the world”. What a joy to be accused of such a thing!

3. Let us be very cautious with the help that comes from Geneva! We must maintain pure ecclesiology as well as soteriology. Error in one will eventually impact the other.

4. Let us be ready to suffer for the sake of Christ our Savior. We must not simply like Christianity when it “walks in silver slippers”, but also when it has a noose about its neck or faggots at its feet.

5. Let us be humbled. We are not “the greatest generation”. We are pygmies among the giants in our history! We pale in comparison to these humble people who, generation after generation, walked with God. They lived simply, but their influence was great. Perhaps we should be preparing to shine their shoes in heaven—what a happy task that would be! O for their mantle to fall upon us! Where is the God of

Baptists and Missions
Dan Chamberlin

I am happy to address this subject today because it is one that is dear to my heart. It must be dear to the heart of all who know the grace of God, not just intellectually, but experientially.

Romans 10:13-15. “For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!” May these words sink deeply into our souls!

First let me define the term. By “missions” I mean the work of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ among those who are ignorant of it, and seeking to establish churches that follow the New Testament order. Though the term “mission” is not found in the Bible, the concept is found throughout the book of Acts, and all throughout church history. Simply put, it is the carrying out of the Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20.

I have been asked to address two matters in particular: (1) the issue of the doctrine of sovereign grace and its influence on missions among Baptists, and (2) three great Baptist missionaries: Carey, Judson and McCoy.

General Observations

Baptists have historically been at the forefront of spreading the gospel. In another message we mentioned briefly
manded in the Word of God. Nor do we recognize proper ordinances as valid when given to subjects not designated in Scripture and which also attribute to these ordinances effects which are nothing more that Roman Catholicism wrapped up in a new package.

We do not mean to imply that those who compose unscriptural churches are unsaved. Landmarkers have never taught this. We believe they are deceived and therefore we cannot extend the hand of church fellowship to those who sprinkle water on the face of a baby and claim this makes him a child of God and a member of the church!

We cannot receive churches which teach that baptism is essential to salvation and that men contact the blood in the water. Nor do we embrace those as churches who teach that the elements of the Supper become the body and blood of Christ and convey grace to those who partake of them. Baptists hold to the ordinances as symbols of grace already given not as a means to obtain grace.

Who are the Landmark Baptists? Landmark Baptists are those who believe:

1. The commandments of Christ are as essential to the preservation of the truth of the gospel today as they were in AD 33!
2. That no man was a member of a church in AD 40 who did not profess to be saved.
3. That no one was a member of a church in AD 40 who was not scripturally immersed.

If these principles were right and proper then, why not now? If these rules are now changed, who changed them? By whose authority?

May God help us not to squander our spiritual legacy, but to be heirs of whom our forefathers would not be ashamed!
Acts 19:1-7. “And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve.”

Who are the Anabaptists? Before we can accurately identify who they are, we must first understand what they are. The term Anabaptist comes from two words transliterated from the Greek: ana meaning “again” and baptises meaning “baptist.” Hence, the word Anabaptist refers to those who baptize over again or rebaptize. However, Baptists have never called themselves Anabaptists because they do not rebaptize people who have scriptural baptism. This name has been given to them by their enemies. In their confessions of faith Baptists have always denied they were Anabaptists. On the title page of the first London Confession of Faith printed in 1644, the following appears: “The Confession of Faith of those Churches which are commonly (though falsely) called Anabaptists.”

The Oxford Universal Dictionary of Historical Principles defines anabaptism as: “1. Re-baptism: 2. The doctrine of

The universal claim that no one in all the realm practiced immersion before 1641 demands an omniscience not frequently granted without express proof! Why should it be so in this case? Thomas did not put it too strongly when he said:

“Boldly, and as it appears to me incautiously, he has committed himself to the demonstration of a wide and drastic negative, viz: that there were never any Baptists whatever (i.e. anti-pedobaptist immersionists) either in England or Holland before the year 1641” (Thomas. Both Sides. 1).

We have other indications that this theory will not square with the facts. For example, Kiffin left the Jessey church and formed the Devonshire Baptist church about 1640. He left Jessey’s church because he did not believe a sprinkled man should occupy a dipped pulpit! How could this be if immersion was not introduced until 1641?

These few facts prove the practice of dipping before 1641. Whitsitt’s theory cannot overthrow these plain statements.

As Landmark Baptists we know Christ set up His church in the days of His flesh. We know the gates of Hades did not prevail against this church.

We may not be able to find the historical connection fully demonstrated by which his church was perpetuated in history. We may lose the trail time and again. We may search in vain for the line—but it is there none the less. It still exists. His Word cannot fail.

As Landmark Baptists we do not recognize as scriptural churches those which deny the essentials of a true church. We cannot place these in the position of true churches while they hold forth and contend for ordinances which are not com-
7. Apocalypsis on Anabaptists ...1640
8. Articles of Visitation, 1562 ...1612
9. Barber, E.A., A Treatise on Dipping ...1641
10. Dale, J., A Declaration that He is not a Dipper ...1547
11. Baptismi de Erroribus ...1592
12. Ballinger, agt. Anabaptists ...1535-6
13. Ballinger, Three Dialogues ...1551
14. Cassander, Geo., De Bapt. Ifanm ...1562, 1616
15. Catrou, Hist. des Anabaptists depuis 1521 ...1699
16. Common Prayer, First Ed. Of ...1549
17. Clyfford, Answer to Anabaptist Opinions ...1608-10
18. Cole, Thos., Sermons against Anabaptism ...1553
19. Coleford (Maidstone), Anabaptists Errors Refuted ...1550
20. Day, J., Summe of Scripture on Baptism ...1549
21. Edward VI. Articles to be Inquired into ...1547
22. Edward VI. Common Prayer, 1st and 2nd edition ...1549, 1552"

(http://www.geocities.com/baptist_documents/index.html)

Burrage changed his position about the term “ducking over head and ears”, between Vol. I and II. He says:

“In Vol. I., p. 334, I speak of this mode of baptism by ‘dipping’ as having received about 1641 the nickname of ‘ducking over head and ears’. This expression, however, seems to have been of much earlier origin, for in Stephen Denison’s ‘The Doctrine of both the Sacraments’, London, 1621, p. 23, occur the following unexpected words: ‘Be baptized, the word translated baptizing doth most properly signifie dipping over head and eares.’ He also says, p. 11, that ‘by report’ there were ‘not a few Anabaptists’ about London in 1621, but gives no suggestion that they then practiced immersion” (Burrage. II. 303).

Baptists have never baptized anyone over again any more than Paul did in our text, as we shall explain later. Baptists were in Germany in 1521, but they did not originate there. Interestingly, the OUD admits immersion was practiced in 1521, a fact some Baptist historians who follow the Whittsitt theory claim never happened until 1641, especially in England.

The American Dictionary of the English Language 1828 Edition by Noah Webster defines an Anabaptist as “one who holds the doctrine of the baptism of adults, or of the invalidity of infant baptism, and the necessity of rebaptization in an adult age. One who maintains that baptism ought always to be performed by immersion.”

The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia states: “The name Anabaptists (meaning Rebaptizers) was given by their opponents to a party among the Protestants in Reformation times whose distinguishing tenet was opposition to infant baptism, which they held to be unscriptural and therefore not true baptism. They baptized all who joined them; but, according to their belief, this was not a rebaptism as their opponents charged.” (Vol.1, p. 161.)

Who the Anabaptists Were

The Compendium of Baptist History by J. A. Schackelford identifies many ancient groups of Christians out-
side the state church or churches as those who were called Anabaptists. On pages 107, 108 Mr. Shackelford says: “The Waldenses, Albigenses, Paterines, Paulicians, Donatists, and Montanists were all known as Anabaptists, from the fact that they rebaptized all who came over to them from the Catholics.”

John Lawrence Mosheim wrote of the Anabaptists, “The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of the Anabaptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites, from the famous man, to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained” (Ecclesiastical History, John Lawrence Mosheim, Vol. 2, pp. 119, 120). Mosheim then showed that the Anabaptists of the seventeenth century were descendents of the Waldenses, the Petrobrussians, and other ancient sects.

Perhaps the most significant statement of the antiquity of Baptists came from the two men whom the King of Holland appointed in 1819 to prepare a history of the Dutch Reformed Church. Dr. Ypeij, Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen, and Rev. I. J. Dermout, Chaplain to the King published their History of the Dutch Reformed Church in 1823. In their history they devoted one chapter to the Baptists in which they wrote: “We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who long in the history of the church received the honor of that origin.” Then these commissioned historians said, “On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the apostles, and as a Christian society has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.” (This well-known and oft cited quotation is taken from Baptists in History by W. P. Harvey which appears in Pillars of Orthodoxy, or Defenders of the Faith edited by Ben M. Bogard, p. 417). When the authenticity of this quotation was questioned in the late 1800’s, resuscitation, indeed and his return to life, etc.’ (VOB. 9).

There is also this account of the immersion of Samuel Eaton:

“Similarly, the account given by John Taylor in 1641 of the immersion of Samuel Eaton, by John Spilsbury, shows the practice of immersion in England previous to 1641. For the court records show that Sam Eaton (and there can be no question about his being the same man) died Aug. 25th, 1639, and that he was constantly in prison from May 5th, 1636, till his death. Hence his immersion and his immersing others must have taken place before May 5th, 1636” (VOB. 10).

Dr. Joseph Angus of England said concerning dipping before 1641: “But there is another kind of evidence even more decisive showing that ‘the immersion of believers’ was the common faith and practice of our fathers. I refer to the books published by them and against them in the century to which 1641 belongs. I mention a few of the most important, giving the names in the briefest possible form. Most of them show clearly what the writers, or their opponents, the Baptists, were supposed to hold.”

1. AErnstelodamus Dissertation, Contra Anabaptist … 1535
2. AErnstelodamus, Baptimus Christianus … 1539
3. Ampsing, J.A. Disputationes, Contra Anabap-tist ...1619
4. Almsworth, H., A seasonable Discourse on Anabap-tism ...1623, 1644
5. Anabaptist, Proclamations against ...1560
6. Articles of Visitation (Edward VI., and Elizabeth) … 1559
whole works treats of them as ‘Dippers,’ who in baptism always ‘dipt,’ and had he know that they had ever done any thing else, he would have been very happy to have charged them with now throwing aside the right method and with taking up the wrong” (Armitage. 441).

Burrage, who favors the Whitsitt theory, makes this concession on dipping before 1641:

“Baptist…. Baptisterium, that vessel for sprinkling or washing, called [called] a Font, we read not of in Scripture, it being another of their inventions. And for the further information of the manner, note the word Baptize, immergo, to plunge, dip, in, or overwhelm;…Thus in the command of Christ they forsake him the fountain, and hew to themselves a broken Cistern….In the yeare 1635, …I found one Baptist, who declared so much unto me, that I perceived in those tyrannical times there was a Church of Christ under his Ordinances according to Gospel manner” (William Britten. Moderate Baptist. pp. 65-67. 1654. Quoted by Burrage. Early English Dissenters. I. 378-379).

Burrage also appends this note: “This sentence without doubt means that this anonymous (English) Anabaptist in 1635 baptized his converts by immersion, or ‘dipping’” (I. 379).

Christian quotes Fox from a Latin book written in 1517:

“The title of the book is Reformatio Legun Ecclesiastuarum, &c., A.D. 1517. In this book, Fox says (in Latin which is given in full by Dr. Christian): ‘But while we are plunged into the waters and rise again out of them, the death of Christ first, and his burial is symbolized, and next his

Dr. Harvey contacted Dr. George Manly who was President of a college of languages in Berlin to verify this statement. Dr. Manly found the volume by Ypeij and Dermout written in the Dutch Language containing the quotation and translated it for Dr. Harvey. Thus the authenticity of their oft-quoted statements concerning the Baptists was confirmed (Baptists in History, Harvey, cited in Pillars of Orthodoxy, edited by Bogard, pp. 418-420).

Were the so-called Anabaptists really rebaptizers? Absolutely not! They could no more be charged with rebaptism than Paul can. The Apostle Paul baptized, not rebaptized (1 Cor. 1:14-17) the twelve disciples mentioned in Acts 19:1-7. They did not have scriptural baptism, nor were they baptized by John the Baptist whose baptism was scriptural enough for our Lord and all the Apostles (Matt. 3:13-17; Acts 1:21, 22). These twelve disciples at Ephesus had “been baptized unto John’s baptism,” not by John the Baptist. “Unto John’s baptism” means with reference to John’s baptism. That they could not have been baptized by John the Baptist is evident from the fact he never left Galilee and Judea. Furthermore, he had been dead for many years at this time, and these twelve disciples had been recently dunked by Apollos, who before being taught the way of God more perfectly by Aquila and Priscilla, knew only the baptism of John (Acts 18:24-28). Since he at that time knew only the baptism of John, he himself had evidently been baptized by John many years previous to this occasion. Therefore, it had to have been he that baptized these twelve disciples unto John’s baptism. But Apollos was not sent to baptize as was John (John 1:6, 33). Therefore, these twelve disciples did not have scriptural baptism until they received it from Paul. Thus, Paul administered baptism, not rebaptism.

What the Anabaptists Believed

Those falsely called Anabaptists held to Biblical positions advocated by all true Baptists in every age. Doctrines are
not true because they are historical; they are true because they are Biblical. In a paper read before the American Society of Church History in 1890, Henry S. Burrage, D.D., stated the following concerning the beliefs that characterized the Anabaptist movement of the Sixteenth Century:

“(1) That the Scriptures are the only authority in matters of faith and practice. (2) That personal faith in Jesus Christ only secures salvation; therefore infant baptism is to be rejected. (3) That a church is composed of believers who have been baptized upon a personal confession of their faith in Jesus Christ. (4) That each church has entire control of its affairs, without interference on the part of any external power. (5) That the outward life must be in accordance with such a confession of faith and to the end it is essential that church discipline should be maintained. (6) That while the State may properly demand obedience in all things not contrary to the law of God, it has no right to set aside the dictates of conscience, and compel the humblest individual to set aside his view, or to inflict punishment in case such surrender is refused. Every human soul is directly responsible to God” (Henry S. Burrage, American Society of Church History, pp. 157, 158, quoted by W. A. Jarrel, Baptist Church Perpetuity, pp. 182, 183).

Following are some of the beliefs that characterized the Anabaptists:

A Regenerated Church Membership: It was this conviction that caused them to reject infant baptism. No person could be a member of an Anabaptist Church who had not been regenerated and professed his faith in Christ. “They believed in regeneration by the atoning blood of Christ, but they demanded method of baptism they had never heard of, never read about in the Bible, that is a dipping the candidate in water—we are asked to believe this was done in a matter of a few months—without even a ripple on the pond!

Of course all that is needed to prove the 1641 theory false is one single case of immersion before 1641. A single case of dipping before 1641 means the invention was not new at all and the theory false!

References to Dipping Before 1641: I propose now to give some specific references to dipping before 1641. If even one case can be produced, then Whitsitt’s proposition is false. Armitage says:

“They have followed these terrible practices ‘nere the place of my residence for more than twenty years.’ He [Featly] wrote this Jan. 10, 1644. ….But he never accuses the English Baptists of substituting dipping for some other practice which they had previously followed. He gives not one hint that in England they had ever been any thing else but ‘Dippers,’ an unaccountable silence, if they had practiced some-thing else there within the previous fifty years” (Armitage. 458).

Armitage goes to some length to disprove the 1641 theory. Referring again to Featly, the author of The Dippers Dipt, he says:

“He conveys the idea that they had defiled the ‘rivers with their impure washings,’ in being ‘dipt after their manner,’ quite as long as they had defiled ‘our pulpits’ and ‘presses,’ and that near his own residence ‘for more than twenty years.’ To his knowledge, then, they had ‘dipt’ ‘both sexes,’ in the English ‘rivers’ from before A.D. 1624; his
Those who have had any experience in attempting to get new measures through a Baptist church know that such a major change through so many churches in the time allotted would demand miraculous gifts!

We know many of these Anabaptists in the period referred to, were scholars. They knew Greek, Hebrew, Latin and other languages as well as English. They had lexicons. They were not ignorant of the terms of the Bible. To imagine none of them knew anything of immersion from reading the Bible is incredulous. Furthermore they had grown up in an environment of immersion because it was universally taught and practiced in the Episcopal and was not foreign to the Roman Catholic Church. Sprinkling was the new kid on the block. It had only recently come into England from Calvin and Geneva via Scotland. These changes from one form to another take time. Look how long it took Mantz, Hubmaier and other Anabaptists to dump infant baptism for that of believers after they were convinced this was the teaching of Scripture! Thus to pretend that because there are few records of dipping before 1641 begs the question.

In other words, why is it that we have no records of these anti-dipper churches becoming pro-dipper churches? How could such a mighty transition, not of merely one or two churches but of dozens of congregations, scattered widely, transpire in the short time of two years, 1641 to 1643?

