

Some
CRITICAL
LECTURES
ON
BAPTIST SUCCESSION

by

A Follower of the Lamb if His Heart Does Not Deceive Him

R. E. Pound

Published by:

Those Who Have A Reason To Hope They Are

A Flock Of Sheep or A Baptized Church of Jesus Christ Known as:

©

**The Old Faith Baptist Church
Rt. 1, Box 517
Magazine, Arkansas, 72943
Ph. 501-963-6221**

No part of this work may be copied or reproduced without prior written consent from the publishers.

1993

The Foundation For This Work

1. At the first coming of Jesus Christ, He established a **New and Everlasting Covenant**; which included, but was not limited to, His people, His statutes and His ordinances;
2. He **engaged** Himself to **bring** His People into the *Visible* and *Orderly Manifestations* of His Covenant, which includes, but is not limited to, believer's baptism, the gospel church and its ordinances, as **parts** of the **whole** Covenant;
3. These *Visible* and *Orderly* Manifestations of Christ's **New and Everlasting Covenant** have an *unbroken succession* from Christ's **First Coming** to His **Second Coming**;
4. Outraged at his failure to **overcome** Jesus Christ, Satan has turned all his rage, war and deception towards Christ's Covenant and all its particular parts;
5. Satan seeks to *counterfeit and destroy* the *manifested and orderly succession* of Christ's **New and Everlasting Covenant** which includes, but is not limited to, His saints, His Churches of Saints, and His ordinances for His Saints;
6. Satan has used the Jews, the Gentiles, the Pagan Rulers, and then the Roman and Greek Catholic Churches as his earlier tools to destroy Christ's kingdom;
7. This all failed. Satan used a new approach, the **Protestant Reformation** and its influence, to murder and persecute the saints and their churches. Now he uses the *doctrines* and *practices* of the **Protestant Reformers** to infiltrate, influence, and weaken the saints and their churches;
8. Satan is using Calvin's **theology** and **church order** to a great advantage;
9. Since the *social revolutions* in Europe, 1840s-1860s, and the *American Civil War*, Satan's agents and their doctrines are among the Baptized churches as a new type of ordinances, ministry and historians;
10. These are the **DOWNGRADED** Calvinized or Protestant Baptists with their several offspring;
11. This *era* of the **DOWNGRADERS** is characterized by *anti-Trinitarians*, *anti-particular redemption*, *anti-human depravity*, *anti-predestination*, and *anti-inspiration* of the Sacred Scriptures in their original tongues;

12. The **DOWNGRADERS** produced their own **human inventions**, with their own ministers, church members, theologians, historians and doctrines, all in the place of Christ's;
13. The **DOWNGRADERS** all, with one voice, **deny** the **Divine Origin** and **Unbroken Succession** of the Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ;
14. The **Pre-downgrade** historians **all** believed in the *inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures in their original tongues*. They also believed in the **divine origin** and **unbroken succession** of the Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ.
15. This treatise maintains the **older, original**, pre-downgrade concepts of *Baptist origins and their unbroken succession*.
16. The Baptized people and their churches have stood alone among the nations. They are beyond the control of the Beast's hireling ministers and their creeds and confessions. This is why they have been so hated and persecuted.

BY WORD OF CAUTION

Since the first coming of Jesus Christ, there has been a constant attempt to downgrade Him and His followers. This attempt was very real during His life and times. The major, established religions bodies always tried to discredit Him when He came into contact with their views and practices. It has not changed since that time. Downgraders are in most, if not all, religious organizations. In these, they continue their efforts.

The Downgraders are in **UNION** with the *earthly systems*. They know *only* what is capable of being known as a **natural, brute beast**. They *cover-up* their **nakedness** by their own mental, natural ability and reasoning. That is their **fig leaf**. The standard of their theology is some Government's religious council and its creed. The Downgrader bases his concepts on whatever the established religious systems determine are the standard for theology and religion. Therefore, it is not safe to take any civil-religious creed for the standard of theology, faith and order. Earthly powers and their systems are not the rule for the followers of Jesus Christ.

The **Beast's systems** always are in conflict with Christ's *faith, order, worship* and *works*. Therefore, they will use all means to discredit Christ and His faith. Antichrist has **his own views** of the *Trinity, salvation, justification, the church, the ordinances, church members, and their standard of holiness and good works*. Everything which is not **measured** according to the *Creeds and Confessions* of the Civil-Religious governments is heresy. More than heresy, it is *dangerous*. It is dangerous to the *establishment's Priests and Ministers*. Therefore, all **dissenters** are thought to be a danger to the state. This in turn makes it dangerous for the **citizens** of the state. The dissenters offer little or no hope for **salvation** to anyone. To safeguard the government's interests its religious-political systems, the **self-seeking, hireling ministers** have condemned *all others* as the worst sort of heretics and apostates ever to walk on the earth.

During Baptist history there have been **several** downgrading eras. Each era is precipitated by a **lowering** of the standards of true and Biblical Christianity. Then, is gross darkness and ignorance which **overcomes** the *churches and ministers*. When this happens,

it always follows that the **standard** of all faith and practice is borrowed from the **established religion**. The **voices** of the *established religious' leaders* are always heard *rather* than the **voices** of the *former followers of Jesus Christ*. Then, **the old faith and its practices** are *cut off*. New *practices*, to **support** a new *faith*, are brought in. The *former ministers of Christ* are condemned as heretics of the worst sort. The **witnesses** for this *condemnation* are the old voices of their **enemies**. Baptist's enemies are used as a **testimony** to determine the **soundness** or **lack of soundness** of the older and former Baptist ministers and their views. Since the Protestant Reformation, the English and Welsh Baptists have passed through several major downgrading eras.

The **Continental Anabaptists** have passed through several of these *eras*. Their story must be told later, in another volume. Mostly the **English and Welsh Particular Baptists** are considered in this lecture. The **American Baptists** are entirely different in their eras.

Remember, it does *not matter* **what** the Downgraders have said about the Baptists. *Most of their statement cannot be trusted*. Neither can those statements be trusted which have been made by their followers, even among the so-called Baptists. Here are some examples:

1. The Beast's ministry has **labeled** as *Antitrinitarian* most Baptists because most Baptists have rejected the Beast's Trinity;
2. The Beast's hireling ministers have **labeled** most Baptists with opposing either baptism or infant's salvation;
3. The Beast's ministers and priests have claimed that most Baptists have denied the need for due order and ordination, which is always according to Civil Government.

Also remember that in history only an **accusation** was necessary to bring a **suspected** dissenter to trial or even to condemnation and death. A **dissenter** was always **guilty** until he could prove himself *innocent*. Everyone was called an Anabaptist whether or not he was. The **Roman Catholics** even called one another *Anabaptists* during the days of Henry the 8th's inquisition, Crosby, Volume 1, pages 42, 43. In addition, all heretics, especially the German ones, were called Anabaptists, *Ibid.*, p. 47.

During the times of Crenmer, the late 1500s, two different types of Anabaptists existed in England, the **Predestinationists** and the **Arminians**, the former differed mostly from the Protestants on infant's baptism, Crosby, *ibid.*, p. 57.

I have said these things to **forewarn** you, dear reader, of the sad and evil **attitudes** toward our forefathers. The Beast's **hireling** ministers and their children condemn the **old Baptists** and deny our *most sure and true Baptist succession*. The Downgraders always take the side of the *Beast and his hireling ministers*. The Downgraders **only say what Baptist enemies have been saying**. The Downgrader's standards are the **Government's Creeds and Confessions**. These are always in **conflict** with Christ's **Creed and Confession** which is maintained by His *people*.

The following pages are a brief survey of the eras involving the English and Welsh Particular Baptists since their rise in England in 1633. This is **not to say** that the

Particular Baptists arose then for the first time, for they did not. That date only *marks* the beginning of the first *lasting* Particular Baptist Churches in England and Wales since the terrible times of Archbishop Laud and the Star Chamber.

Laud tried to establish his own **Vatican** in England. He followed the lead of **Luther** in Germany, **Calvin** in Geneva, **Knox** in Scotland and **Zwingli** in Zurich. **All these men** were *bloodthirsty murders* of Christ's people. They established their **religious systems** with their own *creeds* and *confessions*. All religion had to be **judged** by these systems with their creeds and confessions. The old Anabaptists **refused** these religions systems with their creeds and confessions. The Protestants persecuted the Anabaptists from the **Protestant Reformation** to near the *close of the 1600s*. The **Prince of Orange** exercised a strong influence *not only* in England and Wales, but *also in* Europe in bringing these horrible persecutions to a close, in most cases, by the 1690s. Even before the times of **William and Mary**, the *Prince of Orange* saved many poor Anabaptists from certain and horrible death by the hands of the European Protestants. In **Fox's Martyrology**, the Latin and early English editions, these things are presented. In the **Martyr's Mirror** they are documented as well. **Both** of these works were issued in lasting and fair editions in the early and mid 1600s. The Particular Baptists were driven out of England during Laud's days. Some sought refuge in Holland even before his rise to power. These churches were disbanded in most cases. We have been able to find only **two** which lasted through that era, the one at **Hill Cliff** and the one at **The Hop Garden**, in the *Abingdon* area. Laud *almost* succeeded. But there were enough English dissenters then to stop that terrible work. They rallied around **Oliver Cromwell**.

These **Lectures** cover from 1633 to the present date **only** in their treatment of the different *eras* which have effected **Particular Baptists** and *the attitudes about their own Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession back to Christ* which have developed since then. These **Lectures** are only a *brief survey*. They *do not* enter into many of the **original** documents. At one time, I had **most** of these documents. I **don't** have them now. I have found the different Baptist historians to be *mostly trustworthy*, **except the Downgraders**. **Always**, the Downgraders try to *disprove* the *Divine Origin* of the Baptists and their *Unbroken Succession* back to Jesus Christ. They do this in order to disprove the need for the Baptists to be a **separate people alone from all others**. Therefore, they *group* them among the **daughters** of Rome and *place* their succession through Rome by **means** of the *Protestants*. No **falsehood** is too *harsh* to be repeated, no **historian** is too *honored* to be misrepresented and no **gossip** is too *base* to be told about the old Anabaptists in order to **discredit** them and **separate** them from those who are the present day *old school* Particular Baptists.

Their history **remains** to be told. This effort is an **introduction** to that history. Someone day, perhaps, someone will have most of the parts to tell the whole story. Somewhere locked up in some Library there has to remain a lot of information about the English refugees who led to Holland during the early 1600s. This is where men like John Spilsbury and John Norcott came into contact with the old Waldenses. There they received their historic baptism, according to John Lewis. While in exile the historic old Particular Baptist Church which met at Norwich, as a closed communion church, because a Baptist Church. They fled from England as a dissenting church. They seemed to return as a Baptist Church. In this same era, men like Captain John Turner were imprisoned in England. Some didn't make it out in time.

I must close for now. I hope these accounts increase your desires for a more factual and complete history of our forefathers in the faith.

A Debtor to Mercy

R. E. Pound II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Foundation for this Work	p. 2
By Word of Caution	p. 3
Foreword	p. 10
Introduction to the Whole	p. 11
Lecture 1 The Old Baptists, An Alternative to Modern Christianity	p. 12
Lecture 2 Baptist Concepts About Baptist Succession	p. 17
Lecture 3 What Have the Old Baptists Believed About Their Succession?	p. 35
Lecture 4 Baptist Succession in the 1600s	p. 51
Lecture 5 Testimony from Baptist Enemies as to Baptist Succession	p. 68
Lecture 6 The Form of Baptist Succession	p. 73
Conclusion to the Whole	p. 79
Appendix 1 The Vindication of Henry D'Anvers	p. 82
Appendix 2 <i>The Baptists</i> , the article from The Baptist Encyclopedia	p. 86
Appendix 3 The Vindication of William Jones and the Waldenses	p. 90

FOREWORD

I preached the substance of this message at the annual Bible Conference of the Pinehaven Baptist Church, Columbus, MS March 1975. The late Elvis Gregory was then the Pastor.

The First Baptist Church of Nappanee, Indiana, where Brother Ralph Hawkins is the Pastor, voted to share in the expenses of printing this lecture. They did so nearly 20 years ago.

This does not mean either of these two churches endorse all the conclusions in these lectures. Nor does it mean that **The Old Faith Baptist Church** is one with these Churches.

Over the past nearly 20 years the material has taken a more organized and larger format. Therefore, one lecture has become several. Quite naturally, that is par for the course!

R. E. Pound II

INTRODUCTION TO THE WHOLE

There have been many epic periods throughout Baptist history. Certain men within the churches have caused these epic periods. They did so by teaching *doctrines and practices* contrary to the Lord Jesus Christ. The old Baptists maintained Christ's faith and order during their **long and unbroken succession in that old faith and order**. The last epic period was 1800-1866. It covered two generations. When this era was finished, most of the Baptists were totally different from those of the previous **1800** years. This epic period is covered well by Dr. David Benedict in his **Fifty Years Among the Baptists**.

In my early years, I worked with Dr. R. L. Crawford and *The Missionary Baptist Church*, Hayward, Calif., in reprinting Dr. Benedict's informative work. Our edition sold out very quickly. Then **The Missionary Baptist Seminary**, Little Rock, AR reprinted it. I suppose they still have some in stock.

Following 1866, Baptists did not feel these results until near the close of the 1800s. Since the 1900s most Baptist churches in America have drifted rapidly and steadily into Protestantism. Some into **Calvinistic** Protestantism. Some into **Arminian** Protestantism. This is a **subtle, steady** and **deadly** drift. It is like cancer. Those who have it mostly don't know they have it. This drift has become very rapid. It has manifested itself several different ways. These manifestations are the results of the deadly drift and not the causes.

There are now more Baptist Churches in America, with more church members, and ministers, than at any other time. But, these are not Baptists according to the historic and Biblical standards. Modern Baptists do not reflect the old and historic Baptist faith, order, worship and works as found in and maintained by the **historic** and **bloody** unbroken succession or trail of our forefathers all the way back to Christ and His Apostles.

In the chapter which follows, I have given a general survey of some of the important theological differences between the **modern** Baptists and the **old** Baptists. Now I want to call attention to this important epic as it regards the historic awareness of Baptists as to their *Succession and Divine Origin*.

By the terms "**old Baptists**" I **do not refer** to any group calling themselves Old Baptists or Old School Baptists. I simply mean those Baptists before the 1860s. By the terms "**new Baptists**," I mean those post American Civil War Baptists. The American Civil War changed the religious structure in the South. All America became one in apostate Christianity as the South joined the Northeast. Finally the West fell. America became one

in its admiration of the Beast in all his systems. Then, from this new Christianity, the religious life of the entire world has been refashioned into a new form of **Gospel Socialism** to work with political socialism.

Both **Gospel** and **Political Socialism** are rooted in *Arminianism*, *Unitarianism*, and *Universalism*. To secure these desired ends, the ministers and agents of Antichrist, both in religion and politics, entered into a tremendous **DOWNGRADING** effort.

Coming from the last downgrading efforts which produced the terrible drift modern Baptists are now in, we find these destructive features:

1. Baptists are not of a Divine Origin anymore than anybody else is;
2. They have no succession before the 1600s, the General Baptists about 1610 and the Particular Baptists from about 1641;
3. Baptists have no connecting links with any of the Dark Ages groups.

Therefore, Baptists are simply one of the many none-Roman Catholic or Protestant bodies of the Western world, so we are told.

To **accomplish** this, those whom I call the **Downgraders** or the **Downgrader Historians** totally *ignore* the original records, documents and writings of the Anabaptists. The Downgraders **distort** the facts and **quote** from **false reports** and **records** in an effort to justify themselves and their *pretended* history. The Downgraders are nothing more than Pedobaptists concerning Baptist origins and successions.

How do they accomplish this? They rely upon the statements of Baptist enemies or hostile witnesses, and when they **do quote** from the old Baptists, mostly they quote their writings *before they became Baptists*. Concerning the English and Welsh Baptists, our American forefathers, their misrepresentations can be grouped as follows:

1. There were no Baptist type of old Waldenses;
2. John Wycliffe, and others like him, were not Baptists;
3. The Baptists simply appeared and started up on their own without any succession or connection;
4. John Spilsbury, the Pioneer Baptist minister who established the mother Pre-Calvinistic Particular Baptist Church near London, at Wapping in 1633, is usually slandered and misrepresented in several different ways;
5. Roger Williams is made into a Baptist, when he was not a Baptist any days of his life.

The evil work of *rewriting true Baptist history* with **false Baptist history** or *wish history*, is not limited to the English and Welsh Baptists and their historic succession and divine origin. **Wish history** goes back into the 1500s and concerns itself with the old Continental Anabaptists, some of whom were called Mennonites.

Some of the later generations of Mennonites followed the Protestants into sprinkling and abandoned dipping. This was not true of the earlier generation of Continental Anabaptists who were contemporary with the Reformers. It can be shown that these old Anabaptists generally passed from Pedobaptist into Anabaptists and then defended the Anabaptists by their **post-conversion writings**. Their **post conversion writings** are *always ignored* in favor of their **pre-conversion** Pedobaptist writings. In addition, their

original languages are mostly ignored as well. Some of the modern generation of Mennonite historians are helping to distort the history and practice of such men as Menno Simons and some others of that era. The **sprinkling** Mennonites have their own historians who must justify their modern practices. They claim their history **is in sprinkling** rather than **in dipping**. They are **only** partly correct. Since they exchanged sprinkling for dipping, that is true. It has not always been true any more with the **Mennonites** than with the old **Waldenses**. The history of the **Continental Anabaptists** and their doctrinal positions in the 1500s is only hinted at in these lectures. That history must wait for another time.

Remember, the **Downgraders** are among all the churches no matter their name or denomination. This only fulfills what the Scriptures teach will always happen. The Downgraders always deny the:

Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession of the Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ.

Because

The Downgraders **do not appreciate Jesus Christ and His atonement**. They don't view the **Scriptures as Divinely Inspired** in *their original languages*. Therefore, **they do not consider the saint's gospel obedience as the sure and certain results of the purpose of God in the atonement of Jesus Christ**. Consequently, they do not understand that **all the gospel acts of the saints, in their good works, are included as sure and certain in the Everlasting Covenant**. They fail to understand the simple Gospel truths that Jesus Christ:

1. Died to save a people from their sins, not leave them in their sins;
2. Died to deliver a people from the present, evil world; not to leave them undelivered in this world;
3. Died to bring a people unto God, not leave them on their own to come unto God;
4. Died to cleanse us from all evil works and cause us to be zealous of all good works, not leave us in Babylon to follow Antichrist in his works.

Nor do they understand that God's Decrees are **inclusive** in that:

1. Those who are **saved by grace** are **also ordained unto good works**;
2. These **good works** are the **sure and certain** results of God's **DECREES**;
3. The elect **always obey**, not always as **quickly**, nor with the same amount of **fruit**, but they always obey because God works in them **both to will and to do** of His good pleasure. He makes them to differ according to His measure of Grace and gifts.
4. These **predetermined good works**, which God **causes** His elect *always* to obey, are **not conditions or causes**, but **manifestations of life formed first within**.
5. These manifestations are the **fruits showing the tree is first good** and then it bears good fruits.

Downgraders certainly **do not** understand the **exaltation** of Jesus Christ as the **King, Priest and Prophet** of God to His saints and Churches of Saints, in that:

1. As **God's King** over all creation He guides and controls all events so that all things, both **good and evil** fall out for the good of His people and the furtherance of His glory. Christ comes to His people in their natural state and **conquers** and **subdues** them in their quickening and conversion. Then He **rules and reigns** in His Saints, and Churches of Saints, so they can **now join Him** in His rule over the **saved nations**. Further, this rule will be expanded into **all its primeval fullness and glory** in the New Heavens and upon the New Earth, during the *eternal ages*. The elect **never** reign over the **goat nations**. Christ **does**, but the saints **do not**.

2. As **God's Priest** over God's **House or Temple**, Christ **makes** His people **clean and holy** by His *one offering*. Therefore, when they are fully **sanctified** by Christ alone, by Him they are made **Kings and Priests** unto God the Father *with* Jesus Christ. Because Christ has made them sanctified and holy, the Kings and Priests of God, the saints, now **manifest** this in their **good and holy works**. These good and holy works are **Temple or House** works. They are all built upon the **form** which Jesus Christ established.

3. As **God's Prophet or Teacher**, to God's Saints and Churches of Saints, Christ **teaches His people how** they are to **live** in **His Faith**, **walk** in **His order**, **enter** into **His Worship**, and **follow** in **His good works**. He teaches them who they are, and unto Whom they belong. Because **He is such a good Teacher**, and not because of anything they do, have done, or shall do, they **know** God, their election, and eternal life. They **know** the true faith, order, worship and works of God because Jesus Christ teaches them **these things** and gives them His Holy Spirit within them and upon them as **His witness and helper to them** as they do these good works. Because Jesus is such a **good Prophet and Teacher of God**, His people **know Him**, His **truths**, His order and His **eternal life**. They also **know** that they *know* these things.

The **Downgraders** and their **Children**, among all the churches, deny most, if not all, of these points. That is not **unusual**. Christ has not **revealed Himself** nor **His Father** to them. So they have no **experimental knowledge** of Jesus Christ. Neither has He given them a **gospel comprehension** of these things. Their Downgradism is simply a **manifestation or fruit**. It shows who they are and unto whom they belong.

R. E. Pound II

June, 1993

Lecture I

The Old Baptists,

An Alternative to Modern Christianity.

As you consider these Lectures, I want you to realize that **modern Baptists** are **not** what these lectures are about. **Modern Baptists** are *not* built upon the New Testament pattern **established** by Jesus Christ and **worked out** by His apostles under the **direction and power of the Holy Spirit**. Modern Baptists are built upon **human inventions** and **apostate** Christianity. Here are some points which I feel must be understood:

Modern Baptists are Theological Apostates.

I.

The Doctrines of Grace

It is an historical fact that the **Baptist Succession** is through those who believed in **the doctrines of grace**. These people were known also as **Predestinarians**. They were often condemned by their enemies, the Roman and Greek Catholics, as **Predestinarians**.

1) Deniers of these Divine Truths are called General Baptists in England and Free-Will and General Baptists in America.

2) Most American Baptists do not claim any union with the Free-Will or General Baptists in America, but they are **one in theology with them on most points**.

II.

An Experience of Grace

The **Baptist Succession** is through those who believed in an **experience of grace** or **the new birth**, as a requirement for baptism and church membership.

1) Yes, most modern Baptists **claim to believe in the new birth**, but what is their new birth but simply a human experience or their free-will choice? They call their **natural or mental decision** a new birth. Of course, it is not.

2) The modern concept of the new birth is simply a natural choice or a mental decision which is worked out by going forward in a church invitation and then being baptized and attending church.

3) The old Baptists believed in an experience of grace or **enablement** of the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner Who brought the sinner to repentance and faith. The sinner's faith is in Jesus Christ as his only and alone Prophet, Priest and King. Modern Baptists have no comprehension of these things. They try to avoid Jesus Christ in most cases, except in lip service once in a while. They seldom preach Christ and Him crucified, but simply about religious things. Their services are like religious lectures or general counseling sessions. You could go to a religious survey course in a secular college and hear as much as you hear in modern Baptist churches.

III.

The Supernatural Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures

The old Baptists believed in the **supernatural inspiration** of the *Scriptures* of the Old and New Testaments in their original languages of Hebrew and Greek. They did not believe any other writings were so inspired. This meant that the Sacred Scriptures were the **alone and only rule of life, faith and practice** for the Christian and the Christian churches.

1) Modern Baptists don't even know what the Holy Scriptures are. They are trying to bring all kinds of modern versions into their Christianity. These modern versions all come from **anti-Trinitarian texts**.

2) Because modern Baptists don't know what the Scriptures are, and use **Roman Catholic or Jewish texts**, they have no rest upon Christ's sure Word. Therefore, they have no respect for the Scriptures as the only sure and perfect revelation of Christ as His way for His people. Therefore, in comes all manner of human inventions to help Christians help Christ reach as many people with the Gospel as they can. They **drain** the church members of their money under a type of ***gospel socialism called mission work***.

IV.

God's Purpose in Christ's Death

The old Baptists believed Jesus Christ died for a definite number of people. He did in fact bear their sins. Therefore, because of the purpose of God in the death of Jesus Christ, all these for whom He died shall be saved by Him. He uses ways and means to bring them unto Himself, but only those ways and means which He has instituted in His New Testament and nothing more. Modern Baptists are apostates on the purpose of God in the death of Jesus Christ. Therefore, they know nothing about the real Christian experience nor the higher Christian life in the **heavenly places** of Jesus Christ now, **on this earth, the gospel church and gospel ordinances**.

1) Old Baptists believed in the **Union and Oneness of Christ and His people**. They may have differed as to what this Union and Oneness meant regarding **eternal union and union in time**, but they believed in Union with Christ and through Him Union with the entire **Beings and Nature of the Eternal Trinity**.

2) Modern Baptists see **no purpose in the death of Christ** except as either an **example** of God's love for us, if we do our part, or a **potential way** opened unto God for those who will let God save them. The modern Baptist says, "**God has done all He can do**, now it is **all up to the sinner**. **God wants to do so much if men will only let Him**." That is apostate because the Word of God **teaches that whatsoever God wants to do**, that *He does and no one can stop Him*.

3) Some modern Baptists are so apostate that they even claim that sinners **can bypass Christ** and **not believe in Him** and **still go to heaven**. Most American Primitive Baptists hold this, (the Conditionalists) as do the large majority of Missionary Baptists who are called by several different names. They teach people will be saved **simply by believing in God**.

