

A

VINDICATION OF THE GOOD OLD PATHS

WHEREIN OUR FATHERS WALKED

CONCERNING

1. The authority of Christ exercised only in His church in opposition to the state sending ministers or ministers sending themselves; and in opposition to all human inventions sending ministers;
2. The mystical body of Christ being the visible, gospel church constituted by water baptism in opposition to the invisible, universal church constituted by Holy Spirit baptism;
3. The continued succession of the true church, her officers or administrators, and ordinances to the end of the world in opposition to the reformers, and seekers;
4. The administration of rebaptism, Anabaptism or new baptism in opposition to all not baptized in the good old way of the Lord called Anabaptism;
5. The polity of separation and non-recognition in the following:
 - a. Personal Separation from the world;
 - b. Church Separation from the unbaptized;
 - c. Gospel Separation from those called Free-Willers.

by

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

R. E. Pound

Presented as a *love token* to the Spouse of Jesus Christ *for her help and comfort*

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

To the Kind and Interested Saint

During the mid-1980s, I delivered this message at the annual Bible conference of **The Sovereign Grace Baptist Church** in Duncan, Oklahoma, Jarrell Huffman, Pastor. This does not mean that they would endorse everything herein. Nor does it mean I would endorse all their positions. During the course of study for these messages the Lord enabled me to become much more certain about baptism and church succession. I was led to correct these problems in my personal ministry. I renounced my Arminian baptism and Arminian church ordination. Later I received Gospel baptism from the **Welsh Tract Baptist Church** and a gospel commission from **The Old Faith Baptist Church** still later.

I am happy to say that Lord has brought me, and those about me, into the good old ways of the Lord. We are very happy walking in what we have a reason to hope is the Baptist Way of Jesus Christ. I had been dipped by the **Southern Baptists** in Southern California as a young boy in the early 1950s. For nearly 30 years I was very unsettled about that dipping. *Now I have peace.*

This does **not mean** that I hold *all baptisms invalid* except those who are administered by a minister who is known as an **Old School Baptist**. I do not. But it does mean that I do hold all baptisms as invalid which are administered by a minister who preaches Arminianism. I consider all churches under the baptism and succession of Arminianism as invalid. Names are nothing. The gospel preached by the administrator of baptism shows if he is a true minister of Christ or not. For a full discussion of these things, study:

1. John Spilsbery's **God's Ordinance, the Saints Privilege**, London, 1646; Magazine Arkansas; 1993.
2. R. E. Pound, **The Administrator of Baptism, Studies in Particular Baptist Ecclesiology**, Magazine, Arkansas; 1994.
3. R. E. Pound, **Arminian Baptism**, Magazine, Arkansas; 1993.

The second work is in its final stages to be ready in 1994, the Lord willing. It traces the position of the first generation of **Particular Baptists** through their writings. There are nearly 200 pages taken from the original sources showing their position as to the meaning of a "preaching disciple" or an administrator of the ordinances, a gospel minister. No one should be at a loss as to what the **First London Confession of Faith** meant by an administrator of baptism being a preaching disciple.

Before Calvinism came into the Particular Baptists, they considered themselves, and all others of like faith and order, as the only preaching disciples Jesus Christ called and empowered then in His kingdom.

A preaching disciple may be distinguished from the pastor/teacher in this way, he is not in office. He may be called into office or sent into the world as a begetting minister, one who begets others into the gospel faith, order, worship and works. As John Spilsbury pointed out, a **true administer** is known by his **gospel message**. This is my position and I believe it is a fair representation of the **Old Paths Wherein Our Fathers Walked**. I believe I have vindicated that position in this Treatise.

1. Is the gospel essential for a true administrator of baptism?
2. Is Arminianism the gospel?
3. Has the true gospel system had an unbroken succession?

Please read these messages and then conclude for yourselves. I would like to hear from you.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction, Definition of Terms and A Statement of the Real Issue,	p. 4
2.	The Historic Vindication of the Old Landmark of <i>Church Authority in Baptism and Sending Out</i>, in Opposition to the State Sending, or The Minister Sending Himself; and in Opposition to <i>All Human Inventions Sending out Ministers</i>.	p. 9
3.	The Historic Vindication of the Old Landmark of The Continued Succession of the True Church, Her Officers, Administrators, and Ordinances, to the End of the World, in Opposition to the Pedobaptists and Seekers.	p. 15
4.	In Vindication of <i>The Old Landmark of Scriptural Baptism or Anabaptism or Rebaptism: Called in England "New Baptism."</i>	p. 20
5.	In Vindication of the Old Landmark of <i>Gospel and Church Separation or Non-Recognition</i> of Those Who are Not of True Gospel Order.	p. 29
6.	Conclusion to the Whole Work	p. 33

INTRODUCTION
DEFINITION OF TERMS
AND
A STATEMENT OF THE REAL ISSUE

Scripture Texts: Proverbs 22:28, 23:10.

A. INTRODUCTION

Modern Landmarkism is **NOT** the good old way of the Lord, nor a fair presentation of the glorious correction of a false liberalism eating at the Baptists in the last century. It is mostly a mixture of some good points with some bad points under a pretense of calling **certain actions by the proper names**. It is a system built on abuses and it is abusive.

POINT OF ORDER:

Modern Landmarkism (*not old Landmarkism which I hold*) destroys the Biblical old ways of the Lord touching:

- a. Ordination and,

- b. Sending forth by the church.
1. Abuse in the *A. B. A., B. M. A. A., S. B. C.*, and many *Independent Baptists* as seen by their church **voting on everything**. (As if there is no church authority given by the ordination and sending forth with **the gospel commission**.)
 2. *Baptist Examinerism*, must be able to trace church succession by means of a motion and second behind each church organization to a mother church, or a grandmother church, and on and on. (As if there is no church authority in the church sending out.)
 3. Particular Baptists held to the Biblical doctrine of church authority in the good old ways of the Lord, church ordination, and sending out. This recognizes the proper place of the Lord and His church both in due order. The Pastor functions by his gift and commission, *not* by a vote on everything that comes about.
 4. Modern high churchism came about as a result of improper correction of abuses:
 - a. The origin of boardism, conventionism, extra-church societies and other human inventions, answer--church must vote on everything; this was **over correction** and just as *extreme and abusive*.
 - b. Big spending preachers and free-lancers also caused the church, rather than the minister, to take the lead.
 - c. In many concepts the abuses have been answered by abuses just as wrong.

NOTE: CHURCH AUTHORITY IN ALL THINGS AND IN EVERYTHING, BUT THE QUESTION IS: HOW IS CHURCH AUTHORITY EXECUTED? Modern Landmarkism destroys the Biblical concepts of ordination and sending out by its modern ideas and abuses of voting on everything that comes about.

B. DEFINITIONS:

- 1) A Landmark is a boundary or a visible sign along the way.
 - a. *Baptists have spiritual boundaries in their Spiritual Land.*
 - b. *They have many problems within the Land, but it is still in the Land.*
 - c. *In Ecclesiology the key to Baptist soundness is SEPARATION, but not extremism.*
 - d. *No real Baptist places his church activities beyond the wall or landmark of baptism and membership.*

Thomas Grantham, in his **Treatise on Gospel Separation**, stated:

Baptism is made a boundary of Church Communion, and therefore may not by any specious pretenses to Godliness be removed out of that place where God hath fixed it... But alas there

is no stay when once we have gone beyond the ancient Landmarks, which our Fathers (I mean the Apostles) have set us.

Thomas Grantham: **Christianismus Primitivus, or the Ancient Christian Religion**; London, 1678,, Treatise VI, page 184.

2) We need a **FRESH, SCRIPTURAL VIEW OF WHAT BAPTISM IS AND WHY IT IS SPECIAL:**

William Kiffin stated:

The ordinance of baptism is none of the least, **the very foundation of religion being comprehended in the Form thereof.**

William Kiffin: **A Sober Discourse of RIGHT to Church-Communion**; London, 1681, To the Reader p. 4.

3) Do we really believe ***THE WATER BAPTISM JOHN THE BAPTIST ADMINISTERED TO JESUS CHRIST WAS A PICTORIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE DEATH, BURIAL AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FOR HIS ELECT?***

4) If we view water baptism properly, we will be ***Particular Baptists.***

- a. true baptism was a part of the fulfilling of all righteousness in the life of Jesus Christ;
- b. Jesus Christ was made known to Israel as the Messiah at His water baptism, the Holy Spirit of God, in the form of a dove, came down upon Him in the water;
- c. We are buried with Him in water baptism and have put on Christ by water baptism.

EITHER THESE POINTS ARE IMPORTANT OR THEY ARE NOT

C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE:

What were some of the Old Landmarks which formed the heart of the Particular Baptist Ecclesiology?

Some of the basic Baptist concepts are:

- a. The Supreme authority of the Bible in all matters of faith and practice;
- b. Believer's baptism--this is the conspicuous conviction of Baptists--
Immersion is the Apostolic form;
- c. Churches composed of believers only;

- d. Equality of all Christians in the life of the church;
- e. Independence of the local church;
- f. Separation of the church and state.

The Encyclopedia Britannica,
1971 edition; Vol. 3, pps. 139-143.

The foundation concept of **Particular Baptist ecclesiology** concerning the importance of **BELIEVER'S BAPTISM AND THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH**, and those societies which do not have believer's baptism and the proper constitution of their churches, is as follows:

- 1. Those who are not immersed as believers are not baptized;
- 2. Those who are not baptized cannot make up a true church.

An important statement:

ALL PARTIES ARE AGREED, THAT BAPTISM IS THE INITIATORY RITE WHICH GIVES MEMBERSHIP IN THE VISIBLE CHURCH OF CHRIST. . .BAPTISM RECOGNIZES AND CONSTITUTES THE OUTWARD DISCIPLESHIP. Now if all other form of baptism than immersion are not only irregular, but null and void, ALL UNIMMERSED PERSONS ARE OUT OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH. But if each and every member of a Pedobaptist visible church is thus unchurched: of course the whole body is unchurched. All Pedobaptist societies, then, ARE GUILTY OF AN INTRUSIVE ERROR, WHERE THEY PRETEND TO THE CHARACTER OF A VISIBLE CHURCH OF CHRIST.. .It is hard to see how any intelligent and conscientious immersionist can do any act, which countenances or sanctions this profane INTRUSION. They (immersionists) should not allow any weak inclinations of fraternity and peace to sway their consciences in this point of high principle. . .They are bound, then, not only to PRACTICE CLOSE COMMUNION, BUT TO REFUSE ALL MINISTERIAL RECOGNITION AND COMMUNION TO THOSE INTRUDERS. . .THE ENLIGHTENED IMMERSIONIST SHOULD TREAT ALL THESE SOCIETIES, JUST AS HE DOES THAT SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN. . .there may be many good, misguided believers in them [Pedobaptist churches R.E.P.], but no church CHARACTER, MINISTRY OF SACRAMENTS WHATEVER.