If such did happen, then it must have been a mighty and gracious Pentecost-like thing! Surely such a Spirit-wrought wonder was chronicled as a powerful moving of that kind could not be hid! How is it that we have no record of it? But this great change among so many congregations, within a year or two, without objections, without debates, without exceptions, and without one single congregation refusing to go along with this reform and giving their reasons, is incredible! We are asked to believe that fifty plus churches went from sprinkling to a

the fruits of regeneration” (Burragge, quoted by Jarrel, p. 183). Neither did they believe in baptismal regeneration in any form. Balthazer Hubmeyer, a prominent leader among the despised Anabaptists from 1525 to 1528 said, “Salvation is conditioned neither on baptism nor on works of mercy. Condemnation is the result, not of neglect of baptism, but of unbelief alone” (Burragge, quoted by Jarrel, p.184).

A Baptized Church Membership: The Anabaptists obviously believed in and practiced baptism, else they would never have been called Anabaptists. Hubmeyer called baptism an ordinance of Jesus Christ, saying, “It is not enough that one believes in Jesus; he must confess him openly. . .The divine order is, first, the preaching of the Word; second, faith; third, baptism” (Burragge, quoted by Jarrel, p. 183). Hubmeyer further said, “Where there is no baptism, there is neither church nor ministry, neither brothers nor sisters, neither discipline, exclusion, nor restoration” (W.W. Everts quoted by Jarrel, p. 185). Obviously, they believed in baptism by immersion only. In a book which appeared in Holland in 1532 by an unknown author, with reference to baptism it is said: “So we are dipped under as a sign that we are as it were dead and buried as Paul writes in Rom. 6 and Col. 2” (Jarrel, p. 192). The Baptist Quarterly, Rev., July 1889 quotes the following from Dr. Philip Schaff: “The controversy between the reformers and the Anabaptists referred only to the subjects of baptism. . .The mode of baptism was no topic of controversy, because immersion was still extensively in use, and decidedly preferred by Luther and the other reformers as the most expressive and primitive, though not the only mode” (Jarrel, p. 195).

The Reformers believed in a parish church, i.e. everyone within a certain locale was a member of the church whether or not he was regenerate and had professed his faith in Christ publicly. The so-called Anabaptists rejected this practice, and they were in turn rejected by the Reformers. Leonard Verduin discusses the difference between the Anabaptists and the Re-
formers concerning who constituted the church in a chapter entitled Catharer in his book, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*. The Anabaptists were, he says, falsely accused of perfectionism, but “when the Cathars said that the church consists of changed men and women, they were not saying that it consists of sinless men and women” (Verduin, p. 102).

**A Separated Church Membership:** Those called Anabaptists were a separated people. Not only were they separated from wicked men in their church membership, their churches were separate from the state. Leonard Veruin discusses their separation from both a worldly society and the state in a chapter entitled *Winckler (The Reformers and Their Stepchildren)*. The Anabaptists refused to get permission or a license from the state to preach (Verduin, p. 182), and they did not make their marriage vows in a state church, for which they suffered great hardship and had their marriages looked upon as illegal cohabitations (Footnote in Verduin, p. 161). Of this important difference, Philip Schaff wrote: “The Reformers founded a popular state-church, including all citizens with their families. The Anabaptists organized on the voluntary principle select congregations of baptized believers, separated from the world and the state” (*History of the Christian Church*, Philip Schaff, vol. 8, p. 71).

**An Instructed Church Membership:** The hated Anabaptists were well-instructed in the Word of God. “The supreme authority of the Scriptures was made especially prominent in these teachings. The great evangelical truth which the Swiss reformers preached, they held” (Burrage, quoted by Jarrel, p. 183). They believed in total depravity, unconditional election, and Holy Spirit regeneration. “They held that there could be no contradiction between God’s doctrine of his church and of salvation, that election and justification by faith and regeneration by the Spirit result in a church of believers” (An article in the *Standard* by Prof. Howard Osgood, quoted by Jarrel, p. 189). Baptists by the ruling powers. But as soon as they had liberty, we find many evidences of their churches before 1641. Christian, in reviewing Whitsitt, put the shoe on the other foot by asking, Where is the Confession or book where these “Baptists” practiced sprinkling?

“Not one example has been cited to show that any one Anabaptist practiced sprinkling in England before or since 1641” (*VOB* Ch. 7).

We know Baptists were dipping in 1643. We have their confession to prove the fact. How many Baptist churches practiced dipping in 1643? Professor Jesse B. Thomas answers:

“Neal distinctly affirms that there were at that date (1643) ‘54 congregations of English Baptists in England who confined baptism to dipping’” (*Both Sides*).

Thomas then reminds us of what the Whitsitt theory requires:

“We are required then to believe, either that out of one congregation of ‘immersers,’ organized in 1641, there had grown this great company in two years, or that in the same time fifty or more existing Baptist congregations had simultaneously repudiated a custom to which they were traditionally attached, and which was in universal use, in behalf of another custom which nobody among them had ever practiced or even heard of: they, without any newly assigned or intelligible motive, suddenly ceased wholly to do what they had always and uniformly been accustomed to do, and began exclusively to do what they had never done at all” (*Both Sides*).
water as the way and manner of dispensing this ordinance” (London Confession of 1644, Article 40). Independent, NY. September 9, 1880 (VOB. Chapter 1).

He even ventured to give the name of the man who introduced or invented immersion! “Happily for us, however, the above assertion is confirmed by the authority of Edward Barber, the founder of the rite of immersion among the Baptists” (VOB. 146).

When confronted with these articles his explanation was not good.

“Doctor Whitsitt’s explanation was that he “wrote from a pedobaptist standpoint in order to provoke discussion and compel the Baptists to study their own history.” This explanation might have stopped the controversy had not Doctor Whitsitt written a number of articles and a book, all written from a Baptist standpoint, to prove his Independent editorials which “were written from a pedobaptist standpoint.” It was this that stirred the Baptists to the depths, and not Doctor Whitsitt’s ‘writing from a pedobaptist standpoint’” (Nowlin. 147).

Whitsitt’s book, A Question in Baptist History, was published in 1896.

Whitsitt claimed immersion was invented in 1641! This means no one immersed before this time in England or Holland! If this is true then there were no Baptists in the early 1600s, at least none in England or Holland! Whitsitt’s theory is an argument from silence. Because there were no Baptist confessions before 1641 specifying dipping, he falsely deduced that there was no dipping before then! Of course there were no confessions before 1643 because of the severe persecution of Philip Schaff is quoted in the Baptist Quarterly as saying of the Anabaptists,

“They preached repentance and faith, baptized converts, organized congregations, and exercised rigid discipline... They accepted the New Testament as their only rule of faith and practice... They were generally orthodox... Their demand of rebaptism virtually unbaptized and unchurched the entire Christian world... These two ideas of a pure church of believers and of baptism of believers only were the fundamental articles of the Anabaptist creed” (The Baptist Quarterly, quoted by Jarrel, p. 194). Do not these teaching clearly identify the ancient Anabaptists with modern Baptists who hold to historical Baptist positions?

The Munster Affair

What is known as the Munster Affair occurred in connection with the Peasant Wars. There had long been trouble in Germany between the peasants and the nobility. For one hundred years, the peasants had attempted to throw off the yoke which their feudal lords had laid upon them. Thomas Munzer was a leader of this tumult. This insurrection had more to do with politics than it had with religion. The men of Munster wielded the sword and dreamed of establishing a secular kingdom. They even practiced polygamy, insurrection, and other actions which were repugnant to the true Anabaptists.

“Thomas Munzer was never really an Anabaptist. Though he rejected infant baptism in theory, he held to it in practice, and never submitted to rebaptism himself nor rebaptized others” (The Baptist Encyclopedia, p. 26). Conrad Grebal, Thomas Manz, and others wrote to Munzer to exhort him, while passing judgment upon his inconsistencies. They exhorted Munzer to abandon all non-scriptural usages (The Bap-
Since he resisted the abuses of magistracy with the sword, he certainly was out of step with the Anabaptists who were always a passive and peaceful people. Munzer and the whole episode at Munster wrongly became a calumny against the Anabaptists. Accusing the Anabaptists of every conceivable evil and heresy had long been the practice of their enemies. Thus, we are not surprised that they were quick to identify the Munster Affair with the Anabaptists.

The Connection with Particular Baptists

There were several different groups of Anabaptists just as there are many different fellowships of Baptists today. Some so-called Anabaptists believed in a general atonement and the free will of man. These Anabaptists were located in northern Europe. The General Baptists of England descended from them. Other Anabaptists believed in Particular Redemption and the bondage of the will. They were primarily located in southern Europe and were also known as Albigenses and Waldenses. In a footnote in Ecclesiastical History in a Course of Lectures by William Jones, vol. 3, p. 45, this statement is made: “Clark, in his Martrology, p. 111, says, ‘About this time, A. D. 1210, the English, who now possessed Guienne, which bordereth upon the earldom of Toulouse, began to help the Albigenses, being stirred up thereto by Reynard Lollard, a godly and learned man, who by his powerful preaching converted many to the truth and defended the faith of the Albigenses.’” The Lollards in England were named for this man who had preached among them. Henry Danvers called him a Waldensian barb or pastor (A Treatise of Baptism, p. 275). Samuel Moreland, whom Oliver Cromwell sent to aid the persecuted Waldenses, wrote, “Lollardo, who was in great Reputation amongst the Evangelical Churches of Piemont, by reason of a commentary that he made upon the Revelation: As also for having conveyed the knowledge of their Doctrine into England, where his Disciples were known by the name of Lollards” (The History of The Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piemont, p. 184).

Who Are the Landmark Baptists?

842) which shows this claim is fictitious as far as Graves was concerned!

The Whitsitt Controversy

William Heth Whitsitt was the grandson of the famous James Whitsitt of Middle Tennessee. When Whitsitt was ordained in 1862 one of the men on his ordination council was J.R. Graves.

“William Heth Whitsitt was born in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1841. He was ordained a Baptist minister in 1862 and served in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. A professor of Church history at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, between 1872 and 1895, he served as President of the seminary from 1895-1899. He finished his career as a professor of philosophy at Richmond College, now the University of Richmond, in Richmond, Virginia, from 1901 to 1910. Whitsitt died in 1911” (http://www.lva.lib.va.us/whatwehave/bio/whitsitt/index.htm).

The Whitsitt controversy began officially in 1896, when he wrote an article on the Baptists for Johnson's Encyclopedia, in which he set forth his theory that the English Baptists did not begin to baptize by immersion until 1641, when a part of the Anabaptists, as they were then called, began immersion.

As it turned out, Whitsitt had also written several articles for the Independent, a Pedobaptist (Congregational), paper in 1880, from a Pedobaptist standpoint.

Whitsitt was very bold. He said: “It was not until the year 1644, three years after the invention of immersion that any Baptist confession prescribes ‘dipping or plunging the body in
and witnesses necessary to the continuance of the principles—a celestial chivalry, undying in their influence and triumphant even in their seeming defeats” (http://geocities.come/Athens/Delphi/8297/diss/dis-c31.htm#N_105_#N-105).

Needless to say neither Ford or Pendleton would be welcome in any EMDA church! Yea! Graves himself could not be a member of one of their churches!

**J. B. Gambrell’s Illustration of Succession:** “I do not place much stress,” he says, “on historical succession—but the New Testament reads as though things were started to go on. Let me illustrate my idea of succession: A man lost a gray horse. He finds some horse tracks step by step for a hundred miles. Then he comes upon the horse—but it is a black horse. That is historical succession. Tracks are not worth a cent. If, on the other hand, you find the gray horse, it does not make any difference if you do not find any tracks. The whole business lies in the identity; we have the horse hunted for. So, the man who takes the New Testament and finds a church in his neighborhood or elsewhere like the one in the Book, has succession,” (Burnett. 194).

**Succession-Perpetuity-Continuity:** It has been asserted that these terms (succession, perpetuity, continuity) are not synonyms but have divergent meanings. It is argued that succession is head and shoulders above perpetuity. One writer claims Graves and other landmarkers in the 1800s could not defend succession in debate and consequently had to retreat to the lesser perpetuity which they could defend! In this claim no reference was supplied (GCC.131;142). No distinction between the terms succession, perpetuity, continuity are found in Graves’ writings so far as I am able to detect. Such assertions are worthless and meaningless without documentation. Graves, in his debate with Ditzler, used the term succession (GCD.

Another writer has said:

“Seemingly they [the Waldenses] took no share in the great struggle which was going on around them in all parts of Europe, but in reality they were exercising a powerful influence upon the world. Their missionaries were everywhere, proclaiming the simple truths of Christianity, and stirring the hearts of men to their very depths. In Hungary, in Bohemia, in France, in England, in Scotland, as well as Italy, they were working with tremendous though silent power. Lollard, who paved the way for Wycliffe in England, was a missionary from these Valleys [emphasis mine]” (Cross and Crown, McCabe, p. 32).

Baptist Historian Abel Morgan wrote,

“And that the first that revived the ancient practice of adult baptism in England had it from them [the Waldenses], is no more unlikely, than for the Presbyterians to have their discipline from Geneva, for the English had possession of those parts of France where the Waldenses were mostly countenanced, from the year 1152 to the year 1452, which was long enough for many persons to become acquainted with the principles and practices of those Godly people, by such intercourse, and from their example, to endeavour a reformation in England, though with no great success for a while” (Anti-Paedo Rantism, pp. 172,173).

Consequently, Baptist Historian R. E. Pound has concluded,

“Please note when those in England became acquainted with the principles and practices of the
Godly people in Southern France, between 1152-1452. He [Abel Morgan] further notes that those who first revived adult dipping in England, in modern times, revived the ancient practice of adult baptism from those in Southern France. He points out that their efforts in this revived practice met with no great results for a while. This testimony shows that the London Particular Baptists secured their baptism from the already existing Albigensian-Waldensian churches in Southern France, not in Holland” (The French Connection).

Though They Were Falsely Called Anabaptists, These Churches Were the True Churches of Jesus Christ

There are those who would call our Baptist Churches Anabaptist Churches today because we baptize those who come to us from the both the Church of Rome and Protestant Churches so-called. We do not rebaptize; we baptize, because those who have been either sprinkled or dipped by these societies do not have true and Scriptural baptism.

As we have seen, there were many more distinguishing characteristics of the Anabaptists than baptism alone. They held tenaciously to the old, Apostolic faith which was once delivered to the saints (Jude 3). May we, as their spiritual descendants, continue to hold to that same faith.


Pendleton on Succession: Pendleton, [according to Ford] said that “the ana-Baptist question [did they sprinkle?] really has nothing to do with the landmark question; nor has the church succession question.” Pendleton believed in a succession of “persons.”

“But he was a Landmarker in its strict sense” (http://geocities.com/Athens/Delphi/8297/diss/dis-c31.htm#N_101_#N-101).

S.H. Ford on Succession: Ford was also a Landmark Baptist but differed with Graves on some points. He believed in church succession, but not a linked succession. In an essay entitled, “The True Succession of Christ's Witnesses—What Is It?” he stated that:

“Succession is a misleading term; especially when applied to a church or to churches. A church is like a day, independent of any church that has preceded it, as any day is independent of every previous day” (http://geocities.com/Athens/Delphi/8297/diss/dis-c31.htm#N_101_#N-101).

After more than fifty years of study, Ford’s position was that

“there has been a sacred succession—to use the words of William Hague of Rhode Island—of God's witnesses through the ages—torch bearers in the world's gloom—the earthen vessels of immortal principles. The principles and the vessels were divorced, often riven but never uprooted,
What did Graves believe about succession? His statements before quoted denied the idea he believed in EMDA! It is my position he believed in a succession of baptisms.

To illustrate let me give you what I call the Roger Williams rule. Everyone knows Roger Williams had no authority to start his church. He did not obtain his baptism from any other church but began by se-baptism.

The Roger Williams rule will show what a man believed as to EMDA succession by how he treats that case. For example: Benedict approved of Williams’ rebaptism and self-constitution, hence he could not have believed EMDA (Benedict. 450).

When Graves deals with the Williams’ case he says not one word about the fact that Williams and his group did not have EMDA! He says nothing about churches which might have come from this church having no authority. What he does say is that no church received its baptism from the Williams’ church! “There is not a minister or member of any church on earth whose baptism is derived from Roger Williams” (GCD. 896).

A recent SBC writer finally got it right and said of Landmarkers:

Landmarkists held that an unbroken succession of immersion baptisms from the apostolic era, a necessary basis for the existence of true churches. If the chain was broken, there were no more baptisms and no more churches.” (http://archives.sbts.edu/partner/Article_Display_Page/0,,P T I D 3 2 5 5 6 6 % 7 C C H I D 7 1 7 9 0 0 % 7 C C I I D 1 9 7 8 9 0 0 0 .html)

This essay is mainly about the English Particular Baptists, but sections on Wales, Scotland and Ireland are also included.

There is only one way we can expect the perpetuity of an institution in this world; that is: if the Lord Jesus Christ promised it! And he did that with his Church in Matthew 16:18-19: “And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” B. H. Carroll, the highly regarded Texas Baptist minister and educator, wrote that this portion of Scripture is: “perhaps the most remarkable passage in the New Testament.”

Carroll then continued: “The first thought that I would impress upon the mind is that Christ alone founded his church. I mean that the church was established in the days of his sojourn in the flesh; that the work of its construction commenced with the reception of the material prepared by John the Baptist. That organization commenced with the appointment of the twelve apostles, and that by the close of his earthly ministry there existed at least one church as a model, the church at Jerusalem.”