4) Modern Baptists have no **comprehension** as to the outworking of **Christ's life in the believer**, after regeneration, in a **living union manifested** by *saving faith and gospel obedience*. Therefore, they don't realize that **obedience to Christ** in all His ordinances and ways is the outworking of spiritual life from within which exists first. The **dead sinner cannot repent or believe or do any gospel works**. **He is dead**.

V.

Trinitarians

Modern Baptists are a mixture of **Semi-Unitarians** or **Unitarians**. They are not Biblical Trinitarians. True, most believe in a **form of the Trinity**, but it is mostly the Protestant or Roman Catholic concept of the Trinity which is semi-Unitarian and heathen.

VI.

The Beings and Attributes of God

Modern Baptists have no comprehension of the **nature, character or attributes of God**. To them He is either like the Wicked Witch of the North or Santa Clause. Therefore, they cannot see the **purpose of God** in the ordering of all events so that they **happen according to His eternal purpose**.

VII.

Prophecy

Modern Baptists are **total apostates** on the historic Baptist position on prophecy. Therefore, they either hold to **hyper dispensationalism or Origen's a-mill or gospel-millism**. They think everybody should hold either to **Scofieldism or Origenism**. You either must hold to a form of **Zionism (Scofieldism or Phariseeism) or Pedobaptist Nationalism (Gospel or A-Millism)**. They would tell us there are no other prophetic expectations except from the Pharisees, or the Infant Baptizers and their national church concepts.

VIII.

The Church and The Ministry

Modern Baptists mostly believe in the **invisible** church. (This is Protestantism. The Bible does not teach about an **invisible** church.) Therefore, they feel that the gospel church or the local church as they call it, is simply an outlet of the larger invisible church. Hence, the gospel church is not very important. All the promises of succession and Christ's promises and blessings apply to the **invisible** church or to personal believers and not to the gospel church, so we are told. They also hold that the ministry is a servant of the church and not a servant of Jesus Christ. Therefore, the ministry must be bound to the will of the deacons, the boards, the conventions, the ladies' auxiliaries and such like. They have no comprehension about the Gospel church as the only church. Modern Baptists don't understand that the ministers are Christ's servants. Christ calls and empowers them. Of course, most of theirs are not called by Christ but by men.

1) Certainly the terms church, body and temple are used in a **particular way** in the New Testament and also in an **enlarged way**. The **enlarged way** takes in the sum total of **all the particular gospel churches in one mystical or general bond or union**. The term church cannot refer to a visible, local, organized assembly and then a universal, invisible unorganized assembly at the same time. That is a violation of the very term **ekklesia** or church, **soma** or body, or **hieron** or temple. This enlarged concept is explained quite well in **The Particular Baptist Records, 1650-1660**. In addition, Hansard Knollys explains the nature and usages of the term church in his **Commentary on the Book of Revelation**, London; 1688. A **Particular** Church is a gospel church constituted on gospel faith and gospel baptism.

2) Certainly the **ministry is Christ's gift to His church**. His servants minister by a spiritual gift. They must be free to serve Christ. Ministers are **never in bondage** to any **men or extra-church organizations**. They are **commissioned** by the gospel church. That **commission is all they need** in order to do the **orderly work of the ministry**. When a church **votes on everything the minister wants to do**, that is

unscriptural. True, when it concerns the church, the *church should be involved in the decision*, but I am speaking of the **work the minister is called to do**. That is **between him and the Lord**. Churches are to **follow the minister as he follows Christ, never to lead or bind him**.

3) **Jesus Christ established only a gospel church**. He placed an **able ministry in the church**. This **ministry is taught and empowered by the Lord Himself** through *various and different ways and means*, but **never in violation** of His revealed Scriptures. Human learning is good and a help **when human concerns** are necessary. It is not **necessary to preaching Christ**. The **able ministers** of the New Covenant are **able by their union with Jesus Christ Who empowers them**. The untaught Teacher Himself **teaches and empowers** His ministers. Their *preaching* of the **very same Gospel Christ preached distinguishes** them from all *other ministers men make and teach*. The **gospel church is the only school** Christ established. The **gospel ministers in the gospel church are the only teachers** Christ calls, teaches and empowers. Everything and everyone else is extra Biblical and antichrist or in the place of Christ's church and teachers.

Human Inventions In the Place of Christ's Institutions

Jesus Christ came and established the New and Everlasting Covenant. The Sacred Scriptures of the New Covenant or Testament are the expression of His mind as to what He wants done and how He wants it done. He established all He wanted His people to do and how He wanted them to do it. Everything else not found in the New Testament is of men who are **empowered** by God *to serve Satan to show they are reprobates*. All human additions and inventions are Antichrist.

Churches and Churches Only

Jesus Christ did not establish associations, conventions, mission boards, colleges or seminaries. Nor did He establish tract societies or Bible societies except Gospel Churches. The Gospel church is a complete association. It is a complete tract and Bible society. It is a complete college or seminary. If what you are a member of is not complete, **then it is not of Christ**.

1) Believers are to join together and form a gospel church. But where is it in the Bible that churches joined together to form an association or convention?

2) Churches are complete. They are the fullness of Christ here on earth. They have all the leaders, teachers, pastors and helpers Christ needs or He would have given and ordained more. Where are all the extra church officers found in the New Testament that flood modern Christianity and feed off the saints?

In Church Officers and In Church Ordinances

For a larger discussion of this and what it means and how it has changed among Baptists see my work on the **Lord's Supper**, as practiced by Baptists. Here is what I mean:

1) The only officers of Christ are in a gospel church. All who serve outside of a church, for example, in unscriptural or extra scriptural offices and works, under the name of Christ, are antichrist. Where is an inter-church officer found in the N. T.? Don't justify such by the Apostles, there are no apostles today.

2) The only ordinances observed in the New Testament are in church ordinances. Where is it recorded that believers observed ordinances in a private, social or inner church way?

In Conclusion

Note the following points:

1. **Modern** Baptists **are not** of divine origin **nor** have they had an unbroken succession from Jesus Christ to the present times;
2. **Modern** Baptists are apostates on all major or constitutional Biblical doctrines and theology
3. **Modern** Baptists are involved in all types of human inventions and additions to the simple, complete way of Jesus Christ.
4. **Modern** Baptists are mostly reprobates, that is, they have not Jesus Christ within them;
5. **Modern** Baptist preachers are mostly in a state of nature, being not of Christ, nor divinely called and gifted by Him, but only hirelings who preach for money. Stop all their income and see what happens.

The New Testament teaches that in the **final days** before Christ's Second Coming, there will be a world wide apostasy and forsaking of the true religion of Jesus Christ. Jesus taught that the world would be like Sodom and Gomorra before He returns. Paul taught that the religious people would not endure sound doctrines, but follow after false doctrines and be deceived and seduced by the power of Satan. John taught that the entire world would follow after antichrist except those whose names were **written in the Lamb's Book of Life from the foundation of the world.**

Therefore, when you see what the old Baptists have believed and what their succession is all about, it becomes very simple,

you either serve Christ or Antichrist.

Lecture 2

BAPTISTS' CONCEPTS ABOUT BAPTIST SUCCESSION

Introduction:

Knowing Your Historians!

Please turn and read from 2 Corinthians 10:11-13; Job 8:7-10; Judges 2:7-13 and Matthew 16:18.

The Historical Consensus

Baptists today should know **about** Baptist historians and their views **about** Baptist history and succession. This is what I call the *historical consensus*. A Baptist's *historical theology* includes the historical consensus. All students of Baptist history should realize that **theology** shapes the historian's views.

BAPTIST HISTORIANS SHOW THEIR APPRECIATION OF JESUS CHRIST BY THEIR HISTORICAL PHILOSOPHY

1. *Maintainers of the Verbal Inspiration of the original Scriptures*, also believe in Baptist Church Succession or Perpetuity;

2. *Deniers of the Verbal Inspiration* of the Original Scriptures, also deny Baptist Church Succession or Perpetuity;

3. *Arminians who believed in the Verbal Inspiration of the original Scriptures*, make no attempt to trace their succession by **theology**. They have limited their results and reports to deal only with **outward ordinances and organizations**. Most of the time, these historians have tried to trace out a succession through churches which were **particular redemptionists and absolute predesterians**. They would try to tie themselves onto those churches and claim their succession. A good example of this is the A. B. A. and B. M. A. A. type of modern Baptists with their claims to a succession through the old Particular Baptists of England and Wales.

4. *Particular Baptist who have believed in the Doctrines of Grace and Verbal Inspiration* usually trace their succession by **theology and outward ordinances and organizations**. A good example is **William Jones**.

5. Many of the American Primitive Baptists try to **make** the Particular Baptists into their **type** of Baptists. The old Baptists were not like their types.

All interested students in Baptist History should ask themselves:

1. What does this historian believe about these important doctrines?
2. What does he believe about Baptist origins and Baptist succession?
3. Does he believe in the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ?
4. Does He believe that Jesus Christ **rules** now as a King over all men and nations, devils and demons including Satan?
5. Does he believe that Jesus Christ over rules all events and guides them so as to maintain His people and His churches?
6. Does this historian believe that the faith, order, worship, works and succession of the gospel system of Jesus Christ here on earth, through out church history, is a sure and certain fruit or result of the atonement of Jesus Christ, or merely the acts of men and their free-wills?
7. What does this historian mean by church history? Does he mean a history of the Roman Catholic Church, or the Baptized people of Jesus Christ in His gospel order?

WHAT BAPTIST HISTORY IS AND IS NOT

Baptist church history is **not** the history of the errors and superstitions of Roman or Greek Catholicism. **It is** the history of the faith, order, worship and works which Jesus Christ has

maintained by His Holy Spirit for nearly 2,000 years. Baptist church history is a history of the **way Jesus Christ has walked through His people during His spiritual reign**. It is a record of **how He has been treated by His enemies here on this earth for nearly 2,000 years**. True, ours is an incomplete record. Heaven keeps better records and histories than men do. Therefore, it is important to realize **what** the different Baptist historians **believe about Jesus Christ and His gospel system or churches**.

Why should we have any confidence in what a Baptist historian says who does not believe in the **Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures**, and **does not have a true and proper understanding of the person and work of Jesus Christ**? Such a historian will often do an injustice to the churches and ministers in Baptist succession. An example is the way the modern historians of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland are constantly downgrading the old Particular Baptists.

Growing Up and Facing the Facts About Baptist Historians

Why should we have any confidence in any historian whom we would not recognize as a **born again** person? Why should we recognize the value of any historian whom we could not fellowship with as a member of a gospel church? We should **grow up** and **face the facts**. The Downgrader historians **were and are reprobates**. These historian's **downgraded views of Jesus Christ and His saving work manifest this** to the elect. Their historical philosophy is merely an outgrowth of their **evaluation** of Jesus Christ. Baptist's enemies **have not been honest and reliable**, in the main, in their testimony about Baptists throughout history. The Downgrader historians are merely another **voice** of the old Pedobaptists, the ministers of Satan. This time, Satan's ministers are calling themselves Baptists.

Here are some examples of this:

1. **D. B. Ray** was a violent opposer of the old Particular Baptist theology and order. He wrote his **own** confession of faith and tried to **falsify** history to make it appear that the historic succession was through his faith.

2. The **Downgrader** historians, such as **H. C. Vedder, A. H. Newman, Norman Fox, and William Whitsitt** all denied the **verbal** inspiration of the Scriptures. They could find no Particular Baptists under **immersion** before 1641. They denied the **substitutionary work of Jesus Christ in His death, burial and resurrection**. Is it any wonder they also **denied Baptist church succession**? Gospel succession is a **fruit** of Christ's death, burial and resurrection.

3. The modern denials of Baptist Church Succession, as maintained by all the **Downgrader** historians since the mid-1800s, have all come, **without exception**, from seeds sown by the ministers who made up the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland. George Gould spread his anti-succession through Thomas Armitage in the North and Norman Fox and William Whitsitt in the South. Newman and Vedder are the examples of this in the North. All the modern Southern Baptist historians are examples of this in the South.

Before the second horrible downgrading of the English Baptists in the early and mid-1800s, the English Baptist historians **believed in Baptist church succession**. From these downgraded historians this evil has come into America and the rest of the English speaking world.

I.

THE PHILOSOPHY WHICH PRODUCED THE *DOWNGRADER* HISTORIANS

Definition of Terms: By "Downgrader historians" I mean those historians who were the students of German higher criticism. German higher criticism came from German universities. Many fake "converted Jews" taught a Unitarian or Semi-Unitarian concept of God. They strongly influenced the German universities. Most of the Old Testament was not inspired in its original Hebrew according to them. This is simply a form of Protestantized Phariseeism. This philosophy produced **Augustus Neander**. He taught low-grade views of Jesus Christ, His work and His Gospel church or kingdom. Neander is the **modern father** of the Babylonian theory that Christ modeled His Church after the Jewish Synagogue rather than the Greek Ekklesia. Neander, and the others, tried to free Christianity from all its Hellenistic influences and bring it back into Judaism.

The Program of the Downgrade Historians

1. Imitate the Pedobaptist Nationalists in all points possible:
 - A. Divide the old Anabaptists by using **NATIONAL TERRITORIES AND BOUNDARIES**. The Albigenses of Southern France were not the same as the Waldenses of Northern Italy. The reason is, they were in two different countries. Yes, they were one and the same people in faith and order, but that is not good enough, we are told. The Downgraders must justify their own existence. To do so, they classify the old Anabaptists by National Boundaries rather than showing their oneness of faith and order like Benjamin Hooke and Henry D'Anvers did. Hooke quoted D'Anvers to show the folly of the Pedobaptists when they did this. The Downgraders have learned nothing. They are only modern day copyists of the false conclusions and slanders of the old Pedobaptists.
 - B. The Downgraders follow the Pedobaptists into a classification of the old Anabaptists by disunion.
 - C. By creating supposed disunions among the old Anabaptists and classifying them by national boundaries, the Downgraders could justify their salaries, titles and extra-church human inventions. They consider themselves the most advanced of all Baptist historians. They are re-writing Pedobaptist slanders and falsehoods under the name of **Baptist History**.
 - D. The Downgraders repeat, aid and abet every slander, lie or falsehood the Pedobaptists put on the old Anabaptists that time, space or money will allow. As they do this, the Pedobaptists smile, pat the Downgraders on the head, and tell them they are such good boys. Now they will be greatly honored as usable and respected Christian historians. If the Downgraders continue being the spokesmen of the Pedobaptists then the Downgraders might, just might, be invited into an important College or University to give one of the lectures. If this lecture contains enough lies, slanders and historical miss-

statements, the Pedobaptists just might give the Downgraders an honorary Doctorate and publish his work. What higher honor could a Downgrader lust after? In order to qualify for such high honors, the Downgraders must:

1) Lie about and slander the Montanists, Novations, and Donatists.

It is always pleasing to the Pedobaptists to repeat their lies such as Montanus was a charismatic, or he believed in special revelations, or he taught that he was the Holy Spirit. Always give the Novations a good slandering by finding fault with Novatian and his baptism. In addition, remember the Donatists opposed Augustine. Therefore they must be suspect. So all kinds of lies and slanders are in order here. These old Anabaptists are free from these slanders.

2) Include the Paulicians in these slanders.

Since the Romanists claimed they were dualists and Adamites, it would never be good to check the original sources and find out what the Paulicians were really like. Simply rely upon the lying Papists. To do otherwise would offend many Pedobaptists. It is always good to add a few lies and slanders to these old martyrs of Jesus, like they were heretics on the Trinity, or they were messed up on baptism or they either baptized in the nude or went naked as Adamites. Oh yes, remember always to add they had their wives in common. If that is not enough, the Downgraders can always add that they were wild eyed fanatics or anarchists. This they did to the Particular Baptists of the 1600s in general and Paul Hobson in particular. Paul Hobson is represented as a traitor, coward, and betrayer of his own brethren by some of the Baptist Union Historians. Always it is good to affirm that these old Anabaptists taught infant damnation. These old Anabaptists are free from these slanders.

3) If these didn't downgrade the old Anabaptists enough, then add this

one, the Anabaptists are about to **revolt**. They are planning on going around the country and killing off as many as they can in the night, while people sleep. That lie and slander surely will outrage the general public and turn people against the Anabaptists when nothing else will. The old Anabaptists are free from this slander.

4) All irregularities in practice must be noted as regular practices and

truisms among the old Anabaptists.

a. Roger William's baptism is an example.

Williams was a Seeker. He was never a Baptist. He formed an unbaptized church and they started baptizing each other. Still, he must be claimed as a Baptist simply because he was dipped and dipped some others. Never mind that he claimed the Baptists were not true churches of Jesus Christ and their ministers were not qualified ministers. He must be used anyway. It is great honor to claim Roger Williams because the New England Pedobaptist historians speak so highly of him. He joined them in trying to discredit the old Anabaptists.

b. Disunite the Waldneses from the German Anabaptists.

Then disunite the English Baptists from the German Anabaptists. The Downgraders must never allow others to know that there is a oneness uniting the English Particular Baptists with the old German Anabaptists and through them a union with the old Waldenses. If the German Anabaptists are separated from the Particular Baptists, then it follows, the Particular Baptists have no succession. If the Waldenses are separated from the German Anabaptists, then it also follows that the German Anabaptists have no succession.

c. Under no circumstances must the succession of the hated

Anabaptists ever be maintained.

5) Always point out the falsehood and slander that no Baptists or

Anabaptist dipped for baptism before 1641.

a. Downgraders totally ignore that the English baptisms were mostly all by dippings before 1641.

b. This includes the Anglican's infant baptisms.

c. Downgraders always ignore the terrible results of the murdering Calvinists. The Calvinists of Europe were more blood thirsty than the Papists, if that is possible. When they came into power under Oliver Cromwell in 1641, they started a move to change the mode of baptism in England from dipping into sprinkling. The Calvinists always tried to change the subject of baptism from an adult believer to an unbelieving infant. This they did in England in the early 1640s. When the Anglicans again gained control in 1660, dipping was again re-established because of its place in the Anglican Manual of Discipline. Because so many infants were sprinkled under the Calvinists from 1641-1660, sprinkling became accepted rather than rebaptizing by dipping all those the Calvinists had merely sprinkled.

d. Of course the Downgraders ignore all this. To tell the truths of baptism and its history in England would destroy everything the Downgraders stand for. It would mean that the old Anabaptists had an **unbroken succession** back to Jesus Christ. That would mean they are of a **Divine Origin**. That would rule out all other churches, ordinations and baptisms. *That must never do.*

First, remember that the Downgrade Historians denied the Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures.

Second, they denied the substitutionary saving death of Jesus Christ.

Third, they denied the certain and sure succession of the gospel system of Jesus Christ as a fruit of His Atonement.

Fourthly, they had perverted ideas of the Mediatorial Offices of Jesus Christ as the King, Prophet and Priest of His Saints and Churches of Saints, or no ideas at all.

Fifthly, they had perverted ideas of the Perfection of the Everlasting Covenant.

Sixthly, they had perverted ideas of the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ to build His House according to the pattern and descriptions which His Father gave Him in eternity past, or no ideas at all. In this regard they believed that Moses was more faithful than Jesus Christ. Therefore, they built large booths for Moses and Elijah and tried to tear down what Jesus Christ built.

Seventhly, they denied the divine origin of the true and proper Gospel churches of their age, and their succession back to Jesus Christ. They had perverted ideas of what a Gospel Church was or no ideas at all.

Invisible Church People

Of course, they were **universal, invisible** church people. Therefore, they had little or no concern for the succession of the visible, gospel system of Jesus Christ.

Simply Copyists

Rather than going back to the original sources, they were simply **copyists**. They took what the older Baptist enemies said about the Baptists. They formulated their historical theories from these anti-Baptists. Here are some examples:

1. **They slandered all the Dark Ages Anabaptists they could.** Often times these historians merely restated the false statements and slanders which the Roman Catholics and others used to falsify the image and influence of the old Anabaptists.

2. **John Wycliffe.** Wycliffe was raised a Roman Catholic. As a Roman Catholic, he defended Pedobaptism in many of his writings. God converted John Wycliffe from Romanism. The converted Wycliffe wrote many new works justifying what would now be called the old school Particular Baptist position (not the modern American Primitive Baptists). We have Wycliffe's Pedobaptist writings. But, also, we have John Wycliffe's writings when he was an anti-pedobaptist. The Downgraders Historians choose to ignore the writings of the converted Wycliffe in favor of the unconverted Wycliffe.

3. The **Continental Anabaptists** are another example. I am speaking of those Anabaptists who opposed the Protestant Reformers. Therefore the saintly (?) Protestant Reformers murdered them. This is just what Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and the others did or tried to do. The Protestant Reformers were more cruel toward Christ's sheep than the Roman Catholics or Infidels were. To justify their murder of these defenseless Christian men, women and children, the Protestants charged them with all kinds of perverted or false ideas and practices. The German Anabaptists involved in the Mutzer uprisings are proof of this. What did the downgraders historians do:

A. They didn't **check the original sources**, they simply took hearsay testimony from hostile witnesses;

B. They claimed the old English Baptists didn't **claim** identity with the Continental Anabaptists, Waldenses or Albigenses. Point **B** is **totally untrue!** Here is the truth concerning the old English Baptists and how they claimed identity with the Continental Anabaptists, Waldenses and Albigenses.

C. The old English Baptist historians, **both** Particular and General, denied any origin from John Smith, the reported Se-Baptist;

D. The old English Baptist historians, **both** Particular and General, claimed kinship and identity with the old Continental Anabaptists, but denied they were **ANABAPTISTS**, except by slander and reproach. **The English claimed the people but denied the name.**

E. The old English Baptist historians, **both** Particular and General, **denied being Anabaptists because they didn't rebaptize anyone.** Their baptism was the only true and valid baptism. Therefore it was not rebaptism.

F. The old English Baptist historians, **both** Particular and General, **denied** the name Anabaptist. They **didn't deny** the faith and order of the Continental Anabaptists.

G. No, the Continental Anabaptists were not all sprinklers anymore than the Waldenses or Albigenses were.

H. Yes, some Mennonites evolved into sprinkling. Some maintained both dipping and the doctrines of grace.

I. Yes, some of the Waldenses and Albigenses evolved into infant baptism. These were the post-Calvin Waldenses. The old **Appleton's Encyclopedia** makes this very clear.

3. Old Baptist writers who traced their succession through the Continental Anabaptists and or Waldenses claiming kinship with them were:

A. Particular Baptist writers, John Spittlehouse, in his **Vindication of the Continued Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ, now Scandalously called Anabaptists**, London; 1652; Henry D'Anvers, his historical writings from 1673 to 1677, starting with his **Treatise of Baptism**, London; 1673; Benjamin

Stennett, in his **Answer to Russen**, London 1704; and later in America, that eminent Welsh Baptist, Able Morgan, and his **Anti-Pedo-Rantism**; Philadelphia: 1742.

B. General Baptist writers, Joseph Hooke in his **Necessary Apology for the Baptists**, London: 1701; Thomas Davye, **The Baptism of Adult Believers Only Asserted and Vindicated; And that of Infant's Disproved. In which is shown, That the People called Anabaptists are of an Apostolic Original, and not a new upstart Sect; and that there have been in every age, from Christ and the Apostles time, more or less, a People professing Believer's Baptism and rejecting that of Infants.** London: 1719; and later in the 1840s, Woods said this in his history.

At the risk of sounding somewhat like a **downgrade historian myself**, I must say, the General Baptist historians have been mostly an embarrassment to Baptists. Look closely at Davye's title again. How could there be people who rejected infant's baptism since the days of Christ and His apostles in every age when it was not practiced until the third century at its earliest date? Some have even suggested that the Emperor Gaius' son in Northern Africa was the first infant baptized in about 354 A. D. How then could there be people who professed believer's baptism and rejected infant's baptism when infant baptism did not even exist? Certainly professed believers were baptized in the first three ages of church history because they were the only ones baptized. Infants, no!

Following Joseph Hooke, most General Baptist historians are unfortunate and better left unread. This goes for the American Missionary Baptists as well, especially those in this century in the A. B. A. and B. M. A. A. We can say the same for the American Primitive Baptists also, especially the conditionalists.

Hostile or Hearsay Witnesses

The original sources and original people are always the safest guide. We should never rely upon hostile or hearsay witnesses. What did the Jews do with their hostile witnesses against Jesus Christ and the Apostle Paul? This should serve as an example to us.

II.

THE DOWNGRADE HISTORIANS' ATTACK UPON THE OLD BAPTIST HISTORIANS

The downgrade historians found very little good about the older historians. Let me show some differences and then illustrate some of the attacks.

- A.** The older Historians:
- 1.** In Theology they were mostly Calvinists, some were Pre-Calvinistic Particular Baptists, some were General Baptists;
 - 2.** In Church order, they were church only men;
 - 3.** In historical interpretation they were Biblical Successionists.
- B.** The Downgraders Historians were:
- 1.** Theistic Evolutionists, Unitarians, Semi-Unitarians, Arians and Universalists or semi-Universalists;

2. In church order, they were college and seminary trained men; hence they were extra church followers of a different Jesus than the older historians followed. They followed a Jesus who was refashioned by semi-Jewish and heathen concepts;

3. In historical interpretation they would be considered existentialists and violently opposed Biblical succession.

Method of Attack

The Downgrade historians attacked the older Baptist historians in a very simple way: they made them *look foolish, ignorant and incapable*. The older Baptist historians didn't have college or university degrees. Therefore, they were all **idiots**. They were unscientific in historical matters. What is still worse, they believed the Bible as the Word of God. They tried to hold forth Jesus Christ as the Son of God. They taught that He is **the only way** to God the Father and everlasting life.

