

# The Discipline of the Primitive Churches

A. Fuller  
From *The Baptist Manual*, 1849

## ***In This Issue:***

***The Discipline of the Primitive Churches***  
Page 1

***Believing in Vain***  
Page 7

***Cooperation Among Baptists***  
Page 8

***Did Ancient Baptists Refuse to Recognize Pedobaptist Societies as Scriptural?***  
Page 10

***Hansard Knollys***  
Page 16

***Contending for the Ancient Faith***  
Page 21

**W**hen the apostles, by the preaching of the word, had gathered in any place a sufficient number of individuals to the faith or Christ, it was their uniform practice, for the further promotion of his kingdom in that place, to form them into a Religious Society, or Christian Church. Being thus associated in the name of Christ, divine worship was carried on, Christian ordinances observed, holy discipline maintained, and the word of life, as the light by the golden candlesticks, exhibited. Among them our Lord Jesus Christ, as the high priest of our profession, is represented as walking, observing the good, and applauding it, pointing out the evil, and censuring it, and holding up life and immortality to those who should overcome the temptations of the present state.

Let us suppose him to walk amongst our several churches, and to address us as he addressed the seven churches in Asia. We trust he would find some things to approve; but we are also apprehensive that he would find many things to censure. Let us then look narrowly into the discipline of the primitive churches, and compare ours with it.

By 'discipline' however, we do not mean to include the whole of the order of a Christian Church; but shall at this time confine our attention to that part of church-government which consists in A MUTUAL WATCH OVER ONE ANOTHER, AND THE CONDUCT WE ARE DIRECTED TO PURSUE IN OASES OF DISORDER.

A great part of our duty consists in cultivating what is lovely, but this is not the whole of it; we must prune as well as plant, if we would bear much fruit, and be Christ's disciples. One of the things applauded in the church of Ephesus was that they could not bear those who were evil.

Yet we are not to suppose from hence that no irregularity or imperfection whatever is an object of forbearance. If uniformity be required in such a degree as that every difference in judgment or practice shall occasion a separation, the churches may be always dividing into parties, which we are persuaded was never encouraged by the apostles of our Lord, and cannot be justified in trivial or ordinary cases. A contrary practice is expressly taught us in the Epistle to the Romans (Chap. 14) and the cases in which it is to be exercised are there pointed out. An object of forbearance however must be one that may exist without being an occasion of dispute and wrangling in the church. It must not be to doubtful disputations, ver. 1.

It must also respect things which do not enter into the essence of God's kingdom, the leading principles of which are righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, verses 16, 17. That which does not subvert the gospel of the kingdom, nor set aside the authority of the king, though it be an imperfection, is yet to be borne with. Finally, it must be something which does not destroy the work of God, or which is not inconsistent with the progress of vital religion in the church, or in one's own soul, verse 20. In all such cases we are not to judge one another, but every man's conscience is to be his judge, verse 23.

In attending to those things which are the proper objects of discipline, our first concern should be to see that all our measures are aimed at the good of the party and the honour of God. Both these ends are pointed out in the case of the Corinthian offender: All was to be done that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord, and to clear themselves as a church from being partakers of his sin. If these ends be kept in view they will preserve us from much error; particularly, from the two great evils into which churches are in danger of falling, false lenity, and unchristian severity. There is often a party found in a community, who, under the name of tenderness, are for neglecting all wholesome discipline, or if this cannot be accomplished, for delaying it to the utmost.

Such persons are commonly the advocates for disorderly walkers, especially if they be their particular friends or relations. Their language is, "He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone. My brother hath fallen today, and I may fall tomorrow." This spirit, though it exists only in individuals, provided they be persons of any weight or influence, is frequently known to impede the due execution of the laws of Christ; and if it pervade the community, it will soon reduce it to the lowest state of degeneracy. Such for a time was the spirit of the Corinthians; but when brought to a proper sense of things, what carefulness it wrought in them, yea what clearing of themselves, yea what indignation, yea what fear, yea what vehement desire, yea what zeal, yea what revenge.