Baptist historians in our day disagree on some issues, among them the origin of British Baptists. The late Kenneth Scott Latourette, a Baptist and Professor of the History of Missions at Yale University wrote, “A true history of the Baptists will never be told because they were mostly poor and did not keep good personal records.” Many records are not available to us; many are conflicting concerning the earliest Baptists in the British Isles.
Charles Thompson, pastor of First Baptist Church, Cosley, Staffordshire, England, wrote a *Historical Sketch of the Baptist Denomination* as the Circular Letter for the Midland Baptist Association, in 1832. It was requested to be printed and made available to the public by this Particular Baptist association. They designated themselves *Particular Baptists* because they believed in particular redemption instead of a general atonement as it related to the Lord Jesus Christ’s death on the cross (that is: that Christ’s death was for his elect people and not just a death in general with no particular application or purpose). Thompson referred to Thomas Crosby’s (1738-1740) and Joseph Ivimy’s *History of the English Baptists* (1811-1830), 4 volumes each, as being much more complete for Baptist families to read than his essay, but acknowledged there would be few who would have access to these larger works. He believed the principles of baptism had come through Baptists’ continental forebears and stated, “The candid concessions of great and learned men will shield us from the charge of bigotry, in laying down this position—that the first Christians were Baptists: for it cannot be denied that, as they practised baptism by immersion, the Apostles would now be called Baptist ministers, and the first churches, Baptist churches. With them, therefore, our history must begin.”

The noted British Baptist theologian and pastor, Andrew Fuller, made the following entry in his diary: “1781 July 3.—I was occupied today with Mosheim (Ecclesiastical History), whose partial account of the English Baptists would lead me to indulge a better opinion of various sects who have been deemed heretics.” Fuller in his Bible Commentary on the book of Revelation explained that he believed Baptist heritage went back to New Testament times.

In the mid-nineteenth century many leading British Baptists had not changed from this view. Mr. B. W. Carr, at the ceremony of laying the first stone for Metropolitan Tabernacle in London in 1859, said “No novelty whatever led to the distinctness of our communion. No factious spirit induces us to perpetuate it. As a

He also contended churches obtain their authority directly from Christ! “Each particular church is independent of every other body, civil or ecclesiastical, and receiving its authority directly from Christ, it is accountable to him alone” (*GIW*. 552).

Graves also said that neither he nor any Landmarker known to him ever advocated the succession of any particular church or churches!

“Nor have I, or any Landmarker known to me, ever advocated the succession of any particular church or churches; but my position is that Christ in the very ‘days of John the Baptist,’ did establish a visible kingdom on earth, and that this kingdom had never yet been ‘broken in pieces’” (*OL*. 122-123).

Is this not what EMDA brethren claim? Graves did not hold to this idea and said he never knew of a Landmarker who did! If not, then how did this become an essential of Landmarkism? Someone has moved this old landmark! Can there be any doubt who changed?

Some are now claiming Graves believed EMDA and that if you do not believe EMDA you are a heretic! Some circulate a so-called link-to-link list of churches through non-existing men and counterfeit places until they reach the first church in Jerusalem.

Set yourself to find these names and places: H. Roller, Aaron Arlington, Archer Flavin, Balcolao, Darethea, Ponto-fossi, Bing Joy, Africa.

You will soon see this whole link-list is a fake and may have been put together by someone who wanted to spoof Baptists! (Mason. 110; *LUF*. 180).
nanted together to hold and teach, and are gov-
erned by the New Testament,…there is a Church
of Christ” (Jarrel. 1).

Jarrel goes on in this same place to quote Graves: “even
though there was not a presbytery of ministers in a thousand
miles of them to organize them into a church, there is not the
slightest need of a council of presbyters to organize a Baptist
church” (Jarrel. 1).

Graves said in his debate with Ditzler: “It is true that
two or three baptized individuals can organize a church, pro-
vided they adopt the apostolic model of government, and cove-
nant to be governed by the sole authority of Jesus Christ” (Graves. Great Carrollton Debate. 975).

Of course these statements are diametrically opposed to
EMDA. Graves also contends churches are independent of all
other bodies and that its authority is divinely invested:
“Therefore, each assembly was a complete church, and being
complete in itself, it was independent of all other like bodies in
other localities, and being each independent it was divinely in-
vested with all the powers and prerogatives of a church of
Christ” (NGIW. 125).

He argues that what the church receives from Christ is
delegated and that no church can delegate what is delegated to
it!

“This power, with all her [the church’s—JC] other
prerogatives, is delegated to her, and it is her
bounden duty to exercise it; she cannot delegate
her prerogatives.

‘Quod delegatur non delegatum est’ is a legal
maxim as old as the civil code. What is delegated
can not be delegated” (OL. 48).

protest against an innovation still fostered in Christian churches,
we preserve the inscription of “Baptist” on our banners. By
“immersion” the converts to Jesus in apostolic times made their
public profession. In Godly and pious communities of the one
church of Christ, the primitive ordinance of discipleship has been
practised through an unbroken succession. Holding in common
with brethren of other denominations the unity of the faith, we
desire now, as ever, in our own fellowship, to maintain the pure-
ness of that polity, which is formed upon the model of the church
at Jerusalem” (Charles Spurgeon, The Park Street Pulpit, Volume
5, “The Ceremony of Laying the First Stone of the New Tabernacle,” August 16, 1859). Carr spoke on behalf of the deacons of the
church; the statement was included in a longer essay, followed by a
sermon by Pastor Charles Spurgeon. Spurgeon had argued for the
location of the new building because of the holy association of the
past with that place: in 1546 three Anabaptists had been burnt to
death near the spot.

David Benedict, an early American Baptist historian,
wrote, “From all the fragments of history, I am inclined to the be-
"
membered that the persecuting courts of High Commission and Star Chamber went out of existence August 1st, 1641, and that then the Baptists, who had been obliged to conceal themselves, came out of their hiding places and preached their doctrine boldly, and broadly, as they could not do before. This, of course, made a stir, and it was all new to many of the people of that day. What wonder, then, that these Baptists should be pronounced “new” and “upstart?” But it is grotesque to claim such expressions as proving that Baptists began their practices in England at that time. The very fact that they showed themselves so vigorously and preached their doctrines so boldly in 1641, as is conceded on all hands, just so soon as they could do so safely, proves that they did not then invent or adopt these practices. They came from their hiding places and advocated openly what they had been believing and practicing in secret all the time.”

**Particular Baptists in the Seventeenth Century**

The Particular Baptists in England took on a more public face when they drafted a Confession of Faith in 1644. About half of the document was taken, almost word-for-word from what was known as the Separatist Confession in 1596.

In 1642, the Civil War broke out which led to greater religious toleration and assisted in the development of the Baptist cause. When the king was executed in 1649, it tended to break the hold of the Church and State relationship, which had been British policy for centuries.

In England the term *Anabaptist* often was associated with the activities in Munster, Germany, over a century earlier, when a cult that immersed became famous for their communal life-style and atrocities. The English Baptists denied any association with that dreadful and heretical group. During the Interregnum, the period until King Charles II was restored to the throne; the government was led primarily by Oliver Cromwell. Baptists grew in number, but there was confusion about doctrine among some Bap-

There are those today who claim Landmarkism teaches the “Essential Mother Daughter Authority” (EMDA), that is, that a group in gospel order (saved and baptized) must have the authority of a mother church to constitute. They appeal to Graves to prove it. They teach the medium of succession is EMDA! They claim that the Holy Spirit was given only once (Acts 2) and ever after it was communicated only by a mother church granting EMDA! (*SCO*. 81). Thus the only way a church can get “church-hood or church-life” is by a birth. Some actually say that when a new church is *born* Christ and the mother-church have a new baby girl! (*SCO*.52). Is this Landmarkism? Is it an essential of it? Is this what Graves taught?

It is a very sad thing when men maintain the foundation of Landmarkism is a doctrine which was totally rejected by the early Landmarkers and Baptists as well—but that is the case!

**Graves and the Medium of Succession:** What did Graves believe the *medium of succession* to be?

Graves expressly denied the *begetting* or EMDA of one church by another. A few quotations from his works will forever settle this issue.

“Christ said, where two or three are gathered in my name [authority], there am I in the midst of them” (*NGIW*. 135. The bracketed word is Graves’).

“the kingdom which he set up ‘in the days of John the Baptist’ has had an unbroken continuity until now. I say kingdom, instead of succession of churches, for the sake of perspicacity” (*OL*. 121-2).

“Wherever there are three or more baptized members of a regular Baptist church or churches cove-
dents of Landmarkism, demonstrates the ideas of Graves, Pendleton, Dayton, and others were not new but had a foundation in Baptist history and were the natural outgrowth of Baptist thought and practice long before these men began their work.

In fact, Hogue wrote his dissertation in response to Tull’s assertion the Landmark movement was: “a minority, alien, heterodox element in the domination” (Hogue. iv).

Hogue then states his theme: “Basically, the intent has been to indicate the sources in Baptist life from which Landmarkism sprang and to show, by reference to these antecedents, that Landmarkism represented, at every major point, simply the logical extension of practices and beliefs widely held among Baptists in the one hundred year period preceding the rise of the movement. In the view of this writer, there are many elements in Baptist history which bear an obvious and direct relationship to the tenets of the Landmark system and which clearly demonstrate that the architects of the movement, ‘the Great Triumvirate,’ were building on a foundation in Baptist life which was already laid” (Hogue. v).

The account of Kiffin, who started a new church because he did not believe an unbaptized preacher should be allowed to preach in a dipped pulpit, is an example that goes back even further. So also that of John Clarke who did not believe the non-Baptist churches of New England were true churches (Asher. 100). Jesse Mercer among others took the same position, (Mallary. Addendum 4). These cases are multiplied when we look through the centuries back to Christ.

Landmarkism and Succession: The Scripture teaches the origin and succession of Christ’s church (Mt. 16:18; 28:18-20; Eph. 3:21 etc.). But the question is raised: By what means is this succession? During that period some of the Baptists aligned themselves with very radical groups; several of them expected an immediate return of Christ and disposed of their earthly goods. But many of the more level-headed came to the Baptist position as well. The historian W. T. Whitley calculated there were one hundred and thirty-one Particular Baptist churches by 1660, the year of the restoration of the king.

Soon after this growth spurt Baptist churches began having inter-church fellowship known as Associations. The first assembly in 1689 was called by William Kiffin, Hanserd Knollys and Benjamin Keach. When they met they disclaimed "all manner of superiority, or superintendence over the churches, having no authority or power to prescribe or impose anything upon the faith or practice of any of the churches of Christ, their whole intendment being to be helpers together of one another, by way of counsel and advice" (Crosby, A History of the English Baptists, 1738, Vol. III, pp. 249-50). Each church was to maintain its independence. The associations were regional. The churches declared themselves to be “a society of people holding forth and practising the doctrine, worship, order and discipline of the Gospel according to the primitive institution.”

Some of the prominent early leaders of the English Particular Baptists were William Kiffin, John Spilsbury, Hanserd Knollys, Benjamin Keach, Benjamin Cox, and Hercules Collins among others.

Late in the seventeenth century the pedobaptist John Wall wrote against the immersion policies of the Baptists. The historian, Joseph Ivm, said of Wall's charges: “In a work published at the close of the seventeenth century by Mr. John Wall, entitled “Baptism anatomized,” the writer says, Their baptism is not from heaven, but will-worship, and so to be abhorred by all Christians; for they received their baptism from one Mr. Smyth who baptized himself; one who was cast out of a church, and endeavoured to deprive the church of Christ of the use of the bible.”
“To this charge, made with so much asperity, Hercules Collins, a Baptist minister at Wapping, replies with great indignation in a work entitled, “Believers’ baptism from heaven, and of divine institution: Infant baptism from earth, and of human invention.” published in 1691. Mr. Collins denies that the English Baptists received their baptism from Mr. John Smyth, and says, ‘It is absolutely untrue, it being well known to some who are yet alive how false this assertion is; and if J[ohn]. W[all]. will but give a meeting to any of us, and bring whom he please with him, we shall sufficiently shew the falsity of what is asserted by him in this matter, and in many other things which he hath unchristianly asserted’” (A History of the English Baptists).

Also in the late seventeenth century there was a difference among the churches concerning the Imposition of Hands at the time of baptism and the matter of the “Seventh Day” or Sunday for worship. Men sometimes published their views in tracts and open letters to their opponents concerning these and other theological issues. These controversies carried over to the colonies of America as well.

In 1689 the Particular Baptists published a Confession of Faith, which was very much a restatement of what they had previously published in 1677. This Confession influenced the early Regular Baptists of America and has been often reprinted and used by some Baptists today.

Many of the Particular Baptist ministers developed private schools to supplement their pastoral income, which was usually not sufficient to support their families. In Bristol, Edward Terrill, a wealthy member of the Broadmead Church, left the bulk of his will (1679) “to support a minister at the Broadmead Church, who should be well skilled in Hebrew and Greek and devote three half-days a week to the instruction of young men, not exceeding twelve, members of any baptized congregation in or about Bristol, for two years at most.” By 1720, in the western area of the nation, the first college of the Baptists, Bristol College was begun.

In Nashville he met J.R. Graves and became co-editor of The Baptist with Graves. His Theodosia Ernest was very successful as well as his The Infidel’s Daughter. The royalties would have been considerable but due to unscrupulous men, they were able to publish his books without paying the royalties. I have two sets of Theodosia Ernest; neither set has his name anywhere.

In 1863, Dayton moved his family to Perry, Georgia to escape the ravages of the war. In November 1864, his wife Lucy united with the Perry Baptist Church by baptism. Here he died of tuberculosis on June 11, 1865 in his forty-second year. He left behind his invalid wife and eight children when he died.

LEADING DOCTRINES OF LANDMARK BAPTISTS

Landmarkism Defined: Landmarkism teaches there are two essentials of a true church. One, it must preach the true gospel and two, it must practice the ordinances properly.

In this definition, Landmark Baptists agree with other denominations. Because Landmarkers believe immersion alone is scriptural baptism and that scriptural baptism is essential to church membership, they believe those who are not scripturally baptized are not members of a Scriptural church.

Churches composed of those who are not scripturally baptized are not in gospel order and are not true churches and therefore cannot give scriptural baptism, regardless of the mode. Nor can they execute properly any gospel act any more than a society not in legal order can organize a posse, pass legislation or appoint an ambassador (LUF. 10-11).

The statement is often made that Landmarkism originated with Graves, Pendleton and Dayton and that it was unknown before they began their work. This seems to be an unfounded proposition. Hogue, in his dissertation The Antece-
Pendleton and his wife had seven children. One son was killed while serving in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. He was co-editor of *The Baptist* with Graves for several years and co-editor with Graves of *The Southern Baptist Review* for six years.

Pendleton differed with Graves over slavery and left the South over his position in 1862 and took a church in Ohio and then later in Pennsylvania. He had many conversions in his church in Pennsylvania at one time baptizing 200 and at another 40. Pendleton wrote several books. He was a strong Landmark Baptist but he did not agree with Graves on communion. His dying testimony was: “It is grace, grace, from first to last. My hope is just what it was sixty years ago, and I go into eternity with the one hope and plea, that Jesus Christ died in the place of sinners.”

*A.C. Dayton*: Amos Cooper Dayton was born in 1813 and died in 1865. His parents were Presbyterians. He had health problems early on but was able to graduate from medical school in New York as a dentist when twenty-two. After his marriage to Miss Lucie Harrison they moved to the south for his health, living in Florida, Mississippi, and Georgia.

Through study of the Scriptures in 1852 Dayton became a Baptist and was baptized into the fellowship of the Shelbyville Baptist Church of Shelbyville, Tennessee.

His conversion to Baptist principles came about in this manner. In 1852, while attending a Presbyterian meeting, he stayed in a Baptist home. The lady of the house put a book in his room. That book was Carson’s *Baptism: Its Mode and Subjects*. Dayton said he learned he had never been baptized. His wife did not then become a Baptist. Two years later he was ordained by this church and soon moved to Nashville.

Some say the use of hymns was prohibited in public worship because of the elaborate fashion and pomp of the Roman and Anglican organizations in their services. Others thought pre-written words were not a genuine expression of the worshiper’s heart. Others believe Baptists refused congregational singing because their forefathers had been fearful of being detected by their enemies for singing in their assemblies; then being punished for violating laws that forbid their worship. Whatever reason, early Particular Baptist in England did not sing hymns in their worship services. Benjamin Keach, the father-in-law of the historian Thomas Crosby, attempted to introduce hymns in his church's services. Crosby describes the resistance that often occurred in the church as this "new" practice was introduced:

“And tho’ he had very great success therein, yet it brought upon him much trouble and ill-will. When he was convinced that singing the praises of God was an holy ordinance of Jesus Christ, he laboured earnestly and with a great deal of prudence and caution, to convince his people thereto; and first obtained their consent to the practice of it at the conclusion of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, (Matthew 26:30) and had but two of the brethren, in his church, that opposed him therein . . . After his church had continued in this practice about six years, they further assented to practise the same on public thanksgiving days, and continued therein about fourteen years; and then by a regular act of the church, in a solemn manner agreed, to sing the praises of God on every Lord's day, excepting about five or six persons that dissented therefrom” (*History of the English Baptists*, Vol. IV, pp. 298-99).