Here are some examples:

1. **William Jones**, was a Scottish Baptist historian who lived in London and pastored a Scottish Baptist church in London. He wrote several historical works and edited an able Baptist magazine in the early 1800s. Jones's main objects were the old Waldenses and Albigenses. He exhausted all the known authors and material. He left no stone unturned. His results, the old Waldenses and Albigenses maintained the Doctrines of Grace. They were Baptists. This would not do. The Pedobaptists attacked him and used old Pedobaptist Waldenses as their witnesses. Next they used the post-Calvin Waldenses and Albigenses. This was supposed to discredit Jones. It did not do so. The Baptists vindicated Jones. It is very strange that John L. Waller, one of the great leaders of the Southern Baptist Convention before the American Civil War, lead in vindicating Jones. Now, the Southern Baptists ignore Waller and would discredit Jones and his conclusions.

a. The Downgrade historians use the Pedobaptist Waldenses and the Post-Calvin Waldenses and ignore the pre-Calvin Waldenses, the anti-Pedobaptist Waldenses, their confessions, statements and their very existence. The downgrade historians were, and are now simply the **modern day voices** of the old *Pedobaptists*.

b. The Old **Waldenses** and **Albigenses** then received so much attention because it was popular for all major religious denominations, except the Roman Catholics, to trace their succession through them.

2. **Gov. Henry D'Anvers** is another example. He lived in the 1600s and produced hundreds and hundreds of pages of historical information to prove the historic succession of the Particular Baptists through the Old Waldenses, Albigenses and older British and Welsh Christians. He vindicated the Continental Anabaptists, and showed their union with the English and Welsh Particular Baptists.

a. His contemporary Pedobaptist enemies did not tolerate his historic conclusions. They slandered him and called for the Baptists to try him for misrepresentation. The Baptists did so. They vindicated him. The Pedobaptists used the same old arguments, the pre-conversion Wycliffe, the Pedobaptist Waldenses and the post-Calvin Waldenses.

b. Finally, the Pedobaptists found a way to silence D'Anvers. They charged him with being an enemy to the state. He was an Anabaptist and what's more, a **"Fifth Monarchy Man."** The Anglicans banished him to Holland where he died. To the everlasting disgrace and discredit of the English Baptists since then, D'Anvers' works have

never been republished. The Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland would never touch them because he was involved in politics...how sinful. The truth is, D'Anvers was a Particular Baptist **successionist**. That offends the modern English Baptists who measure themselves by the modern philosophies of the Pedobaptist **think-tanks**. We hope to modernize and reprint the historical writings of D'Anvers, the Lord willing.

III.

DEFINITIONS OF SUCCESSION

There are **several types of succession**. These different **types** come from different denominations. They all represent efforts to vindicate their respective churches, baptisms and ministerial ordinations.

1. **Natural succession** speaks of the succession of the Old Testament system of National Israel. This depended upon the natural seed or offspring of the members of National Israel. It had nothing to do with the Spiritual offspring nor the spiritual members of National Israel. This is the foundation of all pedobaptist nationalists and their disenfranchised sisters in America.

2. **Personal succession** speaks of the succession of the administrator or minister who administers the ordinances of the church (whatever church that is). His validity as an administrator depends upon his being able to trace a succession of baptized and ordained men like himself back to Christ. This is the succession of the Roman Catholics and their off-spring, the Protestants and the Puritans.

3. **Succession through Antichrist** speaks of that theory which many pedobaptist English dissenters maintained when they contested with the old Baptists. Yes, they actually maintained that God preserved His ordinances through the antichrist system. In the 1640s, Praisegod Barebones championed this against John Spilsbury, Thomas Kilcop and Richard Barrow, who were Particular Baptists.

A. American Presbyterians also were forced to this conclusion during the early 1800s. They answered, **we cannot tell** if the Roman Catholic Church was a valid church or not. Now they say we cannot tell.

B. The Second Generation of Particular Baptists in England were low-grade Calvinists. Many came out of the Anglican church and passed through the General Baptists before they became Particular Baptists. Besides the semi-Unitarianism and semi-universalism, they also brought Episcopal conformation. These new Baptists called it **Laying on of Hands, the Fourth Principle**. They claimed they could pass on the Holy Spirit from one to another by laying on of hands. They had **Simon the Magician's** theology. Many modern Baptists are followers of Simon as well.

a. Most of the older Generation of Particular Baptists opposed this. William Kiffen debated over this and opposed it. John Spilsbury's student, Daniel King, wrote against this as the fourth part of his **Way To Zion**. Edward Harrison wrote against it. Then came the great Henry D'Anvers who also wrote against it. Benjamin Keach, who brought it into the Particular Baptists, opposed D'Anvers and justified the practice. He admitted that it was true that there has been no historical succession of the

practice among the Baptists. That didn't matter because God had used the Bishops among the Pedobaptists to keep the ordinance going. That was the position of Benjamin Keach.

b. The later English Baptist historians didn't take the time to get the facts correct and **reversed** the authors and their positions. Yes, they maintained that D'Anvers **maintained conformation** and Keach **opposed it**. That disaster and misrepresentation is even found among the historical writers of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland today. How could such a thing happen? The old habit of **only copying and never going back to the original sources is how it happened**.

The Downgraders' Philosophy Joined with the Cornfield Historians' Philosophy and Produced the Same Results

The old original sources must never be used. They must be stored away behind lock and key as in the old monasteries during the Dark Ages. If they were used and students knew about them, they might use them, learn from them and cause too many problems for the modern religionists. Therefore, the modern religionists keep the people in captivity by ignorance and false doctrines. This is the same old priesthood game played by the old heathen and Catholic priests. It is played very well today by all politicians who teach that the U. S. Constitution and Bill of Rights cannot be understood by simply reading them.

4. Modern link-chain-succession is the position that there has been a link-by-link connection in a chain like succession all the way back to Jesus Christ. This comes by means of a church voting on baptisms and voting a new church into existence.

A. This position became very popular during the late 1800s among the American Southern Baptists. The anti-Convention men among the New Schoolers developed it to stop the spreading of the Downgrader Historians and their anti-succession views. In addition, the church voting on everything concept, came into being to fight the growing influence of The Southern Baptist Convention which was an extra church organization in every detail.

B. Like all reactionary teachings, this position has some merit and **much unfortunate dismerit**. Here are some examples:

a. *All baptisms must be voted on.* Baptisms are disorderly and perhaps invalid if they are not voted on. The believer who holds otherwise **may be** unsound in the faith. His church **may not be a true church** and his **baptism may be invalid**. This CONCEPT **invalidates** all who hold it. **It is self-destructive**. Few, if any, Baptists held this concept before the **reaction** to the Downgrader Historians. This is not the way baptisms were administered in the New Testament nor in the Baptist succession before the late or middle 1800s in America.

b. All churches **must be voted into existence by an already existing church**. If new converts are **not carried back** to a mother church and received and then **voted out into a new church**, *their church is not scriptural*. It does not have proper authority. Some have even gone so far as to say that this is the way the **Holy Spirit is passed from one church to another church**. That is what Popery is all about. Some have claimed the Papists learned this from the True Churches. If so where? One Biblical example of such a practice will suffice us. If a mother church did not vote your church into

existence, then you are not a true church, we are told. No matter what, you are an invalid church. They are very serious about this. They will tear up all the churches possible to get this done. It does not matter to them that this was **NEVER DONE** in the New Testament. They don't care. Forget about Baptist history and ecclesiology, these modern high church people all **know more** than the old Baptists did. That is their position. They know what is **not** in the Bible and what the Baptist succession is **not** about. **That is what they know and they don't care about Biblical facts.**

Biblical link-chain-succession is a valid and true succession. It is proven by Biblical examples and methods. That will be explained in the concluding lecture. **Modern link-chain-succession is like modern Landmarkism**, totally and completely different from the Word of God and *the true and real Baptist succession and old Landmarkism.*

IV.

THE BASIC POSITIONS ABOUT BAPTIST CHURCH SUCCESSION

The Concepts:

These fall into *four basic concepts*:

1. The John the Baptist, Jordan River and Jerusalem Theory;
2. The Anabaptist-Spiritual Kinship Theory of Baptist Origins;
3. The English Separatist Descent Theory;
4. The John H. Shakespeare Theory.

Strangely enough a Downgrader Baptist historian, Torbet, in his **Baptist History**, is responsible for arranging and classifying Baptist historians. I am indebted to him.

The Concepts:

1. The John the Baptist, Jordan River and Jerusalem Concept of Baptist Origins.

This classification denotes the oldest views of the Baptist historians. It is the uniform concept of all the Baptist historians before the 1850s. Since then, Baptist historians have held to a modified concept as seen by the later views.

This Concept defined:

Baptist baptism began with the first Baptist, John. Jesus Christ received His baptism from John who was commissioned and sent by God the Father. Jesus Christ baptized through His disciples during His personal ministry. Following His resurrection, Jesus sent His disciples into all the world to preach and baptize. This they did. The Holy Spirit administers water baptism now by means of His gospel ministers, Christ's gifts to His churches. This gospel system has had an unbroken succession of preachers, administrators and churches since that time. God the Father administered this **ONE BAPTISM** by John the Baptist. Jesus Christ administered this **ONE BAPTISM** through His disciples **DURING** His personal ministry. The Holy Spirit administers this **ONE BAPTISM** through

the ministers and messengers of the churches, the glory of Christ. Therefore, there is **ONE HEAVENLY BAPTISM** *which is in water*, by God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. **This is heaven's baptism.** Matt. 28:18-20; Matt. 3; Eph. 4:4-6; John 4:1,2; I Cor. 12:13,14.

Jesus Christ constituted the first Baptist church in Jerusalem during His personal ministry. The gospel church then existed in its **womb-like condition** until after Christ's resurrection. It was **lifted into the heavenly realm** by Christ's post-resurrection ministry. It then ceased its womb-like condition and came forth. The gospel church grew up at the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit **empowered** it by taking the **personal place** Jesus Christ vacated when He returned to Heaven. The Jerusalem Church then reached out into all the world by many different Apostles and ministers. Some were merely preaching disciples. Gentile churches became formed. From one of these, the Gentile church at Antioch through the Apostle Paul, the Gospel and its system spread into the Western world. Once established in the Western World, it has continued unto this day. Note these points:

A. I **do not affirm** that others will claim the systematic arrangement of what I have just said, but they will claim the concept.

B. I **do claim** that the oldest known Baptist historians would claim this concept. Torbet, the downgraders historian, thought so too.

C. R. B. C. Howell, the god-father of the Southern Baptist Convention, defined this concept almost in the same manner as I have. He said so in his statement of Baptist History in **The Baptist**, as I shall quote later.

The Historians

First, note the Particular Baptists, and Braght, who was a Mennonite:

A. English, Welsh, Scottish and Dutch: John Spittlehouse 1652, J. Van Braght, 1660; Henry D'Anvers, 1673; Thomas Crosby, 1738; Archibold M'Lean 1790s; Joshua Thomas, late 1700s Joseph Ivimey, 1811; William Jones, 1816; and G. H. Orchard in the mid-1800s.

B. American Baptists: John Comer, early 1700s; Isaac Backus, late 1700s; Morgan Edwards mid to late 1700s; John Miles in the early 1880s; David Benedict, early to mid 1800s; Joseph Belcher, mid 1800s, J. Newton Brown, early to mid 1800s; William Cathcart, mid to late 1800s; J. R. Graves, mid to late 1800s; J. Davis, early 1800s; D. B. Ray, late 1800s; W. A. Jarrell, late 1800s; S. H. Ford, late 1800s; J. A. Shackelford, late 1800s; J. H. Grime, J. B. Moody and John T. Christian, all in the late 1800s or early 1900s. In addition note J. M. Cramp, a Canadian Baptist.

C. During the late 1800s, William Whitsitt of the Southern Baptist Seminary of Louisville, Ky., popularized the Downgrader Movement in the South. George Lofton, of the First Baptist Church in Nashville, Tennessee defended Whitsitt and Whitsittism. This is known as Whitsittism. Whitsittism caused many different Baptist histories between 1875 and 1900. Most were of the **corn-field** variety and abounded with errors and misrepresentations. The Cornfield Historians only added fuel to the Downgraders' claims that they alone were the sole and proper historians and all others were idiots, ignorant and

not to be trusted. Unfortunately, writers like Ray and Shackelford fit that description very well.

D. John L. Waller, of Kentucky, a very important writer of the early 1800s, became a popular preacher, debater, and editor of the **Western Baptist Review**. He is best known for his debating and opposing Alexander Campbell. He was one of the ringleaders in the organization that grew into the Southern Baptist Convention. Dr. Waller defended William Jones and his **Church History**. See our Appendix.

E. Another historian of surprise would be R. B. C. Howell, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Nashville, Tennessee before the American Civil War. He founded and edited **The Baptist** before J. R. Graves was asked to take its editorship. Howell, more than anyone else, fathered the Southern Baptist Convention. Now they would disown his historical conclusions.

F. I have not listed the old School or American Primitive Baptist historians of the 1800s or 1900s because I don't know any but Hassell. I don't know how to classify him. ("Hassell is generally recognized as a valid historian among the Primitive Baptists in the South. He supported the use of the **Fulton Confession of 1900**, which indicates his closeness to the Arminian / Conditionalists." *Dan O'Dell*.) J. S. Newman may also be like Hassell. He wrote **The Baptists in All Ages**, reprinted by Cayce Publishing Co., Thornton, AK, 1978.

G. There were several Baptist state historians among the New School writers. These would be Robert Semple in Virginia, early 1880s; Jessee Mercer in Georgia, early 1800s; S. H. Spencer in Kentucky, late 1800s; T. M. Bond in Mississippi, in the 1840s; and R. S. Duncan in Missouri, the late 1880s. **Mercer** and **Duncan** are of special note.

H. The first 10 major Baptist Associations in America each had their own historian. An example would be Gillette and his **History of the Philadelphia Baptist Association 1707 to 1807**. These associations are listed in Cathcart's **Baptist Encyclopedia**. I collected the histories of each association in my earlier days but don't have them now as they showed a trend downward away from Christ and His system.

I. Lastly, each state which had a strong Baptist association or convention soon also had a Baptist paper. If preachers fell out with each other often it had more than one. These editors published many historical reports and materials when they were not doing battle with the Campbellites or others who were the **terrible threats of the day**.

This classification maintains a **visible succession** of Baptist churches back to Jesus Christ. This succession is link-chained in that it existed in every generation back to Christ. There have always been gospel churches in gospel order. Of course, they were called by different names in various countries and in each generation. Their **unity** is not one of **name but of kind**. This unity of kind is built upon **gospel faith, order, worship and works**. **This is not a oneness by territory or nationalism**. This **oneness** is built upon the larger and general union these saints have with Jesus Christ and one another as one **mystical** body joined to Jesus Christ. *All believers who are brought into gospel order are one. They are a part of the eternal union in Christ which is manifested and made visible by gospel order during the age of the New Covenant, Ephesians 3.*

2. The Anabaptist Spiritual Kinship Theory

This is the **INVISIBLE SUCCESSION** classification. The invisible succession classification is, there **has been a true and real succession** but it cannot be traced out. The idea here is not an invisible church, but an invisible succession of the gospel system of Jesus Christ. The true system of Christ is always present, but its succession is not traceable because the records have mostly been destroyed by enemies. This is also an old and safe concept. Note:

A. The various Dark Ages groups were indeed Baptists in most points;

B. They should not be called Baptists, we are told, because they had many different concepts which are not found among Baptists today. In most cases, however, these didn't cause them to be anti-Baptistic. Perhaps when these **supposed** weak points are investigated, it may be found that they were more Baptist than most today are. I am quite certain they knew more of Christ than most Baptists do today. Two examples are:

1. The **Paulicians**, in Europe during the middle of the Dark Ages, are usually considered as Manichaeic Dualists. The Paulicians were one of the Eastern Anabaptist groups of the middle Dark Ages. Their enemies called them this, on account of one of their most notable ministers, one Constantine of Samosata. Constantine had been a Gnostic. After his conversion he was numbered among those in the old Baptized Way. He changed his heathen name to Paul. The Manicheans were named from Manes, an oriental minister whom the established Priests accused of holding the eternity of evil and good. The Roman and Greek Catholics placed this charge on them for years. But, as their own writings were discovered and considered, these charges were proved false. They neither went about naked nor practiced nude baptisms. One example of their own writings is Fred C. Conybeare's translation of **The Key Of Truth**, in 1898.

2. The **Albigenses**, in Southern France, were also called dualists because they didn't recognize the holiness and authority of the Pope. Again, when the writings of these people were discovered and studied they were seen merely to be the same as the Waldenses. The Albigenses lived in Southern France, near Albi. Therefore, they were called Albigenses. By taking the statements of the Roman Catholic enemies about the Albigenses, the Downgrader historians have proudly announced that these followers of Jesus Christ **were not** Baptists or Waldenses. They must be considered as separate people. The reason, they lived near Albi and not in the Alps. Besides, the Roman Catholics said they had **three eyes, long black hair and large moles** on the end of their noses. Therefore, *they had to be very bad people.*

3. **Thomas Crosby** showed that any dissenter could be condemned as a heretic simply by accusing him. The dissenter was automatically guilty, and had to prove himself innocent. Guilty until proven innocent. Guilty by slander. Roman Catholic priests even turned each other in to the authorities by calling one another horrible **ANABAPTISTS**.

C. These historians show that there **may have been some** irregularities among the **Dark Ages groups**, but they were Baptists. The truth is, there were *few* irregularities among them. They stood heads taller than most modern Baptists. They were simply slandered and lied about by the Roman Catholics and others.

D. Some foreign historians of this type would be C. H. Spurgeon and B. Evans of England, in the mid and late 1800s. In America, R. Cook would fall into this class.

NOTE

The further removed historians became from the Dark Ages the further removed they became from the **Baptized People** of the Dark Ages. The facts of the Dark Ages became less and less known. Therefore, the later Baptist historians did not make as many bold historical statements as their forefathers did. They merely claimed a kinship with the old Dark Ages people.

3. The English Separatist Descent Theory

This is the position of the Downgrader Historians. Among other things they claim there were no immersed adult believers in England before 1641. Some of them have tried to start Baptists in England from John Smith about 1609. Always the Pedobaptists are the authorities. This is done so the Downgraders can have the honor and respectability they would not have otherwise. Always *every abnormal event in history* is held up as an example of Baptist regularities. According to them, what is **irregular** becomes **regular**.

Here are some examples:

A. Roger Williams, the Seeker, received baptism from an unbaptized administrator. He and some of his friends formed into a group and started baptizing each other. The Baptists were not good enough for them. This was done in Providence, R. I. in 1639. They soon disbanded. The present church in Providence claims history from Roger Williams. Historians have shown *otherwise*. It is more honorable to claim Roger Williams as the first Baptist in America than it is Dr. John Clark. Dr. Clark gathered the Newport church in 1638. Some members of John Spilsbury's church at Wapping helped him. Dr. Clark was an old school Particular Baptist, and regular in all matters. He is an embarrassment to the Downgrader Historians who love and serve the Pedobaptists. When he was forced by magistrates to attend a Pedobaptist church, under bondage to the law, he kept his hat on in services to show his contempt. Dr. Clark returned to England and secured the Charter for the original Constitution for the state of Rhode Island. He did this at his own expense. Dr. Clark sold his American plantation to support himself while in England. In London he ministered to one of the Churches and underwent severe persecution from the Pedobaptists. Yes, they were the very Pedobaptists whom the Downgraders receive over such men as Dr. John Clark. This is one of the reasons why the Downgraders love men like Roger Williams and John Smith. The Downgraders are so irregular they tend to gravitate toward all other irregularities and misfits.

B. It is never explained how these early English Particular Baptists started. No one has ever been charged with Se-baptism like John Smith. None of them have ever been charged with forming into an unbaptized church and then starting baptism like Roger Williams did. It is simply stated that they were unbaptized until 1641. John Spilsbury is not supposed to have received baptism until near 1651 according to G. Gould. On and on we could go with the slanders and misrepresentations from the mixed communionists and Downgraders. There is no end to their misrepresentations.

C. Sometimes the Downgraders do differ from the Pedobaptists, but only when the Pedobaptists go against Downgrader ideas. Here are some examples:

1. **John Lewis**, the Anglican historian, stated near 1717, that John Spilsbury was baptized while in Holland as an exile. That would have occurred in the early 1600s. The Downgraders know about Lewis' **Brief History of the Anabaptists**, but they never cite it.

2. **John Saltmarsh**, the Seeker, in his **Smoke in the Temple**, 1641, shows that the Baptists practiced closed church membership and closed communion. They made their churches up of the baptized only. But, no matter, according to Gould, that was not true. In his own mind, G. Gould, in the 1850s knew more than Saltmarsh did, even though Saltmarsh lived during those very times and contested with the Baptists. According to Gould, all Baptists in the mid 1600s practiced open membership and open communion except William Kiffen and maybe Benjamin Cox. Certainly these two were closed communionists, but so were all the others except Jessey, Tombes and Bunyan, the misfits. So much for Gould.

3. The Downgrader historians **fight among themselves**. Gould claims there were **no closed communion Particular Baptists except Kiffin and Cox**. The contemporary Baptist Union writers, under the leadership of B. W. White, are contending that they were mostly all closed communion except Jessey, Tombs and Bunyan. Gould's conclusions have been disproved by his own grandchildren in theory. No matter to them, the damage has been done already. Whitley's account of the Kiffen Manuscript in **The Journal** is very reliable, and shows that the second group of Particular Baptists during the first Generation received their baptism from the old **Mennonites** by means of **Richard Blount**. This is correct. But, then comes B. W. White, who in his treatment of the matter, is so confused that he ignores what his **forefathers had said only 50 years before and claims that Blount returned to England unbaptized and that he and Blaylock baptized each other and started immersion in that manner**. His position is unique. Not only is he wrong, but he totally apostatized even further from his historical godfather, Whitley and grand-godfather, Gould. White's uniqueness does not stop there, he is the only one on all the earth who has arrived at such a misunderstanding so as to add the names of Blount and Blaylock to the list of supposed self-baptizers. White totally misunderstood the account given in the **Kiffen Manuscript**. He arrived at a different conclusion from those of his earlier forefathers concerning the account given in the Kiffen manuscript.

4. **Remember, there were Pedobaptists who lived during these very days and witnessed the baptisms of the old Particular and General Baptists**. Some of these Pedobaptists were honest enough to give a factual account of these people and their mode of baptism.

5. The Anglican historians, **Thomas Fuller** and **Daniel Featly** affirmed that the Particular Baptists were **dippers**.

a. **Thomas Fuller**, who wrote in the early 1600s, called the Anabaptists, the Donatists **NEW DIPPED**. The Downgraders said Fuller was simply **fooling**. We believe Fuller knew what he saw and reported it.

b. **Daniel Featly** reports that Anabaptists were not new as the newly established Presbyterian ministers were claiming. The established Presbyterians were new to England. They came from Scotland. They said that Baptist immersion was a new type of Baptism. In the introduction to his **The Dippers' Dipped**, London, 1645, Featly reports that the Anabaptists had been **dipping** for over 20 years near his home. He

witnessed these dippings. Featly's account is beyond question and is so destructive to the Downgraders that they **play like** Featly *left no account of Baptists or dipping*.

c. Toward the close of the 1600s, another Anglican historian, William Wall, wrote his **History of Infant Baptism**. He showed that before 1641 most baptisms in England were by dipping. The Westminster Assembly changed the mode of baptism in 1641 from dipping to sprinkling. He was correct. The Calvinists had come into England and became the established church of England during Cromwell's reign. Their main mischief was to change the mode of baptism in England. They changed it from **dipping** to *sprinkling*. Even Dr. John Gill, the Calvinistic Baptist leader of the 1700s, shows this in his **The Ancient Mode of Baptism**.

d. The disenfranchised Anglicans went to war with the established Presbyterians and their changes from the older Anglican traditions and codes. The Anglican Church in England practiced infant's dipping before 1641. But, no matter, the Downgraders believe their **own fairy tales** over the Anglican historians **in this matter**. Of course, they don't desert the Anglicans in other matters. William Wall's **History of Infant Baptism**, London; 1697, does give a good account of this conflict between the two Pedobaptist groups who fought for control of England in the mid-1600s. He is correct in affirming that the English were **dippers**, both Baptists and Anglicans, before the Presbyterians took over in 1641. The Downgraders are **wrong again, as usual**.

e. One good thing the Downgrade historians have done is to give us some original documents and materials which were not discovered before their times. B. W. White's **Records of the Particular Baptists from 1650-1660** are an example. These are some of the most important contributions towards the Particular Baptist's history published in modern times.

6. When the Presbyterians and Seekers tried to discredit the Baptists and claimed they started from John Smith, the Se-Baptist, an unbaptized administrator, the Particular Baptist writers denied this. When the Presbyterians tried to charge the Baptists with a new mode of baptism, dipping, the Anglicans denied that dipping was new and also denied that the Baptists were new. The Presbyterians were wrong on this issue as they were on most other issues. The sooner the Calvinists were driven out of England by the Anglicans in 1660, the better off everybody was except for the bitter persecutions which followed.