R. L. Dabney: **Lectures in Systematic Theology;**
Zondervan Publishing House; Grand Rapids, 1972, pps. 774, 775.

Whose remarks are these? These remarks were made by a **Presbyterian**, R. L. Dabney, under the title of

***"THE ODISIOUS ECCLESIASTICAL CONSEQUENCES
OF THE IMMERSIONIST DOGMA."***

Observe, according to Dabney, if immersion is the only true baptism:

- 1. ***Pedobaptists are not a true church;***

2. *Pedobaptists are guilty of an intrusive error;*
3. *Pedobaptists are simply misguided believers;*
4. *Pedobaptists have no church character, ministry or sacraments whatever.*
5. *Immersionists should not recognize Pedobaptists.*

Dr. R. L. Dabney was the leading Presbyterian theologian in the old South before the Civil War. He was chaplain to Stonewall Jackson.

Old Landmarkism Defined:

Dr. J. M. Pendleton stated:

Ecclesiastical Separation is the ***HEART*** of Landmarkism. While the terminology associated with the movement was mainly derived from this publication the principles drawn upon have a long standing precedent. **ECCLESIASTICAL SEPARATION IN EVERY AGE HAS INCLUDED:**

1. Refusal to recognize heretical bodies as gospel churches;
2. Refusal to recognize their envoys as gospel ministers;
3. Refusal to recognize their ordinances as valid.

J. M. Pendleton: **An Old Landmark Reset;**
Walker, WV., 1899. (Introduction)

Dr. J. R. Graves stated:

To preserve and perpetuate the scriptural design of baptism, and its validity and recognition only when scripturally administered by a gospel church. . .

To preserve and perpetuate the doctrine of a divinely called and scripturally qualified and ordained ministry, to proclaim the gospel, and to administer the ordinances, not upon their own responsibility, but, for, and under the direction of, local churches alone.

J. R. Graves: **Old Landmarkism;** 1880, page 94.

Baptists all believe in **Church Authority** in baptism, commissions, and in church constitutions. The question is--

WHAT CONSTITUTES CHURCH AUTHORITY?

1. The mob-rule A.B.A., B.M.A.A. concept or the majority rule of the church in every case, **modern** Landmarkism, voting on everything.

Or:

2. The Biblical, Old Landmark of churches as independent republics, where the administrators are empowered to act on behalf of the church by their ordination, commission and sending forth.

In Conclusion

We are Particular Baptists. We do not hold *to the vote only concept of church authority*. *We hold to* the good old ways of our fathers who understood the due order of the Lord's house. They held to a true and proper meaning of **CHURCH COMMISSION OR ORDINATION, for A PASTOR AND/OR TEACHER (ONE AND THE SAME), AND SENDING OUT AS A CHURCH MESSENGER OR ADMINISTRATOR**.

These two different types of ministers were called:

A **feeding ministry**, pastor and/or teacher, to the church;

A **begetting minister**, sent to the world to bring forth the elect into the faith, order, worship and works of Jesus Christ. See Dr. John Clark's **Personal Confession of Faith**.

I.

THE HISTORIC VINDICATION OF THE OLD LANDMARK OF
CHURCH AUTHORITY IN BAPTISM AND SENDING OUT,
IN OPPOSITION TO THE STATE SENDING
OR
THE MINISTER SENDING HIMSELF;
AND
IN OPPOSITION TO
ALL HUMAN INVENTIONS SENDING OUT MINISTERS.

Thomas Grantham stated:

That as the Church is of Divine Institution by Christ, so are all her officers; IN WHOSE NAME SHE SENDS THEM FORTH, AND NOT IN HER NAME, OR IN THE NAME OF ANY OTHER CREATURE, AND SO OF NO HUMAN INSTITUTION, NOR TO ACT IN THEIR MINISTRY BY HUMAN AUTHORITY.

**"The Successors of the Apostles", in Christian.
Prim. "Treatise V", 1678 page 159.**

Again:

For, if those who go to preach to the World, cannot justify their calling, as being enabled with lawful Power from God, and his Church; how shall they comfort themselves in their undertakings, or answer opposers when questioned, considering their Commission, especially in such, that as the Gospel is to be preached, so those that go forth as Ministers, thereof, MUST BE SENT, EITHER BY IMMEDIATE MISSION FROM HEAVEN OR SOME MEDIATE MISSION FROM HIM BY HIS CHURCH.

Ibid., p. 160

Grantham, again:

I say, this Ministry if of Divine Institution, because the whole MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY, which the CHURCH HATH RECEIVED AS SUCH IS OF DIVINE INSTITUTION; yea, the very church herself is of Divine Institution; and therefore said to be built up a Spiritual House to offer Spiritual Sacrifices; called also an Holy Nation, a Royal Priesthood, the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which also is Holy. . .

Ibid., p. 167.

William Kiffin stated:

I have no other design, but the preserving the Ordinances of Christ, in their purity and Order as they are left unto us in the Holy Scriptures of Truth; and to warn the Churches to keep close to the Rule, lest they being found not to Worship the Lord according to His prescribed Order He make a Breach amongst them.

A Sober Discourse of The Right of Church Communion,
London: 1681 **To the Reader**, (Next to last page).

John Spittlehouse stated in regard to the established ministry being of Antichrist and not of Christ:

All of which doth clearly declare them [Pedobaptists, R.E.P.] to be Ministers of Antichrist and the State, and not of Christ; for His servants they are whom they obey.

In relation to their Mission [Antichrist ministers, R.E.P.] it is from the State, and not from Jesus Christ. Instance, the State's disposing of them at pleasure; WHEREAS THE CALL AND MISSION OF GOSPEL-MINISTERS I THE APOSTLES DAYS, WAS BY A JOINT CONSENT OF THE CHURCH OUT OF WHICH THEY WERE ELECTED, viz. Acts 2, from verse 13 to the end of the chapter, viz., also Acts 6 from verse 1 to ver. 7.

John Spittlehouse: **An Explanation of the Commission of Jesus Christ**; London, 1653, p. 5.

POINT OF ORDER:

Church officers or administrators are empowered by their commission and sending out by the church. This is one of the **historic Landmarks of the Lord's good old way**.

The Associational Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland, to 1660; The Baptist Historical Society, 4 Southampton Row, London, W. C. 1. Edited by B. R. White:

1. Concerning a minister and some brethren who differed with a church and left it, the brethren stated:

That a letter be sent to the said disorderly brethren to exhort them to consider from whence they are fallen and their present practices; and to forbear for the future to utter rash or scandalous words of the church; or receiving into or keeping in their fellowship, such as are or shall be cast out by the church or any that shall come away from them; that they attend upon the CHURCH MINISTRY NOT PRACTICING IN THEIR PRIVATE MEETING ANY SUCH ORDINANCES AS ARE PROPER TO THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST.

page 6.

2. This is said of the Pastor and the ordinances: "Administer all ordinances in the church."

page 11

3. QUESTION whether if be not unlawful for a member of the church of Christ to go forth to peach by the magistrate's authority and to be maintained by him accordingly? Oct. 24, 1655.

ANSWER: IT IS UNLAWFUL:

1) Because Our LORD CHRIST SENDS FORTH HIS MINISTERS BY HIS POWER ALONE, MATT. 28:19; and HE IS THE HEAD OF THE BODY THE CHURCH THAT IN ALL THINGS HE MIGHT HAVE THE PREEMINENCE. Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22.

2) Because Christ hath left all power in this CHURCH BOTH TO CALL AND TO SEND FORTH MINISTERS, MATT. 28:20 saying I am with you to the end of the world, and I Tim. 3; Titus 1. Acts 14; Mt. 18 and 16:18.

3) Because we find the CHURCH ONLY EXERCISING THAT POWER BOTH IN CHOOSING AND SENDING FORTH MINISTERS AS APPEARS BY THESE SCRIPTURES; Acts 1:23, 26; 8:18; 13:2; and 11:22.

page 23.

4. QUESTION: Whether it be the duty of EVERY CHURCH OF CHRIST TO CALL FORTH THOSE TO OFFICIATE IN THE OFFICES OF CHRIST IN HIS CHURCH AS THEY FIND IN A GOOD MEASURE QUALIFIED FOR THE SAME ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES? [This relates to those not already in office but only gifted--R.E.P.]

ANSWER: It is agreed in the affirmative and that from these Scriptures. Matt. 24:45; Titus 1:5; Eph. 4:11; I Cor. 12:28; Acts 20:28.

Ibid.

5. QUESTION: There are many congregations that have GIFTED brethren that are approved of for the public preaching of the word that do not baptize nor administer the Supper, The churches are desired to consider whether these churches may not CALL FORTH THOSE MEMBERS TO BREAK BREAD AND TO BAPTIZE AS NEED SHALL REQUIRE?

ANSWER: In the affirmative: the churches may call forth such to baptize and administer the Supper provided they be very careful that their effectual endeavor after

an official minister be not hereby neglected [the church was to secure a regular Pastor even though she had gifts--R.E.P.]

Ibid., pages 23, 24

6. QUESTION: Whether a gifted brother so judged of by the church MAY GO OUT TO PREACH AT HIS OWN WILL AT THE TIME OF THE CHURCH MEETING OR IS TO BE ALONE AT THE DISPOSING OF THE CHURCH?

ANSWER: We answer that such a brother so adjudged of by the church ought wholly to BE AT ITS DISPOSING. a. First, because that all those GIFTED ARE THE CHURCH'S, I Cor. 3:22; 12:28; Eph 4:11. . . and after admonition that it is the church's duty to deal with him as an offender. [That showed what happened to those who went forth on their own, R.E.P.]

Ibid., page 34

7. QUESTION: Whether the setting apart of any to administer officially in the church of Christ is not to be done by that church of which the person set apart is a member?

ANSWER:

1. That it is in the POWER OF THE CHURCH TO ORDAIN AND SEND FORTH A MINISTER TO THE WORLD, Acts 13:2;

2. That this person sent forth to the world and gathering churches, he ought with them and they with him to ordain fit persons to officiate among them, Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5

Ibid., page 56.

8. QUESTION: Whether the power of the keys spoken of in Mat. 16:19, Jn. 20:23; Mat. 18:18 be given to the church or to the Eldership in the church?

ANSWER: The exercise of the power of Christ in a Church having officers, in opening and shutting, in receiving and casting out, BELONGS TO THE CHURCH WITH ITS ELDERSHIP, Matt. 18:17; I Cor. 5:4; III John 9; Acts 15:4,22.

9. QUESTION: Whether it be an absolute duty not lying on several churches speedily to send forth persons fitted for the great and good work of preaching the Gospel to the world?

ANSWER: We judge it to be a duty and at this time much to be laid to heart and performed to send forth such brethren as are fitted to the work of preaching the Gospel to poor sinners that they might be saved.