**The Eighteenth Century**

As the eighteenth century opened and during most of the century, about eighty percent of the English people were living in rural areas and living from agricultural employment. Most Baptist churches were small (less than 100).
The concern for educating Particular Baptist ministers became a concern. “In 1675 the Baptist ministers in London invited their brethren throughout the country to meet in the following May in the metropolis with a view to form a plan for providing an orderly standing ministry who might give themselves to reading and study, and so become able ministers of the New Testament. Four years after this meeting, in 1679, an excellent deacon of the Broadmead church, Bristol, Mr. Edward Terrill, executed a deed leaving a considerable part of his property to the pastor of the Broadmead church for the time being, provided he be a holy man, well skilled in the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and devote three half-days a week to the instruction of any number of young students, not exceeding twelve, who may be recommended by the churches. Progress, however, was slow for various reasons. Mr. Terrill’s fund did not become available until the death of his widow. With the acceptance of the pastorate at Broadmead by Mr. Bernard Foskett, in 1720, the Bristol Academy became a recognized institution among the churches. Sixty-five students were taught by Mr. Foskett, of whom the most noteworthy were Benjamin Beddome, John Ryland Sr., Benjamin Francis, Hugh Evans, Morgan Edwards (afterwards of Philadelphia), Dr. Ash, and Dr. Llewellyn. Hugh Evans succeeded Mr. Foskett, and was succeeded by his son, Dr. Caleb Evans” (The Baptist Encyclopedia, 1881).

Early in the century Particular Baptist established a “fund” to provide assistance to their men studying for the ministry. Soon after its establishment John Gill was provided a grant; he was later to become one the Particular Baptist's greatest preachers and writers for a period of nearly fifty years.

In the 1730’s the issue of inviting the unconverted to receive Christ became divisive among the Particular Baptists. John Gill, along with John Brine, believed it was inappropriate to “offer” Christ to sinners. Joseph Ivimy, the historian, called their method the “non-application, non-invitation scheme.” Gill was a prolific writer; his works are still popular today. Charles Spurgeon later wrote that Gill “cramped himself, and was therefore strait ...

But one constant must be kept before us. No man can understand or properly evaluate the history of the SBC nor the history of the Baptists of the South without looking objectively at the life and works of J.R. Graves. Many who have written about Graves had a hawk-eye for his errors (and he had these) but were bat-blind as far as any good! Much of this critical agenda was produced by the liberal element of the SBC and anything conservative is to them as the shepherd was to the Egyptians in Joseph’s day.

A man does not have to agree with everything Graves taught to recognize his teaching had a powerful curing effect on Baptists and this influence continues to permeate and preserve although largely unrecognized, disclaimed and now waning. Graves held fast to the principles of the Word of God and he never hesitated to publish and defend what he believed. By the grace of God he put iron into Baptist blood. No error escaped his attention. He never furled the flag in the face of the enemy! He had these words as the motto of his paper for many years:

Desiring the whole truth  
Daring to oppose any error,  
Fearing no man:  
Christ is my Judge!

J. M. Pendleton: Pendleton was born in 1811 and died in 1891. He was converted when he was seventeen and became a Baptist. He was called to preach and was soon licensed. His strides in learning were remarkable and he became a professor. He read the NT through in Greek twenty seven times and more than once in Latin and French.
church and not thereby unchristianize its members. If my opponent should attempt to make the impression upon you that I deny that you are Christians because I deny your society is a church, he will pursue a course both unwarranted and unprincipled” (Graves. *GCD*. 927).

These quotes by Graves indicate Torbet’s assertions are wide of the mark. T.A. Patterson, father of Paige Patterson, is more objective:

“A study of Dr. Graves’ influence upon Southern Baptist life would be a ‘total history of the Southern Baptist Convention.’ … This paper (TN Baptist) along with his books were in part the explanation of why he turned the Southern Baptist Convention around…There is good reason to believe that if it had not been for Graves, Southern Baptists would today be where American Baptists (formerly the Northern Baptist Convention) are – small in number and lacking in deep theological conviction” (Quoted by Cross. *Landmarkism: An Update*. 5, 6).

Graves was described as “a flaming wheel on a burning axle!” (Hailey. 73).

S. H. Ford knew Graves intimately and said of him:

“Into that great burning heart of his, into that intense and fearless soul, we cannot pierce. His sorrows and his joys, his hopes and his fears, his knowledge of his defeats and mistakes, and above all the shining into that soul of the supernal light and strengthening power of God's grace; the tried and trusting spirit that never showed fear of mortal man, and never a momentary waverer in his grasp on vital truth and grapple with deadly error where there was no scriptural reason for being so” (*The Metropolitan Tabernacle: Its History and Work*). Soon Regular Baptists realized that Rationalism was becoming rampant throughout the country and they sought to close ranks on their disagreements.

When word came from America in the 1740’s that there was a revival of religion, many of the Particular Baptist pastors at their associational meetings began calling for a spiritual awakening in their churches.

In 1784 John Sutliff made a call to the churches of the Northamptonshire Association to establish a monthly call-to-prayer for revival among the churches. He wrote the Circular Letter; a portion said:

“Upon a motion being made to the ministers and messengers of the associate Baptist churches assembled at Nottingham, respecting meetings for prayer, to bewail the low estate of religion, and earnestly implore a revival of our churches, and of the general cause of our Redeemer, and for that end to wrestle with God for the effusion of his Holy Spirit, which alone can produce the blessed effect, it was unanimously resolved, to recommend to all our churches and congregations, the spending of one hour in this important exercise, on the first Monday in every calendar month.

“We hope also, that as many of our brethren who live at a distance from our places of worship may not be able to attend there, that as many as are conveniently situated in a village or neighbourhood, will unite in small societies at the same time. And if any single individual should be so situated as not to be able to attend to this duty in society with others, let him retire at the appointed hour, to unite the breath
of prayer in private with those who are thus engaged in a more public manner.”

“The grand object of prayer is to be that the Holy Spirit may be poured down on our ministers and churches, that sinners may be converted, the saints edified, the interest of religion revived, and the name of God glorified.”

Many associate this spirit of prayer with the revival that was experienced in the latter eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

John Rippon, Abraham Booth and Andrew Fuller were leaders who followed John Gill (Rippon was the pastor of the church after Gill died) and they were less rigid in their views of Calvinism. They believed and made it clear there was an offer of salvation to sinners in the Gospel. John Rippon published in 1790 his first Baptist Annual Register in which he printed Baptist statistics. Rippon later published William Carey's mission letters, and often letters from Baptists in America. Abraham Booth published many of his sermons in a book titled The Reign of Grace and an important book on immersion as baptism. Booth's Apology for the Baptists was a defence of strict communion. Andrew Fuller published The Gospel Worthy of all Acceptation in 1785 and wrote, “that faith in Christ is the duty of all who hear or have the opportunity to hear the gospel.” Fuller has been misrepresented to a great degree and only in the past few decades has he been more fairly represented and recognized as a good Baptist theologian.

Fuller was also closely aligned with William Carey in the beginning of British Baptist foreign missionary efforts. William Carey preached a famous sermon in 1792 that would ultimately lead to the formation of the Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel to the Heathen (later changed to the Baptist Missionary Society). His sermon was from Isaiah 54:2-3: “Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains

**J.R. Graves**: J.R. Graves was born in 1820 and died in 1893. He became the editor of The Baptist in 1846 and continued his editorial labors until his death (Wardin. 246). Graves’ ministry was intense, vast, varied and influential. As a writer, revivalist and debater he excelled. Even his enemies and detractors begrudgingly admit this. But because of his Landmarkism he was hated and suffered for it (OL. Xiv).

Graves is the whipping boy of numbers of SBC writers. If J.R. Graves was the culprit these writers assert he is (Cf. Tull; Torbet, Patterson to mention a few), then he must be in the same category as Jesse James or Joe Smith! These authors set their teeth on edge when they speak of Graves and Landmarkism.

For example. Tull says of Graves: “Besides these tenets, The Seven Dispensations revealed Graves to have been, perhaps, with respect to his theological opinions, the greatest heretic ever produced by Southern Baptists” (Tull. 520).

Torbet says: “He assumed that the apostolic Christians were Baptists, hence everyone who was not a Baptist could not rightly be considered Christian” (Torbet. Hist. Bap. 281).

Is this true? These men pride themselves for accuracy and objectivity! We let Graves respond: “We believe there are many precious Christians in the Pedobaptist sects, though in great error. We have no bitterness—nothing but love in our heart toward them, and this leads us to pray for them, and to endeavor to convince them of their error” (Trilemma. 116).

Again: “1. Old Landmarkism is not the denial of spiritual regeneration to those with whom we decline to associate ministerially or ecclesiastically” (OL. 132).

Once more: “I may unchurch an organization, i.e., deny that they possess the scriptural characteristics of a gospel
Who Are the Landmark Baptists
J.C. Settlemoir

In 1854 J. M. Pendleton wrote an article for The Tennessee Baptist at J.R. Graves’ request. This article Graves then published as a tract. He gave it the title An Old Landmark Re-set. It had an immense circulation. Those who reviewed this article referred to those who accepted these conclusions as Old Landmarkers (OL. Xii). The name was given by opponents but adopted by Landmarkers. In this article we seek to answer the question, “Who are the Landmarkers?”

That there are certain minimum standards of the Faith for a Scriptural church, few would be willing to deny. But when it comes to defining what these are, there is considerable diversity. Yet, almost every evangelical denomination of Christians has had their own list of such principles, whether strict or liberal, defining what a true church of Christ is. Landmark Baptists also have such minimum standards as to what constitutes a scriptural church. To this end we will consider 1. Who were the leaders of this movement? 2. What are their leading doctrines? 3. The Whitsitt controversy.

Leaders of the Landmark Movement

There were three men who were the original and undisputed leaders of the Landmark movement in the 1800s. They were J.R. Graves, J.M. Pendleton and A.C. Dayton. They have been described as the triumvirate of Landmarkism. Barnes called Graves the warrior, Pendleton, the prophet, and Dayton the sword bearer (Barnes. SBC 103. Cf. TN Baptist History Journal. Fall 2005).

British Particular Baptists

of thine habitations: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited.”

He had two points: “Expect great things from God, and Attempt great things for God.”

The Particular Baptists sent Carey as their first foreign missionary. He spent the rest of his life in India and Burma and is known as the “father of modern missions.” He and his associates also translated the Bible into many different languages and dialects. Fuller remained secretary of the Missionary Society from its beginning until his death in 1815.

The Nineteenth Century

In the early nineteenth century, Alexander Carson, who was reared a Presbyterian, while studying his New Testament to refute the Baptist position of immersion for baptism, became a Baptist and then a Baptist pastor. His book Baptism: Its Mode and Subjects Considered was influential in Ireland where he was born, as well as England and America. It continues to be reprinted.

The Baptist Union was founded in 1813, as a Particular Baptist organization. In 1833, it was restructured to allow for membership of General Baptists. By 1891, most of the remaining General Baptists merged with the Particular Baptists in the Baptist Union of Great Britain.

Abraham Booth believed in a strict communion as did Andrew Fuller, William Carey and many others. Robert Hall Jr. opened a debate concerning open or closed communion. He was opposed by Joseph Kinghorn, who believed if the Lord’s Supper were opened to all regardless of baptism, then the need for believing faith to precede baptism could not be preserved as a Baptist distinctive.
As some Baptists accepted an open communion, it eventually led to a nearly complete open membership. By 1883, John Clifford, writing in the *General Baptist Magazine*, emphasized the increase of open membership among the Particular Baptists. He claimed responses to his inquiries indicated that two of every three of the leading Particular Baptists were practicing open membership. Tragically two of the defining doctrines of Particular Baptists were losing their meaning; for these churches a new dictionary definition for particular was needed.

As Particular Baptists began losing much of their identity, Charles Spurgeon, a London Baptist pastor, said of them, “they are going down fast.” He began what became a fifteen-year attempt to restore historic Biblical principles to the Baptist Union in 1887, with an article published in *The Sword & the Trowel* magazine. It became known as the “Downgrade Controversy.” Spurgeon charged that the inspiration of the Bible and the Doctrines of Grace, among other issues, were being down-graded from their historic beliefs. Some saw it as a personal conflict between Spurgeon and John Clifford, a liberal Baptist leader of the Baptist Union. Eventually Spurgeon and his church, the largest Baptist church in London, became disassociated from the Baptist Union.

The majority of early Particular Baptists rejected open membership and open communion. There are Baptist churches in England today that hold this view, but they are in the minority. The Strict Baptists of England consider themselves descendants of the Particular Baptists and were never a part of the Baptist Union. Often they are referred to as "Strict and Particular" Baptists: the “strict” refers to the strict or closed position they hold on membership and communion.

It seems that the Strict Baptists could have been a help to Charles Spurgeon, as he almost single-handedly took on the “Higher Critics” of his day, but for some reason they did not join him during the “Downgrade” effort to defend the inspiration of scripture or the doctrines of grace.

He said, “Without the Spirit of God I am utterly unable to speak to you. I have not those gifts and talents which qualify men to speak; I need an afflatus [i.e. inspiration] from on high...” Truly he was God’s reaper for God’s harvest.

1. Let us admire the grace of God that made C.H. Spurgeon.

2. Let none of us try to imitate Spurgeon. He was unique. We are not all meant to be Spurgeons! We must however be the very best we can be. And we may learn much from him and, in many respects, model his ministry. (Spurgeon himself sought to model George Whitefield.) Let us use our gifts and opportunities to the fullest for the glory of God!

3. Let us pray that God would raise up another Spurgeon. Our generation desperately needs one. Let us pray for a season of harvesting for God’s name and fame.

4. Let us remember that preaching is the primary gospel ordinance. We may do more than preach, but we can do nothing more important than preach. Nothing can replace it. Let us be challenged to keep preaching the gospel. Let us stir up the gift that is in us, by the grace of God. Let us labor on until we join the Prince of Preachers around the throne and sing, “Worthy is the Lamb!”
When this poor, lisping, stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave.

**The Preaching and the Sermons**

It is fitting we conclude with a few thoughts on the work that lay nearest Spurgeon’s heart—that of preaching. No less than B.H. Carroll said, “Charles Haddon Spurgeon, by common consent, is acknowledged to be the greatest preacher since apostolic times.” What was it about his preaching that drew the crowds? It is the same thing that keeps the printed sermons in demand to this day. His “clear, strong and bell-like” voice is silent, but even with the limitations of the printed page, you cannot miss his clear-cut message. It is full of Christ, full of grace, full of the right proportion of law and gospel, full of vivid imagination and illustration, full of the great heart of a loving evangelist and shepherd who, next to honoring his Master, sought to bring all his hearers to heaven, and to bring heaven to his hearers. The truth Spurgeon preached is timeless and therefore will never become outdated. It is what souls who are made hungry by the Holy Spirit of God will find satisfying until Christ comes again.

The sermons endure because God’s truth endures. And let us not forget that they were wrought on the anvil of deep experience, tempered with ongoing afflictions, and bathed in much, much prayer. (Spurgeon’s prayer life is a study in itself!)

During the 1880’s a group of American ministers visited England, eager to hear some of her celebrated preachers. One Sunday morning they left the City Temple saying, “What a wonderful preacher is Joseph Parker.” That evening they went from Spurgeon’s Tabernacle saying, “What a wonderful Savior is Jesus Christ!” (Dallimore, p. 216).

Mr. Spurgeon can only be explained ultimately by the good pleasure of God to raise up, equip, sustain and use him.

**Twentieth Century**

Just prior to the twentieth century the mission societies of the Particular and General Baptists merged. Soon the colleges of both groups were accepting each others students. Their associations also merged. The British Baptist historian, Earnest A. Payne, wrote, “With remarkable ease and amity, the older distinctions passed from the mind of the denomination as a whole” (The Baptist Union, p. 79).

As the century progressed those adhering to the Particular Baptist Confessions of Faith of 1677 or 1689 were in decline. Toward the middle of the century there was a renewed awakening to Particular Baptist Confessions, especially that of 1689. Some of those holding to these earlier British Confessions refer to themselves as “Reformed Baptists” and claim to be descendants of the Particular Baptists.

**Wales**

David Benedict says, “long before the ecclesiastical changes on the continent, or in England, we see the Welsh Baptists among the first reformers; and they did not appear to be novices in the business, but entered into the defense of their sentiments . . . like those who had been familiar with their principles.

“The oldest churches of Wales, of whose origin any distinct information has come down to us, are those of Olchon, Llantrisaint, Llanwenarth, Carmarthen, Dolan, and Swansea. These united in an association at Swansea in 1655, their first meeting was held at Abergavenny; and Vaughan, Prosser, Parry, Watkins, Garson, and Brace were among the principal ministers who attended it.”

Benedict concludes, “They are Baptists through and through, of the trans-Jordan cast. Their hard-mouthed Celtic dialect brings out immersion to the full, and among their preachers
we have some very fine specimens of native genius and pulpit eloquence.”

The preaching by Christmas Evans is an excellent example of the early Welch proclamation of the gospel. Vavasor Powell was often referred to as the Whitefield of Wales because of his zeal and Calvinistic preaching. He was imprisoned in thirteen prisons, dying in one of them in 1670.

John Myles came to New England from Swansea, Wales, in 1663, being driven from his native land by religious persecution in the reign of Charles II.