D. In conclusion:

a. The English Separatist Descent Theory is the Baptist's form of **German Higher Criticism**. Its main purpose is to destroy the **divine origin** of the Baptists and their **entire gospel system**. This is done because the Downgraders do not recognize Jesus Christ as Divine nor His New Covenant as **Divinely Inspired and Preserved**. Therefore, what they do to the Lord and Master, the Downgraders also do to His followers.

b. This position is admired and maintained by all the Unitarians, the Semi-Unitarians, the Arians and Semi-Arians among the Baptists who also deny the **Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures** and the **Deity and Substitutionary Death of Jesus Christ**.

c. This theory was first invented by George Gould in his efforts to steal the old Particular Baptist church at Norwich in the 1850s. He succeeded. Then Thomas Armitage in the North, Norman Fox of William Jewell College in Missouri and William Whitsitt in Louisville, Ky., popularized it. The Norwich church was founded in exile in Holland during the early 1600s. It remained a closed communion church for nearly 200 years. Gould was successful in transforming it into open communion. The majority of members wanted it that way or it would not have happened. They were tired of not being honored and accounted as important people by men. This gave them honor from the Pedobaptists they would not have had **in any other way**. Their ministers could be called **Doctors, Reverends** and the such like. What great *honor*. *Ala. John Leland*, the great Revolutionary War era Baptist who openly ridiculed the New School men and their lust for titles and offices.

d. Dr. **A. H. Strong** became the major theologian of the new prophets and their **new, new, new school theology**. This is new schoolism worked out to its fullest. This is Fuller's semi-Unitarianism and universalism worked out to its logical and final conclusions. Strong even **out Fullered** Andrew Fuller, his new model teacher, and went from universal redemption and semi-Unitarianism into Theistic Evolution and Ethnical Monism. Ethnical Monism is simply a Downgraders key term for Christian Pantheism. Naturally, Strong would finally arrive all the way over to full Unitarianism.

e. **A. H. Newman** and **H. C. Vedder** became the historical Goliath's. Now, the new Baptists would have accredited colleges and universities with their great and honorable Doctors, Reverends and the such like in the New World getting ready for the New World Order of Protestantized Baptists (?).

f. Remember, this is simply Phariseeism under a Baptist name.

g. Their historians are all modern. They didn't exist before the middle and late 1800s. They all sneaked in unawares following the social revolutions in the Western World during the mid 1800s.

IV.

THE JOHN H. SHAKESPEARE THEORY

John H. Shakespeare, a Congregationalist, developed this theory. He stated briefly:

1. That the Baptist succession was through the Particular Baptists rather than through the General Baptists and John Smith;
2. That the General and the Particular Baptists must be distinguished;
3. That the present day Regular Baptists succeeded from the Particular Baptists.

V.

CONCLUSION TO LECTURE TWO

The Theology of the Baptist Historians

First the theology of the anti-succession historians. These men, such as Gould, Vedder, Newman, and William Whitsitt all had in common the following points:

1. They were not Particular Baptists. They were not even Calvinistic Baptists. **They all denied substitutionary redemption of any kind.** As they began, like Strong, they may have given public assent to redemption. As time went on they also evolved with the errors of their times.
2. They did not believe in the **Verbal Inspiration of the original Scriptures.** **They held that the Scriptures are inspired just like other great works such as those by Shakespeare and Longfellow.**
3. They were all followers of evolution, some theistic and others natural.
4. **H. C. Vedder** is an example:

" . . . that theory that supposes Christ to have borne our sins and died in our stead, . . . of all the SLANDERS men have perpetrated against the most high, this is positively the grossest, the most impudent, the most insulting. . ."

George W. Dollar, **A History of Fundamentalism**, 1972; page 153.

Their Theologian

A. H. Strong, the President of Rochester Theological Seminary, N. Y. was their theological representative. He taught theistic evolution and other concepts. He evolved into the theory of Gould and Whitsitt, who claimed there were no Baptists before 1641. Therefore, there is no divine origin of Baptists. They have no succession before 1641.

Their Arian Role-Model

In England, during the late 1700s, Robert Robinson, a General Baptist who evolved into full grown Unitarianism, produced two profound historical works, **A History of Baptism**, 1790, and **Ecclesiastical Researches**, 1792. Robinson:

1. Denied the Deity of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit;
2. Denied the Verbal Inspiration of the Bible;
3. Maintained Open Communion;

Robinson was so liberal that Andrew Fuller, the Semi-Unitarian, Semi-Universal Redemptionist, wrote 5 large articles against him. They may be studied from **Fuller's Works**. When the old **Philadelphia Baptist Association** considered reprinting Robinson's works, they agreed to do so only when his Unitarian views were edited out. **David Benedict** did this in the early 1800s. **J. R. Graves** did so in the middle 1800s.

Secondly, the Theology of the Successionist Historians. I do not claim that these were Particular Baptists. I don't even claim they were all Calvinistic Baptists. Most were Calvinistic Baptists. **John Spittlehouse** and **Henry D'Anvers** were pre-Calvinistic Particular Baptists. **B. D. Ray**, and the later *corn-field historians* were low grade Arminians. But they all held in common the following:

1. The Verbal Inspiration of the Original Scriptures;
2. The substitutionary death of Jesus Christ;

3. The Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession of Baptists.

I Conclude by saying:

All Baptist historians who have believed in the Verbal Inspiration of the Original Scriptures have believed in the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ. They also believed in the *Divine origin and succession of the Baptists.*

LECTURE III

WHAT HAVE THE OLD BAPTISTS BELIEVED ABOUT THEIR SUCCESSION?

Please read from Judges 2:8-10; I Cor. 10:1-6; 2 Cor. 10:11,12; Joshua 4:6, 21-24; and Rev. 2:5.

INTRODUCTION

The **Divine Origin** of the old Baptists is the **oldest** and **most accepted concept** of **Baptist origins**. A **Divine Origin** demands a proper view of *succession* maintained by *Jesus Christ through His Holy Spirit* to fulfill the decrees of God by bringing His people into their *visible oneness and inheritance*. This was the **only** position before the days of **evolutionary** theology. Therefore, I shall establish the **HISTORICAL CONSENSUS** of the older Baptist historians. First, remember that:

A. If the old Baptists **have a Divine Origin**, then they also must have an unbroken succession maintained by Jesus Christ **Himself** through His Holy Spirit to fulfill the purpose of God by the church in every generation of this age of all ages, Eph. 3:21.

B. If the old Baptists **do not have** a **Divine Origin**, then the *Roman Catholics* are the only ones who do since all *Protestants have come from them*.

C. If the old Baptists **do not have** a *Divine Origin and an unbroken succession* administered and maintained by Jesus Christ, then they are only one of the different groups. They have **no justification** for a ***separate existence***. This is the position of the Downgraders.

To establish the **HISTORICAL CONSENSUS** I shall go back to the beginning of church history. Then I shall come to the age before the Downgraders. Before we do this, I must lay down the following axioms:

AXIOMS

1. Gospel church succession **is not** a succession **only** of *outward organizations*. It **is** the succession of the *true gospel and its visible manifestations as Jesus Christ maintains them by His Holy Spirit*.

2. Gospel church succession **does not give being** to a church. The church in turn **does not give being** to the members of the church. The **being of the saints** comes **FROM** their **union with Jesus Christ**. The saint's **union** with Jesus Christ gives being to the church as **they are brought together in a visible way and give themselves up to the Lord and to one another in a visible manner**. This *visible way* is the **manifested way** in which Jesus Christ Himself walked by His Holy Spirit. This is the *way* He has brought His people along. He places them together **so they can know who they are and unto Whom they belong**.

3. Gospel church succession is **maintained** by the Holy Spirit as the **visible and manifested witness on this earth of the exaltation of Jesus Christ at the right hand of God our Father**. This gospel succession bears witness to Jesus Christ as the alone and only King, Priest and Prophet of His saints and churches of saints.

4. The church exists in a **covenant and spiritual way** before any visible manifestation. Then, the elect are called out of death and sin and brought into a manifested union with the Lord and one another in a **visible and manifested** manner. The elect are already the church in a **covenant way** by their **union** with Jesus Christ. This **covenant** is the **Eternal, Everlasting Covenant of Life or Grace**.

5. By virtue of their **being in Christ from eternity**, their eternal union, the elect have all they need **directly** from Christ **in order to** their being a gospel church. They don't receive anything from men, churches, associations or conventions. *When gospel order* is established, the actions of men are **visible and manifest actions**. This action does not **cause** anything. The church is a church before it is organized but only in **anticipation**. This is only in a **spiritual** sense. Its organization makes it visible. The organization of a gospel church **manifests** what and who the members are and have been from eternity. This action does not **cause** anything, it only **manifests** what already **exists** in God's plan. Its organization brings out of the eternal womb, the man-child who already exists in a secret way by the power and purpose of God. **The business of the everlasting covenant is to make manifest what has been invisible or hidden from eternity**.

OBJECTION:

You seem to be teaching a **universal invisible church**.

ANSWER:

I am not. I teach no such thing. The universal invisible church concept is Protestant. It is a doctrine of devils. **Zwingli invented it in the 1,500s** to justify the Protestant Reformation. That is a fact of **historical theology**. The only way the church may be considered **INVISIBLE** is, there are **uncalled elect** who are not yet **in visible or manifested order**. In addition, the work of grace within is **invisible** until **obedience comes and makes it visible**. The *unconverted elect* are **unknown or invisible** to us. In due time, if the Lord wills, they too are called into a **manifested union and order**. By this they will become *visible*.

Note the following two statements:

A stage is marked in the history of this doctrine (church) by the development which Zwingli gave of it, in which for the FIRST TIME THE TWO RELATIONS OF THE IDEA ARE CLEARLY DISTINGUISHED AND EXPRESSED. He also sets out from the material principle of the Reformation; Christ is the Rock on which the Church, that is, the company of believers, is built. From that he obtained the idea of a community of men all bound together by one faith and one spirit; let anyone place all his trust in God through Christ, and he is in the church, that is, in the community of all pious Christians. In his Antibolium (A. D. 1524) he distinguishes first of all the Church in the sense which includes all who have professed Christ, and are found in the outward community of Christians although they do not belong to true believers and secondly, the church as it is described in Ephesians 5., which is without spot, in as much as only those are understood to compose it who believe in Redemption through Christ; they alone are the Church of Christ in the true sense. The community of the sanctified through Christ is the Church which cannot error, for it is founded on the Word of God.

Dr. Augustus Neander, **The History of Christian Dogmas**;
1858; Vol. 2, pps. 686, 687.

Later Protestant theologians developed more fully the differences between ecclesia visibilis and ecclesia invisibilis (in addition to which the other distinction between ecclesia militans and ecclesia triumphans continued to be made). The ecclesia visibilis is either universalis (i. e. dispersed through the world) or particularis (i. e. some Church which has adopted a particular form). The particular Churches are either opposed to, or stand on friendly terms with, each other (1).

Dr. Hagenback, **A History of Christian Doctrines**;
1881; Vol 3, p. 135.

I hold no **Protestant** doctrines or concepts of ecclesiology. The **business** of the everlasting covenant is to make **visible** what has been **invisible**. Christians or true believers do not remain invisible. The **revealed system** of Jesus Christ is the **standard of unity for all believers**.

OBJECTION

There is a **union which** all Christians have with each other, even those who are in **false** churches.

Answer

Yes, they are all members of the **family of God**. This is **not** the invisible church. Visible church union is based on **visible oneness according to Ephesians 4:1-6**. There is no **invisible church** which cuts across all denominational lines as the basis of Christian fellowship. ***The basis of Christian fellowship is union with Jesus Christ in His gospel system of faith, order, worship and works.*** This is the unity of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit brings His converted saints into this **visible or manifested union** for ***Christ's sake*** and ***God's honor and glory.***

Before we go into this lecture, we should remember that the **seeds of death** were sown in the Christian faith even during the life and times of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. Therefore, there may be some **quotes** in this lecture which are not as **Biblical** as they should be.

1. There is a **form of succession** which is Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. That is **Personal Succession**.

2. There is a **form of succession** which is **natural**, the natural seed of church members, that is Hebrew or **O. T. succession**. The **Pedobaptists** of all types also maintain this to justify infant baptism and church membership.

3. Believers ***outside of and before there was a Roman or Greek Catholic Church*** have **maintained Church Succession**.

4. During the **middle of the second century**, Apostates laid the foundation for what has grown into the **Roman and Greek Catholic Churches**.

5. There was no case of **infant baptism recorded** until the middle of the **fourth century**.

6. The first **universal Pope** did not come until **606 A. D.**

7. The **dipping of adult believers for gospel baptism** is of divine origin.

8. This **baptism** has had an **unbroken succession** back to John the Baptist and Jesus Christ.

I.

DID THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS BELIEVE IN CHURCH SUCCESSION?

Yes, they did. The Apostolic Fathers lived during the first century after the Apostles' deaths. They are the Apostles' disciples. Their opinions are valuable because they taught what they **understood** the Apostles to teach. The problem is, there are **several versions** of their works. The only way to have a fairly safe statement on any given subject is **to**

secure the several different renderings of their works. This I did. I offer the following remarks as **historical opinions, not binding authority.** Irenaeus is a general representative of the others during that era.

Irenaeus, 120-202, stated:

Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church, those who, as I have shown, possess the SUCCESSION from the Apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But (it is also incumbent) to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive SUCCESSION, and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, (looking upon them) either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory. For all these have fallen from the truth. And the heretics, indeed, who bring strange fire to the altar of God--namely strange doctrines--shall be burned up by the fire from heaven, as were Nadab and Abiud. . . .

The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 1, p. 497.

Again he said:

Paul then, teaching us where one may find such says, "God hath placed in the Church, first apostles; secondly; prophets; thirdly, teachers." Where therefore, the gifts of the Lord have been placed there it behooves us to learn the truth, (namely), from those who possess that Succession of the Church which is from the Apostles, and among whom exists that which is sound and blameless in conduct, as well as that which is unadulterated and incorrect in speech.

Ibid., p. 498.

But, again, when we refer them to that tradition which originates from the apostles, and which is preserved by means of the succession of presbyters in the Churches, they object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth.

It is within the power of all, therefore, in every church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the Churches, and to demonstrate the succession of these men of our own times; . . .

Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the succession of all the Churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, ASSEMBLE in unauthorized meetings; we do this I say, by indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also by pointing out the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the Bishops, . . .

Ibid., p. 415

We use these statements to illustrate the early Christians' belief in the **succession of the churches, ministers and gospel system of Jesus Christ.**

II.

THE SUCCESSION OF BAPTIST FOREFATHERS

Most of the Baptists in America are descendants from the old Welsh and English Baptists who settled here from the early 1630s to the early 1700s.

First, let us consider the **succession of the Welsh Baptists**. J. Davis, in 1835 stated:

They (Welsh Baptists) must have been a separate people, maintaining the order of the New Testament in every age and generation, from the year 63 to the present time.

J. Davis, **A History of the Welsh Baptists**; 1835: p. 20.

Secondly, we will now consider the statements of some early American Baptists:

A. **John L. Waller**, the godfather of the Kentucky Baptist Convention, 1800-1854, stated in the **Western Baptist Review**, which he edited:

*Let these authorities suffice for the present. They prove conclusively for they are concessions wrung from unfriendly lips by truth too stubborn to be compromised, that the Baptists were not called out of mystical Babylon by Luther or Calvin, or Henry the 8th, that they existed long before the time and dreary darkness of the world's moral midnight, and we give this as the concluding reason **Why I Am A Baptist**.*

John L. Waller, **The Western Baptist Review**; 1848: p. 166.

The godfather of the Kentucky Baptist Convention, and one of the leaders of what evolved into the Southern Baptist Convention, **believed so strongly in the divine origin of the Baptists and their succession**, that he gave that as the concluding reason why he was a Baptist.

B. The **Sandy Creek Association** is the third oldest Association in America, being organized in 1758. They wrote in 1839:

Baptists have never succeeded from any other denomination. All other denominations have either succeeded from Rome or one another; they made a division when they came into existence; instead of receiving their baptisms as valid, they are to be marked and avoided for causing divisions, Rom. 16:17.

We cannot admit the validity of their baptism without admitting that they are true and scriptural gospel churches. If we do this, we unchurch ourselves, for God never set up or authorized but one Christian denomination. He is not the author of confusion; or of antagonistic denominations. The Baptist is the only denomination that can claim descent from the Apostolic churches, through the true persecuted and witnessing church that fled into the wilderness for 1260 years; Revelation 12:6 and 14.

History of the Sandy Creek Association, Minutes for the Year 1839.

C. **Dr. William Carry Crane**, then Pastor of the First Baptist in Columbus, Mississippi, stated while preaching before the Columbus Association of Mississippi in 1845:

It is not pretended that always there have been a people called Baptists. The name is nothing; we only maintain that always there have been people who have cherished and practiced Baptist principles. The Welsh churches claim an unbroken continuity since the days of the Apostles.

The Baptist Preacher, 1846; pps. 144-149.

D. **Dr. J. Newton Brown**, framer of the **New Hampshire Baptist Confession of Faith**, and Author of **A History of the Religious Denominations** and many other works, stated in **The Baptist Memorial** of 1846:

Briefly, we mean that Christ has had for eighteen hundred years past a visible church on earth, made up of the entire body of particular churches formed under the general constitution of the New Testament, of faithful men acknowledging Him alone as their head and preserving the doctrine worship and discipline which He has commanded. . . That this church has had all this time a succession of vicissitudes and characters so peculiar as to furnish materials for the most valuable record-- and that the complete and authentic collection of these facts-- in all their real connections and relations from age to age--so as to present a true picture of the visible body of Christ, in distinction from all other bodies of men, of whatever name, is necessary to a faithful history of the Church of Christ.

Again he stated:

As will be evident from the above expositions of their principles, the Baptists claim their origin from the Ministry of Christ and His apostles, they further claim, that all the Christian Churches of the first two centuries after Christ were founded and built up upon these principles.

Dr. J. Newton Brown, **A History of Religious Denominations in the World**; 1873: p. 40.

E. **Dr. Jesse Mercer**, the leading early Baptist of Georgia and spiritual founder of Mercer University in Georgia, stated as to why the Baptists of his days did not receive dipping from others who were not Baptists:

The Apostolic Church, continued through all ages to the end of the world, is the only true gospel church. . . . Our reasons therefore for rejecting baptism by immersion, when administered by Pedobaptist ministers. . . .that they are connected with churches clearly out of the Apostolic succession, and therefore clearly out of the Apostolic commission.

Jesse Mercer, **The History of the Georgia Association**, 1838;
Circular Letter for 1811, Pages 196-201;

F. **Dr. R. B. C. Howell**, the godfather of the Southern Baptist Convention, edited **The Baptist** before Dr. J. R. Graves, and stated:

1846 years since Jesus Christ came on earth to set up a kingdom, which is to endure to the end of time. . . . What is called ecclesiastical history is the narrative of almost everything but the History of the Churches of Jesus Christ. . . . We have evidence before us, full and conclusive, that the great body of the ancient Waldenses would now pass for sound, consistent Baptists. From them originated the Lollards and Wycliffites in England and Several of the Old English Baptist Churches.

The Baptist, Vol. 3; 1846.

It is unnecessary to state again the doctrines we shall support. This we did at the beginning of the last volume. Our principles are those which have characterized the legitimate church of Christ in all ages and countries.

The Baptist, Vol. 2; 1845.

The churches themselves, indeed which are known by the name of Baptist, were organized, perhaps the oldest of them in Europe, since the Reformation, although the Welsh Churches claim an unbroken continuity from the days of the Apostles.

Ibid.

G. **Dr. David Benedict**, the most complete general historian of the New School Baptists, stated:

The more I study the subject, the stronger are my convictions, that if all the facts of the case could be disclosed, a very good succession could be made out.

David Benedict, **A General History of the Baptist Denomination**; 1848; p. 51.

H. **Dr. Thomas Armitage**, leading Downgraders historian of the North stated:

The best service that can be rendered to the Baptists is, to trace the noiseless energy and native immortality of the doctrines which they hold, after all their conflicts, to the glory of Christ, for it is exactly here that we see their excellency as a people. If it can be shown that their churches are the most like the Apostles that now exist, and that the elements which make them so have passed successfully through the long struggle, SUCCESSION from the time of the their blessed Lord gives them the noblest history that any people can crave.

Thomas Armitage, **A History of the Baptists**; 1890: p. 11.

I. **Dr. Joseph Belcher**, Baptist author, stated in his large work, **Religious Denominations in Europe and America**:

It will be seen that the Baptists claim the high antiquity of the commencement of the Christian church. They can trace a succession of those who have believed the same doctrine and administered the same ordinances directly up to the Apostolic age.

Page 53.

J. **Dr. William Cathcart**, editor of **The Baptist Encyclopedia**, stated:

The Baptist denomination was founded by Jesus during his earthly ministry.

William Cathcart, Editor, **The Baptist Encyclopedia**, page 74; 1881.

III.

STATEMENTS FROM THE EARLY AMERICAN BAPTIST

ASSOCIATIONS AND THEIR CONFESSIONS OF FAITH

The oldest associations of Churches in America are:

1. The Philadelphia Association, Penn., 1707;
2. The Charleston Association, South Carolina, 1760;
3. The Sandy Creek Association, North Carolina, 1760.
4. The Kehukee Association, North Carolina, 1765.
5. The Kettocton Association, Virginia, 1776;
6. The Warren Association, Rhode Island, 1767;
7. The Stonington Association, Connecticut, 1772;
8. The Red Stone Association, Pennsylvania, 1776;
9. The New Hampshire Association, New Hampshire, 1776;
10. The Shaftesbury Association, Vermont, 1781;
11. The Woodstock Association, Vermont, 1783;
12. The Georgia Association, Georgia, 1784;
13. The Holston Association, Tennessee, 1786;
14. The Bowdoinham Association, Main, 1787;
15. The Vermont Association, Vermont, 1787.

Here are some samples from the associational records:

1. **The Philadelphia Baptist Association** stated:

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of positive and sovereign institution; appointed by the Lord Jesus the only law-giver, to be continued in His church to the end of the world. . .

The Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith,
Article 1, Chapter 30.

2. **The Sandy Creek Association** stated:

That baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of the Lord, and to be continued by His church until His Second Coming.

The Confession of Faith, article 8.

In their history George Purfory stated:

That the Baptist Churches are of Apostolic origin we think has been clearly proven in the preceding pages, and also that they have existed in every age of the Church, from the days of John the Baptist until now.

George Purfory, **A History of the Sandy Creek Association**; p. 31.

3. **The Kehukee Baptist Association** stated in their history:

The word Baptist may be considered as a society or as a Baptizer. If by it we are to understand a Particular society of people, we may claim the highest original, since we read in the very front of the N. T. in those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness. It does not say, in those days came John the Church man, nor John the Presbyterian, nor John the Quaker, but John the Baptist.

Burkett and Read, **The History of the Kehukee Baptist Association**, Page xiii.

4. **The Georgia Baptist Association** stated:

We believe that water baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of the Lord, and are to be continued till His second coming.

Mercer, **op. cit.** Article 3 under Gospel Order, p. 31.

5. **The Virginia Baptist Association**, organized in 1771, adopted the **Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith**, see Semple's **History of The Baptists in Virginia**; 1810: p. 92 of edition of 1972.

6. **The Mississippi Baptist Association**, organized in 1806, stated:

We believe that baptism and the Lord's Supper are gospel ordinances, appointed by Jesus Christ, and are to be continued in the church, . . .

Bond, **A History of the Mississippi Baptist Association**;
1846: p. 9; Article 2, of *Gospel Order*.

7. **The Charleston Baptist Association** adopted the **Philadelphia Baptist Confession of Faith**. See King's **History of South Carolina Baptists**, page 62.

8. **The Kentucky Baptist Association**, when meeting on June 25th, 1785, considered this question:

*Whether the **Philadelphia Confession of Faith**, adopted by the Baptists, shall be strictly adhered to, as the rule of our communion, or whether a suspension thereof, for the sake of society, be best?*

*Answered: It is agreed that the said recited **Confession of Faith** be strictly adhered to.*

Is it *any wonder* **The Baptist Encyclopedia** stated:

The Baptist denomination was founded by Jesus during his earthly ministry.

William Cathcart, Editor, **The Baptist Encyclopedia**, page 74; 1881.

See our Appendix I for the full section from **The Baptist Encyclopedia**.

IV.

THE FOREIGN BAPTIST TESTIMONY

I. **The English and Welsh Baptists.**

1. **C. H. Spurgeon:**

We believe that the Baptists are the original Christians. We did not commence our existence at the Reformation, we were reformers before Luther or Calvin were born; we never came from the Church of Rome, for we were never in it, but we have an unbroken line up to the Apostles themselves.

Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, 1861, p. 225.

2. **B. W. Carr**, on behalf of the deacons at the laying of the foundation stone for the Metropolitan Tabernacle, stated:

*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 practiced through an **UNBROKEN SUCCESSION**.*

The New Park Street Pulpit, 1859; p. 347.

3. **The Welsh Baptists:**

The Welsh Baptists contend, that Baptist principles were maintained in the recesses of their mountainous principality, all along through the dark reign of popery, God had a regular chain of true and faithful witnesses in this country, in every age, from the first introduction to Christianity to the present time.

J. Davis, **A History of the Welsh Baptists**; 1835: p. 16

4. **Robert Robinson**, the most liberal of the English Baptist historians, an Open-Communionists and Unitarian, stated:

All over the Empire (Roman REP) puritan churches were constituted and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterward, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and a succession of them continued till the Reformation.

Ecclesiastical Researches, 1790; p. 476.

5. **B. Evans**, in his **History of the Early English Baptists** stated:

A succession of able and intrepid men taught the same great principles, in opposition to a corrupt and affluent state church, which distinguishes modern English Nonconformists; many of them taught those peculiar views of Christian ordinances which are special to us as Baptists.

History of the Early English Baptists, Vol. 1, p. 2.