In opposing the extreme of false tenderness, others are in danger of falling into unfeeling severity. This spirit will make the worst of everything, and lead men to convert the censures of the church into weapons of private revenge. Persons of this description know not of what manner of spirit they are. They lose sight of the good of the offender. It is not love that operates in them, for love worketh no evil. The true medium between these extremes is a union of mercy and truth. Genuine mercy is combined with faithfulness, and genuine faithfulness with mercy; and this is the only spirit that is likely to purge iniquity. (Prov. 16: 6)

Collusion will produce indifference; and undue severity will arm the offender with prejudice, and so harden him in sin, but the love of God and of our brother's soul are adapted to answer every good end. If we love God, like Levi, we shall know no man after the flesh, nor acknowledge our nearest kindred; but shall observe his word and keep his covenant. And if we love the soul of our brother, we shall say, "He is fallen today, and I will reprove him for his good; I may fall tomorrow, and then let him deal the same with me." Love is the grand secret of church discipline, and will do more than all other things put together, towards insuring success.

In the exercise of discipline, it is necessary to distinguish between faults which are the consequences of sudden temptation, and such as are the result of premeditation and habit. The former requires a compassionate treatment; the latter a greater portion of severity. The sin of Peter in denying his Lord was great, and if noticed by the enemies of Christ, might bring great reproach upon his cause; yet, compared with the sin of Solomon, it was little. He first gave way to licentiousness, then to idolatry. And on finding that God, as a punishment for his sin, had given ten tribes to Jeroboam, he sought to kill him. Cases like this are immediately dangerous, and require a prompt and decided treatment, and in which hesitating tenderness would be the height of cruelty. "Of some have compassion, making a difference; others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." (Jude 22, 23. See also Gal. 6:1)

In all our admonitions regard should be had to the age and character of the party. An elder, as well as other men, may be in fault, and a fault that may require to be noticed; but let him be told of it in a tender and respectful manner. While you expostulate with younger men on a footing of equality, pay a deference to age and office. "Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father, and the younger men as brethren." (1 Tim. 5: 1)

In the due execution of Christian discipline there are many things to be done by the members of churches individually; and it is upon the proper discharge of these duties that much of the peace and purity of a church depends. If we be faithful to

one another there will be but few –occasions for public censure. Various improprieties of conduct, neglects of duty, and declensions in the power of godliness, are the proper subjects of pastoral admonition.

It is one essential branch of this office to "rebuke and exhort with all long-suffering." (2 Tim. 4: 2) Nor is this work confined to pastors. Christians are directed to admonish one another. (Rom. 15:14.) Indeed there are things which a wise and affectionate people will be concerned to take upon themselves, lest a prejudice should be contracted against the ministry, which may prevent its good effects. This is peculiarly necessary in the settling of differences, in which whole families may be interested, and in which it is extremely difficult to avoid the suspicion of partiality.

In all cases of personal (hence, the rule laid down by our Lord, in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, ought to be attended to; and no such offence ought to be admitted before a church till the precept of Christ has been first complied with by the party or parties concerned.

In many cases where faults are not committed immediately against us, but which are unknown except to a few individuals, love will lead us to endeavour to reclaim the party if possible, without any further exposure. A just man will not be willing to unnecessarily make his brother a public example. The Scriptures give peculiar encouragement to these personal and private attempts. "If any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins." (James 5:19, 20)

In cases of evil report, where things are said of a brother in our hearing, which if true, must affect his character, and the purity of the church, it cannot be right to go on to report it. Love will not lead to this. Many reports we know are unfounded, or if true in the main, they may have been aggravated. Or there may be circumstances attending the case, which if fully understood would make things appear very different from the manner in which they have been represented. Now it is almost impossible that anyone but the party himself should be acquainted with all these circumstances, or able to give a full account of them. No time therefore should be lost, ere we enquire at the hand of our brother, or if on any consideration we feel that to be unsuitable, it would be proper to apply to an officer of the church, who may conduct it with greater propriety.