The first Baptist church in Pennsylvania, the mother of the Philadelphia Association and of many churches in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, kept its records, in the Welsh language for many years, and its first Bible, which is now in the American Baptist Historical Society Library, was in Welsh.

Ireland

Baptists have been documented to have been in Ireland since around the middle of the 17th century. Churches were formed in Dublin, Waterford and Cork at that period and they exist to this day.

By 1653, there were known to be ten Baptist churches in Ireland. The Irish Baptist Association was organized in 1862, and was replaced by the Irish Baptist Union (or Baptist Union of Ireland) in 1895. The Irish Baptists initially had a close relationship with the English Particular Baptists. Their desire for independence and more conservative theology caused the Irish Baptists to distance themselves from the English Baptists. They supported Charles Haddon Spurgeon during the Downgrade Controversy (B. R. White, Association Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660).

During this time, Spurgeon was stricken with kidney disease, which left him weaker than ever. The remaining four years of his life he was often sick and deeply grieved, yet thankful for the continued fellowship and confidence of his church and a few faithful friends. In the midst of dramatically changing times, he stood like a Rock of Gibraltar. He despised innovations in theology and even in worship style. He said, “I am quite willing to be eaten by dogs for the next fifty years, but the more distant future shall vindicate me.” So it was. Time has proven conclusively that Spurgeon’s fears and warnings were right.

His last sermon at the Tabernacle was preached on June 7, 1891. He was in Mentone, France, when he passed from his earthly tabernacle and entered eternal rest on Jan. 31, 1892. He outlived his mother by only four years; his father outlived him ten years. Susannah outlived him twelve years. Before his burial in London, over 100,000 people viewed his body while it lay in an olive wood casket in the Tabernacle. On his monument are inscribed two verses of his favorite hymn:

E’er since, by faith, I saw the stream
Thy flowing wounds supply,
Redeeming love has been my theme,
And shall be till I die.

Then, in a nobler, sweeter song,
I’ll sing Thy pow’r to save
ings at the Tabernacle. Little wonder he was known there as the “Governor”! Besides all this he always made time to entertain a host of guests, including ministers from all over the world. Of course his favorite work was preaching, which he did often ten times per week in his own pulpit as well as in others’. Was there ever such a model of industry and sacrificing labor among mortal men?!

Obviously, Spurgeon had many helpers on which he leaned heavily. He praised his elders and deacons for all their labors behind the scenes. Mr. Harrald, his secretary, was likewise invaluable.

The demand of such a workload took its inevitable toll on Spurgeon’s physical constitution. While still in his thirties, his health broke. He suffered from rheumatism and gout as well as sciatica pain. Mrs. Spurgeon’s health had broken even earlier, shortly after giving birth to the twins. She was homebound most of the time. There were whole years in which she could not attend church and hear her husband preach. But she maintained her workload nonetheless. In the closing 25 years of his life, Mr. Spurgeon was absent from his pulpit about one third of the time. In the winter he would travel to the warmer climate of southern France for weeks or months at a time. Usually his brother, James, who became his co-pastor in 1867, preached in his absence. The lingering sickness no doubt contributed significantly to the bouts of severe depression that Spurgeon suffered.

Another event that precipitated his death at the age of 57 was the departure of many of his Baptist brethren from the orthodox faith. This came to be known as the Downgrade Controversy. Liberalism from German theologians was gaining ground among the Baptist Union, of which Spurgeon was a member. When he learned of it, he withdrew from the Union as a matter of principle, charging it with apostasy. After much confusion and misrepresentation, the Union voted on a wa-

---

Scotland

In the latter part of the 16th century, John Knox, the Presbyterian leader, was opposed to Baptist sentiments. In a letter to his brethren in Scotland he characterised their opinions as “maist horribill and absurd;” and in a lengthy discussion with an English Anabaptist on “Predestination,” he told his opponent that his doctrines would not be welcome in the land of the Covenant (George Yuille, History of the Baptists in Scotland from Pre-Reformation Times, 1926).

Robert Carmichael, the pastor of a small independent church in Edinburgh, came to accept Baptist principles through a close study of Scriptures and correspondence with Archibald McLean, a Glasgow bookseller and printer. Mr. Carmichael travelled to London where he was baptized in 1765 by the noted Baptist minister, Dr. John Gill of Carter Lane. On his return to Edinburgh, Carmichael baptized five members of his independent congregation, and organized what is the first Scotch Baptist church for which there are records. A few years after that, Archibald McLean went from Glasgow to be baptized by the Bristo Baptist Church, Edinburgh. In 1767, McLean moved to Edinburgh, and a year later was elected co-pastor with Robert Carmichael. Archibald McLean very quickly became the leader of the Baptist work in Scotland. In 1785 the church began supporting him full-time as their pastor.

As a leader of the Scotch Baptists, Archibald McLean was responsible for helping constitute Baptist churches in Glasgow, Dundee, Montrose, Largo, Kirkcaldy and Paisley.

Archibald McLean wrote of the Scotch Particular Baptists, “They think our Lord and his Apostles used great plainness of speech in telling us what we should believe and practice; and thence they are led to understand a great many things more literally and strictly than those who seek to make the religion of Jesus correspond with the fashion of the time, or the decent course of the
world. Though they hold the doctrine of particular election, of God's unchanging and everlasting love, and of the perseverance of the saints: yet they think it dangerous to comfort people by these considerations when they are in a backsliding state” (J. J. Goadby, *Bye-Paths in Baptist History*).

The early British Particular Baptists had a pronounced effect on the early Baptists of America. This is shown by some of the correspondence between the two groups. Baptist churches in New England and those of the Philadelphia Baptist Association wrote their English and Welsh brethren to have them recommend pastors for their American churches. The Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith, which had a far-reaching effect in the early American Baptist churches, was patterned after the English Particular Baptist Confession.

His own literary output was astounding. Besides the weekly painstaking work of editing his Sunday sermons for publication (which was his Monday morning “relaxation”!)), he found time to write commentaries, most notably the extensive *Treasury of David*. He also published a review of hundreds of commentaries authored by others. He wrote scores of evangelistic and practical books. (One of the most influential, *All of Grace*, begins by saying, “The object of this book is the salvation of the reader”!) He influenced James Nichol to reprint the vast sets of Puritan works with which typeset we are familiar in today’s copies. He compiled a hymnal. Did I mention that Spurgeon answered 500 letters per week, by hand, and in his blend of purple ink—he was writing for the King of Kings! His reading was prolific; he read about one full book per day—and not just theology but also science and Shakespeare. With his near photographic memory he could recall whatever he needed. He amassed a library of 12,000 volumes. He helped to found or direct scores of lesser known organizations and associations. On the 25th anniversary of his coming to London, a jubilee service was held in which his secretary, J.W. Harrald, read the names of 66 such organizations! Many of them held their meet-

book distribution ministry. He started almshouses, or homeless shelters. He started an orphanage for the many homeless boys of London, and much enjoyed visiting them and influencing them for the Savior. A girls’ orphanage was opened a few years later. Many hundreds passed through the doors of the orphanages. He started a college for training pastors, attended over the years by hundreds, who received much personal attention and instruction. Mrs. Spurgeon started a book fund to supply poor pastors and missionaries. It became a huge undertaking. Spurgeon had a part in forming 40 missions in the great city of London. Some of the college-trained men became foreign missionaries, especially in Asia and Africa, supported almost exclusively by the Tabernacle. For the last 27 years of his life, Spurgeon published a monthly magazine, *The Sword and Trowel*.
One of my favorite stories is how that Spurgeon once, while traveling, entered the back of a country chapel unrecognized by anyone present. The minister preached one of Spurgeon’s sermons and did not even give him credit for it. Afterward, when Spurgeon introduced himself, the minister began asking forgiveness. But Spurgeon would hear nothing of it. Rather, he thanked the man for delivering the message that he desperately needed in his weary soul that day.

Another remarkable story is how Spurgeon fell asleep one Saturday before getting his Sunday morning sermon ironed out in his mind. He awoke in a panic and asked Susannah, “What shall I do?” She said, “Have no fear, Charles, for in your sleep you were preaching and I wrote down what you said,” and to his great relief presented him with the notes he needed!

Spurgeon maintained a sense of humor all his life which no doubt helped him endure the heavy crosses. Once when a woman complained about his humor, he answered, “If you knew how much humor I suppress you would thank me!”

Once in a train station, a minister recognized Spurgeon, and in the ensuing conversation said, “I am traveling third class, saving the Lord’s money,” to which Spurgeon replied, “I am traveling first class, saving the Lord’s servant!”

Volumes of amazing and thrilling stories could be told—and have been! (However, there are many “urban legends” as well. Read the biographies to know the truth!)

Now let me summarize some of the noteworthy fruits of Spurgeon’s 38 years in London. Some 300 million copies of his sermons and books were printed. The printed sermons tally nearly 4,000. A total of 14,692 new members were admitted, an average of 400 per year. Each was carefully examined and instructed. Spurgeon knew all the members by name, as well as most anyone to whom he was ever introduced. He started a

I Timothy 5:17. “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.”

Pastors are not only to be efficient administrators, but faithful Gospel proclaimers as well. The name of John Gill is not to be found in the Scriptures, but what he did and how he lived can be found therein. I know of no man since the Apostles who gave as much time and attention to studying and writing about the Scriptures as did John Gill.

Wade Burleson wrote the forward to George Ella’s book on John Gill and Justification From Eternity. In that forward Burleson states: “John Gill was, in this pastor’s opinion, the greatest evangelical theologian and pastor of the eighteenth century. His mighty ministry flowed from experiential and theological knowledge of God’s love. Just as the flock he led was richly blessed, so too, thousands of others who turn to his prodigious writings discover a power example in Gill’s testimony of how much a man may learn of God.”

When I think of John Gill, I think of my text: “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.”

The Greek word translated “honor” in this text means not only money paid, but esteem of the highest degree. John Gill needs to be respected and esteemed for his labor in the word and doctrine. He is truly worthy of double honor!! It is Scriptural and right that some men are to be honored and esteemed.
The Apostle Paul exhorted in Romans 13:7, “Render therefore to all their dues: Tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.”

Our Lord said in Matthew 11:11: “Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; not withstanding, he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he.”

Upon the death of Abner, King David said in II Samuel 3:38: “Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?”

Another prince and great man fell the day John Gill took his last breath.

John Gill was born at Kettering, Northhamptonshire, England on November 23, 1697. Gill’s father was a Baptist, but belonged to a union church of different denominations. Since unity could not be established concerning baptism and the Lord’s supper, the Baptists pulled out and established a Baptist church calling William Wallis to be pastor, later becoming the pulpit of Andrew Fuller.

When Gill was twelve years of age, he began to feel the first pains of conviction upon hearing his pastor preach on Genesis 3:9: “And the Lord God, called unto Adam, and said unto him, where art thou?” However, he did not make a public profession of faith until November 1, 1716, as he approached age 19. He was baptized in a river, and partook of the Lord’s supper three days later at church. That same evening, he preached his first sermon to an assembly of believers in a private home. He spoke from Isaiah 53. One week later he preached on I Corinthians 2:2: “For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.”

heard the words, which were to him a message from heaven. Smitten with conviction, he put down his tools, went home, and after a season of struggle, found peace with God by beholding the Lamb. The man told the story on his deathbed.

At last in 1861, a totally new building was completed. Spurgeon named it the Metropolitan Tabernacle, noting it was just a temporary dwelling until heaven. At the great dedication of the building he said:

“I would propose that the subject of the ministry in this house, as long as this platform shall stand, and as long as this house shall be frequented by worshipers, shall be the person of Jesus Christ. I am never ashamed to avow myself a Calvinist; I do not hesitate to take the name of Baptist; but if I am asked what is my creed, I reply, ‘It is Jesus Christ.’”

The Tabernacle could hold 6,000. It was full every time Spurgeon preached. In time, the members were encouraged to alternate their Sunday evening attendance so as to make room for the throngs of visitors who wanted to hear the pastor. A trip to London was not complete without going to hear Mr. Spurgeon. Thousands of hearers testified to having been converted under Spurgeon’s ministry, while thousands more told of being saved by reading the printed sermons.

In year after year of great blessing and usefulness, Spurgeon remained exceedingly humble. He believed the Lord used his frequent illnesses to help keep him humble. When one asked him the secret of his success, he replied, “My people pray for me.” As Bob Ross wrote, “He himself only wanted to be a ‘John Ploughman,’ keeping his hand to the plough and ploughing a straight furrow.”
When Exeter Hall was no longer available, the church planned to use the Music Hall of Royal Surrey Gardens. Spurgeon’s sons were but a month old when the first service took place. He was almost overwhelmed at the capacity crowd of 10,000, with thousands more unable to enter. After song and Scripture, Spurgeon began to lead in prayer. Just then someone began yelling, “Fire!”—and another, “The galleries are falling!” Panic broke out and the place was in chaos. There was no fire, of course, but in the rush to exit the building, seven were trampled to death and 28 wounded. As some fled, many outside were trying to enter. Spurgeon could not see all that occurred and had not even heard the original cries. He was sure that thieves and pickpockets had arranged the whole event. He sought to calm the crowd, and many encouraged him to proceed with the service. But as the disruption continued, he soon had to dismiss. When he learned what had happened, he was devastated and in shock, driven nearly unconscious. Some thought him dead as he was carried from the Hall. A cloud of gloom enveloped him and he was overcome with severe depression for many days. He was cruelly vilified in the press as a money-grubbing charlatan who had no heart for the dead and dying. But God was not finished with his servant! In divine strength he returned to the old chapel to preach after only one Sunday’s absence. Eventually he was able to go back to the Music Hall, which the church continued to use on Sunday mornings for the next three years.

Large crowds in large buildings troubled him the remainder of his days. However just one year after the great disaster, Spurgeon preached to 24,000 in a special service at the Crystal Palace. So exhausted was he afterwards that he slept 36 hours, awaking to discover he had lost a whole day! One of the most fascinating conversion stories took place a day or two before the service, when Spurgeon was testing the pulpit and acoustics of the Palace. He thundered out, “Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.” A workman in one of the galleries, who knew nothing of what was being done,

He would soon become pastor of the Baptist church at Horseleydown, Southwark in London. This would be his only church pastorate. He preached there for 51 years. He died at the age of 73 years, 10 months, and 10 days.

John Gill Was An Intellectual Genius

He was born with a tremendous thirst for knowledge, possessing a fine capacity for instruction. John Rippon states:

“Being soon out of the reach of common teachers, he was very early sent to the grammar school in the town, which he attended with uncommon diligence, and unwearied application; quickly surpassing those of this own age as well as others who were considerably his seniors. There he continued till he was about eleven years old. During this time, besides going through the common school books, he mastered the principal Latin classics, and made such a proficiency in the Greek, as obtained him marks of distinction from several of the neighboring clergy, who condescended occasionally to examine and encourage his progress.…At length he studied logic, rhetoric, as also natural and moral philosophy. He likewise learned Hebrew without any living assistance. He could soon read Hebrew with great ease and pleasure. He was next improving his mind by reading Latin.”

It has been said that Dr. Gill traveled the whole world cycle of human learning.

John Gill Was A Literary Genius

Much is said about the chair of John Gill. This is where he exercised his mind in grace, and directed his pen in defining
truth. Mr. Spurgeon spoke of Gill’s chair as well as did Tom Nettles who said: “While Wesley and Whitfield were in the fields, Gill was in his chair.” If one wanted to express utmost confidence in an assertion, he would say: “It is as sure to happen as Gill is in his study.”

In addition to the responsibilities of preaching and pastoring, countless days, months and years were consumed with Gill’s writing. He wrote the following books and papers:

1. The Doctrine of Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, Stated and Defended (1730)
2. The Doctrine of the Trinity Stated and Vindicated (1731)
3. The Doctrine of God’s Everlasting Love to his Elect, and Their Eternal Union To Christ (1732)
4. The Cause of God and Truth (1734-38)
5. The Necessity of Good Works Unto Salvation Considered (1739)
7. Exposition of the Old Testament (1748-63)
8. The Doctrine Of Predestination Stated and Set in Scriptural Light (1752)
9. The Doctrine of the Saints’ Final Perseverance Asserted and Vindicated (1752)
11. A Body of Doctrinal Divinity (1767)
12. A Body of Practical Divinity (1770)
13. Three Volumes of Sermons and Letters

John Gill Was A Theological and Exegetical Genius

He is the only man whoever wrote a commentary on every verse in the Bible. Generally his comments on a verse were never brief or abridged, but rather lengthy and exhaustive. He covered his field well. There were no stones left unturned. He was very thorough, yet to the point. Gill was not merely a reaper to harvest! The following words were printed at the beginning of each volume of sermons:

To the one God of heaven and earth.
In the Trinity of His sacred persons.
Be all honour and glory, world without end, Amen.
To the glorious Father, as the Covenant God of Israel.
To the Gracious Son, the Redeemer of His people;
To the Holy Ghost, the Author of Sanctification;
Be everlasting praise for that Gospel of the
Free Grace of God herein proclaimed unto men.