6. **Thomas Crosby**, the English Baptist historian, when he had ignored the early origin of the English Baptists in volume one, devoted 58 pages to their origin and succession in his introduction to volume two. Torbet places him at the head or first of the **succession historians**. Torbet is *incorrect*. **John Spittlehouse** deserves that honor. He published his history in 1652. Then came **Henry D'Anvers** with his hundreds of pages between 1673 and 1676. **Joseph Hooke**, a General Baptist was next, about 1701. Then came **Thomas Davye**, also a General Baptist, about 1716. But none the less, Mr. Crosby stated:

Besides, it having been objected to me, that a more early account of the English Baptists might be obtained it gave a new turn to my thoughts; and put me upon considering the State and condition of the Christian Religion, from the First Plantation of the Gospel in England, now in this inquiry, so much has occurred to me, as carries in it more than a probability, that the first English Christians were Baptists. I could not therefore pass by so material a fact in their favor; and because it cannot now be placed where it properly belongs, I have fixed it by way of preface to this second volume.

A History of The English Baptists,
Volume 2; *To The Reader*: 1740.

7. **Joseph Ivimey** wrote a large, *mistake filled* 4 volume set on English Baptist history. ***There is no set of Baptist Historical works which is filled with more blunders and errors than Volume 2 of Ivimey's works.*** However, he did devote 572 pages to tracing the Baptists in the Dark Ages from Christ to the 1600s. He published his first volume in 1811.

8. **G. H. Orchard** wrote several large volumes tracing the succession of the Baptists from Christ's time to the present. He published his works in the early 1850s.

9. **J. H. Wood**, a General Baptist, wrote his **History of the Baptists** in 1847. He devoted nearly 100 pages showing Baptist Church succession. Then he gave a chart showing Baptist Church succession. His weakness is, like the modern A. B. A. and B. M. A. A. historians, he tried to make the succession of the General Baptists run through the old People who were predestinarians or particular redemptionists. He stated:

Who can then doubt the existence of a succession of churches perpetuating the most important principles of the Primitive Societies? We will present a table of succession in which they are

unequivocally identified as Baptists, we adduce one more authority on the continued denominational existence and witnessing of the Baptists through successive generations. . .

(Woods then cited Cardinal Hosius who placed the Baptists back to 370 A. D. Hosius stated such in 1570.)

10. **The Northern Association of Baptist Churches in the North of England**, at their annual session of June 1, 1841, requested that "*a summary account of our rise, progress, and present state, as a denomination in the North of England be submitted to the Association next year.*"

The executive committee of the association requested D. Douglas to prepare the history. This was completed and published as a **History of the Baptist Churches in the North of England from 1648-1845** and printed in London in 1846. The author devoted 26 pages to Baptist history from Christ to 1648 and summed it up by making the following observations:

Thus have we taken a hasty survey of the exhibition of Baptist principles, under a variety of names, from the Apostolic era to the present time, and have, we trust, shown successfully, that there have been those in all ages who have signed for purity of communion, and have made baptism the line of demarcation between the church and the world. We conclude, that the Baptists are a very ancient party, desirous ever to maintain purity of Christian character, and of Apostolic institutions.

Page XXIII.

11. During 1809 the **Particular Baptists** who followed the *New School* concepts of **Fuller** and **Carey**, established **The Baptist Magazine**. They stated in 1809:

The Baptists have no origin short of the Apostles. They arose in the days of John the Baptist and increased largely in the days of the Apostles, and have existed, under the severest oppressions, with intervals of prosperity, ever since.

12. **James Culross**, ex-President of Bristol Baptist College, stated in 1885 about the Baptists of 1645:

Had Baptists thought anything depended on it, they might have traced their pedigree back to New Testament times and claimed apostolic succession. The channel of succession was certainly purer, if humbler, than through the Apostate church of Rome. But they were content to rest on Scripture alone, and, as they found only believer's baptism there, they adhered to that. . .

The Life of Hansard Knollys, London; 1885: page 38.

13. **Thomas Davye** stated:

I have been the larger on the fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters, therein chiefly to make it out, that the Antipedobaptists are not a People of so late an original as is pretended, and to remove that grand and vain objection, That they are but of Yesterday; when it is as clear as the Sun, they have been a People in all Ages, even successively Down from the Apostles to this very Day, and so doubtless will be to the end of the World. God has not, or will suffer His truth to be lost, though it find cold Entertainment in the Eyes of most of the Great Men of this World.

**The Baptism of Adult Believers Only Asserted
and Vindicated;** London: 1719; pps. vii and viii.

14. **Benjamin Hooke** devoted the first 32 pages in his remarkable work to show that the Baptists did not start in Germany in 1522 or thereabouts. He divided his first chapter into two sections, showing the Baptists did not originate in Germany in the 1500s. He devoted the second part to show that they started with Jesus Christ and have continued **in an unbroken succession from then to the present.** Here are some of his remarks:

*Thus having showed Negatively, when this Sect called Anabaptists did not begin, We shall shew in the next place affirmatively, when it did begin; for a beginning it had, and it concerns us to inquire for the Fountain Head of this Sect; for if I was sure that it were no Older than the Munster-Fight that Mr. Eratt puts in mind of, I would Resolve to forsake it, and would persuade others to do so too. **That Religion that is not as Old as Christ and His Apostles, is too new for me.***

But Secondly, Affirmatively, we are fully persuaded and therefore do boldly, though humbly, assert, that this Sect is the very same sort of People that were first called Christians in Antioch, Acts 11:26. But sometimes called Nazarenes, Acts 24:5. And as they are everywhere spoken against now, even so they were in the Primitive Times. See Acts 28:22.

Whose first Author was a poor Wise Man, one Jesus of Nazareth, a Prophet mighty in deed and word, before God and all the People, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with him. Some said He had a Devil and was mad, and some called Him Beelzebub the Prince of Devils. This was the Master of this Family and first broacher of this Sect, as we verily believe, Who employed for His Missionaries, to propagate this Sect, a Company of Fishermen, Publicans, and Tent-makers, these Foolish, Weak, and Base things of the World, and the off scouring of all things, these He chose to go on His errand, and these did go and do His business effectually, and prevailed with many people in many Nations, to follow this way, and be of this Sect.

And ever since it has had a being in the World, but had been hated in all Ages, by bad Priests and Interested men, who have been very tender of their Worldly Privileges, and look with a Jealous Eye upon this Sect, lest they should undermine them and overthrow their interests. . .

*But we may observe, that this Sect was not always called by one Name, as in the Apostles days, they were sometimes called Christians, and sometimes Nazarenes, so afterwards they had divers Names by which they were known and distinguished in History, as is manifested from approved Authors, by the great diligence of that Learned Gentleman Colonel Danvers, in his **Treatise of Baptism and History of Christianity Amongst the Ancient Britains and Waldneses**, where he showed, that these People were sometimes named from the Places of their Abode, sometimes from their Principal Leading Men, and sometimes from Reproach and Slander.*

He observes, amongst other names, too many here to rehearse, that they were called Lyonists, or the poor people of Lyons, in France, Albigenses, Arletenses, Waldneses, Lollards, Wickliffits, &c.

And sometimes Anciently they were called Anabaptists, as they have been of late times, and for the same cause; for when others Innovated in the Worship of God, and changed the Subject in Baptism, they kept on their way, and Men grew Angry, and for mending an Error, they called them Anabaptists, and so they came by this name, which is very Ancient, as appears from Dr. Russell in his Answer to Mr. Harrison, p. 66.

I can prove (saith he), and that by an Imperial Edict that was issued forth against them by that name, that in the time of Theodoius and Honorius, Anno, 413. They were in that called Anabaptists, intending thereby such who maintained the same opinions with the Baptists in this Age. For proof he refers to the Bloody Theater, &c. See also Danvers' Treatise, 2 ed., page 113.

But though they had such diversity of Names, yet they were one People, and all had one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all. They were Massacred, Banished, Hanged, Burnt, and Drowned, and by such like Powerful Arguments Solicited from time to time, both by papists and Protestants, to leave their way and join with them, especially to join with the Church of Rome. But these Arguments, though deadly strong, could not prevail with these valiant Worthies, to own the Pope for their Lord, or to receive Baptism or Orders from him, or to Symbolize with him in his Ceremonies, or to Worship the Idols that he and his Babylonish Tribe set up.

The Ancient British Churches also, (if Authors mistake not) were exactly of this mind in the Sixth Century, when Austin the Monk came hither from Gregory Bishop of Rome, which was Anno Do. 596.

Pages 19-21.

But we think it sufficient, that we can prove all that we teach by the infallible Record of God's Word, and if all Histories and Monuments of Antiquity had been overlaid, lost or burnt, as many have been so that we had never been able to shew from any Book but the Bible, that there were never any of our Persuasion in the World, till within a few Years, yet we should think that Book enough to prove the Antiquity of our Persuasion, that we are not a new Sect, seeing we can make it appear by that one Book, that our Persuasion is as old as Christ and His Apostles.

And on the contrary, if we could shew from approved History, That multitudes in all Ages and Nations since the Apostles days have been of our Persuasion, yet if we could not prove by the Word of God, that our Persuasion is true, it would signify very little. Therefore in the next place, we shall Demonstrate that our Doctrine is according to the Holy Scriptures, The Standard of Truth, as Mr. Eratt calls them.

A Necessary Apology For the Baptized Believers, London; 1701, p. 32.

15) **William Jones**, the historian whom the Pedobaptists tried to ruin during the early 1800s, stated in his **Church History**:

When the first churches began to swerve from the form of sound words, to corrupt the discipline of the House of God, and to commit fornication with the Kings of the earth, by forming an alliance with the state, we cease to trace the Kingdom of Christ among them, but we find it successively among the Churches of the Novatians, the followers of Aerius, and the Paulicians, the Cathari, or Puritans in Germany, the Paterines and the Waldenses, until the times of the Reformation.

Church History, London; 1826, page v.

William Jones published his **Church History**, his **Ecclesiastical Lectures** and founded and edited **The Gospel Magazine** for a number of years in the early 1820s. In addition he wrote and published a large **Commentary on the Book of Revelation** in 1833. His entire scope of work illustrated the **succession** of those people known as Particular Baptists. His works, like those of Henry D'Anvers, should be read and studied by all concerned Christians throughout the Christian world. His **Church History** forms a fine history of Western Civilization with many little known facts about the Roman Catholic Church and its Crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenses as well as against the Turks and others who owned the Holy Lands.

2. **The Scottish and Irish Baptist Testimony.**

1. **Archibald M'Lean** stated:

Christ's promise imports the fulfillment of all the Prophecies and Promises relating to His kingdom, even unto the end of the world.

Christ's promise of being with His church was not exhausted in the first ages of Christianity, but extends through all succeeding ages, even unto the end of the world.

The Commission, p. 238.

Christ has instituted the standing ministry of Pastors and teachers in His church unto the end of time, and they are supposed to be acting as stewards over His house when He comes. This promise therefore extends to all succeeding ordinary teachers whom He calls to that work, and who in their sphere shall faithfully execute this commission, according to the doctrine and example of the Apostles, even unto the end of the world.

The Commission, 1786; pps. 234, 235.

3. **The Dutch Baptist Testimony**

1. **Christian** stated:

The Baptists of the Reformation claimed that they had an ancient origin and went so far as to suggest a succession of Churches. This claim was put forth by them at the very beginning of the Reformation, A. D. 1521.

John T. Christian, **A History of the Baptists**; Nashville, 1922: Vol. 1; p. 92.

2. **Thieleman J. Van Braght** stated:

Why we have treated a History of the Anabaptists, may easily meet with some opposition because some will not admit that the Anabaptists, or those who maintained such a Confession as they do, have existed through every century, from the days of Christ up to the present time; and what is still more, that they have had their martyrs. . . .

The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror, Covering from Christ to the Year 1660; p. 16.

We arrive now at the point we had in view from the beginning, and which we shall now present more plainly and fully. It is certain that the Lord has spoken here of the preaching of the Holy Gospel, of faith, of baptism, and of the manner of establishing up His church as it was His will that the same should be built up and maintained through all ages, after saying this, He gave the before mentioned promise. . . . (Matt. 28:18-20).

It is settled, therefore, that the visible church of Jesus Christ . . . shall exist through all time, even unto the consummation of the Ages; for, otherwise, the promise . . . "Lo, I am with you all the days," cannot be fulfilled in her.

Even as, besides preaching and faith, baptism shall continue in the Church to the end of time, so also the Holy Supper. This appears from the Words of Paul, I Cor. 11:26.

It follows that there will be, throughout all ages to the end of the world, a Church which will observe the external ordinances of Christ not only in respect to Holy Baptism, but also to the Holy Supper, and the showing forth of the Lord's Words "till He come. . ."

V.

IN CONCLUSION TO THIS LECTURE

When I defined the various concepts of **Baptist Succession** in Lecture Two, I made this statement:

Baptist baptism began with the first Baptist, John. Jesus Christ received His baptism from John who was commissioned and sent by God the Father. Jesus Christ baptized through His disciples during His personal ministry. Following His resurrection, Jesus sent His disciples into all the world to preach and baptize. This they did. The Holy Spirit administers water baptism now by means of His gospel ministers, Christ's gifts to His churches. This gospel system has had an unbroken succession of preachers, administrators and churches since that time. God the Father administered this **ONE BAPTISM** by John the Baptist. Jesus Christ administered this **ONE BAPTISM**, through His disciples **DURING** His personal ministry. The Holy Spirit administers this **ONE BAPTISM** through the ministers and messengers of the churches, the glory of Christ. Therefore, there is **ONE HEAVENLY BAPTISM** *which is in water*, by God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. **This is heaven's baptism.** Matt. 28:18-20; Matt. 3; Eph. 4:4-6; John 4:1,2; I Cor. 12:13,14.

Jesus Christ constituted the first Baptist church in Jerusalem during His personal ministry. The gospel church then existed in its **womb-like condition** until after Christ's resurrection. It was **lifted into the heavenly realm** by Christ's post-resurrection ministry. It then ceased its womb-like condition and came forth. The gospel church grew up at the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit **empowered** it by taking the **personal place** Jesus Christ vacated when He returned to Heaven. The Jerusalem Church then reached out into all the world by many different Apostles and ministers. Some were merely preaching disciples. Gentile churches became formed. From one of these, the Gentile church at Antioch through the Apostle Paul, the Gospel and its system, spread into the Western world. Once established in the Western World, it has continued unto this day.

I pointed out that this was my understanding of what Baptists have believed about their succession even though they may not have broken it down in as simple terms as I have. In what way or ways am I wrong?

Remember R. B. C. Howell the god-father of the **Southern Baptist Convention**? I will conclude this lecture with some of his remarks:

One thousand eight hundred and forty-six years since Jesus Christ came to earth to set up a Kingdom, which is to endure to the end of time.

The "beginning" was in the ministry of his forerunner John in the year 26. Its organization was completed under the ministry of the Apostles, in the year 33. The history of this kingdom, in its Scriptural character and simplicity, and in consecutive order of time, has never been fully written. What is called "**Ecclesiastical History**," is the narrative of almost every thing *but the history of the churches of Jesus Christ.*

To support my claims I have shown what the old Baptists have believed by:

1. Showing by Ireaneaus that the Apostolic Fathers did believe in Church Succession;
2. Showing the views the early American Baptists held as to their own succession;
3. Showing the statements of the early American Baptist Confessions of Faith and Associational histories;
4. The Foreign Baptist testimony.

In Conclusion to this Lecture:

My conclusion is, where ever we find God's people, we find them believing in their Divine Origin and their unbroken succession back to Jesus Christ.

Finish

LECTURE IV

BAPTIST SUCCESSION IN THE 1600s

When we look into the 1600s we see the General Baptists and the Particular Baptists.

I. Statement of General Baptist Writers

Among the General Baptists, the most important writers would have to be **Thomas Grantham** who wrote in the late 1600s and **Samual Fisher** who wrote in the middle 1600s.. Grantham's writings were many and fair on the church and ordinances. They were not yet **characterized** by Quakerism, the Invisible Church, and Invisible Holy Spirit Baptism. The General Baptist writings lacked the depth and completion we are used to. When a General Baptist studied in depth and completed his quest for knowledge then he became a Particular Baptist. We shall produce some remarks from Grantham:

A Defence of the Office of Subordinate Apostles of Christ, or Messengers of His Churches, and the perpetuity of His Ministry by Divine Institution, for the more orderly Promulgation of the Gospel, and the better settlement of Churches to the end of the World.

Book IV, Treatise V, Primitive Christianity, page 152.

That there is such a Ministry of Messengers of Apostles as we have defined, or right remaining to the Church to the end of the World, is yet more evident, from the fixedness of the Gifts bestowed on the Church through the ascension of Christ, Eph. 4; 1 Cor. 12:28. Here we observe the Gift of God's Spirit is that which fits Men for the Ministry; this Ministry so fixed in the Church to the end of the World; part of this Ministry are Apostles, and therefore to continue in the Church to the end of the World.

Ibid., p. 156.

The sum of that which has been said; from the State or Order of the first Churches, lies in this Syllogism.

The first Churches had a Ministry of many Apostles or Messengers, beside the chief Apostles. This Ministry was never taken away, or de jure made to cease.

Therefore the Church of Christ has, or ought to have, such a Ministry of Apostles or Messengers to the end of the World.

Ibid., p. 159.

If it be the duty of the Church in all Ages, to pray to the Lord that he would send forth such a Ministry into the World, there is not any room left for any to doubt of the continuance of such an office, as that of Messengers or Apostles, as by us asserted, . . .

Ibid., p. 162.

Grantham's concept was, the gospel church should have two different kinds of ministers, a fixed ministry in the church, and an at large ministry to the world. This was the common position of all Baptists before they became Protestantized during the 1700s. The Particular Baptists called this a **Feeding** Ministry and a **Begetting** ministry.

II.

The Calminians

Thomas Collier walked with the Particular Baptists during the early part of his ministry. He was with William Kiffen and Hansard Knollys in London. Later he went into the Western part of England and helped gather the churches in the Somerset Association. Following that, he abandoned most of his Particular Baptist theology and tried to united the Particular and General Baptists. He was unsuccessful. Finally the Particular Baptists disowned him by 1677. They issued, thorough Nemeiah Cox, their rejection of his new theology. However, Collier remained constant in Baptist **ecclesiology**.

Collier stated:

God hath in all his administrations throughout all ages, had his INSTITUTED ORDINANCES BY WHICH HIS PEOPLE (HIS CHURCH) WAS DISTINGUISHED FROM OTHERS, and in the observation of which they did own God in the World, and the truth is, that the institutions of God in matters of Worship, have been the Badge of distinction between the Church and the world throughout all ages, and the cause of all the woe and misery that hath come on mankind, and on the people of God, hath been for the Transgression of Instituted Ordinances.

Body of Divinity, London; 1674: page 466.

III. Statement of Particular Baptist Writers:

1. **John Spilsbury** gathered the first lasting Particular Baptist Church in London, at Wapping, in 1633. Often he defended the Particular Baptists against the charges of Pedobaptists and Seekers. Concerning the alleged Baptists lack of a true succession, he answered:

Objection 20

The Church and Its Ordinances have Departed and are Not Restored Yet

It is said, Rev. 6:14, That heaven departs, & c. Which must be understood of the Church and Ordinances, and we do not find when she appeared in the like manner again.

Answer

That this must necessarily be understood of a departing of the Church and ordinances is not so certain as is imagined. See the like prophecy in Isaiah 34:4, and note well what went before in vers. 2, 3, and what follows in verses 5, 6-11 and then consider whether Isaiah did there prophecy of such a departure of the Church and Ordinances as is now spoken of. That departing of heaven as a scroll, spoken of in Rev. 6:14, shall then be when the Sun becomes black as sackcloth, and the Moon as blood; when the stars of heaven fall unto the earth, as figs from a fig-tree shaken with a mighty wind; when every mountain and island are moved out of their places, when the Kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich, and the chief Captains and the mighty, and every bondman, and every free-man hide themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains, &c. See the place, viz. Rev. 6:12-16, and then judge whether it be certain that this prophecy is fulfilled, and the heavens departing as a scroll is a departing of the Church and Ordinances.

But let this seem as granted for the present; (because heaven in this Book of the Revelation, does sometimes signify the Church:) but then also mind that the Church's departing is here set forth by a similitude of a book or scroll folded together, which before lay open. So then the Church sometimes lay open in her glory, and her light did shine abroad among the Nations; but now when that great opposition and persecution did rise against her, she retired herself in a more private way. A book or scroll is not defaced nor destroyed when it is rolled up together, but is as perfect in itself as before, only it lies not so open for every one to look into: and so it is with the Church, her departing is not from being a Church, but in respect of her obscuring and hiding of herself from her enemies, as Isaiah 26:20; Rev. 12:6, 14. For she only departed as a scroll when it is rolled together, and so continued in herself a Church, enjoying (as her right) her ordinances and her communion still. For in the next Chapter there is the Lord upon His throne, with His Church and Ministry about Him worshipping. The Church then here departed (as is aforesaid) from her enemies, together with her Ordinances, to a more retired and obscure condition then before, but never departed from herself.

Objection 21

There is now no Entering into Church Order

It is said, Rev. 15:8, That the Temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from His power, and no man was able to enter into the Temple, till the seven plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled; whence it is gathered, that in the time of Antichrist, and the Beast's reign, there is no entering into any Church-order, &c.

Answer

This Teaches There is a Church and Ministers Who Come Out of Her

1. *Consider whether it be not a manifest property of an erring spirit, to wave clear places of the Scripture, calling for the perpetual use of the Ordinances of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper; as Matt. 28:19; I Cor. 11:26, and other like places; and to choose to walk in the dark, retiring to obscure places (not yet understood) for a seeming refuge.*

2. *Consider whether this place do not manifestly allude to that in I Kings 8:10, 11, and whether that place do import that there was any cessation of Ordinances in Solomon's time.*

3. *Then notice that this place in Rev. 15, does hold forth unto us a Church, and a glorious one too. For here is a Temple out of which the seven Angels go with their seven golden vials full of the wrath of God against Antichrist, or the Beast. For this see Rev. 15:1,5,6; Rev. 16:1, &c. Are not these the Ministers of Christ, which go forth of the Temple, which is the Church of Christ, into which men must first come, or else they cannot go out thence: for no man can be said to go out of a place that he never came in.*

Thus this Scripture well considered, shows the weakness of those that take up the same to oppose the Saint's fellowship now, and their confession of Christ in their profession to His order of the New Testament. This text is so far from keeping any back, that it rather calls all that have faith to come, seeing Christ will have at this time (even under the reign of Antichrist) such a Church, out of which God shall raise such notable instruments to encounter with His enemies.

The Various Conditions of the Church are Like Jesus Christ

and

His Various Conditions and Appearances.

Though the Church lay sometimes low and obscure, yet God at sometimes raises her up again. The Church is as the Temple, sometimes open and sometimes shut, and as the Moon, sometimes at the full and sometime in her change; and a wife, sometime sporting with her husband, (as Rebecca with Isaac, Gen. 26:8.) and sometimes in travail and pain: sometime singing the song of Moses and the Lamb, and sometime hanging her harp upon the willows. Thus she is made conformable unto Christ her head, Who is sometime in blood, sometime on His throne, sometime in a cloud, and sometime with His face shining as the Sun; sometime with a rain-bow on Head, and sometime in the brightness of His glory. Therefore, although that truth does not always in like manner appear, yet this frees not man from his obedience unto it when it appears, but rather engages him the more.

God's Ordinance, The Saint's Privilege, London 1646,
Second edition, Magazine, AR 1993, pages 26, 27.

2. **Robert Garner**, a co-worker with Hansard Knollys, stated this:

And if some shall say, The Church is in the Wilderness, and therefore all the Ordinances of God do lie as it were lost, being hidden from us, until the recovery of the Church out of that estate. Their opinion being grounded chiefly upon Revelation 12:6, 14.

I shall propound by way of answer, what I conceive, in a few words. Her wilderness condition, does not figure out or denote her darkness, hiddenness, or not appearing, or the loss of her Ordinances during that space of time, to wit, a thousand two hundred and threescore days: but it teaches us chiefly, a certain middle state or condition, wherein the Church was to continue for such a season, somewhat like that of the Israelites wandering in the Wilderness, after their deliverance from the face of that Serpent, or red Dragon Pharaoh, until their entrance into the Land of Canaan: for I conceive the allusion is chiefly, if not wholly taken from the dealings of God with Israel in those times. This wilderness condition therefore of the woman, is some middle state which God has appointed to her, and prepared for her to continue in, until the time be expired when she shall enter into Canaan, all oppositions being trodden under foot. And concerning this matter, there are two or three things in this Scripture, worthy of our consideration, Rev. 10:

First, that during her condition in the wilderness, she is called the Woman, or the Church; That name or relation is neither lost nor hidden; but agreeing herein to the estate of the Israelites in the

Wilderness, being called the Church in the Wilderness, and enjoying many precious Ordinances and privileges of the Church of God; and yet not come up to that Glory and rest which was before them.

Secondly, God appointed this Wilderness condition, this Middle state to her, partly for safety, that in that condition, during that time, she might be preserved from the face of the Serpent, verse 14. Even as God sent Israel into the Wilderness to preserve them from the rage of Pharaoh, that red Dragon until such a time as the promised Land was to be given to them: So God appointed such a wilderness, (as it were a wandering, unsettled, wayfaring, traveling) condition to the Church for such a time, that she might be preserved from the overwhelming power of the red Dragon, until she come unto that glorious, settled, peaceful condition of rest, which shall ere-long be given to her.

Thirdly, God does graciously provide that the Church shall be fed and nourished during her wilderness condition: verses 6, 14, even as He did graciously produce for Israel in the wilderness.