There are cases of a more public nature still, in which much of the peace and happiness of a church depends upon the conduct of its members in their individual capacity. The charge given by the apostle to the Romans, (chap. 16:17, 18) though applicable to a church, yet seems to be rather addressed to the individuals who compose it. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

The characters to be avoided appear to be persons whose object it is to set up a party in the church, of which they may be the heads or leaders, a kind of religious demagogue. Such men are found, at one time or other, in most societies, and in some cases the peace of the churches has been invaded by strangers, who are not of their own community. Let the "brethren" have their eye upon such men. Mark them, trace their conduct, and you will soon discover their motives. Stand aloof from them, and "avoid" striking in with their dividing measures. In case of their being members, the church, collectively considered, ought, no doubt, to put away from amongst them such wicked persons, but as every collective body is composed of individuals, if those individuals suffer themselves to be drawn away, the church is necessarily thrown into confusion, and rendered incapable of a prompt, unanimous, and decided conduct.

Let members of churches, therefore, beware how they listen to the insinuations of those, who would entice them to join their party. Men of this stamp are described by the apostle, and therefore may be known, particularly by three things. First, by their doctrine: "it is contrary to that which has been learned of Christ." Secondly, by their selfish pursuits: "they serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies." Thirdly, by their insinuating whining pretenses of affectionate regard towards their partisans: "by good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple."

To this may be added, there are duties on individuals in their behaviour towards persons who lie under the censure of the church. If they still continue in a state of impenitence, persist in their sin, or be irreconciled to the church's proceedings with them, it is of the utmost consequence that every member should act a uniform part towards them. We may, it is true,

continue our ordinary and necessary interactions with them as men, in the concerns of this life, but there must be no familiarity, no social interchange, no visiting them, nor receiving visits from them. Nothing in short that is expressive of connivance at their conduct. "If any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, [we must not keep company] with such an one no not to eat." (1 Cor. 5:1.) If individual members act contrary to this rule, and carry it freely towards an offender, as if nothing had taken place, it will render the censure of the church of none effect.

Those persons also who behave in this manner will be considered by the party as his friends, and others who stand aloof as his enemies, or at least as being unreasonably severe which will work confusion, and render void the best and most wholesome discipline. We must act in concert, or we may as well do nothing. Members who violate this rule are partakers of other men's sins, and deserve the rebukes of the church for counteracting its measures.

With respect to those things which fall under the cognizance of a church in its collective capacity, we earnestly recommend in general that everything be done not only with a view to the honour of God, and the good of the party, as before observed, but with a special regard to the revealed will of Christ. That some kind of order be preserved, in every community, is necessary to its existence. Decency, reputation, and even worldly policy, will induce us to take some notice of gross immoralities: but this is not Christian discipline; nor will it be productive of its salutary effects.

In the choice of officers, few if any churches would elect a profligate, but if opulence be allowed to supply the place of spirituality, or ambitious or litigious characters be preferred on the principle of expediency, as a means of keeping them in better humour, is it not carnal? So, in matters of discipline, few churches would suffer a grossly immoral or litigious character to continue amongst them unnoticed, but if, instead of a calm, impartial and decided procedure, we enter into cowardly compromises with the offender, consenting that he should withdraw of his own accord; if the crimes of rich men be either entirely overlooked, or but slightly touched, lest the cause should suffer from their being offended. Or if the misconduct of poor men be disregarded, on the ground of their being persons of little or no account, are we not carnal, and walk as men?

Brethren! Are there any such things amongst us? Search and consider. Such things ought not to be. The private withdrawal of an individual, if it be without good reason, may justify a church in admonishing him, and, if he cannot be reclaimed, in excluding him. but it cannot of itself dissolve the relation. Till such exclusion has taken place he is a member, and his conduct affects their reputation as much as that of any other member. With regard to a neglect of discipline lest it should injure the cause, what cause must that be which requires to be thus supported? Be it our concern to obey the laws of Christ, and leave him to support his own cause. If it sink by fulfilling his commandments, let it sink. He will not censure us for not supporting the ark with unhallowed hands. And if it be criminal to fear the rich, it cannot be less so to despise the poor. Let brotherly love abound towards both. Do all things without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

We cannot enumerate all the particular cases which fall under the cognizance of a Christian church, but shall mention a few which are recorded in the Scriptures for our imitation.