Not everyone was happy. Many in the secular press scoffed at the young pastor as a passing sensation, and the sooner he passed the better, as far as they were concerned. Some predicted fame would destroy him. Others disliked his dynamic and direct style of speaking to the common people, preferring the more formal and respectable manner of established clergymen. Some even made fun of his clothing. Among Christian reviewers, the criticism was especially ugly. Spurgeon’s old-style Puritanism, complete with unconditional election and particular redemption, was viewed as “rantings” out of step with modernity. On the other end of the spectrum, some lashed out at him for being Arminian because of his free offer of the gospel and his pleading with sinners to come to Christ. Painful as these assaults and false accusations were, Spurgeon remained unshaken and outspoken in his convictions.

Soon the chapel had to be enlarged. During the construction, the ever-growing crowds met temporarily in Exeter Hall. About this time Spurgeon married Susannah Thompson, who had been recently converted under his ministry and baptized by him. She was a great asset to his ministry and happiness. Less than a year later, twin sons were born, both of whom subsequently became faithful ministers.
were expecting the other one to do the preaching! Finally Spurgeon agreed to the task. The few families present were amazed. Doors continued to open. At the young age of 17, he became the pastor of a church in Waterbeach, a notoriously wicked town. Through his ministry in the pulpit and in the street, a remarkable transformation took place. Crowds gathered to hear the young preacher who possessed such depth and maturity. Many were converted and baptized.

Spurgeon was never ordained and thought it was not necessary, so long as a man was ordained of God. Nor did he receive any formal ministerial training, though he one time sought it. In an amazing turn of providence, the Lord made it clear to him that he was not meant to have it.

Reports of his influence spread to London. He agreed to preach in a church there. Though both he and the saints in Waterbeach dreaded the thought of parting, they saw the hand of Providence at work. Two months before his 20th birthday he became the pastor of the New Park Street Chapel. The remainder of his life was devoted to this congregation.

The Long Ministry in London (1854-1892)

The previous pastors of the historic New Park Street Chapel included Benjamin Keach, John Gill and John Rippon. But by 1854 it had been reduced to a fraction of its former number (then 232 members). Immediately upon Spurgeon’s arrival, crowds gathered to hear the young powerful preacher. He began to print his sermons before his 21st birthday, a work which continued for the remainder of his life. The sermons were sold individually, then were printed together in one volume at the end of the year. In the preface to the first year’s sermons, Spurgeon could say, “There is scarce a sermon here which has not been stamped by the hand of the Almighty, by the conversion of a soul.” God had the fields ready, and sent his

Baptist, but rather a Particular Baptist, or known also as a Strict Baptist. This is revealed over and over again in his commentaries. He was a strong “5-Point Calvinist” who believed and faithfully preached The Doctrines of Grace. He devised a confession of faith which his church strongly endorsed, the tenets of which are described below:

1. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament are the Word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.

2. We believe that there is but one only living and true God; that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost Who are equal in nature, power, and glory; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are as truly and as properly God as the Father.

3. We believe that, before the world began, God did elect a certain number of men unto everlasting salvation, whom He did predestinate to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, of his own free grace, and according to the good pleasure of his will, and that in pursuance of this gracious design, He did contrive and make a covenant of grace and peace with his Son, Jesus Christ, on behalf of those persons, wherein a Saviour was appointed, and all spiritual blessings provided for them; as also that their persons, all their grace and glory, were put into the hands of Christ, and made his care and charge.

4. We believe that God created the first man, Adam, after his own image, and in his likeness…, but he sinning, all his posterity sinned in him, and came short of the glory of God: The guilt of
whose sin is imputed, and a corrupt nature derived to all his offspring…

5. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, being set up from everlasting as the Mediator of the New Covenant, and He, having engaged to be the surety of his people, did, in the fullness of time, really assume human nature, in which nature, He really suffered and died as their substitute, in their room and stead, whereby He made satisfaction for their sins…

6. We believe that the eternal redemption which Christ has obtained by the shedding of his blood, is special and particular, that is to say, that it was only intentionally designed for the elect of God, and sheep of Christ, who only share the special and peculiar blessings of it.

7. We believe that the justification of God’s elect is only by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, without the consideration of any works of righteousness done by them; and that the full and free pardon of all their sins and transgressions, past, present, and to come, is only through the blood of Christ…

8. We believe that the work of regeneration, conversion, sanctification, and faith, is not an act of man’s free will and power, but of the mighty, efficacious and irresistible grace of God.

9. We believe that all those who are chosen by the Father, redeemed by the Son, and sanctified by the Spirit, shall certainly and finally persevere, so that not one of them shall ever perish, but shall have everlasting life.

from his shoulders and rolled into the empty tomb of Christ. For the first time he saw the way of salvation—through simple looking to Christ for all righteousness. He was immediately overwhelmed with peace and joy in believing. He never looked back; he never looked away from Christ. (I believe we can only understand the rest of Spurgeon’s life and ministry by understanding the depth of his conviction, the manner of his almost violent conversion, and the suddenness of his closing with Christ and gaining strong assurance).

All the years of reading, study and learning proved not to be in vain. It all now made sense and became personal and experiential. With such a foundation, Spurgeon progressed by leaps and bounds—he grew overnight from a child into a man. In an instant he came to a clear understanding that even his desire to be saved had come from God. As he studied the Scriptures he came to see his need for baptism as a believer in Christ. This was a big step, seeing his beloved father and grandfather were paedo rhantists (baby sprinklers). As soon as weather permitted and he could find a Baptist minister willing to baptize him, he submitted to the ordinance. It occurred on his mother’s birthday, May 3, 1850. He awoke early to spend a couple of hours in communion with God, then walked the eight miles to Isleham where he entered the water and publicly confessed Christ. One day his mother said to him, “Ah, Charles! I often prayed the Lord to make you a Christian, but I never asked that you might become a Baptist!” He replied with his typical humor, “Ah, Mother! The Lord has answered your prayer with his usual bounty, and given you exceeding abundantly above what you asked or thought.”

Joining the church where Robert Hall was pastor, Spurgeon soon began teaching Sunday School. Then he became involved in their lay-preachers association. His first sermon was preached much to his surprise. He was walking with another lay-preacher to a cottage in the village of Teversham, where a service was to be held. But both of the young men
leader, full of wit and having a winsome personality. When he was 10, a preacher who was a guest in the grandfather’s home was so impressed with the boy that he predicted he would one day be a great preacher, would preach to thousands, and would preach in the pulpit of Rowland Hill (a renowned Congregationalist minister who had died the year previous to Spurgeon’s birth). He made him promise that when his prediction came to pass, he would have the congregation sing, “God moves in a mysterious way, his wonders to perform.” It all came to pass! Years later Spurgeon preached in both of Hill’s pulpits and kept his promise each time.

At the age of 15, Spurgeon left home to attend a better school and to work there as a part-time assistant. Though he had gained much knowledge of the Scriptures, he was still without hope in his soul. Saving faith remained a mystery to him. He had been under conviction since his early years, but his agony of soul now intensified. His burden thus weighed heavily on his shoulders for six months. He began visiting various churches seeking relief for his distress. While staying with his parents during the winter break, he continued his search. On Sunday morning, January 6, 1850, the snow was so blustery he could not walk to the church he had determined to visit, but instead entered the chapel God had determined for him—a Primitive Methodist one. The minister could not even get there, so a simple-minded layman took the pulpit and briefly spoke to the dozen or so who were present from Isaiah 45:22, “Look unto me, and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth.” After about ten minutes, he had said all he knew to say. Then he gazed at Spurgeon seated in the back and said, “Young man, you look very miserable, and you always will be miserable—miserable in life, and miserable in death—if you don’t obey my text; but if you obey now, this moment, you will be saved.” Then lifting his hands he shouted, “Young man, look to Jesus Christ. Look! Look! Look! You have nothin’ to do but to look and live.” Spurgeon did look. He said, “I looked until I could almost have looked my eyes away.” Then and there the burden was lifted.

10. We believe that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust; and that Christ will come a second time to judge both the quick and dead, when he will take vengeance on the wicked, and introduce his own people into his kingdom and glory, where they shall be forever with Him.

11. We believe that Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are ordinances of Christ, to be continued until his second coming; and that the former is absolutely requisite to the latter; that is to say that those only are to be admitted into the communion of the church, and to participate of all ordinances in it, who upon profession of their faith, have been baptized by immersion, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The Adversaries of John Gill

Whenever the truth is heralded and set forth, one can expect adversity and opposition. The late E. W. Johnson said there are three things which truth will do: (1) It will draw fire; (2) It will hold fast; (3) It will repel. That is a very true statement. Truth does draw fire, and it comes from different sources. Gill had many adversaries who continually dogged his heels. I would mention two of their charges, which of course were not true.

John Gill was charged with being an Antinomian. The one thing that triggered such a false indictment was probably Gill’s position on Justification. He believed in Eternal Justification rather than a justification that takes place in time; that if a person is forgiven of all of his trespasses, past, present, and future, before he is born, then the law has no jurisdiction over him. His enemies believed this would lead to licentiousness and willful sinning on the part of a believer. He, however, cleared
up such a misunderstanding in a sermon entitled: “The Doctrine of Grace Cleared From The Charge of Licentiousness”. In discussing the doctrine of redemption, Gill continues:

“It is indeed a redemption from the bondage, curse, and condemnation of the law; but does not exempt from obedience to it, as it is in the hands of Christ; for saints are still under the law to Christ…..Redemption is a deliverance from sin, from all sin, original and actual; and that not only from the guilt of sin and the punishment due unto it, but in consequence of redeeming grace, the redeemed ones are delivered from the dominion and governing power of sin, and at last from the being of it. Christ saves his people from their sins; He does not indulge them in them.”

Another false indictment against Gill was that of Hyper-Calvinism, especially in the area of being against evangelism. The charge was that Gill did not believe in taking the Gospel to the unregenerate. Tom Nettles, in his book, The Baptists, pp. 220-221, states that Gill had no quarrel with the remarkable feature of the Evangelical Awakening during his day and time in which the Gospel was being presented to many of the unsaved. He took exception sometimes to the matter of what was preached, but not that it was done. Gill believed the Gospel minister must proclaim his message to all sorts of hearers. He would urge ministers, “You are to acquaint all that you are concerned with that salvation is by Christ alone.” All were to know that God had chosen Christ to be his salvation to the ends of the earth.

True preachers of the grace of God have always been accused of believing things they don’t believe, and saying things they did not say. That has not changed. The same is true today. Truth still draws fire!!!
In the middle of the century it became obvious to some Baptists that doctrines were not preached and taught as they had been in previous decades and by the early Baptists of our nation. An emphasis upon the doctrine of God's sovereignty, which had been focal to earlier Baptists, had been set aside in most preaching of the day to emphasize the decision of the person being primary in salvation. As liberal views of theology seemed to be dominating, a new emphasis emerged stressing the doctrines of the Bible that had been de-emphasized for a good portion of the century. Many older Baptist books on Bible doctrine, church polity, and practice were republished. This emphasis seems to have developed among Baptists who did not align themselves with either of the major Baptist conventions.

Late in the 1970’s Southern Baptists began what came to be called the “Conservative Resurgence” in re-stating their orthodox doctrinal positions, and by removing most liberal professors from their seminaries and secondary schools. This resurgence continues into the twenty-first century.

Baptists have been a significant religious factor in the development of our nation. As our society continues to be more secularized, as Baptists we must be diligent to stand for the truths “once for all delivered to the saints.” Let us remember the old adage, “Truth is always on the scaffold; Error always seeks the throne.”

Though John Gill fell asleep in Jesus more than 300 years ago, his voice can still be heard today. Countless thousands upon thousands have richly benefited from this man’s work. Only time will tell the additional thousands whose lives will be enriched because of the devotion and commitment of this servant of God. Truly a great man and a prince has fallen among us. I highly encourage you to study the writings of this great man of God.

In the providence of God, another preacher would one day stand where Gill stood. When, in the tumultuous days of the beginning of the Downgrade Controversy, Charles Spurgeon faced the possibility of the loss of friends and finances. He recalled in a letter to his church a moment of poignancy in the ministry of John Gill. Spurgeon said:

“My eminent predecessor, Dr. Gill, was told, by a certain member of his congregation who ought to have known better, that, if he published his book, *The Cause of God and Truth*, he would lose some of his best friends, and that his income would fall off. The doctor said: ‘I can afford to be poor, but I cannot afford to injure my conscience’; and he has left his mantle as well as his chair in our vestry.”

As Baptists we believe in the perpetuity of the church. Begun by our Lord as he walked along the shores of the Sea of Galilee and calling out the first baptized believers who both adhered to his teachings and executed his commandments, the church has existed in all ages since in churches which have descended from this first church. The Lord’s churches, as we have seen, have been called by many names. Having come to America from England and Wales—where they were known as Particular Baptists in distinction from General Baptists—these Baptists in America came to be known as Regular Baptists to distinguish them from the Separate Baptists with whom they would unite prior to 1800.

The Baptists in America have a glowing history. One cannot read the various historical accounts of the role of Baptists in the founding of America, the winning of the Revolutionary War, and the securing of personal and religious freedom without being both proud and humbly grateful to be a Baptist. Life in early America, however, was not easy for the Baptists. Hated alike by both the Congregational Church in New England, and the Established or Episcopal in Virginia, the Baptists suffered immensely both physically and financially at their hands. From the scourging of Obadiah Holmes in Massachusetts to the imprisonment of John Waller, Lewis Craig, and James Childs in Virginia for preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ, Baptists have paid a tremendous price for religious liberty in America. A noted Presbyterian historian, William Wirt Henry wrote almost grudgingly, “It is proper for me to say, Association) withdrew from the Southern Baptist Convention in 1905, mainly over the issue of mission support. They believed the local churches should provide for their missionaries, rather than have a central fund control the finances. This view had been encouraged by T. P. Crawford, a missionary to China for fifty years. Benjamin Bogard was the main leader of this group. The largest segment of the ABA is in Arkansas where they have their main seminary. In 1950 what became known as the Baptist Missionary Association began by withdrawing from the ABA. Their main strength has been in Texas where they have a seminary in Jacksonville.

Scores of Baptists during the mid-twentieth century began identifying their churches as unaffiliated or independent because they did not see the necessity to align with any association or convention. The Philadelphia Baptist Association in the 1700’s stated that there were Baptist churches who chose not to join their association. These churches share fellowship with other Baptist churches through their doctrinal beliefs and periodic Bible conferences, which are usually well attended. There are now many independent Baptist Bible colleges which are the focus of church fellowship, particularly in their locale.

Some pastors who have considered themselves independent have loosely aligned their churches with groups known as the World Baptist Fellowship, Baptist Bible Fellowship, and Southwide Baptist Fellowship. Many churches within these fellowships became involved in the church growth movement, where various gimmicks were used to attract people to their meetings instead of just preaching the gospel. Busses often drove great distances to transport children and prizes were offered to attract larger crowds. Some churches in these groups were influenced by the Modernist/Fundamentalist divide; they refer to themselves as “militant fundamentalists,” with less emphasis on the term Baptist.
Charles Darwin in 1865. It was brought to the forefront in 1925 when the “John Scopes Trial” was held in Dayton, Tennessee. Conservative Baptists viewed Darwin's theory as opposed to orthodox Biblical teaching that God is the Creator of all things. This issue continues in our day as our society becomes more secular; however, there are several strong creationist organizations today.

Southern Baptists in that year passed a Confession of Faith known as the Baptist Faith and Message. It was somewhat vague on the inspiration of Scripture and as liberalism crept into their convention, the liberals used the vagueness of the document to defend themselves. The emphasis was placed more on personal experience rather than the search for Biblical knowledge: “What saith the Lord?” A critical view of Scripture gained ground in the North and the South and those who held a view of the inerrancy of the Bible were thought to be unenlightened by many of those teaching in Baptist colleges and seminaries.

Three men who became leaders of the more fundamental churches and began to stand against the liberalism in the churches and their secondary schools were J. Frank Norris of Fort Worth, Texas, W. B. Riley of Minneapolis, Minnesota, and T. T. Shields of Toronto, Canada. Each was instrumental in beginning a Bible college to train Baptist preachers.

The Ecumenical Movement: Ecumenism is a movement promoting unity among different religious groups by diminishing (or compromising) the doctrinal differences between them. As other denominations called for Baptists to join with them in various projects, it led to more division among Baptists who believed it was important to maintain their doctrinal identity. It continues to be an issue today.

Baptist Divisions in the Twentieth Century: The American Baptist Association, (originally called the Baptist General however, that the Baptists were constant, unwavering, and very effective in the part they took for the same end [the divorce of church and state in Virginia]. They had felt the heel of the oppressor more keenly than the Presbyterians, as many of their ministers had refused to apply for license to preach under the Toleration Act, and as a consequence were often imprisoned as disturbers of the peace. They found an advocate, however, in Patrick Henry, who appeared for them in court whenever it was in his power” (Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia and the Presbyterian Church and Religious Liberty in Virginia, p.291).

For our present purpose, we will limit our study to but four issues concerning the Baptists in America before 1800 viz. The First Baptist Church and Churches, the First Baptist Association and Associations, The Regular and Separate Baptists, and the Baptists and Religious Liberty.

The First Baptist Church and Churches

Paedobaptist and Campbellite historians have claimed that Baptists are without baptism, ordinances, and even a history because it is alleged that one Roger Williams, a Paedobaptist virtually baptized himself and eleven others and organized themselves into the first Baptist Church in America. These historians falsely assumed that all Baptist Churches in America descended from the church Williams founded, and wrongly concluded that all Baptist Churches are without baptism, and hence, not churches.