1. That it is a duty appears by the commission of Christ, Matt. 28:18; and BY THE CHURCHES THAT FIRST TRUSTED IN CHRIST ACCORDING THEREUNTO, Acts 11:22; 13:1; 1:15-23.

page 64.

10. Concerning those who were baptized where there were no churches, and who didn't join any church following baptism, this conclusion is given:

And also to prevent such neglect for the future, that WHEN AN ADMINISTRATOR IS SENT FORTH BY ANY CHURCH TO PREACH AND BAPTIZE THE SAID CHURCH DO TAKE CARE THAT HE BE MINDED TO EXHORT ALL SUCH PERSONS AS HE SHALL BAPTIZE TO JOIN THEMSELVES WITHOUT DELAY TO SOME TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND THAT EVERY SUCH ADMINISTRATOR BE IN

LIKE MANNER EXHORTED THAT SOON AFTER HE SHALL BAPTIZE ANY PERSON, HE GIVE NOTICE THEREOF TO SOME ADJACENT CHURCH.

page 132.

11. QUESTION: By whose authority these gifts are orderly to be called forth unto their actual service and administration?

ANSWER: For our direction herein we had recourse to apostolic precept and practice in Acts 1:13 to the end, Acts 6:2-5; Acts 14:23; In the first of these places we note that there being a vacancy in the apostleship by the fall and death of Judas, Peter in the name of the eleven, advised with the body of disciples about the trial, election and ordination of an apostle then, much more is that authority needful in calling and approving an inferior officer.

In the 3rd place, Acts 14, Luke informs us that elders were ordained in every church by lifting up of the hand, so, in the original by election, so it is in the old translation which must imply the ACTION OF THE CHURCH.

By the which it appears WHERE CHRIST HATH PLACED THE AUTHORITY OF TRIAL AND ELECTING, VIZ. IN HIS CHURCH.

That evangelists are fit to be instruments to administer in the name of Christ and His church in this work, we ground on the example of Timothy and Titus.

pages 170, 171

OBSERVE THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

These old Baptists believed the following points--

- a. *Christ gave the commission unto the church and her ministry;*
- b. *Only those who were sent out by the church could preach, baptize, gather churches and administer the Supper.*

These old Baptists believed in the Separation of the church from the state because--

- a. *Christ gave the authority only to the Church to send out in His name;*
- b. *The church, not the state, is to maintain the ministry.*

Church authority, then, was the **foundation position of Particular Baptists** as well as the foundation concept of the General Baptists of the 1600's. This understanding **caused the separation of church and state**. *This foundation concept destroys all the human inventions developed during the early 1800's and since.*

What about the one who goes forth of his own will?

and we judge if any brother shall persist in such a disorderly practice [go out to preach at his own will] after admonition that it is the church's duty to deal with him as an offender.

What about the separation of Church and State? Why cannot the state send out the minister of the Gospel and sustain him?

IT IS UNLAWFUL...

1. Because our Lord Christ sends forth His ministers by His power alone;
2. Because Christ hath left all power in HIS CHURCH BOTH TO CALL AND SEND FORTH MINISTERS;
3. BECAUSE WE FIND THE CHURCH ONLY EXERCISING THAT
POWER BOTH IN CHOOSING AND SENDING FORTH
MINISTERS AS APPEARS BY THESE SCRIPTURES...

Meeting on Oct. 24, 1655; page 23.

The State **is not to send forth and maintain the ministry.** The minister **is not** to go forth at his own will. Christ has left all power in **HIS CHURCH BOTH TO CALL AND TO SEND FORTH THE MINISTRY.**

NOTE

The same Biblical principle that **destroys the state sending forth** also **destroys the concept of the association, board, committee and convention sending forth the ministry and sustaining them.** *Only the church is to do this work. This is church authority per se.*

IN CONCLUSION

I conclude by noting that **SOME** have remarked that the **First London Confession of Faith** did not require a **church commissioned administrator of baptism.** By its definition of a preaching disciple, it was supposed to have meant only a common disciple which is now, in our apostate times, **any disciple, even one without a church commission.**

The **Particular Baptist's** enemies in the 1640's ridiculed them for not holding to a proper administrator in the **First London Confession of Faith.** Hansard Knowles answered this way:

WE DO NOT AFFIRM, THAT EVERY COMMON DISCIPLE MAY BAPTIZE, there was some mistake in laying down our opinion, p. 14. Where it is conceived, that we hold, Whosoever Disciple can teach the word, make out Christ may Baptize and administer other Ordinances. We do not so, For though believing Women being baptized are Disciples, Acts 9:36, and can make out Christ; yea and some of them (by their experimental knowledge and spiritual understanding of the Way, Order and Faith of the Gospel) may be able to instruct their Teachers, Acts 18:26, Rom. 16:3, yet we do not hold that a woman may preach, baptize, nor administer other Ordinances. Nor do we judge it meet, for any Brother to baptize or to administer other Ordinances; UNLESS HE HAVE RECEIVED SUCH GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT, AS FITTETH, OR ENABLING HIM TO PREACH THE GOSPEL, AND THOSE GIFTS BEING FIRST TRIED BY AND KNOWN TO THE CHURCH, SUCH A BROTHER IS CHOSEN AND APPOINTED THEREUNTO BY THE SUFFRAGE OF THE CHURCH.

Hansard Knollys: **The Shining of a Flaming Fire
in Zion, or, A Clear Answer unto 13 Exceptions against
the Grounds of New Baptism;** London, 1646, p. 9.

The misunderstanding arose because the Anti-Baptists didn't know what these old Baptists meant by a **preaching disciple**. At his conclusion, Knollys asks these questions among 12:

7. Whether any person, who hath not COMMISSION TO BAPTIZE, OR IS HIMSELF UNBAPTIZED MAY PREACH?

8. May any be said to BELIEVE unless these signs follow them? Mark 16:17. Or SOME HAVE PREACHED UNTO THEM WHO WERE SENT OF GOD TO PREACH. Rom. 10:13,14,15,16? [How sent of God but by His church...Oct 24, 1655 question and answer--R.E.P.]

12. WHETHER ANY UNBAPTIZED PERSON MAY BE CALLED A DISCIPLE OF CHRIST?

Ibid., pp. 16,17.

These old Baptists considered a disciple as a **baptized believer**. They even denied that there were true believers except those who were converted under the preaching of those sent of God. They claimed no unbaptized person could preach in most cases. This is all a far cry from what is claimed today about these old Baptists and practiced by modern Baptists.

Here are some major points taken from Daniel King's work:

1. The Word and Ordinances are the church's heritage, p. 90;
2. Church may choose administrators. p. 90;
3. Baptism and all other ordinances are the Church's heritage, p. 90;
4. The Church is the wife and spouse of Christ, p. 91;
5. Keys were given by Christ to the church, p. 91;
6. The church has the power, p. 91;
7. THE CHURCH IS THE CHANNEL FROM WHICH ALL ORDINANCES, OFFICERS AND ADMINISTRATORS COME, p. 91;
8. The Temple was a type of the church and the church sanctifies baptism even as the temple sanctified its gold; p. 92,
9. Baptism must come from the church, p. 92,
10. Baptism is a spiritual stream of water from the church, p. 92,
11. Church gives being to the ordinances; p. 93,
12. The Power is in the church; p. 93,
13. Church is compared to a tree which bears fruit, ordinances, p. 93,
14. Christ sent the Holy Spirit to the church, p. 93,
15. Church is the bush that burned not, p. 93,
16. Ordinances and officers are the fruits of the church, p. 94.

Daniel King: **A Way to Sion Sought Out
and Found for Believers to Walk In;** London, 1650; pps. 90-97.

(**Note:** Bro. John and Sister Lisa O'Brien have updated and retyped the 1656 enlarged Edition.) King showed **church succession**, the **true administration of the ordinances** and **who are valid officers and administrators**. He showed that saints, or churches may take up any ordinance, that is, practice it, circulate it, and cause it to go forth. This was in opposition to the Seekers, Papists, and Protestants.

II.

AN HISTORICAL VINDICATION OF THE OLD LANDMARK OF THE *MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST BEING THE VISIBLE, GOSPEL CHURCH CONSTITUTED BY WATER BAPTISM*

IN OPPOSITION TO THE INVISIBLE, UNIVERSAL CHURCH CONSTITUTED BY SPIRIT BAPTISM.

A. Historic Facts:

- 1) *These old Baptists believed in a General church, but it was only made up of all the particular churches;*
- 2) *They held that the particular church is the body of Christ;*
- 3) *They held that I Cor. 12:13 referred to water baptism into either the general visible church or the particular church.*

B. Anti-Baptist concepts:

1) The **invisible church**, made up of individuals was held by the Protestants, Seekers, Quakers and Bunyanites;

2) These groups all held that I Cor. 12:13 referred to Holy Spirit baptism into the **invisible church**, the mystical body of Christ. The old Particular and General Baptists opposed this concept and would not even go to hear those who held to the invisible church except to debate or answer them. Many of the old Baptists then didn't even consider John Bunyan a **true believer**. The Particular or General Baptist Churches did not fellowship with John Bunyan, the Seekers, Quakers or Protestants.

C. Baptist Confessions:

No **Baptist Confession** sets forth the invisible church which cuts across all denominational lines and is a basis for fellowship until the Free-will Baptist confession of the early 1800's.

The 1677, 1689 and **Philadelphia Baptist Confessions** say this:

The catholic or universal church, which (WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERNAL WORK OF THE SPIRIT, AND TRUTH OF GRACE) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are or shall be gathered together into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that fills all in all.

Chapter 26, Art. 1

THIS IS THE IDEAL CONCEPT OF THE CHURCH. It has no real being, but is simply an expression of an idea. (See Hiscox's **Baptist Church Directory** for this explanation.)

- 1) No earlier Baptist Confessions spoke in this manner.

- show they
- 2) This was the Baptist adoption of the Westminster Confession of Faith, Presbyterian. The Baptists adopted this confession in an attempt to show they to the world, and state, that they were not the wild trouble-makers were charged with being.
 - 3) The Baptists, themselves, didn't hold to a Catholic Church or a Universal Church, except the General church made up of all the Particular Churches.
 - 4) In the Baptist writings you can find that they believed the following:
 - a. The church was universal, not limited to one nation as the Old Testament system was.
 - b. The church was visible, not invisible, except in respect to the work of the Holy Spirit and the grace of God within, which all admit.
 - 5) At first, the Particular Baptists allowed the Presbyterian definition of the church for accommodation only. And, then, they made it plain that the church was not invisible, but only, it is **"THE INTERNAL WORK OF THE SPIRIT, AND TRUTH OF GRACE"** within the saints that is **invisible**.
 - 6) No Baptist Confession, Sermon, Tract or Book can be produced among the Regular old Baptists of the 1600's which **maintained a universal, invisible church** made up of all believers by Holy Spirit baptism which cuts across all denominational lines and is the true basis for fellowship.