**A DEPARTURE FROM THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL, OR ANY OF ITS LEADING DOCTRINES** is an object of Christian discipline. "I would they were even cut off that trouble you—I have a few things against thee, because thou hast them that hold the doctrine of Balaam--so hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.—A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." (Gal. 5:12; Rev. 2:14, 15; Titus 3:10)

It is worthy of notice that the only passage in the New Testament wherein heresy is introduced as an object of discipline, makes no mention of anything as composing it but what relates to the principles of the party. It may be supposed that those who were accounted heretics by the apostles were as impure in their lives as they were antichristian in their doctrine, and that they were commonly disturbers of the peace and unity of the churches. However this might be, neither of these evils are alleged as the reason for which the heretic was to be rejected.

All that is mentioned is this: He is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself. He is "subverted" that is, his professed faith in the gospel is in effect overturned, or rendered void. Consequently he requires to be treated as an

unbeliever. He is "condemned of himself" that is, the gospel being a consistent whole, he who rejects some of its leading principles, while he professes to retain others, is certain to fall into self-contradiction, which, if clearly pointed out in a "first and second admonition" and he still persists, he will be compelled obstinately to shut his eyes against the light, and thus "sin" against the dictates of his own conscience.

It has been asked by persons who disapprove of all church proceedings on account of a difference in religious principles, who is to judge what is heresy? We answer: Those who are to judge what is immorality in dealing with loose characters. To suppose it impossible to judge what heresy is, or to deny that the power of so deciding rests in a Christian church is to charge the apostolic precept with impertinence. It is true, the judgment of a church may be erroneous as well as that of an individual; and it becomes them in their decisions to consider that they will all be revised at the great day, but the same may be said of all human judgment, civil or judicial, to which no one is so void of reason, as on this account to object.

In **CASES OF NOTORIOUS AND COMPLICATED WICKEDNESS**, it appears that in the primitive churches, immediate exclusion was the consequence. In the case of the incestuous Corinthian, there are no directions given for his being admonished and excluded only in case of his being incorrigibly impenitent. The apostle determined what should be done. In the name of the Lord Jesus when ye are gathered together to deliver such a one unto Satan. We cannot but consider it as an error in the discipline of some churches where persons have been detected of gross and aggravated wickedness, that their exclusion has been suspended, and in many cases omitted, on the ground of their professed repentance.

While the evil was a secret it was persisted in, but when exposed by a public detection, then repentance is brought forward, as it were in arrest of judgment. But can that repentance be genuine which is pleaded for the purpose of warding off the censures of a Christian church? We are persuaded it cannot. The eye of a true penitent will be fixed on the greatness of his sin, and he will be the last to discern or talk of his repentance for it. So far from pleading it, in order to evade censure, he will censure himself, and desire nothing more than that testimony may be borne against his conduct for the honour of Christ.

But allowing that repentance in such cases is sincere, still it is not of such account as to set aside the necessity of exclusion. The end to be answered by this measure is not merely the good of the party, but the "clearing" of a Christian church from the very appearance of deceitful with immorality, and which cannot be accomplished by repentance only. Though Miriam might be truly sorry for her sin in having spoken against Moses, and though she might be healed of her leprosy, yet the Lord said unto Moses, if her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days? Let her be shut out from the camp seven days; and after that let her be received in again. (Numbers 12:14)

We do not suppose, however, that every notorious fault requires immediate exclusion. The general rule given is that **NOTORIOUS EVILS SHOULD MEET WITH A PUBLIC REBUKE**. Those that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may fear. (1 Tim. 5:20) But this proceeding does not appear to amount to exclusion; it is rather of the nature of a censure or reprimand, accompanying an admonition. To us it appears that the circumstances attending a sin, ought to determine whether it require immediate exclusion or not. If these be highly aggravating, if there appear to have been premeditation, intention, and perseverance in the crime, put away from amongst yourselves that wicked person, but if circumstances extenuate, rather than heighten the evil, solemn admonition, accompanied with rebuke, ought to suffice, and no exclusion to follow but in case of incorrigible impenitence.