Fourthly, During her wilderness condition, she has many faithful children, children of the youth, stout warriors, like Arrows in the hand of a mighty man, who maintains the truth and honor of the Lord Jesus against such as join themselves unto superstitions and erroneous practices. These are called the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the Testimony of Jesus Christ, verses 17. I desire that this may be well noted, that during her wilderness condition, she has a seed, a remnant who keep the commandments of God, and have the Testimony of Jesus Christ. And who can warrantable say that these commandments of God are not the Ordinances of God, and the Ordinances of believer's baptism amongst other Ordinances? And who can therefore say upon good ground, that during her wilderness condition the Testimony of Christ is lost, and the commandments and Ordinances of Christ are lost? Seeing this remnant of her seed do keep the commandments of God, and have the Testimony of Jesus Christ, that is, they practice His commandments, and hold forth His testimony. And thus they maintain the truth and honor of the Lord Jesus, against such as join themselves unto superstitious practices; even as the valiant ones of Israel did of old (during their wilderness estates) maintain the Lord's honor against those who made them a God of their own Ear-rings, and gave honor to it. Ex. 32:26, 27, 28, 29.

Fifthly, during her wilderness condition, the woman and the remnant of her seed, meets with much warfare and with many oppositions from the Dragon, for keeping the commandments of God and the Testimony of Jesus Christ, verse 17, yet these oppositions are not so directly from the Dragon mentioned in this chapter, as from the Beast mentioned in the next, who has the Dragon's power and venom in him, but yet would seem to be very devout; even as Israel in the wilderness, after their deliverance from the Rage of the red Dragon, did meet with many oppositions and many troubles: not only from such as were more manifest enemies, but from such also as would seem to be very zealous. Numbers 16:1-5.

Sixthly, the Holy Spirit makes no mention in this Scripture of the NOT appearing of the Church, nor the loss of her Ordinances; neither will it agree to the condition of the Church of Israel in the wilderness, from whence (as I said) I conceive the allusion to be chiefly taken.

Wherefore I see no reason why such a conclusion should be received, to wit, that the Church is lost, and her Ordinances are lost, and therefore that we can neither know, nor do any thing until the consummation of that time of the churches being in the wilderness. Surely such an opinion does arise, and is maintained from the policy of Satan, and not from the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

A Treatise of Baptism, London; 1645: pages 31-35.

3. Hansard Knollys wrote a large **Commentary on Revelation** and several smaller works on different parts of **Revelation**. In these he maintained the succession of the

Gospel church, ministry and ordinances of Jesus Christ. He published them from 1656 to 1689. Knolly's concept of the Book of Revelation **showed the divine origin and continued succession of the Gospel Church, Ordinances and Ministry of Jesus Christ.**

He stated:

The Historical matter of this Book (The Revelation) concerns the state of the Church of God, from the days of the Apostle John in the Isle of Patmos (about the year 96.) in the Reign of Domitian the Emperor unto the end of this World. And, therefore, I would advise the Reader diligently to observe what is already past and fulfilled, what is now fulfilling in our days, and what is hereafter to be fulfilled. And to that end, search the Scriptures, read Ecclesiastical Histories, and other Expositions of this Book, together with this Exposition.

An Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation,
London; 1689; Epistle to the Reader.

4. Daniel King, a student of John Spilsbury, and minister from the Particular Baptist Church meeting at the Glass House in London, ministered to the Midlands and helped gather those churches which became known as "**The Midlands Association.**" While in the Midlands, he wrote his **A Way to Sion**, in 1650. As the Particular Baptists reached into Scotland, King's works were reissued from Edinburgh in 1656. We shall quote from the second edition:

The 13th EXCEPTION

That the fullness of time is not yet come for Ordinances; for as there were several seasons for giving out of truth before, so now.

The Time Of Ordinances Is Come, Cleared.

Answer: The time of Ordinances is come, 1 Cor. 11:2. Paul praises the Corinthians THAT THEY HAD KEPT THE ORDINANCES AS HE DELIVERED THEM UNTO THEM. So that Ordinances were delivered to the Church long ago, and the time of Ordinances has come. The Gospel or Faith was once delivered to the Saints, Jude 3. We read not of another delivery of it to them. Beside, He says in His Book, entitled (Some Beams, etc.) That to wait for an Administrator and Ordinances in an outward way, is Antichristian. So that it seems He did since believe the time of Ordinances is past, directly crossing this Exception.

But that the time of Ordinances is come, I have fully proved in the first part of this Book, showing from the time of Christ's coming in the flesh, throughout all ages to the world's end, there has been, and shall be a succession of Believers, that have the Spirit of Christ, and the word of Christ communicated to them, and shall be enabled in some measure to declare it.

And the Churches being planted, and Ordinances given out then, it is called, Heb. 12 latter end, A KINGDOM THAT CANNOT BE SHAKEN. The time of Ordinances was then, and have been ever since, and so shall continue with the Church upon earth. And I say, there is not a time of giving out Truths, that are not yet given out, Rev. 22:19. But of seeing Truths more clearly, that have been clouded by Antichrist, and so not so clearly seen. Neither do any of the Scriptures cited, prove the consequence of the Proposition, and some of them do not so much as prove the Proposition; for some of them do not

show that there were seasons of giving out truth, but only of manifesting Truth, and so it is now, and still shall be till the unity of the Faith. Acts 1:4; Acts 7:17; Gal. 4:4; Mark. 1:15; Rev. 1:5, 8; and 16, and 18; Acts 1:6, 7.

Stumbling Blocks Removed Out of the Way,
London, 1650; Edinburgh, 1656; Magazine, Ar 1993; page 130.

Succession of Prophesying or Preaching the Gospel, Proved.

Now to prove a succession of Prophecy. also, (i.e.) ordinary preaching, or opening the Word. _

1. It appears it was so till the time of Antichrist's appearing, from Paul's speech to Timothy, 2 Tim. 4:1,2. PREACH THE WORD, BE INSTANT IN SEASON AND OUT OF SEASON, etc. And He gives the reason; FOR THE TIME WILL COME WHEN MEN WILL NOT ENDURE SOUND DOCTRINE, etc. He does not say, The time will come when sound Doctrine shall not be taught; but if it were so, yet it shows that teaching was always in use, and Therefore till Antichrist had darkened it, teaching God's Truth was always in use. And when the Woman was driven into the Wilderness by the Dragon, which is the same time of Antichrist rising and reigning; she is said to have a seed, THAT KEPT THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, AND HAVE THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS, Rev. 3:22. Now the Testimony of Jesus, is the Spirit of Prophecy., Rev. 9:10. (Rev. 12:6 and 13:5.)

Objection: But some may say, They had the Spirit of Prophecy, but they did not exercise it.

Answer: Then they could not have been persecuted for it, as appears, Rev. 12. ult., THE DRAGON MADE WAR WITH THEM (i.e.) WITH HER SEED THAT KEPT THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, AND HAD THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS. And John Himself was persecuted for this, Rev. 1:9, which shows, That having and exercising the Spirit of Prophecy., is the Testimony of Jesus. _

2. That there was Prophecy. under Antichrist, I mean in His time, appears, Rev. 11:3: AND I WILL GIVE POWER TO MY TWO WITNESSES, AND THEY SHALL PROPHESEY 1260 DAYS, CLOTHED IN SACKCLOTH. Now this is the same time with the Beast's reigning, chap. 13:5. And the time of the Woman's being hid in the Wilderness, chap. 12:6.

1. Now that there were men in Office, I cannot see; for under Antichrist's reign, none were allowed to be in public office, but such as were for Him.

2. That they were extraordinarily inspired, I cannot see either, because the Scripture does not prophesy, or foretell any such thing. And History (as far as I can find) makes report of no such thing: And Therefore I should believe it without any ground, if I should credit this. So that they must needs be ordinary Prophets, men endued with the Spirit of God, able to speak the truth in some measure.

Who The Two Witnesses Are, Rev. 11, Discussed At Large In Five Particulars.

But I shall a little beg leave to open this place, and then proceed; we must discuss diverse Questions, that the place may be made plain, because it concerns me to clear up this truth.

2. How long they prophesied.

3. When they began their Prophecy..

4. How they were slain.

5. How raised again.

6. To prove the continuation of Propheying after their resurrection and ascension.

Question 1: What these two Prophets were, or Who they were? _

Answer: I shall not stand much to confute opinions in this point; some say they are MOSES and ELIAS to appear in the end of the world. _

But that Will Appear But A Fancy, For No Scripture Hath Any Show of Such An Interpretation.

1. What these Prophets were.

Others say, they are the two Testaments.

I think the application of all that is here said, will hardly bear that interpretation without a great deal of harshness; for,

1. *These two Witnesses are called two Olive-trees, and two Candlesticks, verse 4. Which things, how they should be applied to the two Testaments by warrant from Scripture, I cannot see: But either to the Church, or some member, either in the Church, or in Christ.*

As for the first of these; Olive-trees, Isa. 17:5,6. The visible Church of Israel is called an Olive-tree. Isa. 24:13. When God threatens destruction to the visible Church, He says, THERE SHALL BE AS THE SHAKING OF AN OLIVE-TREE, etc. Jer. 11:15,16. The Church of the Jews, which God calls His beloved, verse 15. In the 16th verse He speaks thus of her: THE LORD HATH CALLED YOUR NAME A GREEN OLIVE-TREE, etc. So that the Church is called an Olive-tree.

They Are Called Two Anointed Ones, Because Jehoshuah was High Priest, Zach. 3:1. And Zerubbabel Was Set Apart As A Prince To Lay the Foundation At The Topstone, Zach. 4:6, 7, 9. As Solomon Did The First Temple.

Or else sometimes some principal Member in the Church, or in Christ, is called an Olive-tree; As David in Psalm 52:8. I AM A GREEN OLIVE. And Zech. 4:3. Two Olive-trees are said to stand by the Candlesticks, ONE ON THE RIGHT SIDE, AND THE OTHER ON THE LEFT SIDE THEREOF: And these are said to be the two Anointed Ones, that stand by the Lord of the Whole earth, verses 11-14, which was Joshua and Zerrubbabel, which did refresh the CHURCH like oil in their days: Therefore this must needs be meant of some Member, Believers in these days.

2. *They are called two Candlesticks: And Candlesticks are taken either,*

1. *Literally, for that kind of Vessel, or Instrument in a house whereupon the Candle is set, as 1 Kings 4:10; Dan. 5:5; Matt. 5:15. And a literal, or material Candlestick, is sometimes typical, as the Candlestick in the Tabernacle and Temple, did type out the Church, which bears up the light of truth.*

2. *Metaphorically; Sometimes for the Churches, Zech. 4:2. HE SAW A CANDLESTICK OF GOLD, WITH SEVEN LAMPS, etc. You may easily gather from the Chapter, that this was meant the Church; see it clearly, Rev. 1:12. There is SEVEN GOLDEN CANDLESTICKS: And Christ Himself expounds them, verse ult. TO BE SEVEN CHURCHES.*

3. *For some eminent Members of the Church, Matt. 5:15. NEITHER DO MEN LIGHT A CANDLE AND PUT IT UNDER A BUSHEL, BUT ON A CANDLESTICK, AND IT GIVES LIGHT TO*

ALL IN THE HOUSE. LET YOUR LIGHT SO SHINE BEFORE MEN, THAT THEY MAY SEE YOUR GOOD WORKS. The light (I conceive) was the Word of God, which the Disciples were to declare, according to Prov. 6:23 and Psal. 119:105. Therefore the Candlestick here must needs be meant the Disciples, Who carried the light before men to win them to Christ, that they might glorify God.

So that I conceive the two Witnesses here, are men that are Believers, that bear witness to the truth.

4. Some take these two Witnesses to be the Scriptures, and the Assemblies of the Faithful.

1. For the Scriptures, that they witness, it is clear, John 5:39. SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES, FOR IN THEM YE THINK YE HAVE ETERNAL LIFE; AND THEY ARE THEY THAT TESTIFY OF ME. Rom. 3:21. Being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets.

2. For the Assemblies of the Saints, John 3:11. VERILY I SAY UNTO YOU (said Christ) WE SPEAK THAT WE KNOW, AND TESTIFY THAT WE HAVE SEEN, AND YE RECEIVE NOT OUR WITNESS. We; That is Christ, as He is the head of the body, alluding also to His members. John 15:27. Christ tells His Disciples, YE ALSO SHALL BEAR WITNESS. Acts 5:32. The Disciples of Christ tell the Council, WE ARE HIS WITNESSES OF THESE THINGS. Heb. 12:1. All the Believers spoken of, chap. 11 are called a Cloud of Witnesses there.

And say they, These Witnesses are called Olive-trees, which type is taken out of Zech. 4:12 to show, That as God did then preserve His Church, and did beautify it with the graces of His Spirit, and that not so much by the Ministry of man, as by His own grace, which He gave it bountifully and frequently, like Oil dropping of itself: so it should be now, the Church was in danger to be swallowed up; and said He, The Olive-trees are the Books of Scripture, out of Whose Berries, Oil is poured to refresh the Lamps of the Saints. And that the Candlesticks are the Churches, or Assemblies of the faithful, according to Rev. 1:20.

Verse 5, IF ANY MAN WILL HURT THEM, etc. Here is the power they have to destroy their enemies: The fire that proceeds out of the mouth, is the threatening of judgment and ruin to those that alter Scriptures, change, add or diminish, etc. And the fire out of the mouths of the Saints, is the answer to their prayers, as Luke 18. God is said to avenge His Saints that cry to Him day and night. And Rev. 6:10, THE SOULS CRY UNDER THE ALTAR: HOW LONG, LORD, HOLY AND TRUE, DO YOU NOT AVENGE OUR BLOOD ON THEM THAT LIVE UPON THE EARTH? Here is the fire out of their mouths.

Verse 6, THESE HAVE POWER TO SHUT HEAVEN, etc. (i.e.) Spiritually, as Elijah did properly; for all this time of Antichrist's reign, how was Spiritual dew restrained, and scarcity of heavenly fruitfulness in the world? The rest of the sentences show plagues of the like nature; but I shall not particularize any more at this time.

This I reject not as untruth, and for ought I know it is truth, at least in the substance of it; but I rather incline to another interpretation, and that is this:

That the two Witnesses were men that did prophesy against Antichrist all this time of the 42 months, as I said before. —

Reasons.

1. Because the Scriptures are rather the ground of Prophesying, than Prophets themselves: And these two are said to be Prophets.

2. Because now at this time under Antichrist, the Church was fled into the wilderness, as I showed. Chapter 12:6,14; and the Assemblies of Saints scattered; in so much that I think it was rare to find a visible Assembly of Saints in this dark time: Therefore I conclude they were particular men.

— 3. Because it is said, verse 10, *THAT THESE TWO TORMENTED THEM THAT DWELT UPON THE EARTH.* (i.e.) by testifying against their Idolatry and wickedness, which cannot be properly said of the Scriptures themselves, but as they are opened and applied: And herein, I have Master Saltmarsh on my side, in His Book, entitled, *SOME BEAMS OF THAT BRIGHT MORNING STAR*, page 123, Who says, *They are Ministers or Christians that witness to God*, etc. —

They are called God's Witnesses, because they witness to the truth, not only by their Doctrine, but by sealing the same with their blood; by suffering under Antichrist, because they would not yield to His Idolatry. Rev. 20:4, AND I SAW THE SOULS OF THEM THAT WERE BEHEADED FOR THE WITNESS OF JESUS, AND FOR THE WORD OF God : So that Antichrist slew men for witness of Jesus, and the Word of God. —

And they are said to be two; not that they were only two men, for we never read of any two men that lived 1260 years; but a succession of men, for often times succession is called a man, as 2 Thes. 2:3, AND THE MAN OF SIN BE REVEALED, THE SON OF PERDITION (i.e.) Antichrist in all times successively. Matt. 16:19, AND I WILL GIVE UNTO THEE THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, AND WHATSOEVER YOU BIND ON EARTH, etc. (i.e.) to such as you art successively; for else the power of binding and loosing died with Peter, which is false. (1 Cor. 5:2, 3, 6, 14.)

Why They Are Said To Be Two.

1. But I conceive they are said to be two, wither in regard of the fewness of men, that should stand up for God; that which is very rare, or small, or few, is sometimes said to be two, as 1 Kings 17:12: *I am gathering two sticks, the meaning is, a few sticks, a small company.*

2. Or else in regard of the competency of their Witness; *FOR IN THE MOUTH OF TWO OR THREE WITNESSES SHALL EVERY WORD BE ESTABLISHED.* Alluding to the time of old, where things were concluded upon for truth by TWO or three witnesses, and so in many places of the New Testament also. (Some say they are called TWO, because the Testaments are two; but if it be so, it is because the Testaments are their Sword and Buckler, as it were) so that they give a competent evidence against the Beast.

3. Or else they are TWO, in answer to the old types, Moses and Aaron, Who brought Israel out of Egypt: Elijah and Elisha, that brought them from under Baal's Idolatry: Zerubbabel and Joshua, that testified against Nebuchadnezzar's Idolatry. So that it is as much as if God had said these by two Witnesses, are my Moseses and Aarons, my Elijahs and Elishas, my Zerrubbabels and Joshuas, to testify against Antichrist's Idolatry, and as far as they can, to bring My people from under His tyranny. For in the Revelation, every thing almost answers the old Types: and if so, then this is the most cutting interpretation; As for instance, verse 5, *AND IF ANY WILL HURT THEM, FIRE PROCEEDETH OUT OF THEIR MOUTHS, AND DEVoureth THEM*, etc. And did not Elisha call for fire on the Captains and their fifties? 2 Kings 1:6. (James 5:17) It is said, *THEY HAD POWER TO SHUT HEAVEN THAT IT RAIN NOT*, etc. And did not Elijah do so? And verse 6, *THEY HAVE POWER TO SMITE THE EARTH WITH ALL MANNER OF PLAGUES* as often as they will: And did not Moses and Aaron do so by Egypt? Verse 4, *THEY ARE SAID TO BE TWO OLIVE-TREES, AND TWO CANDLESTICKS:* and were not Joshua and Zerrubbabel such, Zech. 4? So that by two Witnesses, I conclude He means men, just like such men in the ancient Church, that reform and restore Religion, so far as they can: But note, by all these things, as fire coming from heaven, etc. We must not understand them literally, but Spiritually, as verse 8, the City is to be understood, It is Spiritually called Sodom and Egypt: So that the meaning is, that these Witnesses shall so strike Antichrist with Spiritual plagues, that shall bring forth Spiritual

effects of the fall of His Spiritual abominable kingdom, 2 Thes. 2, WHOM THE LORD SHALL CONSUME WITH THE SPIRIT OF HIS MOUTH, etc. So that you see they are men.

Question 2. The second thing is, HOW LONG THEY PROPHESED?

Answer. The Text tells us, 1260 days (that is years, as I proved before) in sackcloth, but not how long beside.

Question 3. The third Question is, WHEN THEY BEGAN THEIR PROPHECY.?

Answer. When the Church fled, and Antichrist began to grow up and appear in His former colors; for then began the sincere Saints to put on their mourning wraps, when the Truth began to be darkened, and corruptions and errors did creep in.

Question 4. The fourth Question is, HOW THEY WERE SLAIN?

Answer. For the manner of their killing; I conceive it is not killing of their bodies; for verse 8, these things are to be Spiritually understood; For if their lying dead, rising again, and ascending be Spiritually to be understood, then their killing must needs be so understood also: and that is, in regard of their performance of the work of Prophesying (i.e.) in regard of suspensions, silencings, out-lawings, etc. So that none durst meddle with them, nor hearken to them (as has often fallen out) for they were killed in respect of Prophecy., as Prophets, not as men; for they lie dead as Witnesses, rise again as Witnesses, ascend as Witnesses; Therefore their killing must needs be as Witnesses.

Question 5. the fifth Question is, HOW THEY WERE RAISED AGAIN? —

Answer. It is said, they lay dead three days and a half: This is not natural days, for this is but a short time for them on the earth to rejoice, and send Presents one to another; But according to prophetic speaking, three years and a half, or some short time. And they rose and ascended by the Spirit of life from God, and by the help of some good Magistrates that called them up, and so came to a higher degree of purity in Doctrine and Worship, than before they were slain, which is meant by ascending into heaven: Answering Christ, Whose body was more Spiritual after His resurrection than before, and more fit for ascension into heaven; For as Christ ascended to heaven in a cloud, so are these said to do. (Rev. 11:10.) —

**Continuation of Prophecy, Proved After
The Witnesses Resurrection**

The sixth thing, is, to prove their continuation of Prophesying after their resurrection. It appears from Rev. 10:8, etc. AND THE VOICE WHICH I HEARD FROM HEAVEN, SPOKE UNTO ME AGAIN, AND SAID, GO TAKE THE LITTLE BOOK WHICH IS OPEN IN THE HAND OF THE ANGEL, THAT STANDETH UPON THE SEA; AND UPON THE EARTH, AND I WENT TO THE ANGEL, AND SAID TO HIM, GIVE ME THE LITTLE BOOK: AND HE SAID UNTO ME, TAKE IT, AND EAT IT UP, AND IT SHALL MAKE YOUR BELLY BITTER, BUT IT SHALL BE IN YOUR MOUTH SWEET AS HONEY. And verse 10 John is said to do so, and it had these effects: Now mark, verse 11. AND HE SAID UNTO ME, YOU MUST PROPHECY. AGAIN UNTO MANY PEOPLE, AND NATIONS,, AND TONGUES, AND KINGS. Now John did represent those that should at this time have the gift of Prophecy. restored, which was much darkened through the smoke that rose out of the bottomless pit, but not quite lost; for the two Witnesses prophesied all that time. And this could not be meant of John Himself, for He was fitted to receive the Revelation before, being in the Spirit, and Therefore this was done, as representing those Who were to live, when Prophesying was to be revived in more purity. —

Objection. *But it is said, the two Witnesses were slain, and lay dead for three days and a half: Now you say, that was in regard of their Propheying; Therefore Prophecy. hath not continued?*

Answer. *This makes nothing against the point, nor what I have said. The Doctrine was; That from the time of Christ's coming in the flesh, and revealing the new covenant, throughout all ages to the world's end; there shall be a succession of Believers that shall have the Spirit of Christ, and the Gospel of Christ communicated to them, and they shall be enabled in some measure to hold it forth and publish it. Now three years and a half is not a Generation, neither does it hinder the succession, it is but an obstruction.*

Simile

If a River be damned up, that it cannot run for a little time, that hinders not, but it is a running River still: And so if Prophecy. be suspended for a time, it hinders not, but it is Prophecy still, as long as the ability remains, only opportunity is taken away, and so it was here. And to clear this comparison, consider, that the dispensation of the Word and Ordinances of the Church, are compared to a River, or to two Rivers, and this Ordinance of Propheying among the rest. Ezek. 47:8-12. The Prophet speaks there of the Gospel, Temple, and City, which should be built, and speaks of waters that issue out of the Sanctuary, and go down into the Sea, which being brought into the sea, the waters are healed (said He) and said that every thing that lived and moved whither so ever the Rivers came, shall live, meaning men that are under the use of those Ordinances, and where they came to their hearts and Spirits, as the commandment came to Paul, Rom. 7. And said He, THE FISHERS SHALL STAND UPON IT (i.e.) the Gospel-Preachers, FISHERS OF MEN, as Christ tells His Disciples He would make them, and the Fish shall be exceeding many (i.e.) Converts. (Matt. 4:19.)

Objection *But by this River is meant the Spirit of God?*

Answer. *I confess by the water is meant the Spirit of God; but by the channel where it runs, is meant the Word preached and Ordinances, wherein God dispenses His Spirit to the Saints more fully; For the Fishers stand upon it, and beside the Text names two Rivers: and what can they be, but the Word preached for one, and other Ordinances administered another; yet all Spiritual, and flowing out of the Sanctuary, and from the throne of God, and the Lamb; because commanded by His Spirit, and enlightened, quickened, and made comfortable by the Spirit. And to make this more clear, consider the Scripture speaks expressly of preaching or Propheying before the fall of Antichrist, 2 Thes. 2:8. It is said, THE LORD SHALL CONSUME HIM WITH THE SPIRIT OF HIS MOUTH; which is the preaching of the Gospel sure, His Word: And if He shall be consumed by it, then the Spirit of His mouth shall breathe before the fall. Consider also, Rev. 14:6-8. Verse 6, He said, HE SAW AN ANGEL FLY IN THE MIDST OF HEAVEN, HAVING THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL TO PREACH UNTO THEM THAT DWELL ON THE EARTH; saying, FEAR GOD, AND GIVE GLORY TO HIM, etc. And now mark, verse 8, THERE FOLLOWED ANOTHER ANGEL, saying, BABYLON IS FALLEN, etc. So that the everlasting Gospel is preached before Babylon's utter fall; And the glorious state of Christ's Kingdom shall not be set up in its excellency, till Antichrist be down, as you may see at large, Dan. 2:31-45, after the destruction of the fourth Monarchy, then the Kingdom of CHRIST takes place, and fills the Whole earth: So that you may see by what I have said, there is a succession of Propheying also. _____*

I shall give you some Reasons for it.

Reasons To Prove A Succession Of Propheying.

Reason 1

1. *Because the voice of the Spirit in the Word written, is to be hearkened to by us, and Therefore the Scripture is to be made use of, and held forth at all times, Rev. 2:7. LET HIM THAT HATH*

AN EAR, HEAR WHAT THE SPIRIT SAID TO THE CHURCHES. Now the Spirit being more principal than any Ordinance, as that whereby God dwells in the heart, and reveals His mind, and enables to Spiritual duties, that must needs (to whomsoever it is distributed), give a man right to divulge the truth.