HISTORICAL VINDICATIONS:

- 1) All the anti-Quaker material of the 1600's proves this point;
- 2) All the anti-Seeker material of the 1600's proves this point;
- 3) All the anti-Bunyan material of the 1600's proves this point.

Henry D'Anvers stated:

Sixthly, Concerning the Church at Corinth, it is said, Acts 18:18, And Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue believed on the Lord with all his House, and that many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized; and in I Cor. 1:13, Paul tells the Church at Corinth, That they were not baptized in his name. And in I Cor. 12:13, that by one Spirit they were all baptized into one BODY VIZ. THAT THEY WERE JOINED TO THE CHURCH BY BAPTISM; of whom it is said, I Cor. 11:2, THAT THEY KEPT THE ORDINANCES AS THEY WERE DELIVERED TO THEM.

A Treatise of Baptism; London, 1674, page 31.

D'Anvers' works so enraged the Anti-Baptists that a trial was held in which they claimed that he **misquoted his authorities**. Baptists all over the Kingdom came to his aid. D'Anvers was forced to publish **Innocency and Truth Vindicated** and **A Rejoinder to Mr. Wills** in 1675. He wrote and published other works in the next two years. Several

Baptists met and considered the charges against D'Anvers. They vindicated him. To show why, they published **A Baptist Answer to Obediah Wills** in 1675. The Pedobaptists **banished** D'Anvers to Holland. D'Anvers died there as a grand and noble pioneer Baptist historian, a former Governor of Stafford, *because he vindicated the divine origin and unbroken succession of the Baptists.*

**D'ANVERS WORK IS NOT AN EXCEPTION
ON BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION BUT IT REFLECTS THE
RULE AMONG THE BAPTISTS. I Cor. 12:13 referred to WATER BAPTISM
AMONG THE OLD BAPTISTS.**

During the great baptismal debates in the 1600's, all the Baptist works refer to I Cor. 12:13 as water baptism not Holy Spirit baptism into the invisible church.

When the Particular Baptists issued the **First London Confession of Faith** (there were about 54 churches in England then according to Neal in his **The History of Puritans** many Pedobaptists attacked it and just as many Baptists defended it.

1. **John Spilsbery** answered Thomas Bakewell's work against the Baptists. Bakewell rebuked the Baptists for not providing for the invisible church in the 1644 confession. Spillsbury replied that they had good reason, **THERE WAS NO INVISIBLE CHURCH!**

2. **Hansard Knollys** answered John Saltmarsh with his "**The Shining of a Flaming Fire in Zion,**" 1646, in which the passages used to try and prove the invisible church are used in reference to the gospel church and water baptism.

3. **Daniel King** answered many Anti-Baptists with his **Stumbling Blocks Removed Out of the Way**, London. He wrote against both the Quakers and the Seekers. The Quakers stated the church was universal and invisible. They held to Holy Spirit Baptism. The Seekers claimed there were no true churches, no true baptism in water, only in the Holy Spirit, and no true Administrators. On page 132, King shows that I Cor. 12:13 refers to water baptism. (Note: this reference is to the 1650 edition. It can be found near page 140 in the 1656 edition.)

4. **Daniel King** published **Some Beams of Light**, London, 1650, Edinburgh 1656. On page 217 he showed that the Seekers argued for one true church, **INVISIBLE, BY HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM**, while the Baptists held to the visible church constituted by water baptism. (This reference would be near page 225 in the 1656 edition)

THESE OLD BAPTISTS HELD TO A GENERAL CHURCH OR KINGDOM, MADE UP, NOT OF INDIVIDUALS OF ALL DENOMINATIONS, but ALL THE PARTICULAR GOSPEL CHURCHES.

5. **Daniel King**, in his **A Way to Zion**, stated:

"I would inform thee, that by Sion I mean not only the Church in general, but particular congregations, branches of this Church, constituted according to Apostolic order, Heb. 12:22,23. And by the way to it, I mean not the way, Christ, who is the way to the Father, Jn. 14:6, But the way of obedience in water, with and unto Christ. The way of constitution of Churches & carrying on outward worship...."

6. **Hansard Knollys**, in 1689, published his **Exposition of the Whole book of Revelation**, London. It contains the greatest remarks on the church found anywhere. Notice:

"Church is an HOMOGENIAL word, as water in the sea, water in a river, in a well and in a spoon is called water; so the assembly or congregation of sanctified believers in the general assembly is called the church, Heb. 12:23; and the particular assemblies or congregations in any city is called the church. I Cor. 1:12,2 so in any Village or Town, Rom. 16:1, yea in any house, Col. 4:15.

7. From the **Records of the Particular Baptists to 1660** we glean this statement:

". . .there is the same relation between the particular churches each towards the other as there is betwixt particular members of one church, FOR THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST DO ALL MAKE UP ONE BODY OR CHURCH IN GENERAL UNDER CHRIST THEIR HEAD AS EPH. 1:22; COL. 1:24; EPH. 5:23; I COR. 12:13. AS PARTICULAR MEMBERS MAKE UP ONE PARTICULAR CHURCH UNDER THE SAME HEAD, CHRIST, AND ALL THE PARTICULAR ASSEMBLIES ARE BUT ONE MOUNT SION, Isa. 4:5; Song 6:9.

Oct. 8, 1652, p. 126.

8. **Thomas Grantham** stated:

"We are now come to Corinth, Acts 18:8, where we find the Word preached. Crispus believing is baptized, his Household also received the Word by Faith, and many of the Corinthians hearing the word, believed and were baptized; and here Paul continues a year and six months preaching the Word of God among them, but not a word of any infant added to this church; neither yet by this Epistle which Paul writ to the Church can any such thing be made to appear, but rather the contrary, for they are said to be such persons as called upon the name of the Lord, being first called to be Saints, and called into the fellowship of the Lord Jesus, who are all required to speak the same thing, and were all BY ONE SPIRIT BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY and made to DRINK INTO ONE SPIRIT, WERE ALL ONE BODY AND ONE BREAD AS THEY WERE PARTAKERS OF THAT ONE BREAD OF THE LORD'S TABLE..."

Book 2, Chapter 1, page 11, **Prim. Christian.**, London, 1678

These old Baptists regarded the MYSTICAL CHURCH AS THE VISIBLE GOSPEL CHURCH and BODY OF CHRIST.

9. Grantham stated again:

"Hence all Baptized believers must be deemed as persons in Christ; born of water and of the Spirit, and called by (or baptized into the Name of) the Father, Son and holy Spirit, and must therefore be received as Brethren and as Members of the visible Church CONSIDERED AS UNIVERSAL."

Ibid., book VI, p. 177.

Grantham devoted several pages on his sixth Treatise answering John Bunyan and his errors. On Pages 177 and 178 he argues that all members of the **UNIVERSAL CHURCH**

ARE MADE SUCH BY WATER BAPTISM, SO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE PARTICULAR CHURCHES MUST HAVE WATER BAPTISM.

Grantham again:

"And the same God which hath ordained marriage for the uniting persons in the state of Husband and Wife hath ordained baptism to unite us to the mystical body of Christ, HIS VISIBLE CHURCH."

Ibid., page 181.

Note King's Answer to the Invisible Church Quakers and Seekers:

ONE Body, yet this hindered not but in visible order of walking, there was at that time, many Bodies, 1 Cor. 12:27. Paul tells the Corinthians, they were the Body of Christ, Rom. 12:7 he says, WE BEING MANY ARE ONE BODY IN CHRIST, speaking of the Romans that were Saints. The Ephesians were a Body, Eph. 4:16 for the body was to be edified in love, by the members. Now, no one member could edify the universal Body (except an Apostle by his writings) but this Exhortation concerns every particular member. Therefore he means such a body, where the members had communion so as they might edify one another. The Scripture speaks of such Bodies which had administrations among them, which have in them, some to see, called, an Eye, some to hear, called, the Ear. Some to administer, called, the Hand. Some to support, called, the Foot. Which cannot be done in the general, but in a particular body walking together, and yet all these are but one body in Christ, in the unity of the Spirit. So there were several Bodies in Asia, Rev. 2 and 3, and Gal. 1:1 and he himself confesses particular Bodies, or Churches, page 306. Yea and visible Churches, pages 145 and 175. Yet all but one, in unity of the Spirit. So Paul calls Christ, THE APOSTLE OF OUR PROFESSION, Heb. 3:1. Yet this hindered not the being of twelve Apostles in those times. And they are to be acknowledged Apostles of our Profession too. So that this arguing is but a sound without substance.

Some Beams of Light, Edinburgh, 1656, page 162

The same is true in **Knollys** and **D'Anvers**. These remarks give us a fair representation of the faith of these old Baptist fathers.

HOW DID THESE OLD BAPTISTS VIEW JOHN BUNYAN AND HIS OPEN COMMUNION, NO WATER BAPTISM AND UNIVERSAL INVISIBLE CHURCH DOCTRINES?

- 1) He was never recognized nor received by the Baptists.
- 2) Many of them considered him as a **Reprobate!**

John Denne said about John Bunyan:

Wherefore John Bunyan and HIS DOCTRINE OUGHT TO BE EXPLODED, AS A DETECTED GANGRENE INCREASING UNTO MORE UNGODLINESS, 2 Tim. 2:18.

page 124.

Touching his faith [Bunyan's] let the God of Heaven answer, I John 2:3--He that says he knows me, and keeps not my commandments is a liar;

And then, if one baptism, what other, but that one (viz., Baptism of Water) so generally practiced by all Disciples?

He [Bunyan] will tell us the Baptism of the Spirit, for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.

To which I answer, The Baptism of the Spirit was not general, and could not be intended by ONE BAPTISM.

John Denne: **Truth Outweighing Error;**
London, 1673, p. 86.

In Conclusion to this Point

While we realize that there are many Scriptures which use the terms **Body** and **Church** in a **secondary** or **enlarged** sense, they do not destroy the basic meaning of these terms. In addition, the old Baptists didn't hold to either the Protestant Invisible or Roman Catholic Universal Visible ideas of the church. All their works on baptism show I Corinthians 12:13 referring to water baptism. The universal invisible church concepts didn't come among the old Particular Baptists until the 1700s.

- 1) These old Baptists believed in **water baptism** unto the visible church, not Holy Spirit baptism into the invisible church;
- 2) The visible churches, not individuals, all made up the one General or Universal church, we call this the Kingdom;
- 3) The Baptists opposed the Protestants, Seekers and Quakers who all believed in the Holy Spirit baptism into the invisible church along with John Bunyan and his Reformers (Called such in Davis' **History of the Welsh Baptists**, p. 20)
- 4) The Church is one body, Eph. 2:13-21, for both the Jews and Gentiles--that is, there is not a separate body of Jews and then a different body of Gentiles, as the Old Testament system.

III.