First, Roger Williams was not a Baptist. No doubt he was a great man and held much in common with the Baptists, but he was no Baptist. Had he been a true Baptist, he would never have sought to re-institute baptism, for he would have shared in common with the Baptists the conviction that they had heaven’s baptism. J. R. Graves says Williams “was never a Baptist one hour in his life. No authentic document sustains the
claim that he was ever the member of, or communed or affiliated with any Baptist Church” (The First Baptist Church in America, p. 50). Samuel Adlam says, “I can see no evidence that Roger Williams, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, established a Baptist Church in Providence” (The First Church in Providence not the Oldest Baptist Church in America, p. 153). Adlam also contended the Providence church, which many historians say Roger Williams started, was founded in 1652, not 1639.

Second, the first Baptist Church in America was founded by Dr. John Clarke in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638. Dr. Graves visited Newport in 1854 to meet Dr. Adlam who was the historian of Rhode Island as well as the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Newport, the very church founded by Dr. Clarke. Under the guidance of Dr. Adlam, Dr. Graves found the grave of Dr. John Clarke. On the monument at this neglected grave, Dr. Graves read, “To the Memory of Doctor John Clarke, One of the original purchasers and proprietors of this island and of the founders of the First Baptist Church of Newport, its first pastor and munificent benefactor…He, with his associates, came to this island from Mass., in March, 1638…He shortly after gathered the church aforesaid and became its pastor…” (The First Baptist Church in America, p. 13). For some reason, Dr. Clarke is slighted by most historians, and most of the credit for securing a charter for Rhode Island is erroneously given to Roger Williams. Even Baptist historians claim the date of the founding of the First Baptist Church in Newport was 1644, so that Williams can be recognized as the founder of the First Baptist Church in America. Morgan Edwards contended that John Clark was properly the founder of the Rhode Island Colony (A General History of the Baptist Denomination, David Benedicts, Vol. 1, p. 453, footnote). Dr. Graves relates the conversation he had with David Benedict, the venerable Baptist historian, while he was in Rhode Island researching the origin of the First Baptist Church in America. Dr. Benedict was 90 years old at that time, and as they spoke about the origin of the two

Liberalism in theology as an issue in the North is demonstrated from this newspaper account:

“In 1920, the Northern Baptist Convention at their annual meeting in Buffalo, New York, called for a committee to investigate all the theological seminaries, colleges and secondary schools of the Baptist denomination, and ‘so far as possible to cleanse them of all infidelic teaching.’ This resolution was presented by Dr. George E. Massee of the Baptist Temple, Brooklyn. The resolution was drawn up at a preliminary conference on Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, which was called by 150 prominent ministers and laymen throughout the United States.”

Another resolution was adopted (almost unanimously) “We call upon all ministers and members of our churches, all teachers in our schools, colleges, and seminaries, and all officers of the Northern Baptist Conference to maintain and proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ in all its simplicity, purity, and power” (New York Times, June 23, 1920 [via Google]).

A Fundamentalist Fellowship of churches began within the Northern Baptist Convention in the 1920’s. By the mid-1940’s they became known as the Conservative Baptist Association, and they did not completely withdraw from the NBC. There have been some additional divisions among this group.

The General Association of Regular Baptist Churches completely severed its relationship from the Northern Baptist Convention in the early 1930’s. Mainly the group’s strength is in the Great Lakes area and other Midwestern states. It has shown growth since its beginning.

The Theory of Evolution and Modernism: The theory of evolution was introduced in a book by a British man named
**Baptist Issues in the Twentieth Century**

*Baptist World Alliance:* In 1905 the Baptist World Alliance came into existence for the purpose of uniting Baptists throughout the world and thereby creating and demonstrating a Baptist world consciousness. It met in different locations and at different time intervals, but every several years. This alliance has never been very strong in the United States.

*Theological Issues:* When the Baptists of the South divided from the northern Baptists in 1845, the northern Baptist churches did not form a convention until 1907. They were not as strong in total organization, but developed many of the same features as the Southern Baptist Convention.

Even before the beginning of the twentieth century, Baptists in the northern states became influenced by the so-called “Social Gospel,” which emphasized primarily the social needs of the poor and under-advantaged. Their focus was on a ministry, which they claimed was Jesus’ emphasis, to the physical, psychological, and social needs — not the spiritual needs of mankind. This system of Biblical interpretation had developed in Europe and made its way to the colleges and seminaries of America, including many Baptist schools. There was a subtle shift in theological terms to give them new meanings. A rationalism that questioned the inspiration of Scripture and the faith of some Baptist leaders began to spread.

As theological liberalism began developing in the United States it affected Baptists, especially those located in the northern states. The Northern Baptist Convention came under the sway of “liberalism.” The initial divide in 1845 between the Baptists of the North and South was not theological, but over the issue of involuntary slavery. Many of the Baptist churches in the northern states were more affected by the liberal view of the inspiration of the Bible and the doctrinal interpretations that follow that view than those of the South.

churches, Dr. Benedict admitted “growing perplexities had for years confused and unsettled his mind as to the correctness of Mr. James Stanford’s history of the Providence church, compiled without any church record, and a full century after its origin *(The First Baptist Church in America, p. 21).* The editor of *A History of New England with Particular Reference to the Denomination of Christians called BAPTISTS* by Isaac Backus (second edition, with notes by David Weston, published by the Backus Historical Society, 1871) in a footnote in Vol. 1, p. 125, says concerning the date the Newport Church was founded, “Backus represents that an earlier date is possible. Many regard the weight of evidence as in its favor. Some have placed it as far back as 1638, supposing that the church was founded by Clarke and his company upon their arrival on Rhode Island.” The *Warren Association* acknowledged that 1638 was the correct date for the founding of this church. From the *Minutes of the Eighty-second Anniversary of the Warren Baptist Association,* Sept. 12-13 (Providence: Printed by H. H. Brown, 1849) pp. 11, 13-15, we learn “A committee appointed by the Warren Baptist Association at its annual meeting in 1848, reported at the following annual meeting at Pawtuxet on Sept. 12-13, 1849, the following conclusion: ‘From this investigation, your committee are of the opinion that the Church at Newport was formed certainly before the first of May, 1639, and probably, on the 7th of March, 1638’” *(John Clarke, Louis Franklin Asher, p. 45, Footnote #3).*

But few Baptist Churches descended from these two churches in Rhode Island. Some churches were constituted in their native land and immigrated to America as a body. Joshua Thomas states that the Welch Tract Church was constituted in 1701 in Wales and came to America, staying for a short time in Pennsylvania before settling in Delaware. According to Thomas, several churches in America came from churches in Wales *(The American Baptist Heritage in Wales, pp 2, & xv in Introduction).*
The First Baptist Association and Associations

Although every Baptist Church is autonomous and independent of other Baptist Churches, Baptists have always associated and cooperated in the kingdom of God. Associations can be found in England, Wales, and other countries throughout the ages. The churches of the New Testament associated and cooperated in receiving funds for the poor saints in Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:1). It is not surprising, therefore, to find Baptist Churches forming associations early in their history in America.

The first Baptist Association in America was organized in 1707 in Philadelphia by five churches, and it was appropriately called the Philadelphia Baptist Association. “The Philadelphia Association originated with churches planted by members from Wales” (Preface in the Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association from 1707 to 1807, p. 3). The five founding churches were the Pennepek, the Welsh Tract, the Middleton, the Piscataqua, and the Cohansie churches. The churches of the Philadelphia Baptist Association published a Confession of Faith and Discipline in 1742. This Confession was essentially the Second London Confession of Faith by about forty churches in London, first published in 1677.

Because of the numerical growth of Baptist Churches and the distances between them, several new associations were formed in various states. The Charleston Association in South Carolina was organized in 1751. In North Carolina the Sandy Creek Association was organized in 1760. The Kehukee Association was formed in North Carolina in 1765, and the Ketocton Association began in 1766 in Virginia. The Warren Association was organized in Rhode Island in 1767. Many other associations were formed in the following years. In his Baptist Encyclopedia published in 1881, William Cathcart lists a total of 15 associations which had been organized by the year 1787. By 1800 Regular Baptist Churches numbered about 1,500 with about 100,000 members according to Hassel’s History of the

In the 1870’s many essays were written as Circular Letters to the churches urging that total abstinence of alcohol as a social beverage be practiced by the churches. Many Baptists had hurt their own personal Christian testimony, as well as the testimony of the churches by using these alcoholic beverages. It was during this period also that many of the churches began using grape juice in their communion service, a policy many temperance advocates urged.

Baptist Publishing: Several theological journals, missionary journals as well as private Baptist newspapers, were published during the century. Often the private publications were sold to another owner/editor when the original owner could no longer operate it. Many of the state associations’ conventions took over the more successful weekly newspapers.

Theological Change: Two professors at the Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, began to teach views opposed to orthodox and historic Baptist teachings, often referred to as “Higher Criticism.” Crawford Toy questioned the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures. William Whitsitt, President and history professor, questioned the practice of the immersion of believers before 1641. Both of these men were removed from their positions at the seminary.

The days of the frontier, which began at the beginning of the nineteenth century, were coming to a close as that century ended. The constant migration to the west and availability of new land was over. The Industrial Age had set in. As a new century dawned, new challenges faced Baptists.
clings to ‘the faith which was once delivered to the saints,’ and which was so nobly maintained by the pioneer fathers. She has not lost the spirit of evangelism, but is less faithful in the maintenance of a scriptural discipline than in former years” (James A. Kirtley, KY).

**Baptist Theological Education:** James P. Boyce led in the founding of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1859, located first in Greenville, South Carolina, and afterwards moved to Louisville, Kentucky. He graduated from Brown University and later from Princeton. Boyce was the seminary’s President and Professor of Systematic and of Polemic Theology. The faculty was Calvinistic in doctrine. Basil Manly, Jr., John A. Broadus, and William Williams were associates in the faculty (Memoir).

B.H. Carroll’s biographer, J. B. Cranfill, said of him, he “is, in the highest, broadest, and best sense of the term, a genuinely great man. In gifts he towers a very giant among his fellows, while in breadth of learning and research he ranks with the profoundest scholars of the time.” “He is an omnivorous reader, having averaged two hundred and fifty pages a day for forty-eight years. The remarkable thing about his reading, moreover, is that he remembers what he reads.” Carroll was born in 1843; he moved to Texas, and became a Christian in 1865. He led in the establishment of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1901 as the theological department at Baylor University, Waco, Texas. It was moved to Forth Worth, Texas, in 1910. B. H. Carroll died in 1914.

**Temperance Issues:** The leading cause of discipline by exclusion from the membership of the church in the early nineteenth century was “spiritous liquors.” Virtually all the Baptist churches used wine in the Lord’s Supper, but members used alcohol socially and it caused serious problems in the churches. Some Baptist associations would plead with the host church to not allow vendors to sell alcohol during the associational meet-


**The Regular and the Separate Baptists**

The first Baptists in America, for the most part, were Particular Baptists. They were called Particular Baptists because they believed the atonement which Christ made on the cross was for a particular people, namely, the elect. There was another group of Baptist Churches which were known as General Baptists. The General Baptists believed the atonement was made generally for every man, woman, boy, and girl who has ever lived or will ever live, including those who died in unbelief and are in hell.

But during the Great Awakening another group of Baptists arose who were called Separates. In New England a great moving of the Spirit accompanied the preaching of Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield among paedobaptist churches, particularly the Congregational Churches. Many people, including men like Isaac Backus, were saved during this revival. Christian states, “With the origin of this revival the Baptists had nothing to do; but from it they reaped great results” (A History of the Baptists, Vol. 2, p. 167). Prior to the year 1734, there was extreme spiritual deadness in the state churches. Edwards and Whitefield preached the doctrines of grace, the sovereignty of God being the central theme, according to Christian (p. 175). The state churches protested against the Great Awakening, causing many of those who had been saved to withdraw from them and organize Separate or New Light churches. During this time, Jonathan Edwards was ejected from his church at Northampton (A History of the Baptists, vol. 2, pp. 177, 178).

Once these churches were separated from the state churches, they began to believe the Bible and Baptist principles taught therein. Many of them saw the doctrine of the baptism of
believers by immersion and sought out Baptist ministers to baptize them. Christian quotes Baron Stow as saying, “In May 1749, thirteen of the members [of Separate Churches] submitted to this ordinance, administered according to apostolic direction and practice. The ordinance was administered by Rev. Mr. Moulton of Brimfield. About fifty of the members were soon afterward baptized, including those before mentioned; the Pastor, the Deacons and the Ruling Elders (A History of the Baptists, vol. 2, pp. 182, 183).

Through the efforts of men like John Gano, James Miller, and David Thomas and others, who were sent by the Philadelphia Association to visit these Separate Baptist Churches, the Separates and the Regulars finally united in Virginia and became known as United Baptists. They united in their common faith in the doctrines and practices set forth in the Philadelphia Confession of Faith.

**The Baptists and Religious Liberty**

Believing in liberty of conscience, the Baptists have ever championed religious liberty. When that liberty could not be enjoyed in a particular land, the ancient Baptists such as the Waldenses would seek refuge in secluded places like the Mountains of Piemont. The vast new land called America provided the Baptists the opportunity they had long sought to worship God and practice their faith openly. They were therefore drawn to America.

Those Baptists who first immigrated to America found the same old prejudices against them that they had faced in Europe. Protestant denominations were state churches in Europe, and they sought to establish the same union of church and state in the new land. Certain eminent Baptists, including John Clarke, John Crandall, and Obadiah Holmes suffered severe persecution in Massachusetts at the hands of the state church for conducting services in a home of an elderly church

lains leaving their churches with only a few laymen to help in worship services, when they could be held. Many Baptist ministers took a leave from their church responsibilities to act as unpaid chaplains for the benefit of the troops. John A. Broadus, Basil Manly, Jr., and William Jones were among the many who served. Like all other phases of life, the churches’ worship and activities were seriously disrupted during the war. During the reconstruction era, churches slowly grew and got back on a more sure footing.

The isolation of the South after the Civil War had the benefit of keeping them more doctrinally strict than the northern states, who were influenced by the liberal theology of Europe. Especially the colleges and seminaries of the North, though claiming to remain orthodox, were becoming more liberal as the century was drawing to a close.

**Church Discipline:** In the early nineteenth century discipline was practiced by virtually all of the Baptist churches. Church book records testify to the diligence of churches to remain as pure in their testimony for Christ as was possible for them to do. They considered their church "the household of God" and sought to have all their members to behave properly. Immorality, drunkenness, theft, lying, and fighting were among the charges brought against offenders. The church would hear the charges, have the offender answer the charges and seek repentance and restoration from the offender. If “satisfaction” (repentance) was not expressed by the offender, exclusion from the membership was the result. Many Baptist churches had a number of regular attendees (or congregants) who would not join the church because they did not want to submit to the discipline of the church.

As the century came to a close the practice of discipline was much less attended to and the testimony and integrity of the churches was not as esteemed as earlier. One pastor recording the history of his church in 1872 wrote, “She still
slavery, and the government recognized each slave as two-thirds of a person for statistical purposes. As the agricultural industry developed in the deep south, there was a greater demand for more slaves.

Baptists owned and evangelized blacks and they usually were referred in church records as “servants.” They were members of Baptist churches, but with no financial responsibility or voting privileges. Usually there was a gallery (balcony) in the meeting house where they were to sit separated from their masters’ families.

There are accounts of black Baptist churches being established early in the nineteenth century. The First African Baptist Church in Richmond, Virginia, was established in 1841 and soon had over 3,000 members, the largest Baptist church in the state at that time. Robert Ryland was the pastor. There was a black Baptist church in Lexington, Kentucky with the largest membership in the state when it was accepted into the local association. It’s earliest reports go back to 1812.

J. M. Pendleton wrote in his Reminiscences: “The overthrow of American slavery was an epoch in the world's history, and it is the providence of God that creates epochs. Now that slavery is abolished, there are no regrets, but rejoicings rather, both in the North and in the South. The North is glad that an institution in conflict with the Declaration of Independence no longer exists, and the South concedes that hired labor is better than slave servitude.” Slavery had divided the nation and came to be looked upon as an evil. It ended with the Civil War and most black Baptist members established their own churches after the war.

The American Civil War: From April, 1861, to April, 1865, the Baptist churches, as well as other denominations were largely depleted of their men. The financial condition of the South was devastated. Many pastors volunteered as chap-
tists of the Revolution” (Baptist Patriots and the American Revolution, p. 70). In this book, Cathcart names several prominent Baptists who fought in the Revolutionary war against the British.

The battle for religious freedom was not won until 1789 when the First Amendment to the Constitution was ratified. Patrick Henry favored the establishment of four churches or denominations as state churches in the new government: the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Baptists (Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia, p. 131). Only the Baptists opposed this establishment. Among the delegates who were nominated to the Constitutional Convention from Virginia was Elder John Leland, an influential preacher among the Baptists. Leland was pitted against James Madison. Madison made a special trip to see Leland, and after spending a half of a day assuring Leland and others he favored religious liberty’s being placed into a Bill of Rights, won the support of Leland who withdrew in his favor. It is believed the sentiments and arguments of Patrick Henry would have defeated the ratification of the constitution except for the presence and influence of James Madison. Referring to this incident in a eulogy upon the character of Mr. Madison, the Hon. J. S. Barbour gave John Leland the credit for the ratification of the Constitution by Virginia and the triumph of the new system of government (Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia, p. 155).