Reason 2

2. Because the Gospel is called the everlasting Gospel, Rev. 14:6. Now if there be any age, wherein there is not some to hold forth this Gospel, but that it is utterly beaten down, how is it everlasting? Can this be an everlasting Gospel, and yet sometimes fail and fall? The Apostle speaks of the Gospel being hidden from ages past, but now is revealed, and He speaks not of the hiding of it again: Beside, it was never quite hid before, but only darkly revealed in types, figures, and shadows, etc. Therefore we cannot imagine it should be quite hid in these times since Christ. —

Reason 3

3. Because Prophecy. is to continue till that which is perfect is come; 1 Cor. 13:8-10. Charity never fails; but whether there be Prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be Tongues, they shall cease; whether there be Knowledge, it shall vanish away: for we know in part, and we prophesy in part: But when that which is perfect is come, then mark, Then that which is in part, shall be done away. Mark, He said, Tongues shall cease: He does not say concerning them, When that which is perfect is come, they shall cease, for they were perfect then: and extraordinary Prophecy. must needs be perfect, as such; That which they fore-told by the Spirit, they could foretell directly: But this is meant of ordinary Prophesying, unfolding the Word, which can never be sufficiently unfolded by man, till that which is perfect is come: and mark, Till then it shall not be done away; for that is the appointed time, when that which is perfect is come, and Therefore it shall continue.

If any say, Paul prophesied but in part, and it was extraordinary: I say, that which Paul spoke by the Spirit was infallible; but Paul could not declare the Incomprehensibleness of God, nor the height and depth of His ways, Rom. 11:33; Gal: 5:17; Rom 7:21; James 3:2; 1 John 3:2.

Objection. *But that which is perfect is come, when the soul lives is the full enjoyment of God and Christ, Who is perfect.*

Answer. *That is not in this life; for here is a flesh lusting against the Spirit, SO THAT WE CANNOT DO THE THINGS THAT WE WOULD. Here is evil present when we would do good. Here, IN MANY THINGS WE OFFEND ALL, and here we know but in part: AND IT DOTHT NOT YET APPEAR WHAT WE SHALL BE; Therefore here He means, when we are perfectly sanctified, purified, glorified; when we are perfected in all things, and degrees; Then that which is in part shall be done away, not till then.*

Objection. *But the Apostle says, IF OUR GOSPEL BE HIDDEN, IT IS HIDDEN TO THEM THAT ARE LOST, 2 Cor. 4:3. Therefore it may be hidden.*

Answer. *1. You may easily see from that place, that it is hidden but only to some men, that is, THOSE THAT ARE LOST. And there is no Age, nor Generation, wherein they are all lost men, as I have proved before: Therefore the Gospel has been, and is revealed in all Ages.*

2. He speaks here, not of the hiding of the Gospel, in respect of the preaching of it to these men; but in respect of the effect of it in their hearts, as appears by the following words: *IN WHOM THE GOD OF THIS WORLD HATH BLINDED THE EYES OF THEIR MINDS, LEST THE LIGHT OF THE GLORIOUS GOSPEL OF CHRIST, WHO IS THE IMAGE OF GOD, SHOULD SHINE UNTO THEM.*

Thus have I proved a succession of Believers, endued with the Spirit of God, and the Word of God, and enabled in some measure to declare it in all ages.

If the doctrine of Succession be denied, or if there is no true succession, then it follows, according to King, that:

***Horrible Tenets That This Doctrine Leads Into,
If Men Stick To These Principles.***

Again, Consider how desperately this Doctrine leads men into most horrible Tenets; that I conceive Hell itself could not have invented a more black way for poor creatures to walk in.

1. *It sets up fancy instead of Faith; it sets up men's conceits above God's truth: How so? why men conceit themselves there shall be extraordinary men raised up to constitute Churches, and take up Ordinances that have been corrupted. But where have they ground for such a thing? where has God promised this? Heb. 1:2. GOD HATH SPOKEN TO US IN THESE LAST DAYS BY HIS SON; But where has His Son revealed any such thing? And to believe a thing without a promise to ground it upon, is but conceit and presumption: What is this but to yield to the Devil? COMMAND THESE STONES TO BE MADE BREAD (said He to Christ) when CHRIST had no such rule, Matt. 4:3. And so it is here; Look for Apostolic men, extraordinarily inspired, when there is no such rule in the Word. (Matt. 4:3.)*

2. *This Doctrine is the fosterer of cruel hellish thoughts against all the servants of God, that have lived in evil times, corrupt times; that they are all damned, lost Men and Women: Satan's slaughter-house has been filled, and heaven has had no man entered into it of a long time: Why? why there has been no succession of Baptism, and Apostolic men, and so no Gospel, no Faith, and so no Salvation: All Believers' faith has been but fancy; all the Martyrs' joy was but vain flashes; all their confidence is but presumption, all their Holy life but mere formality. Is not this to belie the Holy Ghost, Who has witnessed to their hearts, and has in Scripture witnessed to the truth of the Doctrine I have delivered, and to condemn the Whole generation of God's children? Psal. 73. AND IF HE THAT OFFENDETH ONE OF GOD'S SAINTS, HAD BETTER HAVE A MILLSTONE HANGED ABOUT HIS NECK, AND BE DROWNED IN THE DEPTH OF THE SEA, (Matt. 18:6) what is He that condemns all? (Matt. 18:6.) _*

3. *This Tenet tends to the leading of men to the most grossest Atheism that can be imagined: For what is this, but to say, THE LORD HATH FORSAKEN THE EARTH? like those, Ezek. 8:12, and 9:9. And is it not true, if there be no true Baptism can be administered, and so consequently no Gospel, nor Faith, nor Salvation: and is not this high wickedness to say, GOD HATH FORSAKEN THE EARTH? Here is Atheism in judgment, and it brings no less Atheism in life. Is not this the ground of all looseness? of the contempt of all Ordinances? Come to a man, and stir Him up to hear, to pray, to frequent the means of grace; why this Tenet answers all presently: What should I hear for? there is no Gospel preached yet; what should I pray for? There is no Spirit communicated yet; what should I live a Holy life for? It is but formality, hypocrisy, outsideness. Why so? Say it is not true grace, because there is no Gospel, God thinks the worse of me for it, I shall go to Hell for all this. The Scripture says, 1 Pet. 3:12, THE EYES OF THE LORD ARE OVER THE RIGHTEOUS, AND HIS EARS ARE OPEN TO THEIR*

PRAYERS. *No faith this Tenet, the Lord regards the Righteous no more than the wicked, all are alike to Him. Psal. 136. It is said, twenty-six times, HIS MERCY ENDURES FOREVER. Nay, says this Tenet, since Baptism was lost, and the Church corrupted, God's mercy is at an end, and His mercy has been showed to no man for many Generations.*

By this Doctrine, men would make God an Idol; as some would have Him all of mercy, and no justice; so this Doctrine would have Him all justice and no mercy.

By this Tenet a man comes near the blasphemy of the Holy Ghost (Mark 3:22-32): Let the Spirit of God move in men's hearts, and stir them up to keep close to God, to believe, embrace the Truth, perform duty to God: He must needs look upon all as motions from the Devil. Why so? Why there is no Gospel preached, and so no Spirit communicated: and so the Holy pure motions of the Spirit are no better in His account than Satan's filthy deceits, and diabolical temptations: like those in Mark 3:30. That though they saw the Divinity of the God-head sparkling forth in Christ, yet they said, HE HATH AN UNCLEAN SPIRIT; Therefore Christ says, ALL SIN AND BLASPHEMY WHEREWITH SOEVER MEN BLASPHEME, SHALL BE FORGIVEN; BUT HE THAT BLASPHEMETH AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST, IT SHALL NEVER BE FORGIVEN HIM. Just so it is here, the Spirit of God moves and works: No, these are but the Devil's delusions, there is no Spirit as yet given to the sons of men, because there is no Apostolic men, nor any that can work miracles, or that are so gifted as in the primitive times.

By this Doctrine, THE BLOOD OF CHRIST IS MADE OF NONE EFFECT; Why? though it be shed, the Church has lost her succession, there is no believing nor any happy effect of the blood of Christ to be looked for. (Mark 3:22-31.)

By this Doctrine, a man becomes cruel to His friends, children, neighbors: Why, what should He instruct them for, and teach them? all is in vain? Why: till an Apostolic person be raised up that can work miracles, and has power to baptize, there is no Gospel; What should He tell them of the Gospel of Christ, or Heaven for? -

Nay, once more: By this Doctrine a man becomes cruel to His own soul, smothers all the motions that rise in it to good, all His comforts, and comfortable feelings, stifles them all, with black apprehensions of direful wrath, and fills every room of His heart with deep distrust, turns His godly sorrow into desperate sorrow, gives all His Spiritual comforts the lie, and tells them they are but deceits: I am persuaded, would such men speak out the suggestions of their hearts in cold blood, you should hear that from them, which once came from Hezekiah, Isa. 38:11. I SHALL NOT SEE THE LORD, EVEN THE LORD IN THE LAND OF THE LIVING. Verse 15, I SHALL GO SOFTLY ALL MY YEARS IN THE BITTERNESS OF MY SOUL. There are souls that refuse to be comforted, as Psal. 77 and are in danger to be swallowed up of sorrow through Satan's wiles, 2 Cor. 2:7.

—
Now, no comfort can enter here. How could Hell have devised a more subtle stratagem than such a Tenet. —
—

SOME CARP AND CAVIL AT THIS WORD LOST, BUT I WOULD HAVE IT NOTED, I MEAN, AS TO THE PURITY OF PRACTICE IN RESPECT OF THE SUBJECT, NOT IN RESPECT OF THE RULE;

AND I SPEAK IN THE NOTIONIST'S SENSE, GRANTING IT BY WAY OF CONCESSION ONLY.

King's work is one of the most profound works we have ever read outside of the Sacred Scriptures. It has some weak points. One is, King did not believe the Two Witnesses were constituted churches and commissioned ministers. He was alone on that point. Most of the other brethren held that the Two Witnesses **were constituted churches and commissioned ministers**. We agree with the others on this point.

In 1652, **John Spittlehouse** issued his:

**A Vindication of the Continued Succession of the Primitive Church of
Jesus Christ (now scandalously termed Anabaptists)
from the Apostles unto this Present Time.**

**In Answer to three following Assertions, Extracted out of the Writings of Mr. John Brain, and
Chiefly out of his Book, Entitled,**

The Churches going in and coming out of the Wilderness, Viz.,

1. **That the Gospel-Frame of the Primitive Church has been developed into the
Antichristian Estate, and condition since from about the year 406, unto this present time.**

2. **That During the afore said time, there has not been a true Church-frame of Gospel-
government,**

3. **That the Gospel-Frame of the Gospel-Government is to be restored again by some
one Man, Who shall have Authority given him from above, to restore Baptism, and all other lost
Ordinances of the Church.**

**And may also serve as a further Caveat to the present deluded People of this Nation, that are yet
seduced by the crafty Demetriousses of the Times, who for love of Gain, still endeavor to cry up their
Diana of Rome, whom England, and all they call Christendom yet Worship.**

**Matt. 28:19, 20: Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. Teaching them to
observe all things, &c. And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the World, Amen.**

John 10:1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16.

Published by John Spittlehouse, and John More

London, Printed by Gartrue Dawson,

1652.

The title says it all, but let me add this, John Spittlehouse **traced the succession of the
English Baptists (Particular) through the *Continental Anabaptists***. He claimed
they were the English Baptist forefathers. He showed that most of the things said about

them were only **falsehoods and slanders** made up by the Protestants and Catholics. Here are his conclusions:

Many speak truth though not wittingly or willingly. Neither the Popish, Prelatical, or Presbyterian &c. churches can claim the like hidden state and condition, as &c. Germany is the most probable place of the Church's hiding, &c.

But that you declare the very truth is so saying, (though not wittingly) I shall prove further from Scripture, where Jesus Christ promised to be with it to the end of the world, Matthew 28:20, Ergo, It was to have a continuance unto the end of the world. And if so, then during the aforesaid time of 1260 years. Again, If continued a Church, then in all the Essentials, Substantials, and Circumstantials that appertained unto it, (so far as there was need of, in its then condition) as aforesaid. Again, I would gladly know anyone Church (in that which we now call Christendom) that can produce the like hidden condition, (r) as the Church now scandalously termed Anabaptists. And much more in that it is so clearly discovered to be so near, yea even one and the same with the Pattern of the first Church that was erected by the commandments of Jesus Christ, and the practice of the Apostles. And as to the place where it was so preserved, It may be probably conjectured to be in Germany, in as much as the aforesaid Muntzer, &c. did there discover themselves at the time aforesaid.

Redeem the time therefore which you have hitherto spent in opposing so plain a truth (as has been declared) by disclaiming that Error, as you have done many more, (viz., your sprinkling and ordination, &c.) in doing of which, you will have the benefit, I my desire, and God the glory.

Page 30

In Conclusion

During the mid 1600s, all the Baptists **defended gospel church succession** against the Seekers and the Pedobaptists. Their position was, **the church and her ordinances has had a succession**, but if she has not, **then believers can band together and take any ordinance they find lacking**. They *did not affirm* that the church **ceased**, but just the opposite. But, **no matter what**, still they were valid churches and ministers because *they were true believers who were in union with Jesus Christ*. From this union they received all they needed to maintain their condition as gospel churches and ministers. From this union they practiced valid gospel ordinances.

This concludes our survey of the 1600s. What about the centuries between 1600 and 300? I shall give you some statements from Baptist enemies testifying to their origin and succession in the next lecture.

Lecture V

Testimony from Baptist Enemies as to Baptist Succession

At this period of my life, I am 52 years old, I have spent nearly 25 years reading, investigating and classifying the English Baptists of the 1600s. I am not as informed as I want to be about the Baptists of the 1500s. I am just now starting to locate and study their documents in their original languages, Latin, German and Dutch. For these reasons I am not able to give an in-depth lecture yet about these old Anabaptists. In brief, here is what I have found so far:

1. **Once again the Downgraders have struck.** This time, they have altered and restated many falsehoods as to the faith and practice of the Continental Anabaptists. The first Generation of Mennonites, those who were contemporary with the Protestant

Reformers, were **DIPPERS OF BELIEVERS**. Their records have been falsified by later historians, some even among the **modern Mennonites** who disown dipping and practice sprinkling.

a. Gospel preachers like Hubmaier, and others in Switzerland, Moravia, Germany, the Netherlands and other countries, were often Pedobaptist ministers in early life. They wrote to defend the Pedobaptist position. They were converted and became Baptists. Their converted views are totally ignored by the Downgraders always in favor of their earlier, unconverted Pedobaptist views. This is the same as it was with John Wycliffe.

b. By ignoring the original documents, and taking the writings from the unconverted ministers of the Gospel, the Downgraders are able to promote their **wish history** which always tries to **deny the Divine Origin and unbroken Succession of the old Baptists**.

2. But none the less, the original sources vindicate the faith, order, worship and works of the old Baptists when it is known. The author of **Successio Anabaptistica** said of the old Baptists:

I am dealing with the Mennonites or Anabaptists, who pride themselves as having the apostolic succession, that is, the mission and the extraction from the apostles. Who claim that the true Church is found nowhere, except among themselves alone and their congregations, since with them alone remains the true understanding of the Scriptures. To that end they appeal to the letter of the S. S. and want to explain them with the S. S. And thus they sell to the simple folks glass rubies for precious stones. . . . If one charges them with the newness of their sect, they claim that the "true church" during the time of the dominion of the Catholic Church, was hidden in her.

John T. Christian, **A History of the Baptists**, Vol. 1, page 92.

At this time, I must bring **these types of statements** to a close and simply offer the testimony of Baptist enemies as to their origin. Soon, I hope to complete my studies into the original documents in these different countries and languages.

Mosheim, the Lutheran historian of the 1700s, stated:

The origin of the sect, who from their repetition of baptism received in other communities, are called Anabaptists, but who are also denominated Mennonites, from the celebrated man to whom they owe a large share of their present prosperity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity. For they suddenly started up, in various countries of Europe, under the influence of leaders of dissimilar character and views; and at a time when the first contests with the Catholics so engrossed the attention of all, that they scarcely noticed any other passing occurrences. The modern Mennonites affirm, that their predecessors were the descendants of those Waldenses, who were oppressed by the tyranny of the Papists; and that they were of a most pure offspring, and most averse from any inclinations towards sedition, as well as all fanatical views.

In the first place I believe the Mennonites are not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from these Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled witnesses for the truth before Luther. Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, very many persons in those minds were deeply rooted that principle which the Waldenses, Wyclifites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly and others more openly; namely, that the kingdom which Christ set upon on the earth, or the

visible church, is an assembly of holy persons; and ought therefore to be entirely free from not only ungodly persons and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation which was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the Mennonites; and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved some centuries before Luther's time, by those who had such views of the Church of Christ.

Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 3, page 200

Sir Isaac Newton stated:

The Baptists were the only Christians who had not symbolized with Rome.

William Whiston, **Memorials of Sir Isaac Newton**, page 201.

Whiston followed Newton and lectured on Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at the University of Cambridge. He became a Baptist and wrote a work against Infant Baptism.

Alexander Campbell, the founder of the so-called Church of Christ and Christian Church, stated:

I would engage to show that baptism as viewed and practiced by the Baptists, had its advocates in every century up to the Christian era. . . and independent of whose existence (the German Anabaptists), clouds of witnesses attest the fact, that before the Reformation, from popery, and from the apostolic age, to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists, and the practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced.

The Campbell-MaCalla Debate on Baptism, Buffalo, 1824; pages 378, 379.

Robert Barclay, Quaker, stated:

We shall afterwards show the rise of the Anabaptists took place prior to the Reformation of the Church of England, and there are also reasons for believing that on the Continent of Europe small hidden Christian societies, who have held many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have existed from the times of the Apostles. In the sense of the direct transmission of Divine Truth, and the true nature of spiritual religion, it seems probable that these churches have a lineage or succession more ancient than that of the Roman Church.

The Inner Life of the Societies of the Commonwealth, London; 1876: pages 11, 12.

Cardinal Hosius, a member of the Council of Trent, stated in 1560:

If the truth of religion were to be judged by the readiness and boldness of which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists since there have been none for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more generally punished or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to the most cruel sorts of punishment than these people.

Hosius, Letters Apud Opera, 112-113;
Baptist Magazine, CVIII, May, 1826.

Hosius stated again:

The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect. Of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem to have been, although some of them lately, as they testify in their apology, declare that they will no longer re-baptize, as was their former custom; nevertheless, it is certain that many of them retain their custom, and have united with the Anabaptists.

Works of the Heresies of our Times, 1584 Book I page 431.

Luther said on one occasion:

The Anabaptists have been for a long time spreading in Germany.

Michelet, **Life of Luther**; page 99.

Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer, said:

The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for three hundred years has caused great disturbance in the church, and has acquired such strength that the attempt in this age to contend with it appears futile for a time.

Christian, Op., cit.,, p. 86

Linborch, the historian of the Inquisition, stated:

To speak my mind freely, if their opinion and custom were to be examined without prejudice, it would appear that among all of the modern sects of Christians, they had the greatest resemblance to that of the Mennonites or Dutch Baptists.

The History of the Inquisition, London; 1731: Vol. 1, page 57.

He was speaking of the identity of the Waldenses with the old Anabaptists.

Van Oosterzee stated:

They (Baptists) are peculiar to the Netherlands and are older than the Reformation, and must, therefore, by no means be confounded with the Protestantism of the sixteenth century, for it can be shown that the origin of the Baptists reaches further back and is more venerable.

Herzog, **Real Encyclopedia**, IX. page 346.

I could go on and on, but must conclude these remarks with these statements from **Dr. Ypeij**, Professor of Theology in Gronigen and **Rev. J. J. Dermount**, Chaplain to the King of the Netherlands, when they stated to him:

The Mennonites are descended from the tolerable pure evangelical Waldenses, who were driven by persecution into various countries; and who during the latter part of the twelfth century fled into Flanders; and into the province of Holland and Zealand, where they lived simple and exemplary lives, in the villages as farmers, in the towns by trades, free from the charge of any gross immoralities, and professing the most pure and simple principles, which they exemplified in a holy conversation. They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church of the Netherlands.

We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, 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 stood since the days of the apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish Church, that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary, and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their denomination is the most ancient.

Christian, Op., Cit., pages 95, 96.

In Conclusion

The Downgraders are wrong again, as usual. The **Anabaptists were in England and Europe during the 1500s.** They **dipped** believers. When they were inquired of, they always answered that *they believed in their Divine Origin and Unbroken succession all the way back to Jesus Christ.* They **rebaptized all who came over to them from the other churches.** They considered the Papists, and the Protestants, as parts of Babylon.

John Spilsbury stated:

Either Come All the Way to Baptism Or Return Back to Rome

I must here conclude and say, that either such must go forward to baptism, or else turn back again from whence they came; for there is no middle way, not the least light in the word of God to bear up the same, but the contrary.

*You shall not do whatsoever is right in your own eyes, for you are not as yet come to your rest, and to the inheritance which the Lord your God gives you, Deut. 12:8, 9. Arise and depart, for this is not your rest, because it is polluted, Micah 2:10, I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believes on me, shall not abide in darkness, John 12:46. And now why tarry ye, arise and be baptized, and wash away your (antichristian) sins, calling on the name of the Lord, Acts 22:16. They resisted the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him, Luke 7:30. Arise therefore and obey the Lord, and think not within yourselves, we are baptized already, and that by Antichrist, for I tell you, that you are never able to prove yourselves to be under the Lords holy ordinance of baptism, by all the light in Scripture, and art in nature, in that way you go, namely to deny the state as false and Antichristian, and yet retain your baptism there administered by the same power as the Lord's ordinance, and assume a Church to yourselves upon the same baptism. I speak in subjection, I think **THE LAST CHURCH OR CHURCHES, THAT IS, ALL THE REFORMED CHURCHES, STILL RETAINING INFANT'S BAPTISM, ARE AS MUCH AGAINST THE RULES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS THE FORMER.***

A Treatise of Baptism, London, 1652;
Magazine, AR, 1993; page 64,

Again, when dealing with some Protestants (Praisegod Barebones in particular) who claimed that God placed His ordinances in the Whore of Babylon, the Roman Catholic Church, until the Reformation, Spilsbury stated:

*Again, Secondly, God is said in the Scriptures to give or to send the vessels of His House to Babylon, as 2 Chron. 36:17, 18, 21; Jer. 27:21, 22; Dan. 1:2. Now let the like be showed, wherever God is said to give or send His ordinance of baptism unto Antichrist, until then the vessels of God's house remaining His ordinance in Babylon, shall make nothing for them to prove Antichrist's sprinkling of water on the face of an infant, to be God's ordinance of Baptism, and for her being the **MOTHER OF HARLOTS IS TRUE, Rev. 17.5 WHO HAS ALL FOR HER DAUGHTERS THAT DERIVE HER BAPTISM FROM HER, AS DO ALL THAT UPHOLD HER DOCTRINE OF INFANT-BAPTISM.***

Ibid., page 62.

Finish

LECTURE VI

THE FORM OF BAPTIST SUCCESSION

God Called and Holy Spirit Gifted but Church Sent

God called, but church sent, this is the by-word of the saints of God and the churches of saints. This is the order of the House of God. Even in the Old Testament the God-called prophets did not take it upon themselves to function in the Temple or Tabernacle simply because they were called to be prophets. The visible order and worship of the Lord was then done according to the due order of God's House. As it was then, so it is now. It has been so during the great succession of the old Baptists.

AXIOMS

- 1) Following the gathering of the Jerusalem church by Jesus Christ, after His baptism, ***each church found in the Word of God has come into being by means of church authority.***
- 2) This does not mean the mother church **voted into being a new church each time a church was gathered and constituted anymore than every time anyone was baptized.**
- 3) Each New Testament church found in the Scriptures came from the Jerusalem church **by means of a church sent, commissioned or ordained minister, either an apostle, his helper or church messenger.**

I.

The Mother of Us All, The Jerusalem Church

Jesus Christ constituted the first Baptist church near Jerusalem. He called it out as He walked by the sea-side. Its first public worship service was upon the Mountain Top as recorded in Matthew 5-7. He used the disciples whom John the Baptist had prepared. He and they both had one baptism, the baptism from heaven God the Father sent into the world by John the Baptist. Christ commissioned its first officers following a night in prayer, Luke 6-7. Later, He gave this **ἐκκλησία**, or governing assembly, and its officers, the Kingdom of God and the Keys to the Kingdom of Heaven or God, Gal. 4:26; Luke 12:32; Matt. 21:43; I Peter 2:7-9; Mark 1:1-6; Matt. 16:18-21.

One of Christ's final acts was to commission His Apostles to go into all the world. Then, they were the preaching disciples of the Jerusalem Church, Matthew 28:18-20.

II.

THE EXPANSION OF THE MOTHER CHURCH INTO MANY CHURCHES

By the power and leadership of the Holy Spirit, executing the decrees of God and bearing witness to the continued exaltation of Jesus Christ at God's right hand, the gospel went forth and brought into order the elect of God in the following ways.

Outreach No. 1

Philip Goes from Jerusalem into Samaria Acts 8-9:

"There shall be a vine planted in Samaria" Isaiah.

Philip became an ordained Evangelist or assistant to the Apostles, as is recorded in Acts 6. He was not a modern deacon, nor a modern evangelist. He was an assistant or helper. He is called in the Book of Acts, an Evangelist. Being baptized with John's baptism, and commissioned by the Apostles, under the selection of the Jerusalem Church, the Holy Spirit used him to take the Lord's order and baptism to Samaria. This is the place where Christ Himself preached and made many converts a few years earlier. Now, one of the baptized and commissioned preaching disciples, a helper of the apostles, brings Samaria gospel baptism and gospel comprehension or knowledge.