**THE HISTORIC VINDICATION OF THE OLD LANDMARK OF
THE CONTINUED SUCCESSION OF THE TRUE CHURCH, HER
OFFICERS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND ORDINANCES,
TO THE END OF THE WORLD,
IN OPPOSITION TO THE PEDOBAPTISTS AND SEEKERS.**

A. Statement of our meaning: By this we mean the Visible Church of Christ, or Gospel church, has had and will always have earthly existence and will have her administrators and ordinances until Christ's second coming. We do not mean that a church must be able to prove its succession to be scriptural nor do we mean that it must produce a motion and second behind its organization to be a church. Ministers are ordained and sent out to preach, baptize and gather churches. The **SUCCESSION IS IN THE COMMISSION AND SENDING OUT OF THE TRUE MINISTERS BY THE CHURCH.** This is the succession which is taught in the Book of Acts. This is the way our fathers walked.

B. Observe the following facts:

- 1) There is a succession of the gospel church;
- 2) There is a succession of true baptism;
- 3) There is a succession of true administrators of baptism or church officers.

C. In England, as elsewhere, the Anti-Baptists charged the following on the Baptists: (These charges were mostly made by the **Presbyterians** who were new in England following their establishment as the state church in 1641. The **Anglican** historians denied that *dipping was new or that the Baptists were new in England.*)

1) That Baptists have no succession (Quakers and Seekers claimed that there was no succession or true baptism anywhere; the Protestants claimed it for themselves but not the Baptists);

2) That Baptists practiced a new baptism, i.e. Anabaptism or dipping of believers who had been dipped as infants and adults by the Episcopalians and sprinkled by the Presbyterians and Puritans. The Baptists denied this was **NEW BAPTISM**, but rather a **renewal of baptism** or **right baptism**. It was also called the "good old way." and **Anabaptism**. We call it rebaptism.

3) That the newly formed Particular Baptist Churches had no orderly origin but started themselves.

ALL THESE CHARGES WERE DENIED BY THE BAPTISTS AND SOME OF THEM BY THE ANGLICANS. THEY WROTE SEVERAL BOOKS TO CLEAR THEMSELVES OF THESE FALSE CHARGES.

D. Baptist writers who vindicated their origins and succession:

1. **Hansard Knollys** answered one such charge in his **A Moderate Answer Unto Dr. Bastwick's Book Called Independency not God's Ordinance**; London, 1645. Knollys stated:

I say that I know by mine own experience (having walked with them), that they were thus gathered; Viz., Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the Countries where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates [Episcopalians-R.E.P] came to sojourn in this great City, and preached from house to house, and daily in the Temple, and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach

Jesus Christ; and some of them having dwelt in their own hired houses, and received all that came unto them, preached the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concerns the Lord Jesus Christ. And when many sinners were converted by the preaching of the Gospel, some of them believers consorted with them, and of professors a great many, and of the chief women not a few. And the condition which these Preachers, both publicly and privately, propounded to the people, unto whom they preached upon which they were to be admitted into the church was by Faith, Repentance and Baptism. And whosoever. . . did make a profession of their Faith in Jesus Christ, and would be baptized with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were admitted Members of the church; but such as did not believe, and would not be baptized, they would not admit into Church communion.

pps 19, 20

This shows the **orderly origin and succession** of the Particular Baptists in London. Some were constituted by the older ministers from the country churches driven into London by persecution.

2) **William Kiffen** stated in 1645:

It is well known to many and especially to ourselves, that our congregations as they are now, were erected and framed according to the rule of Christ before we heard of any Reformation EVEN AT THE TIME WHEN EPISCOPACY WAS AT THE HEIGHT OF ITS VANISHING GLORY.

Wm. Kiffin: **A Brief Remonstrance of the Reasons of those People Called Anabaptists for their Separation;** London, 1645; page 6.

3) **Thomas Collier**, in his **Body of Divinity** 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.

London, 1674; page 466.

4) The following are Baptist works devoted to true Baptism and Church succession as entire book matter:

a. John Spittlehouse, **A Vindication of the Continual Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ, now scandesly called Anabaptists**, London; 1652. This is the first Particular Baptist work devoted to proving Baptist Church succession.

b. Daniel King, **A Way to Sion Sought Out and Found for Believers to Walk In**, London, 1650 and Edinburg, 1656. (Make sure you get all three parts. We have reprinted the 1656 edition in modern English)

c. Henry D'Anvers, **A Treatise of Baptism**, London, 1674 (The second part is the History of the Baptists. There were several hundred additional pages under separate titles proving Baptist succession against the Pedobaptists).

d. Thomas Grantham, "**The Successors of the Apostles**", in his **Primitive Christianity**; London, 1678

e. Samuel Fisher, "**Christianismus Redivium**," London; 1655.

MANY ARTICLES WERE WRITTEN BY THE BAPTISTS, SERMONS PREACHED AND SECTIONS IN GENERAL WORKS WERE DEVOTED TO CHURCH SUCCESSION, SUCCESSION OF THE ORDINANCES AND CHURCH OFFICERS OR ADMINISTRATORS.

f. **Henry D'Anvers** stated:

By all which you see by plentiful Evidence, that Christ hath not been without His Witnesses in every age, not only to defend and assert the true, but to impugn, and to reject (yes, even to death itself) the false Baptism. In so much that we are not left without good testimony of a **SERIES OF SUCCESSION, THAT BY GOD'S PROVIDENCE HATH EVEN KEPT AFOOT, OF THIS GREAT ORDINANCE OF BELIEVER'S BAPTISM EVER SINCE THE FIRST TIMES.**

Treatise of Baptism, 1674; pps. 321-322

And, in speaking of other writers and historians such as John Fox and Twisk, D'Anvers remarks:

who have especially recorded the Doctrines and Suffering of the Baptists in all ages since our Savior's time, brought down to the year 1660;....Ibid., last page of appendix.

5) Daniel King, in his **A Way to Sion Sought out and Found for Believers to Walk In**, maintained church succession all through his work. Here are some of his points:

1. His three main arguments are these on pages 23,24.
2. Luke 1:48 demands succession, p. 25.
3. Church seen as the 24 Elders in Rev. 4; succession is seen by the fact that the 24 Elders or the church is always present; pp. 28,

29

4. Succession again stated the proven, p.32.
5. David's throne is in the church, p. 32, no succession--no throne of God on the earth.
6. A Succession is demanded because of God's faithfulness, p.33.
7. A Succession is demanded because the world stands for the church's sake and the world has not ceased as yet, p. 33.
8. A Succession is demanded because God has not failed His church, p. 33.
9. A Succession is demanded because God dwells on earth only in his church, no succession, no dwelling place of God on earth, p.

34.

- 10.No church succession would make God careless, p. 34.
- 11.Succession is demanded because of the continuance of God's name, Psa. 72:17; Mt. 1:11--His name is only in His Church, p. 34
- 12.Succession is demanded because there will be no more changing or removing of dispensations; p. 35.
- 13.Succession of the church is demanded because that is where the succession of the Holy Spirit is, pp. 36-38

14.Pastors, teachers and ordinances are to continue in the church forever, p. 52.

15.THE EVILS OF CLAIMING NO SUCCESSION

- a. If the church has no succession--the blood of Christ is of no effect; pps. 82,83.
- b. To deny succession is almost equal to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit; pps. 82, 83.
- c. if there is no succession, believers have no comfort, p. 83.
16. Officers are to continue in the church and administer the ordinances until the coming of Christ, pps. 194, 202.

(Note these page numbers are from the edition of 1650. They may be a few pages off from the 1656 edition, R. E. P.)

This is but one example of the old Baptists and their faith about church succession. In conclusion let me give this statement from **Dr. John Clark**, the founder and pastor of the First Baptist Church, Newport, RI.,

They, and they only [true believers--REP] have visible right to enter and walk in the visible order of Christ's house, and to wait for his coming, whom Christ Jesus himself being the Lord of the house, hath appointed, and his Apostles being his stewards have approved of; but such as first have been taught and made disciples or Scholars of Jesus, and believers in Christ, and afterwards have been baptized or dipped and thereby visibly and lively planted into the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and they, and they only, whom Christ hath appointed and the Apostles have approved of...They, and they only have a visible right to enter into, and walk in the order of Christ's house, and so to wait for his coming the second time, in the form of a King, with His glorious kingdom, according to promise.

Dr. John Clark: **Ill News From New England**; London, 1652.

These old Baptists believed **in their succession back to Jesus Christ and His Apostles**. They didn't believe they were true churches **because they had a succession**, but just the opposite, ***they had a succession because they were true churches***.

In every age wherein Baptists have been able to leave their records and testimony, they have believed in their Divine Origin and Succession.

A new work we have discovered and are trying to secure its translation from the Dutch is **SUCCESSIO ANABAPTISTICA** printed in 1475!!

Succession of the Anabaptists published in 1475 is in one of old Libraries in the Netherlands. It was quoted by Septisbus Bernard in his Gaulten Coloniae, 1603 and 1612 and Van Gent, **Grundlieke Historic**, 1521, p. 85.

In Conclusion:

These old Baptists believed in:

- 1) The Divine Origin and Visible Succession of the true church;
- 2) The Succession of its Ordinances and their Administrators;
- 3) The Baptists were the only ones who had the **true succession** and were **the only Ones Christ would return unto** at His Second Coming.

IV.
IN VINDICATION OF
*THE OLD LANDMARK OF SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM OR
ANABAPTISM OR REBAPTISM:*
In Rejection of Alien Immersion
CALLED IN OLD ENGLAND "NEW BAPTISM"

From the second century onward, the pure churches administered rebaptism to those coming to them from the established or worldly churches.

- 1) This was before Pedobaptism;
- 2) This was before pouring or sprinkling.
- 3) Examples of the historic rebaptism:

A. The **Second Century Baptists** were the Montanists:

"They insisted that those who had lapsed from the true faith should be rebaptized, because they had denied Christ and ought to be baptized anew. On this account they were termed "Anabaptists", and some of their principles reappeared in Anabaptism."

John T. Christian, **A History of The Baptists**; Vol. 1 P.43

B. The **Third Century Baptists** were called Novatianists in the Western world, they were also called Montanists in the Eastern world:

"The Novatians were the earliest Anabaptists; refusing to RECOGNIZE AS VALID THE MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS OF THEIR OPPONENTS, AND CLAIMING TO BE THE TRUE CHURCH, THEY WERE LOGICALLY COMPELLED TO REBAPTIZE ALL WHO CAME TO THEM FROM THE CATHOLIC CHURCH."

H. C. Vedder, **History of Baptists**, p. 64.

"If you be a virtuous believer, and will ACCEDE TO our confederacy against sin, you may be admitted among us by baptism, or if any catholic has baptized you before, by REBAPTISM."

Robinson, *Ecclesiastical Researches*, pp. 127-128

"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." Ibid., pp. 126-127C.