Our Baptist forefathers have left large shoes for us to fill! May we be as diligent to protect religious freedom as they were to secure it. May we be as valiant for truth as they were to advocate and defend it. May we be as willing to suffer and sacrifice for the cause of Christ and his Church as they were.

May others come to realize what they owe the Baptists. Religious liberty is a reality in the United States of America due to the persistent efforts and influence of the Baptists. No other denomination of Christians has the consistent record of championing religious liberty that the Baptists have.

“He was considered among the most distinguished men of the Baptist denomination in the United States during most of the nineteenth century. He described his religious experience as ‘I obtained a joyful sense of acceptance with God on my birthday in 1809.’ He was baptized in 1813, began to preach in 1816, was ordained in 1817, preached to several churches in Virginia, and in 1825 accepted a call to the pastorate of the Fifth Baptist church of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1833 he retired from the pastorate with a diseased throat, and in the following spring his voice had so failed that he was unable to preach, and for a considerable time could not speak above a whisper, and it has been so weak ever since that he has never been able to return to regular service as a minister.

“In 1844 he became President of Mercer University in Georgia for twelve years and taught theology there. After retiring from Mercer he wrote and published his Manual of Theology in 1857, Treatise on Church Order in 1858, Elements of Moral Science in 1859, and Evidences of Christianity in 1868. The first two books have been reprinted and are available to serious Bible students today. He also wrote many religious tracts and newspaper essays, many dealing with doctrinal issues” (The Baptist Encyclopedia).

Slavery: Involuntary African slavery was introduced in England, Jamaica, and other Caribbean islands long before it was brought to America. By the time our Federal Constitution was adopted in 1789, the North and South were involved in
Graves and those who believed like him than following the New Testament.

James M. Pendleton of Bowling Green, Kentucky, wrote a book entitled *An Old Landmark Reset*, published in 1854, that was re-published many times. He also wrote a *Church Manual: Designed for the Use of Baptist Churches*, 1867, *Three Reasons Why I Am a Baptist, with a Fourth Reason Added on Communion*, 1856, as well as several other books and many essays.

A. C. Dayton, M.D. of New Jersey was another writer who emphasized the restoration of the ancient landmarks of Baptist doctrines. Dayton’s most famous work was *Theodosia Ernest*, a theological novel, which was a study of Biblical baptism. It became very popular. Following this, several Baptist writers began publishing theological novels to promote Baptist doctrines. Dayton’s health was fragile and he later moved to Georgia where he died in 1865. His manner of using the novel to teach Baptist doctrine was more recently used by Richard P. Belcher with his books on the doctrines of grace and church discipline (*A Journey in Grace* and *A Journey in Purity*).

In his essay on J. M. Pendleton in *Baptist Theologians*, Keith E. Eitel says, “In effect Landmark influence both protected the Convention from exposure to the channels of liberal influences and forced a withdrawal from the debate over the nature of the Bible because of ecclesiological principles.” He goes on to say, “The Southern Baptist Convention owes much of its own self-understanding to the Landmark emphasis on the local church, and consequently to Pendleton for forming a biblical definition of a local New Testament church and its legitimate functions.”

*Theology of Baptists*: Early Baptists of America identified with the Particular Baptists of England theologically. The Philadelphia Baptist Association stated their beliefs in Calvinis-
went back to his home church in Boone County and witnessed many people converted there.

In central Kentucky there were thousands of people professing Christ as their Savior and uniting with Baptist churches. South Elkhorn Baptist Church had 309 unite with the church in 1800-1801, mostly by baptism. Bryan Station Baptist had more than 367 unite with the church and Great Crossing Baptist 376. Many Baptist churches were constituted during and following this period. A great host of the men who became pastors were without training, and in many cases there was a weakening of Baptist theology and principles.

Samuel H. Ford emphasizes the positive aspects of this revival, “The Baptists were greatly benefited in several directions. Their number was more than trebled, and new views of the Christian life were obtained. Their preachers had hitherto dwelt chiefly on the doctrines of election, predestination and kindred topics. They did not give up or even modify these doctrines. But they were moved to preach a more symmetrical system, to exhort sinners to repent, and Christians to greater activity.”

Some of the abuses of this movement occurred in central Kentucky at Cane Ridge meeting grounds. It is estimated that as many as 20,000 people attended these prolonged meetings in Bourbon County. Reports of extreme responses were common from participants who had traveled many miles to attend. Many were said to have barked like dogs, climbed trees, and swooned as indications they were being revived. Those of Arminian theology took over as the leaders there and the establishment of the “Christian Church” was a result of the Cane Ridge meetings. Its members were popularly known as Newlights. In Kentucky, they were finally absorbed by the Campbellites.

“These queries were all answered unanimously in the negative.”

J. R. Graves was born in Vermont, went to Ohio to work in a school with his brother; then he went to Jessamine County, Kentucky, where he united with the Mt. Freedom Baptist Church. He was ordained there and a few years later moved to Nashville, Tennessee, where he eventually became the editor of the Tennessee Baptist newspaper. Its circulation grew under his editorial leadership to be the largest Baptist periodical in the nation. He wrote several books defining and defending Baptist doctrines. He became a noted preacher and defender of Baptist principles.

Historian Robert A. Baker said of Graves, “the ecclesiastical views of such an influential man as J. R. Graves (and he never relinquished them) continued to develop polarities in churches, state bodies, and the [Southern Baptist] Convention itself. Strong Landmark leadership was a significant factor in several spin-offs just before and after Graves’ death in 1893.”

The late historian James E. Tull was very opposed to the teachings of J. R. Graves, calling Graves’ views “High Church” tactics. He wrote that J. R. Graves spoke at the 1859 SBC for several hours in favor of direct missions—that is, that individual churches were empowered to send out their own missionaries and support them. Churches could work together in this endeavor, rather than being under the authority of a centralized Foreign Mission Board. Graves argued for the right of local churches to designate their mission funds and that the work would be more scriptural if done by the churches and local associations. Tull called this decentralization “extreme local church independency.” Certainly Tull did not get his ideas of “extreme” local church independency from the New Testament. From this and other examples in his book, he seems more interested in defending denominational structures and attacking
born about nine years after Mercer's famous Circular Letter as the innovator of this theological view. It is true that Graves and a large host of Baptist ministers met at Cotton Grove, Tennessee, in 1851 and asked a series of questions relating to Baptist doctrines, known as *The Cotton Grove Resolutions* in 1851. J. H. Spencer, Kentucky Baptist historian, summed them as follows:

“These resolutions, as they were termed, were presented in the form of queries, as follows:

“1st. Can Baptists, consistently with their principles or the Scriptures, recognize those societies not organized according to the pattern of the Jerusalem Church, but possessing different governments, different officers, different class of members, different ordinances, doctrines, and practices, as churches of Christ?”

“2d. Ought they to be called gospel churches or churches in a religious sense?

“3d. Can we consistently recognize the ministers of such irregular and unscriptural bodies as gospel ministers?

“4th. (This queries the propriety of inviting ministers of other religious bodies into Baptist pulpits, or otherwise recognizing them as ministers of the gospel.)

“5th. Can we consistently address as brethren those professing Christianity, who not only have not the doctrine of Christ and walk not according to his commandments, but are arrayed in bitter opposition to them?”

Another group, which developed following the revival, took the name of Cumberland Presbyterians, who were less Calvinistic than the earlier group. The Methodists greatly increased, and there was a renewed interest in their enthusiasm for the doctrine of perfect sanctification. Deism, in various forms, was prevalent during the period; it was not wholly destroyed, but was greatly weakened and gradually lost its influence.

As the remnants of the revival spirit moved to the eastern coast and then north, it finally, by the 1830’s and 1840’s, manifested itself in several different forms, primarily in western New York. The “revelations” of William Miller led to the establishment of the Seventh-Day Adventists. Joseph Smith’s “revelations” led to the establishment of the Mormons. Several communal systems developed: the Shakers developed a half-dozen communes in Ohio and Kentucky, and several other communes developed that have now expired.

*United Baptists (1801):* Separate Baptists came out of the First Great Awakening that took place primarily in New England and along the Atlantic Coastal states. Shubal Stearns and Daniel Marshall were Separate Baptists who came from Connecticut to Sandy Creek, North Carolina, in the mid-1700’s. The Separates were evangelistic and were less Calvinistic than the Regular Baptists. Many of these believers had come previously from a Congregational background that held to sprinkling as baptism.

In 1801, there was an agreement between the Separates and the Regulars in Virginia that they would fellowship with each other’s churches and accept each other’s baptisms. When the Regular Baptists of central Kentucky heard this they arranged to have a meeting with the Separates and agreed to fellowship and called themselves the United Baptists. The Separates did not hold to the doctrine of “limited atonement,” but
both groups said they would not make that doctrine a test of their fellowship.

**Mission Movement:** William Carey, a Baptist from England, felt called to India to carry the Gospel to that foreign land. He, Andrew Fuller, and others formed the Baptist Missionary Society through which they solicited funds to enable Mr. Carey to go as a missionary in the 1790’s. American Baptists were also interested in the furtherance of the Gospel and the Massachusetts Missionary Society was established in 1802; they began publishing the *Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine* the following year.

When Adoniram Judson, his wife, Ann, and Luther Rice sailed from America for India in 1812 for a different denomination, they studied the issue of baptism while en route and came to Baptist convictions concerning immersion. They were baptized at the Baptist Chapel in Calcutta in September 1812. Luther Rice returned to America and promoted the cause of foreign missions. In 1814, men from many sections of the country met in Philadelphia and formed the General Missionary Convention. They met every three years to discuss missionary business, so the organization was usually referred to as the Triennial Convention. This effort lasted until there was a division of sentiments over slavery issues and the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention in 1845.

**Antimission Movement:** In the early nineteenth century as Americans began seeing the need to send missionaries to foreign lands, they began efforts to enlist their churches to support the mission cause. Some Baptists refused to accept any missionary efforts; along with that, they rejected the issues of education for ministers, Bible and tract societies, Sunday schools or what they referred to as benevolent societies. They generally refused to pay for ministerial efforts and saw all of these as unbiblical practices. They began withdrawing from Regular Baptists in 1832 following a Black Rock, Maryland, nearly all over the state and Baptist churches greatly recovered from the effects of Campbell’s and Scott’s attacks upon them.

“The same can be said of Indiana. Daniel Parker had disseminated a rancorous antinomianism through a large portion of that state, and the Baptist cause was extremely low. The revival of ’37-8 changed the whole aspect of things and Parker’s “two-seedism” received a blow from which it never recovered.

“In Illinois Jesse Sweet and Jacob Bower led a series of revivals in which thousands were converted, and in Missouri A. P. Williams and R. S. Thomas became instruments of extensive revivals. The same may be said of Tennessee and especially of Georgia where the labors of Adiel Sherwood and Charles Mallory were signally blessed” (*Ford’s Christian Repository*, 1899).

**Landmarkism:** Jesse Mercer (for whom Mercer University was named) wrote a Circular Letter for the Georgia Baptist Convention in 1811 concerning the proper mode and authority in baptism. He addressed the issue of Baptist churches receiving persons into their membership who had been sprinkled or immersed by ministers who were not properly baptized and ordained and therefore did not have proper authority to administer Biblical baptism. Baptisms by others than ordained Baptist ministers were considered “alien,” that is: not according to the Scriptural pattern. The Philadelphia Baptist Association had written about this matter in 1788 and decided against the validity of such baptisms. This issue, along with close communion, would later be called tenants of Landmarkism.

J. R. Graves is usually termed the “Father” of Landmarkism. It seems absurd that historians would label someone
much opposition to this new practice. The anti-missionary element, which was still in the churches, was especially bitter in its opposition to this innovation on old customs. Many, if not all, of this element deemed any extra effort to bring sinners to repentance an encroachment on the divine prerogative. But anti-missionaries were soon reconciled to the change, and protracted meetings, or, as they were often called, effort meetings, became an established custom. This put an end to the old-time revivals. Hitherto, these general religious awakenings occurred about once in ten years, and continued from eighteen to thirty-six months. During the intervals the churches were inert, and few additions were made to them except by letter. Between the close of the revival of 1827 and the beginning of that of 1837, the Baptists of Kentucky sustained a clear loss of about 13,000 members, nearly 10,000 of whom, however, had been carried off by the Campbellite schism. But during the first three years of the revival of 1837, they made a clear gain of nearly 18,000, and it is probable that they gained at least 12,000 during the next three years. This fruitful revival, unlike those which had occurred before, did not cease at all; but has continued with various ebbs and flows to the present time. And the denomination in Kentucky has increased from 32,000 in 1837, to more than 200,000 in 1899. What hath God wrought for the Baptists of Kentucky?

“Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Missouri felt—though not to the same degree—the effects of this awakening. Dr. Lynd, pastor in Cincinnati, witnessed an extensive revival in the Ninth Street Church of which he was pastor. Revivals occurred meeting and took the designation of “Primitive” or “Old School” Baptists. Some of these labeled themselves as “Predestinarian” Baptists. They not only refused to support these efforts to spread the Gospel that most Baptists of our nation were supporting, but many of them actually fought against what they called new innovations.

Daniel Parker is often thought of as the early leader of the antimission movement, but he is more noted for his unique doctrine known as the Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit theory, which many Primitive Baptists did not accept. He taught that each individual is born either with a good seed from God or an evil seed from Satan and that alone determines their destiny. Parker's greatest influence was in western Indiana and eastern Illinois where he became prominent in the 1820's. The Baptist Encyclopedia (1881) is not very kind in its evaluation of Parker: “he was without education, uncouth in manners, slovenly in dress, diminutive in person, and unprepossessing in appearance.” He was forceful in his cause and spent his latter days in Texas.

The Primitive Baptists, though rejecting “all societies,” did believe in associations. Two prominent associations, Licking and Salem Predestinarian, began in Kentucky in the early part of the nineteenth century and expired by the end of the century. The Primitives are still very alive today in certain sections of the country.

Campbellism: Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander, were Scotch Presbyterians who left Scotland and moved to Pennsylvania. They became convinced that the “infant sprinkling for baptism” views they had been taught were not Biblical and sought baptism by immersion from a Baptist minister who lived near the Pennsylvania border in Ohio. They came to see baptism as an essential part of salvation, not as a symbol of the work of God in a sinner’s heart that merely demonstrates the work of God’s regeneration. They soon after moved to Vir-
ginia and later moved to Kentucky where Alexander began proclaiming the importance of baptism by immersion.

He was an eloquent man and as he debated Presbyterian and Methodist ministers and pointed out their unscriptural practice of sprinkling as a substitute for Biblical immersion for baptism, he caught the attention of many Baptists. At first he did not clearly emphasize his view that there was salvational merit in immersion: that is: “baptism is for the remission of sins.” But as he began a religious newspaper called The Christian Baptist and later changed to The Millennial Harbinger, it became apparent that his views were not historic Baptist doctrines. He also emphasized that creeds were not Biblical and called himself a Reformer. He and his followers gained access to many Baptist churches and took them, or portions, into his camp. He referred to his followers as the Church of Christ, and later as the Christian Church.

The Dover Baptist Association of Virginia in 1832, after experiencing tremendous divisiveness in their churches by the followers of Campbell, referred the subject to a committee consisting of James B. Taylor, J. B. Jeter, and others. The following preamble and resolution was adopted by the association:

“This association having been from its origin, blessed with uninterrupted harmony, and a high degree of religious prosperity, has seen with unspeakable regret, within a few years past, the spirit of speculation, controversy and strife, growing up among some of the ministers and churches within its bounds. This unhappy state of things has evidently been produced by the preaching and writings of Alexander Campbell, and his adherents. After having deliberately and prayerfully examined the doctrines held, and propagated by them, and waited long to witness their practical influence on the churches, and upon society in general, we are thoroughly convinced that they are doctrines not according to godliness, but subversive of the true spirit of the gospel of Jesus Christ—disorganizing and demoralizing in their tendency; and, therefore, ought to be disavowed and resisted, by all the lovers of truth and sound piety.”

Campbell’s views had been taught earlier in Scotland and were known as Sandemanianism; it was earlier discredited as heresy, but was later adopted and further developed by the Campbells and spread on the frontier of America mainly by their efforts.

Complete Religious Toleration: Though religious freedom was generally practiced throughout the nation by the nineteenth century, it was not until 1831 that the Massachusetts state legislature voted in favor of disestablishment. In 1833, the third article of the 1780 Declaration of Rights was finally replaced. The new article promoted religious freedom and prohibited any form of establishment by the state. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution was finally recognized by this New England State.

Other Revivals in the Century: Samuel H. Ford writing on recurring revivals in the nineteenth century said,

“Protracted meetings first came in vogue during this great religious awakening. Hitherto, even during revival seasons, the churches met only in their regular days of worship—usually one Saturday and Sunday in each month—with an occasional night meeting, generally at some private residence. The most courageous preacher would hardly dare go beyond a three-day’s meeting. But during the revival the preachers began to extend the time to a week, and finally two weeks. There was, at first,