BUT

He preached and baptized, but didn't give the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands nor did he gather a church and ordain officers there. The Apostles, remaining then at Jerusalem, sent Peter and John to Samaria to examine the work of Philip. They laid their hands on them and the Holy Spirit fell upon them.

WHY WAS THIS DONE?

1. **Is this first outreach according to Gospel order?**
2. **Was this an example of what should be done or should not be done?**

The giving of the Holy Spirit, by laying on of hands, was the work only of an apostle. If not, then why didn't others do this as well as an Apostle?

Was there any gospel preaching, baptizing, or church gathering done by any one who was unbaptized, uncommissioned, or unsend by the Holy Spirit at Samaria? Or, did the Holy Spirit follow a **special order**?

I believe the Holy Spirit followed a **special order or succession**.

Are we to do otherwise? Did Luke record this to show us **what we were to do** or not to do?

Outreach No. 2,

Peter and 6 messengers, *From Jerusalem into Ceresea, Acts 10:*

Peter was praying elsewhere when the Holy Spirit revealed to him the conversion of the Gentiles. A Gentile saint, Cornelius, of the Italian band, had been praying and was heard of God. The Lord had him send to Joppa and fetch Simon Peter. Peter went, by the leadership and empowerment of the Holy Spirit, doubting nothing. Peter didn't go alone. There were helpers or church messengers from the Jerusalem church with him. They helped Peter like others helped Paul, 2 Cor. 8. Peter tells us there were six brethren, Acts 11.

As Peter preached, the Holy Spirit fell upon those who heard the Word of God. They spoke in tongues and prophesied. Being astonished, the Hebrew church members from Jerusalem thanked God. Peter commanded his six helpers to baptize these first Gentile converts.

NOTE:

In both cases, Samara and Caesarea, the Holy Spirit used the following:

1. Baptized men;
2. Church Commissioned men;
 - a. an apostle's helper;
 - b. An apostle with six church messengers.
3. All came from the Jerusalem church.
4. Peter and the 6 brethren reported these things to the Mother church at Jerusalem. The church took the proper action **after it was done**. They heard the reports from Peter and the 6 messengers and thanked God. They heard of Philip's success at Samaria and sent Peter and John, Acts 8:14-25.

(Does anyone suppose Paul's helpers were church messengers and Peter's were not? Let him prove it if he can.)

Was this record inspired and preserved as our example of *what to do*, or was it for us *not to do*?

Where is there any record of any gospel expansion by the unbaptized and uncommissioned?

Those who deny link-chain succession, let them prove that the works at both Samaria and Cesearea were done by the:

1. non- commissioned private disciples;

2. non- baptized private disciples; or
3. private Christians;

Or

1. Ministers sent by civil magistrates;
2. Ministers sent by an association;
3. Ministers sent by a convention or its mission board;
4. Ministers sent by themselves.

Remember, it is **one thing to make a minister**, God the Holy Spirit does this by His **gift**, and it is **another thing to commission a minister**, God the Holy Spirit does this by **means of a gospel church**.

In these two outreaches, Peter and John followed up on Philip's work. Then God sent Peter and 6 church messengers into Cesarea.

Outreach No. 3

Jerusalem to Antioch by disciples from the Jerusalem Church followed up by Barnabas sent from the Jerusalem Church.

1. In Acts 8:14, the Apostles at Jerusalem sent Peter and John to Samaria. In Acts 11:22, the **Jerusalem Church** sent Barnabas to Antioch. They don't represent separate ways of doing things, but taken together they show that both the church at Jerusalem and the Apostles, chief officers in that church, worked together. They didn't act without each other. Acts 11:22 was not independent of the Apostles anymore than Acts 8:14 was independent of the church

- a. If any private Christian, or unbaptized Christian can do Christ's work His way, then why did the Holy Spirit do things this way?
- b. Why did the church become involved if it is unnecessary to follow the due order of God's House?
- c. Is this an example of what we are to do or not to do?
- d. Were these examples of **how the Holy Spirit led** the saints to fulfill Christ's Commission given in Matthew 28:18-20, or did the disciples make it up as they went along?
- e. ***Did the Holy Spirit lead the early disciples contrary to Christ's wishes and directions?***

The Church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to go as far as Antioch.

Was this according to Christ's mind

or did

the Jerusalem church simply make this up?

Outreach No. 4

Antioch into all the world by *Barnabas and Paul, Acts 13 to the end.*

The Western world received the Gospel and its complete system from the church at Antioch. This church was gathered by members from Jerusalem with the help of Barnabas, who was church sent from Jerusalem.

After the establishment of the Church at Antioch and Barnabas' union there, he went and found Paul. Christ had been teaching Paul, one on one, for nearly 11 years. The Apostle to the Gentiles never baptized anyone nor gathered any church until after he was received into, commissioned and sent out by the Antioch church.

1. Paul, a **Christ-made and Church sent** Apostle and minister of Christ, went into the Western world:
2. Paul and Barnabas were commissioned and sent out by the gifted brethren at the Antioch church, Acts 13:1-6.
3. This all follows the **CLOSED** pattern already established as to the order of the Lord's House.

The Antioch church, a daughter from Jerusalem, went into all the world by means of its commissioned and sent apostles and their helpers. They went into:

Pahos,

Antioch of Pisida,

Iconium,

Lystra,

Derbe.

Then Paul with Barnabas, and the church sent messengers with them, went back to:

Lystra,

Iconium,

Antioch of Pisida

and then to Pamphylia and Atalia.

Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch.

What work did they do on this missionary tour?

They preached, made disciples, baptized them and constituted them into orderly gospel churches with commissioned officers.

Who did this work?

Paul and Barnabas did this work. Christ-made them. The Holy Spirit called and gifted them. The Antioch church sent them out as able ministers of the New Covenant, in the **good old baptized way**.

Was all this necessary as the due order of the House of God under the New Covenant? Or did they do what was unnecessary? Perhaps they simply made it all up as they went along?

Where is there a church which came into being without a link chain succession by means of the commissioned officers from an already existing church?

But

Where is there any vote on baptisms? Where were the new converts taken back to the mother church, voted on for baptism, received in and then lettered out to form a new church?

LINK CHAIN SUCCESSION ALWAYS

But the links between the churches were always the commissioned preaching brethren from an already existing church.

These links or ministering brethren were baptized, in-church disciples and gifted by the Holy Spirit **first**. Then, they were church sent or commissioned.

Outreach No. 5

**Antioch into the Western world again by Paul and his helpers,
*Acts 15:30-21:15.***

The brethren at the Antioch Church sent forth Paul again. He was recommended still by the brethren. Barnabas was not. He dropped from the inspired records. Paul remains on as an example with his ministry recorded showing the mind of Christ for all saints of all generations of this age, Acts 15:26, 15:40. Silas now helped Paul, he was a church sent messenger, 2 Cor. 8.

During this **second missionary** journey Paul went forth and preached at Thessolonia, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Phillippi, Colossia and then Rome. Paul did not necessarily pioneer all these places. But he helped them, approved of their faith and order, and wrote to them.

These churches were established, gathered, approved of and taught by Christ-made, Holy Spirit gifted and called, church sent ministers of the gospel.

Paul returned back to Jerusalem. Then God sent him to Rome. While in Rome, Paul made gospel converts of many persons. Some were of Caesar's household. When some of these in Caesar's household returned home they went back to England and Wales. Once there, they established gospel churches in England and Wales. These churches moved about for several centuries because of persecution. In the early and mid 1600s, some of their ministers and members went into America. Most Particular Baptist churches in America have come from these English and Welsh churches.

In conclusion

Link 1- God the Father calling and sending John the Baptist with heaven's baptism;

Link 2- The baptism of Jesus Christ by John the Baptist;

Link 3- The call and commission of Christ's disciples and their preaching and baptizing by His personal direction during His personal ministry;

Link 4- The great commission sending the preaching disciples into all the world, after and according to the due order as revealed in the Book of Acts;

Link 5- These called and commissioned ministers from the Jerusalem church went forth and preached, baptized and gathered churches and commissioned officers in the newly gathered churches;

Link 6- The Apostles and preaching disciples, being called of Christ, by His Spirit, and commissioned and sent by His churches, delivered the ordinances unto the newly established churches;

Link 7- The newly settled churches walked in all the ways of the Lord according to the pattern of the Lord's house under the New Covenant. They administered the Lord's commission by means of their commissioned officers.

I conclude this by noting:

Christ called and commissioned certain preaching disciples;

These preaching disciples, went forth preaching, baptizing and gathering churches;

Then, they delivered the ordinances unto these new churches, who in turn went forth by means of their *commissioned* officers.

This is my view of Link-Chain Succession.

Finish

CONCLUSION TO THE WHOLE

My purpose has been to show the old Baptists believed in their **Divine Origin** and **unbroken succession back to Jesus Christ**. I relied upon Baptist writers before 1860 to show there was a real and vital difference between the Baptists and their historians **then** and the Baptists and their historians **since then**.

To make this distinction more apparent I did:

- 1) show the different views among Baptist historians as to Baptist Origins and succession;
- 2) show the pre-1860 historians and their views about Baptist origins and successions; (I even used Southern Baptist pioneers and founders to show successions, they churches into while they held to proper views about Baptist origins and also were introducing human inventions and leading the these human inventions.);
- 3) show the post-1860 writers and historians and their views about Baptist origins and succession, (while in the human inventions some hold to the foundation have human could also be Divine Origin of the Baptists and their succession, but laid the for abandoning these older views, for if the churches could inventions to carry on Christ work, then the church itself a human invention, in an human inventions, it would stand human improvements);
- 4) show the different views which were taught by these two different TYPES of Baptist writers and historians about many different doctrines in addition to Baptist origins and succession, (the change was not limited to Baptist origin and succession).

By establishing that the anti-succession historians were **Downgraders**, a very different type or kind of historians then the succession historians were, I did also:

- 1) Show the older historians believed in the verbal inspiration of the sacred scriptures in their original tongues while the newer ones did not;
- 2) show the older historians believed in the vicarious, substitutionary death of Jesus Christ, while the newer ones did not;

- 3) show the older historians were in Christ's institution, the gospel church only, while the newer historians were in extra-church organizations, colleges, universities and seminaries, or human inventions.

I denominated the newer historians and writers as "**Downgraders**" or **Downgrader historians**. I borrowed this term from C. H. Spurgeon. It speaks of the English *downgraders'* movement manifested among the English Baptists during the 1860-1880s. They moved away from many of their earlier views into full grown rationalism and a form of Baptist naturalism so as to keep up pace with the world of science and rationalistic free thinking as it was then called.

I also purposed to:

- 1) show that the English downgraders philosophy made its way into America during the post-American Civil War era;
- 2) show that it came from England into the Northeast first and then secondly into the South and West;
- 3) show this was all done by men in extra-church organizations or human inventions (I speak not of church schools) rather than men who were in Christ's organization, a gospel church.

I also purposed to:

- 1) show the further removed historians were from the Dark Ages, the less they knew about the people of the Dark Ages and their Faith and Order;
- 2) show the Downgrader historians and writers relied upon the same old hostile and false witnesses only, the Pedobaptists, and mostly never went back to the original sources;
- 3) show the Downgraders as simply copyists, and as such were only the new voices of the old Baptist's enemies, saying the same old things and making the same old charges the older Roman Catholics and Protestants did.

I believe I accomplished what I purposed. So in **conclusion** *remember the **Divine model**, or **how** the Church was established and **by Whom**. Also remember **how** the first church became **many**, or **how** the mother of us all, the heavenly Sarah, **gave birth** to many daughters.*

Try my suggestions *by the Sacred Scriptures* to see **who** the *links were between the churches* in the Book of Acts. Acts is the first record of **Baptist Church Succession**. Was I not correct in showing that the already existing mother churches linked with the newly constituted daughter churches by their church sent preaching disciples or messengers? These preaching disciples may have been apostles, an evangelist or church messengers.

Did I not also conclude correctly from the Scriptures that those men who gathered and constituted churches were **called of God, empowered by the Holy Spirit, taught by Jesus Christ**, and also, after He left, they were **CHURCH SENT**? Did I not also show from the Scriptures that when **the new churches were gathered and officers commissioned therein**, the **messengers and ministers from already existing churches did this work**? Does not the Scriptures also teach that these preaching disciples **delivered the Sacred oracles and ordinances to the new churches**?

Is not the New Testament system revealed from **faith to faith**? Is not there a **succession** of *Christ's seed*, to a **new seed and to a seed's seed**, all who have the same Spirit Christ had and speak the same words Christ spoke? I certainly believe these questions can be answered with a "**yes!**"

Therefore, I would say that ***gospel church succession*** is in the ***TRUE FAITH and VISIBLE ORDER*** which comes from heaven.

1. God the Father is the **source** of this succession and He is glorified in every generation of this age of all ages by **His Son** and **His Son's Spouse** and their **gospel seed**, Ephesians 3:21; Revelation 12 and Isaiah 59:21;
2. God the Son is the **means and form** of gospel church succession.
3. God the Holy Spirit is the **power flow** by which this succession flows and is maintained **as a proof of the continued exaltation of Jesus Christ at His Father's right hand in glory**.

Gospel church succession is therefore maintained by a **pure and clear river flowing from the Throne of God to the New Jerusalem**, Rev. 22:1-6. The Throne of God in heaven represents *God's decrees*, the River is **both** the *Holy Spirit* and the *New Jerusalem Way* into which He brings the elect, Christ's ***faith and order***. The New Jerusalem in **glory**, is the **final result**, the completed **Spouse of Christ** in her *perfected and New World glory*.

The old Baptist's views of the **divine origin and unbroken succession** of the system of Jesus Christ forces saints to see the great differences between Christ's people and their succession and Satan's people and their succession. John Spilsbury said it like this:

Christ Sanctified Himself To Bring His Elect Into Visible Gospel Order

This being the end for which God sanctified Him, for Him to call and sanctify a people, to keep Him a name and praise in the earth, that glory might be given to God in the Church by Christ through all ages, and not for such as believe in Him, to give away, as far as in them lies, **His glory, name, and praise**, by forsaking of their privileges, and therein denying themselves to be vessels of mercy, called to hold forth the same according to the Word, to the glory of His Grace.

God's Ordinance, London; 1646; Magazine, Arkansas 1993, ***To the Reader***.

On the other side, Satan's **people distinguish themselves and their succession by their churches which are**:

1. Ecumenical in attitudes;

2. natural in knowledge and experiences;
3. invisible church standards and attitudes;
4. always finding problems with baptism by dipping only;
5. forever hating the strict or rigid Baptists, of whatever name they are called.

These points taken together form a *union* which is Babylonian and not of Christ. This system is modeled after the creeds and councils of the Pre-Papal Church, the Papal Church and her Protestant Daughters and Grand Daughters.

The Church of Christ is of a *Divine Origin* and has had an *Unbroken Succession* from Christ's time to the present, and will have until He comes again in the future, because it stands in an eternal and manifested union with Jesus Christ as flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone. For this cause His Spouse has left all others and cleaves only unto Him and is by Him carried in His Arms into His heavenly courts with His heavenly garments upon her to be presented before His Father as the most pure, holy, spotless and beautiful virgin bride known in all creation. **Why, because Jesus has *made her so*.**

Finish

Appendix 1

In Vindication of Henry D'Anvers

or

**The Baptist Answer to
Mr. Obed. Wills,**

and

His

APPEAL

Against

Mr. H. Danvers

London,

Printed for Francis Smith, at the Elephant and Castle

in Cornhill,

Near the Royal Exchange,

1675.

**The Baptists Answer to Mr. Obed. Wills, his Appeal
Against Mr. H. Danvers:**

Sir:

We have seriously considered your *Appeal* against Mr. *Danvers*, and have also heard, and carefully weighed the *Defence* he makes thereto; and in order to give an Impartial *Judgment*, as you call us to, have desired some of your *Number* diligently to examine the *Authors* cited by you both; and though it appears to us, that Mr. *Danvers*, has earnestly endeavored an accommodation, in a more private and friendly manner, between you and him, so to rectify mistakes on any hand, which (had it been accepted of) might have saved this *trouble*; and that the Method you have used in this *Appeal* be unusual, and unlike the *Pattern* you seemed to take; an Appeal in these Cases being then only *proper*, when the Party appealed against, appears to be so *contumacious*, and *stubborn*, as to reject, and stand out against just *conviction* and *admonition*; which we find not to be justly chargeable upon Mr. *Danvers*, and whether it be not rather your own oversight, we hope you will in time be sensible of; yet we say, we shall not insist upon that *Consideration*; and to give you, and the World that satisfaction *expected* from us, some of us whose names are subscribed, have examined the Particulars you charge him with, and find some mistakes and escapes on Mr. *Danvers'* side, which he ingeniously acknowledges; and we hope may be to your full *satisfaction* as it cannot (in justice) but be to ours, since (as you seem to hint) a *public owning*, is what you expect.

Some of the Particulars in your *Appeal*, we find to be so *trivial*, and *insignificant*, that they deserve not to be *mentioned*, and deem his Answers returned to them *respectively*, sufficient to satisfy the Reader.

Others of your Charges he *traverses*, and joins issue with you at the *Bar* you have brought it to, and the most material of these we now remarks to you; so that what he *acknowledges*, and what is *inconsiderable*, and what is here further *examined*, comprehends your whole *Appeal*.

And we must observe to you, that you lie *obnoxious* to the Return you make to Mr. *Danvers*, when he charge you with leaving out part of the *Sentence of Nazianzer, viz., sialiquid periculiimmineat*, call it, page 7 of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excusing yourself after such a manner as you will not be satisfied with from others; therefore if we say many of your Charges are *frivolous*, your Reason in your own behalf will Justify us, you being Judge.

I.

And therefore, 1. we desire you to consider, whether the **stopping your Translation out of Calvin, where you did**, page 162. *Appeal*, be not unfair, and a misleading of an *English* Reader.

II.

You charge Coll. *Danvers Appeal*, p. 166. to add the words, [*for it cannot be, that the Body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism till the Soul has before received the truth of Faith*] and say they are not *Jerom's* Words, but of Mr. *Danvers* Adding: But upon Examination of that place [Matt. 28. *Tom. 9. Edition Paris, Anno 1546.*] we find them to be *Jerom's* Words Verbatim, as Mr. *Danvers* cites them. And we

observe in your *Quotation* of Mr. Danvers, in that place you add, [*Magd. Cent.* 4, c. 6, 418] as if *Mr. Danvers* had particularly *Quoted the Magd.* there, which indeed he does not; but only *Jeremy* upon *Matthew*, which *Double Injury* we conceive deserves your *Double Consideration*, in order to a Candid *acknowledgment*.

III.

You charge him, p. 169, with Abusing Calvin, fathering Estius's Words upon him, though he has owned it a mistake in his Reply, But we observe also, That he Quotes Estius Annot. Gen. 17:7, at the end, which you leave out, though you took all his words to that, and yet reprove him so often for the same, which seems neither ingenious nor fair.

IV.

You charge him with abusing Dr. *Hamond*, p. 107, in affirming, *That βαπτισμος signifies an immersion, or washing the whole body answering the Hebrew* whereas you say the Dr. tells us, *λασεις* signifies *the washing the whole body, and answer to the Hebrew* &c. We have *examined* the Doctor's Book, printed for R. *Rouston*, Anno 1653 and find Mr. *Danvers'* quoted his words truly, and the mistake to be yours, which we hope will convince you of the untrue and just reproach you subjoin, *That he understands not English Authors, &c.*

V.

You charge Mr. *Danvers* for affirming from *Waldens*, That the *Wicklavian*s, in agreement to the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and others, denied Infant Baptism, he acknowledges it to be his mistake to allege, That it was agreeable to *Pelaius* and others, (said to be for Infant Baptism) but if *Walden* is to be believed, it appears, That the *Wickliffits* judged Ecclesiastical Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words [*nostri Wiclivistae Baptismum Ecclesiasticum inutile judicant parvulis contra omnes praedictos*] against all the aforesaid, viz. *Pelagius, Vincentius Victor, and those that Baptized Children, as born of Believing Parents.* And we must remark to you, that in your Quotation, p. 172, *Appeal*, you leave out [*parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what design or end we leave you to consider.

VI.

You charge him, p. 179, 180, for adding the Words [*it is our will, That all that affirm, That young Children receive Everlasting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or baptism renewed*] to the *Milevitan Decree*. We have examined that 4th *Tom. in Coll. Reg.* and find the *Canon* quoted by Mr. *Danvers* in page 559 of it, taken out of a very *ancient Copy*, immediately following the Words you cite, thus *Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse dominum; In domo patris mei manfiones multe sunt, ut intelligatur, qui in regno Coelorum erit aliquis medius, ant ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate, vivant parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt sine quo in reno Caelorum quod est vita aeterna intrdre non possunt, Anathema sit, An. Christi* 424. Now for you to affirm, that the said Clause was of Mr *Danvers'* own adding; whereas, as he says, *Here is an express Anathema against those that assumed Children might be saved without Baptism, is an Instance* (to give the favorable conjecture of it) that you have made but a lame search: So that it is very just for us to acquit Mr. Danvers of this Charge. We presume you know, that the *Magdeburgs* give an

account when they speak of that *Milevitan Synod*, of some that affirmed Infants Salvation without Baptism, as by the Instances Mr. *Danvers* gives from them, undeniably appears; And in opposition to them was that *Anathema* enacted, and every Circumstance concurs to evidence it as genuine as the other *Canons*; And therefore upon a review of the place we question not but you will be satisfied here is no *forgery* or *prevarication* in *Mr. Danvers* in this Particular.

VII.

Under the Head of his *fathering upon Authors that which they say not*, you charge him with abusing *Basil. Appeal* p. 181. in fathering those Words upon him, [*must the faithful be sealed with Baptism? Faith must precede, and go before*] whereas you say, there is no such speech in what the *Magd. repeat of Basil*, contra *Eunom*, which we conceive to be a very weak ground for your Charge. For must it follow, that the Words are not *Basil's* because you find it not in the *Magedburgs*? We have searched *Basil*, and find his Words to be lib. 3. p. 84, *contra Eunom*. to the sense he is Cited by Mr. *Danvers*, viz. *πασευσαι γαρ δει προτερον ειτα το βαπτισμας επιστηραγισασται*, i. e. *It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism*. So that this is also your own error and oversight.

VIII.

You charge him with a notorious untruth, p. 185, for affirming from the *Magd. That* Gulielmus *added the Virgin Mary to the form of Baptism*. We have examined the *Magd. Cent.* 12, p. 419, *cap.* 4, *Edit. Basil Anno* 1574 and find the words, *Male* Gulielmus *ad formam Baptismi addit Mariam Baptizo te in nomine patris omnipotentis, & filli & spiritus sancti, & Beate Parie Virginis*, as Cited by Mr. *Danvers*; and therefore for you to affirm the contrary is a gross mistake.

And thus, Sir, we have given a true and impartial representation of the Particulars as we find them, being, as we conceive, the principal matters under our *Cognizance*, omitting the less material, & do recommend them to your Christian consideration, hoping that your serious review of them, will discover them to be your *errors*. And as Mr. *Danvers* has publicly owned what of mistake he is convince of in his *Answer* to Your *Appeal*, So it is justly expected, you will also, *according to your promise in the Preface to your Appeal*, do the same in these Particulars. (This was published as *A Rejoinder to Mr. Wills*, London; 1675; R. E. P.)

And since you Charges do not appear to be true to the satisfaction of all impartial persons; but on the contrary great mistakes of your side, you will not, we hope, *think it unjust if we acquit him, & reflect the bland of the Charge upon your self, as you desire, in case you be found in the error*.

The Particulars Mr. *Danvers* owns in his said *Answer* to your *Appeal*, we bring not under our discussion or censure, concluding it to be enough that he acknowledges them.

And such petty Charges as he *sufficiently answers*, and are indeed of little weight, save to *enhance* the number of your Particulars, as also things controverted, and only *collateral* to the grand proposition in dispute, (as are *those things you call strange doctrines*, &c.) we think do not so properly offer themselves to our Considerations. And therefore we conclude we may be excused if we wave them.

And lastly, we propose, That if the Return we give to your *Appeal* should be deemed *insufficiently* by you, or *short in* anything, (which we are not conscious of) and that thereupon you take your self concerned to appear any further in *this Controversy*, you would be persuaded, that things may be transacted in an *amicable* and *friendly* way; which we hope may tend to our *mutual satisfaction* in the clearing up of Truth, and to Cherish that love, that all that fear the Lord should bear each other, though differing in some things, which is our very earnest desire; and to promote which, we shall endeavor to contribute the utmost we can.

London, the 13th of the 5th Month, 1675.

Hansard Knollys,

John Gosnold,

William Kiffen,

Henry Forty,

Daniel Dyke,

Thomas De Launne

APPENDIX II

The Origin of the Baptists

The following account is taken from **The Baptist Encyclopedia** edited by William Cathcart and issued in 1888. The New Baptists in America produced it. However, it reflects many of the **older** and **historic** Baptist concepts. The sad point is, when this was issued, the Baptists were already measuring themselves by Presbyterian theology and concepts. It was a sad day when Baptist murderers would be so interwoven with Baptists that Baptists would be considered one with them except on the mode and subjects of baptism and a congregational church government.

To see how the first generation of Particular Baptists differed from the next generation who were Calvinistic Baptists, see our **The First London Confessions of Faith in Parallel Form**. To show how some of these changes occurred, see my work on **The Lord's Supper**.

APPENDIX III

A

VINDICATION OF WILLIAM JONES

AND

JONES' CHURCH HISTORY

BY

Dr. JOHN L. WALLER

EDITOR

THE WESTERN BAPTIST REVIEW

AND

PIRONEER OF THE KENTUCKY STATE CONVENTION

of

Baptist Churches