In Africa, during the fourth century, the Novatianists were called **Donatists**:

"...they baptized again those whose first baptism they had reason to doubt. They were consequently termed rebaptizers and Anabaptists."

Christian, *ibid.*, citing Crespin, I, p. 45

OBSERVE THE FOLLOWING:

1. These pure, Anabaptist churches existed and rebaptized when all persons baptized were adults and the mode was by dipping;
 2. The differences were not doctrinal but were over discipline and purity;
 3. They would be examples today of what we should do with Southern Baptists, A. B. A. and B. M. A. A., ("As well as most American Primitive Baptists whose succession has come through the Fulton Convention of 1900," **Dan O'Dell**) and others who come over to the true churches from those liberal, worldly and established churches which claim to practice believer's baptism and wear the name of "Baptist."
- D. The Same is true of the Paulicians, Lollards, Waldenses, Albigenses and all the great pre-reformation Anabaptists.
- E. In England, in the 1600's, many Baptist exiles were able to return to England. Some came out of hiding to carry on their worship of God in gospel order. Also, in England, from the days of the Apostles to the early 1600's, **IMMERSION WAS THE ONLY MODE OF BAPTISM PRACTICED BY THE PROTESTANTS, EPISCOPALIANS, and of course as always, for the Baptists.** Infants were dipped by the Protestants, and the Baptists began to dip again in the rivers and ponds, in public during the 1620's, Daniel Featley, **The Dippers Dip**; London: 1645, page last of his *The Epistle*. (Featley wrote this on Jan. 10, 1644 from the Prison in the Lo: Peter's House in Aldersgate-Street. He was in prison because he was a confirmed Anglican and would not join the Presbyterian church when it was established under Cromwell in 1641.)

Featly stated:

They flock in great multitudes to their Jordans, and both Sexes enter into the River, **and are dip** after their manner with a kind of spell containing the heads of their erroneous tenets, and their engaging themselves in their schismatic Covenants, and (if I may so speak) combinations of separation. *Ibid.*, page 4 of **The Epistle Dedicatory**.

Featly's testimony shows there were still Baptists in England who **dipped for baptism** as far back as the 1620s. Down goes the entire concept of the **Down Grade** historians who claim there were no Baptists in England dipping for baptism before 1641. He observed this near his own home.

F. Concerning the English Baptists, their **enemies** stated:

1. **Dr. John Owen:** "The Donatists rebaptized those who came to their societies, because they professed themselves to believe that all ADMINISTRATION OF ORDINANCES, NOT IN THEIR ASSEMBLIES, WAS NULL AND THAT THEY WERE TO BE LOOKED ON AS NO SUCH THING. OUR ANABAPTISTS DO THE SAME THING."

Works, Vol. 13, p. 184

2. **Bullinger**, Calvin's successor, stated: "The Anabaptists think themselves TO BE THE ONLY TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST, AND ACCEPTABLE TO GOD: AND TEACH THAT THEY, WHO BY BAPTISM ARE RECEIVED INTO THEIR CHURCHES, OUGHT NOT TO HAVE COMMUNION WITH EVANGELICAL, OR ANY OTHER WHATSOEVER; FOR THAT OUR CHURCHES ARE NOT TRUE CHURCHES, ANYMORE THAN THE CHURCHES OF THE PAPISTS."

J. R. Graves, **Old Landmarkism**, p. 115.

3. **Wm. Wall**, English Episcopal Historian of the late 1600's, stated of the English Baptists: "They do many of them hold it necessary, as I said, TO RENOUNCE COMMUNION WITH ALL CHRISTIANS THAT ARE NOT OF THEIR WAY. Many of them are so peremptory in this, that if they be in the chamber of a sick man, AND ANY PEDOBAPTIST, MINISTER OR OTHER, COME IN TO PRAY WITH HIM, THEY WILL GO OUT OF THE ROOM. AND IF THEY BE INVITED TO THE FUNERAL OF ANY PEDOBAPTIST, THEY WILL GO THE HOUSE, AND ACCOMPANY THE CORPSE WITH THE REST OF THE PEOPLE TO THE CHURCH DOOR; BUT THERE THEY RETREAT; THEY CALL IT THE STEEPLE HOUSE. THEY SEEM TO JUDGE THUS: THOSE THAT ARE NOT BAPTIZED ARE NO CHRISTIANS, AND NONE ARE BAPTIZED BUT THEMSELVES. So they make not only baptism itself, but also the *time, or age, or way of receiving it, a fundamental.*"

History of Infant Baptism; Vol. I, pps 534-535; 1862.

4. Professor **J. S. Reynolds**, of the University of South Carolina, stated in 1843, about the Baptists of England in the 1500's and 1600's: "The conclusion is IRRESISTIBLE, THAT THEY DID NOT CONSIDER EVEN IMMERSION AS VALID WHEN IT WAS THE ACT OF AN UNIMMERSED ADMINISTRATOR. THE PRINCIPLE OF ACTION, DOUBTLESS, WAS, THAT THERE COULD BE NO VALID BAPTISM UNLESS THE ADMINISTRATOR WAS AUTHORIZED TO BAPTIZE BY A PROPERLY CONSTITUTED CHURCH....THEY REFUSED TO SANCTION THE ACTS OF ANY ADMINISTRATOR, WHO DERIVED HIS AUTHORITY FROM CHURCHES WHICH PERVERTED THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM. THIS IS FIRM BAPTIST GROUND AND THE POSITION IS IMPREGNABLE."

J. R. Graves, **Old Landmarkism**; p.116.

G. The English Baptists of the 1600's wrote several books defending and showing their reasons for Anabaptism or New Baptism. Here are some instances:

1. Samuel Fisher, **Christianismus Redivisers--or That Good old Way...Called Anabaptism Vindicated by that Two-Edged Sword of the Spirit--1655.**

2. Hansard Knollys, **The Shining of a Flaming Fire in Zion: 13 Exceptions against New Baptism--1646.**

3. Henry Haggar, **The Baptizing of Men and Women when they Believe in Rivers and Fountains Proved to be a Standing Ordinance in the Church of Christ to the End of the World--1653**

4. Luke Howard, **A Looking Glass for the Baptists** (A former Baptist who later left the Baptists and reproached them for rebaptizing each other.) 1672. We could go on and show how that the Baptists in America, the Old Philadelphia Association, refused to receive the immersions of Pedobaptist administrators, but such is found in their history, in reprint today, from 1707 to 1807.

Abraham Booth, the ex-General Baptist, tried to influence the Philadelphia brethren to change their minds, but they would not. His letters and requests are stated in Gould's **History of Brown University**.

Spencer H. Cone, a Revolutionary War Chaplain, and Chaplain to the US Senate, and Pastor of the First Baptist Church in New York City, NY., gives good testimony and his remarks may be found in either Nevin's **History of Alien Baptism** or in Grime's **History of Alien Baptism**. Both contain ample documentation and clear evidence of the rejection of alien baptism among the early Baptist works and churches of America.

In Conclusion

Let's remember, our old Baptists were called **ANABAPTISTS** or those who baptized anew, *even when the subject was an adult and the mode was immersion.*

V.

IN VINDICATION OF THE OLD LANDMARK

OF GOSPEL AND CHURCH SEPARATION OR NON-RECOGNITION

OF THOSE WHO ARE NOT OF TRUE GOSPEL ORDER.

These old Baptists **separated** from those who were not in the Baptized way. In addition, they separated from those Baptists **who would fellowship with the unbaptized**. Here are the concepts of separation and groups:

A. The **Particular Baptists** separated from all **Pedobaptists** as well as the **mixed communion Baptists** of John Bunyan and Henry Jessey, John Tombs, and also from the **General Baptists**.

B. The **General Baptists** separated from the **Pedobaptists**, the **mixed communion Baptists** and the **Particular Baptists**.

C. The **Mixed Communion Baptists** separated from the **Papists**, and other **Nationalists**, and wanted fellowship with all dissenters. They were denied **church** fellowship with any of the **Particular** or **General** Baptists. **The separation arose because the Baptists believed their churches, baptisms and doctrines were special, they had a Divine Origin and Unbroken Succession.**

Here are some of the major works dealing with the separation of our old Particular Baptists and some General Baptists, as well

- 1) John Canne - **A Stay Against Straying--Wherein is Proved the Unlawfulness of Hearing Ministers of False Churches**; London; 1639.
- 2) Francis Cornwell - **A Description of the Spiritual Temple--Differences Between Christian and Antichristian Churches**; London; 1646.
- 3) Wm. Kiffin - **A Brief Remonstrance of the Reasons of Those People Called Anabaptists for their Separation**; London; 1645.
- 4) Benjamin Cox - **An After-Reckoning with Mr. Edwards--State Churches are not True Churches**; London; 1646.
- 5) Richard Lawrence - **The Antichrist Presbyter--Antichrist Transformed Assuming the New Shape of A Reformed Presbyter as His Last Disguise to Deceive the Nations**; London; 1647.
- 6) Richard Lawrence - **The Wolf Striped of His Sheep's Clothing or The Antichrist Clergymen Turned Right Side Outward**; London, 1647.
- 7) Thomas Collier - **A Brief Discovery of the Corruption of the Ministry of the Church of England**; London, 1647.
- 8) John Spittlehouse - **Rome Ruined by Whitehall, or The Papal Crown Demolish: Containing a Confutation of the Three Degrees of Popery viz: Papacy, Prelacy and Presbytery, Answerable to the Triple Crown of the Three headed Cerberus the Pope**; London, 1649.
- 9) Samuel Fisher - **Baby Baptism mere Babism--Anti-Sardetism the Deep Dotage of the Divines Discovered or The Antichrist Clergy Cleared to be That Themselves**; London, 1653.

- 10) John Onley (Baptist) vs. John Bryan (Presbyterian) in Debate - **Whether the Parishes (Presbyterians and Puritans) of This Nation Generally Be True Churches;** London, 1655. The Baptists affirmed they were not, but Babylonian.
- 11) Richard Lawrence - **Gospel Separation Separated from Its Abuses;** London, 1657.
- 12) John Tombs - (Reformed Particular Baptist) published *Theodulia* or A Just Defense of hearing the Sermons and Other Teachings of the Present Ministers of England; 1668. This was against the Baptist work that follows.
- 13) **A Christian Testimony Against Them That Serve the Image of the Beast (Greek Title) or in English--A Christian and Sober Testimony Against Sinful Compliance;** 1668.
- 14) **Jerrubball or An Answer to John Tombs' Theodulia Against Hearing Pedobaptist Ministers;** 1670.

THE BAPTISTS ISSUED AGAINST JOHN BUNYAN, (and some earlier views favoring open communion):

- 15) Thomas Paul - **Some Serious Reflections on Bunyan's Confession and Inter-Communion;** 1673.
- 16) Henry D'Anvers - **A Treatise of Baptism** - with a Special Answer to John Bunyan -1673; The 1674 edition does not have this, but rather an answer to Richard Baxter.
- 17) John Denne - **Truth Outweighing Error** - against John Bunyan; 1673.
- 18) William Allen, **Some Baptismal Abuses, AS ALSO Discovering the Disorder and Irregularity that is in Mixt Communion of Persons Baptized, with Such as Are Unbaptized, in Church-Fellowship;** London 1653.
- 19) John Child, **A Moderate Message to Quakers, Seekers, and Socinians with 3 Questions to John Bunyan,** London; 1767.
- 20) William Kiffen, **A Sober Discourse of Right To Church-Communion,** London, 1681.

The following take up the general subject of separation:

- 21) Hercules Collins - **Some Reasons for Separation;** 1682.
- 22) Thomas Delaune - **A Plea for the Nonconformists, Giving the True State of the Dissenters Case - Protestant Separation from Rome - Baptist Separation from Protestants;** 1684.

The following are two representative works dealing with separation:

- 23) Hansard Knowllys - **An Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation**; 1689, under Revelation 17.
- 24) Thomas Grantham - **Christianismus Primitivus** - section on Separation from the World, Book 2, Chapter 4; p. 50 and the "Sixth Treatise - Gospel Separation" - Book IV, p. 171

The following are from:

"The Associational Records of the Particular Baptists of England, Wales and Ireland to 1660" published by the Baptist Historical Society of Great Britain.

A. Part I is from South Wales and the Midlands.

- 1) Exclusion of Thomas Proud for mixing Baptists with Pedobaptists:
1651; p. 5.
- 2) May Baptists join with or hear Pedobaptists? **No**- the answer is given in full on **page 25**: **ANSWER:** Baptized believers **ought not to hear** the national ministers preach nor join with them in their public worship, their **pretended** ministry being **Babylonish**, Rev. 18:4; Neither may they so hear or join with unbaptized persons, though hoped to be godly, because they are disorderly in carrying on a public ministry without baptism, Col. 2:5; 2 Thess 3:6; no, nor with baptized persons neither if not sound in the faith which is the cause of those that are called free willers, Proverbs 19:27.
June 4-6, 1656 p. 25.
- 3) They were not to PRAY with the unbaptized, p. 31.
- 4) Baptized ministers who fellowship the unbaptized are not to be recognized as qualified to officiate in the churches, p. 59.

B. Part III, The Abingdon Association

- 1) Baptized believers are not to bury their dead in the church yards of the national churches and Pedobaptists because such places were considered holy ground (by the Pedobaptists, REP), p. 152. (This is the basic reason the old Baptists had church burial grounds--because the other burial grounds were held to contribute toward salvation in the resurrection).
- 2) No mingling in life, so not in death either, p. 152, 153, 158.
- 3) Don't go to the baptismal feasts of the Pedobaptists, page 153.
- 4) The Pedobaptist or National ministers are a part of the Whore of Babylon - p. 154.
- 5) Saints are not to hear the national ministry - to hear is Babylonian idolatry- p. 159.
- 6) To be among the false worshippers is to partake with them - p. 159.

RANDOM SELECTIONS:

- 1) Don't pray with or before the worldly, pp. 59, 65, 68.
- 2) Don't worship with the worldly - p. 58.
- 3) Pedobaptist ministers are Babylonian Clergy, p. 22.
- 4) Pedobaptists are a part of the Whore of Babylon; pps. 154-156.
- 5) Believers are to flee from all forms of Babylonian; pps 151, 152, 155, 156, 169.
- 6) Separation in Public Worship; pps. 8, 22, 25, 37, 39, 54, 61, 62, 63, 167, 168, 102, 153, 169, 172.
- 7) In Private worship - p. 31.
- 8) Separation in Prayer; p. 31.
- 9) Separation in Burial- p. 152, 158.
- 10) Separation in Marriage- p. 21, 22, 55.

In addition, by reading these scriptures and pages from these old Particular Baptists, you are able to see that they didn't even believe in **asking grace before the world and among the unbaptized.**

Conclusive Remarks about the Baptists of the 1640s and their oneness with the older Anabaptists of the 1500s.

In the early 1640s, the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland sent Mr. **Robert Baillie**, Minister at Glasgow, into England. The English Presbyterians called out to Scotland for help against the Anabaptists, to repress them. Mr. Baillie issued his **Anabaptism, The True Foundation of Independency, Brownism, Antinomy, and Familism, and the most of the other Errors, which for the time do trouble the Church of England, Unsealed. Also, The Questions of Pedobaptism and Dipping handled from Scripture. In A Second Part of The Dissuasive from the Errors of the time.** London, Samuel Gellibrand; 1647.

Mr. Baillie set forth this thesis in his work: **The English Anabaptists of the 1600s are one with the older Anabaptists in Germany and other places, from the 1500s.** He covers the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and makes sure he can place before his readers as many evil reports and slanders as he can dig up. However, in spite of all this, he gives a very good overview of those times and their different groups of Anabaptists.

One of the constants in his work is the place of John Spilsbury and his leadership among the London Particular Baptists. He shows that John Spilsbury wrote most of the **First London Confession of Faith.**

Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists were **rigid Anabaptist dipper separatists.** They were not only separatists, but also rigid dipper separatists. He explains by showing that they withdrew from all others who were not of their dipped way. He then shows that the English Anabaptists are just like them in this same regard of **dipped separation.**

Baillie claims one of the main problems with the Anabaptists of the 1500s was their desire to have a church made up only of **true believers dipped.** **This is what led them away from all other groups.** He then shows the same is true of the Anabaptists in England during his time, the 1640s.

In his efforts to make the Anabaptists look like an unorganized mob of dipped madmen with many, many different opinions, he singles out **John Tombes** for closer consideration. Baillie introduces us to John Tombes, the first English writer in favor of open communion in England.

It seems that Tombes promoted open communion Baptist concepts a few years before he became baptized and joined up with some of the Anabaptists.

Baillie settles this question for us, did Spilsbury and the others walking with him in their church constitutions, practice open communion and mixed membership? He lists them as part of the rigid separatists Anabaptists like those of the 1500s. They were not open communion or open church membership like Tombes and later Jessey, and still later, John Bunyan. Baillie shows us that the conclusions of Gould and Whitsitt, centuries later, were **unfounded, misleading and false**.

John Tombes is placed almost alone and the Rigid Anabaptists are centered around John Spilsbury where they should be. Baillie shows us that the English Rigid Anabaptists held to the ordinance of hearing, that is, they would not even hear the Pedobaptist ministers. He shows us that they inherited this practice from the older Anabaptists of the 1500s. Remember that John Spilsbury was the main mover and writer among the Rigid English Anabaptists. In Baillie's work, Spilsbury is targeted as the main writer of the **First London Confession** and the leader among the Rigid Anabaptist Dippers. He succeeded in causing John Spilsbury later to move into the country away from London due to persecution.

As I give Baillie's definition of **Rigid Separation**, please remember he shows that the English Anabaptists of his days practiced the same concept. **This destroys the groundless falsehood that Spilsbury and Kiffen separated over Pulpit Affiliation, that is, Spilsbury invited unbaptized men into his pulpit.**

Along with Featley and Taylor, Baillie shows that the older Anabaptists of the 1500s and the English Anabaptists of the 1600s were constant **dippers**. Thus, he destroys the very foundation of Whitsittism.

However, one of his most important efforts centers around John Tombs, showing him as writing in favor of open communion before he became a **dipped Anabaptist**. I will take up his remarks about John Tombes because they are vital in understanding some of the positions the old Midland Association of Particular Baptists took.

After I do this, then, I will turn our attention toward Daniel King and show from whence he came. By doing this, I shall show the **oneness** of King and the London Particular Baptists in general and Spilsbury and Kiffen in particular. This will remove effectually even further Mike Ivey's false and misleading claims about the Midland Baptists and their **Confession of Faith**.

John Tombes is the **First English Writer in Favor of Open Communion**. Distinction here between open communion and open or mixed membership should be noted. Later Henry Jessey started the English practice of open or mixed membership, that is a church can include both the unbaptized and the baptized. However, early in Tombes' ministry, even before he became an open communion Baptist in practice, he wrote in favor of open communion. Soon following Tombes' book, Jessey simply practiced what Tombes had written, but had not done. Tombes is the first English writer in favor of open communion and mixed membership and Jessey is the first to practice it in England.

In its proper place I will include Orchard's **History of Open Communion**, show its origin, and rise among the Polish Socinian Anabaptists. For our purposes in England, Tombes and Jessey are the originators of this disorder.

Now, we will take up some of Baillie's remarks:

The Increase of the Mennonists:

While all the other factions of the Anabaptists did decrease, the followers of the priest Menno did much increase. They did reject the earthly Kingdom and Polygamy of the Monasterians and Battenburgicks, also the revelations and extraordinary calling of the Hophmanists, with the most of the blasphemies of David George. Against all these, Menno did write with passion. But to the point of Anabaptism and separation from all other reformed Churches to independency, and to a number more of the Anabaptists' tenets he did firmly adhere, alluring many thousands to his way, who continue to this day propagating their error to many countries.

The Errors of the Mennonists

The wickedness of that spirit which reigned in Menno, and yet rages in his followers, notwithstanding of all their profession of great piety, of singular modesty and extreme destation of all the other sects of Anabaptists, is apparent in the manifold grievous heresies and gross schisms, whereby they themselves have of old broken out and preserve therein to this day.

*Who are pleased to read the late little and accurate and learned **Treatise of Clopenburgh**, may perceive that the Mennonists dippers do oppose the truth of Christ's human nature. (Editor's Note, they believed in the pre-existence of Christ's human nature, REP) **Page 16.***

Independency the Cause of their Increase and Boldness

*Hence, it was that the Anabaptists made little noise in England, till of late the Independents have corrupted and made worse the principles of the old Separatists, proclaiming for errors a liberty both in Church and State; under this shelter the Anabaptists have lift up their head, and increased their numbers, much above all other sects of the land. Their ways as yet are not well known, but a little time it seems will discover them, for their singular zeal to propagate their way will not permit them long to lurk. Only the Confession of Faith which the other year seven of their Congregations did put forth, and of late again in a second corrected edition have set out with a bold preface to both Houses of Parl. May not no more be taken for the measure of their faith, then that Confession which their elder Brethren in Holland did print not long ago in the name of all their Congregations. (see Mr. **Marshall's Defense against Tombes**, page 76, REP) **Page 18.***

The Tenets of the old Anabaptists

The Most applauded Tenets of our modern Anabaptists are the self same with what the old Anabaptists did invent.

THE errors of the Anabaptists and their divisions among themselves are so many that to set them down distinctly in any good order, is a task which I dare not undertake, much less can I

give assurance what is common to them all and what proper to their several sects. Only that I may demonstrate the same very spirit to breath this day in the Anabaptists of Britain, which inspired their Fathers of former times in Germany, I will remark what tenets Authors of good credit ascribe to both; hoping that this discovery maybe a means to bring many simple well-meaning people who are not yet plunged in the deeps of obstinacy to a more accurate trial and greater suspicion of their ways: when they shall all see it made visible and palpable upon undeniable evidence, that their most beloved tenets and practices which they, believe to be full of truth and holiness, are no other but the same very singularities which the known event doth now convince all who without prejudice can but read unquestionable Histories, to have been the inventions and dictates of the false and unclean spirit which acted and moved in Muncer, Becold, David George, and such like abominable monsters of mankind.

Their first and prime Tenet was a necessity of gathering Churches out of Churches, and of separating from the best reformed in their time, because of mixed communion.

The first and leading tenet of the old Anabaptists was a necessity to gather new Churches out of that which Luther and Zuingles and their followers had reformed from Popery. It is remarkable that these men had never a stomach to trouble themselves with any labor to make converts from Popery or profaneness, only so soon as gracious persons had drawn any Cities or Countries out of the kingdom of Antichrist, then they fell on and everywhere did much disturb the work of the new Reformation.

At the beginning, they dissembled the grossest of their errors and their intention to quarrel infant's baptism they did only press a greater measure of holiness and mortification then was ordinary, in this all good men went along with them: but when they began to teach that the Church behoved to consist of no other members but such as were not in profession and aim alone, but also visibly, and really holy and elect, and therefore that new Churches behoved to be gathered, and that all the old any where extant behoved to be separate from as mixed, and so corrupted societies. Then Luther and Zunglius did oppose themselves to this schismatic honor. **Page 29.**

When they found themselves disappointed of the assistance of Luther and Zuinglius, and all the rest of the orthodox Preachers, without more delay they fell upon their intended work themselves alone, first by private conventicles, then by preaching in the open streets they gathered and set up Churches after their own mind, consisting merely of Saints, who did forbear communion in religious exercises with all other Churches, whom they avowed to be for the most part but worldly, carnal, and profane Gospels, and their best Preachers, especially Luther and Zuinglius, to be but Scribes and Pharisees, false Prophets, large as evil as the Pope and his Antichristian Priests.

Antipedobaptism became at last their greatest darling

For the stricter engagements of the Saints and godly party their adherents, and for the clearer distinction of them from the profane multitude of all other Congregations, they thought meet to put upon them the mark and character of a new Baptism, making them renounce their old as null, because received in their infancy, and in a false Church. At the beginning this rebaptism was but a secondary and less principle doctrine among them, for Muncer himself was never rebaptized, neither in his own person did he rebaptize any, yet thereafter it became a more essential note of a member of their Church, and the crying down of infant's baptism came to be a most principal and distinctive Doctrine of all in their way.

Unto their new gathered Churches of rebaptized and dipped Saints, they did ascribe very ample privileges, for first they gave to every one of them a power of questioning in public before the whole Congregation any part of their Preacher's Doctrine. Secondly, to every one of their members they have a power of public preaching. **Page 30.**

Their Pastors must renounce all former Ordination, and take their full call of new, must come from the hands of their people.

Thirdly, to their particular Churches they gave power of electing and ordaining such of their own Prophets whom they thought fittest to be Pastors to the rest.. whoever was not elected and ordained, whoever had not their full calling from the people their full call alone, and did not renounce what ever ordination they had from any other, to them were no Pastors at all.

The Ordinance of Hearing

Upon this ground among others they refused to hear any of the Ministers of the reformed Churches, because they did not renounce their former ordination and calling to the Minister that they might take it again from the hands of their new gathered and separate Congregations.

The Congregation Has The Highest Power

Seventhly, unto their single Congregations they gave supreme and independent power to judge in all Ecclesiastical causes, not only judicially to pronounce all questions about their Pastor's Doctrine, but also to proceed to the highest censure of excommunication, as well against their Pastors as others when they found cause. **Page 31.**

Every Anabaptist is at Least a Rigid Separatists

For the first, the soberest Anabaptists do embrace the whole way of the rigid separation. The Brownists did borrow all their Tenets from the Anabaptists of old, it is but equal that the Anabaptists this day should seek back again their Father's debt from the Brownists. The chief singularities of Brownism are about the constitution and government of the Church, they say the Church is made up only of members who are really and convincingly holy, of such who do evidence the truth of their regeneration to the satisfaction of the whole or the greater part of the Church. **Page 49.**

Though the Independents offer to Conclude with the Anabaptists, yet they separate from the Independents no less then from the Brownists as Antichristian.

The first of these pleas the Independents hold fast with both their hands, and upon it are as rigid Separatists as any we know. But the Anabaptists take possession of both the grounds, that the walls of their separation may the more firmly be established. They will have all their members to be real Saints, and they separate from all other Churches who neglect to press the necessity of such a qualification, but to strengthen the right of their separation, they go on to pronounce all these Churches from whom they separate Antichristian. And, this their charity they extend to their other ways very dear friends the Independents and Brownists, for all even of them are such who by their doctrine and practice of Pedobaptism, deny that Christ is yet come in the flesh. The Brownists in their honest simplicity are loath to be long in the Anabaptist's debt. They quickly unchurch and excommunicate them also for denying baptism to infants, but the Independents will be wiser then their Fathers, Anabaptism to them is so small a peccadillo that is deserves no censure at all. They are most willing to retain the Anabaptists in their bosom, but here they pity, no caresses can keep the most of the Anabaptists in the Independent Congregations. So soon as they begin to weigh their own principles, they find their infant baptism a clear nullity, and so a necessity laid upon them to be rebaptized. The Independents denying to them this Sacrament, they cannot

choose not to go out to the avowed Anabaptists, who by this means embody them in their Churches, where they alone can partake of baptism. **Page 50**

They avow all their Members to be Holy and Elect, and some of them are for their Perfection.

But for the more clear and distinct demonstration of these things, consider yet further first that in the qualification of members, the Anabaptists go as far as either the Independents or Brownists. The Confession of the Seven Churches do clearly bear this much, but others go further, avowing with their Fathers, the Dutch Perfectionists, that all of their society are so perfectly holy as they may not pray for the remission of any the least sin. **Page 51.**

After They Separate from all other Churches, they run next away from them their own selves.

As for the second, a natural result of the former, a separation from all other reformed Churches as impure, it is clear by their constant uniform practice which M. Kiffen, one of their prime Confessionists does justify at length against his opposite, Mr. Ricraft. In this separation, they run on so rashly that themselves know not where to stop it; for first with the Separatists they divide from all other Protestants, thereafter they shake off the Separatists. For the most intelligent and zealous among them refuse to remain in any congregation either of the Independents or Brownists. Lastly, the break among themselves in many pieces. **Page 51.**

They Separate from all who renounce not Pedobaptism

Fifthly, by their rejecting of infant baptism, they fall into the error of rigid Separation; they baptize none but actual believers, such as give them satisfaction of their actual faith and holiness. Thus far, they go along with the rigid Separatists. But hence they proceed to another ground, whereupon they leave the Separatists and all who follow them not to Anabaptism. They take baptism for a sacrament of initiation, for a door and means of entering into the Church. These who are not baptized, they count not as Church members. Infant baptism they pronounce a nullity, and such a disobedience to the Gospel as infers Antichristianism, and a real denial that Christ is yet come in the flesh. So the separatists who are all baptized in their infancy, and refuse to be rebaptized, to them are no better than unbaptized and Antichristian rebels, not capable of Church membership, or of any Church communion. Upon this ground (as their great Patron acknowledgeth) (Spilbury REP) they are forced to declare the Independent and Brownists Congregations, how dear otherwise soever, to be but Antichristian Synagogues, and no true Churches. Pages 90, 91.

CONCLUSION TO THE

WHOLE WORK

I have demonstrated from the historic writings and works of the old Baptists, **most of them are the original sources**, and some works from their enemies, **what** they believed on the following points:

- 1) Church Authority in Baptism;
- 2) The Visible church and water baptism in opposition to the invisible church and Holy Spirit baptism;
- 3) The Doctrine of Church Succession;
- 4) The Practice of Anabaptism, Rebaptism, New Baptism or Renewal of Baptism;

- 5) The Practice of Gospel and Church Separation and non-recognition of those who are not of the True Gospel Order.

Let me call your attention unto two important Biblical teachings:

1.

THE OLD TESTAMENT SYSTEM, LAW, PRIESTHOOD, VESSELS, TEMPLE AND TABERNACLE, AND MINISTRY, ALONG WITH THE PEOPLE WERE ALL SPRINKLED WITH THE BLOOD OF BULLS AND GOATS - Hebrews 9: 21-23.

EVEN SO

but the things pertaining to the heavens (epourania) WERE PURGED WITH BETTER SACRIFICES THAN THE CARNAL SACRIFICES AND LAWS:

The New Covenant; its doctrines, its priesthood, its people, its vessels of the ministry and its temple, have all been sanctified with a better sacrifice, even the sacrifice and blood of Christ.

IN A FEW WORDS

All that pertains unto the **redemption of the people** of the New Covenant, with their **worship of God** and their **walk in the heavenly way or in the New Land**, has been sanctified by the life of Christ and His blood!

DARE WE CHANGE ANYTHING?

If the Church at Ephesus, which was one of the soundest of all the churches, was in danger of losing its candlestick because it left its first love-that of God and Christ-how much more shall we be who change the BLOOD BOUGHT AND SANCTIFIED WAY ESTABLISHED BY JESUS CHRIST?

2.

THE N. T. CHURCH WILL EXIST AS LONG AS CHRIST EXISTS AND WILL, ALSO, IN ADDITION TO CHRIST, SERVE TO GLORIFY GOD AS A SEPARATE PLACE OF GLORY, BUT IN UNION FOREVER WITH CHRIST. Scriptures: Rev. 1:18, "and I because dead and behold living I am **INTO THE AGES OF THE AGES; εις τους αιωνας τον αιωνα ον**"

1. Christ **will never cease, die or go out of existence;**
2. This is a **Greek idiom expressing *eternal existence, unceasing for ever.*** Ephesians 3:21 "Unto Him [God] be the glory **IN THE CHURCH AND IN CHRIST JESUS UNTO ALL THE GENERATIONS OF THE AGE OF THE AGES**"

***GOD RECEIVES GLORY BOTH THROUGH CHRIST AND THROUGH THE CHURCH
UNTO ALL GENERATIONS OF THE AGE (church age or eternal age, which?) OF
THE AGES.***

God is glorified both by Christ His church, in all the generations, unto the great age of all the ages.

**DARE WE CHANGE ANYTHING THAT PERTAINS TO THE CHURCH
AND ITS ORDINANCES?**

***"Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which you the Holy Spirit hath
placed as overseers, to shepherd the church of the God, which he acquired
through the blood of his own."***

Acts 20:28.

Finish