There are also faults which do not come under; the denomination of notorious sins, wherein directions are given for recovering the offenders WITHOUT ANY MENTION BEING MADE OF EXCLUSION, EITHER IMMEDIATE OR ULTIMATE.

There is perhaps in all the churches a description of men whose characters are far from being uniformly circumspect, and yet not sufficiently irregular to warrant their being separated from communion. They are disorderly waiters; busy-bodies in other men's matters, while negligent of their own; in a word, unamiable characters. Now those that are such we are directed to exhort, and charge that they conduct themselves as becometh Christians. If after this they continue disorderly, observe a degree of distance in your conduct towards them; withdraw your intimacy; let them feel the frowns of their brethren; yet be not wholly reserved, but occasionally explain to them the reasons of your conduct, affectionately admonishing them at the same time to repentance and amendment of life.

“Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us. For yourselves know how ye ought to follow us: for we behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. But ye, brethren, be not weary in well doing. And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother. (2 Thess. 3: 6-15)

If churches were to consult only their own reputation, they would often discard such persons at an early period, but where there is reason to hope that the heart is right in the main, great forbearance must be exercised, and long perseverance in endeavouring to recover. How many imperfections were discovered in the conduct of the twelve apostles, while their Lord was with them, and what an example of forbearance has he left us! One character reclaimed is of greater account and more to the honour of a Christian church, than many discarded.

Finally, a watchful eye upon the state of the church, and of particular members, with a seasonable interposition may do more towards the preservation of good order than all other things put together. Discourage whisperings, backbitings, and jealousies. Frown on tale bearers, and give no ear to their tales. Nip contentions in the bud. Adjust differences in civil matters among yourselves. Bring together at an early period those in whom misconception and distrust have begun to operate, ere ill opinion ripen into settled dislike.

By a frank and timely explanation in the presence of a common friend, that may be healed in an hour, which, if permitted to proceed, a series of years cannot eradicate. Be affectionately free with one another. Give tender and faithful hints where it appears to you that one of your brethren is in danger of being drawn aside from the principles or spirit of the gospel. Let all be given, from their first entering into connection with you, to expect them. If anyone take offence at such treatment, give him to understand that he who cannot endure a caution or a reproof, is unfit for Christian society, and is in the utmost danger of falling into mischief.

The free circulation of the blood and the proper discharge of all the animal functions are not more necessary to the health of the body than good discipline is to the prosperity of a community.

If it were duly considered how much the general interests of religion, and even the salvation of men, may be affected by the purity and harmony of Christian churches, we should tremble at the idea of their being interrupted by us. The planting of a church in a neighbourhood where the gospel is preached, and the ordinances of Christ administered in their purity, is a great blessing. It is a temple reared for God, in which he designs to record his name to meet with his humble worshippers and to bless them.

We have seen churches of this description, in the midst of a career of spiritual prosperity, edifying one another in love, and gathering souls to the Redeemer's standard, all in a little time, blasted and ruined by some un-happy event that has thrown them into disorder. One of the members, it may be, has acted unworthily—he is reprov'd—his relations or particular acquaintances take on his side—discipline is interrupted—the church is divided into parties—hard things are said on both sides—the bond of love is broken—tender minds are grieved and retire—worship is but thinly attended, and the enjoyment of it is vanished—God's friends mourn in secret, and his enemies triumph, saying, “Aha! So would we have it! Truly it is a serious thing to occasion the ruin of a Church of Christ! “If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are!” (1 Cor. 3:17)



# Believing in Vain

---

M. L. Moser, Sr.

From *The Baptist Challenge*, January 2014. Originally printed in January 1961

**W**e are going to discuss the question, "Believing in Vain," but before we do, we want to ask these questions. "Is it possible for a man to believe and yet not be saved?" "Can a man have a false or a spurious belief that does not result in salvation?" It is to that, that we want to devote our attention in this message.

In First Corinthians we read, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:1-4).

Paul here gives us a definition of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is amazing to me how many people do not know what the gospel is. In the course of my ministry, I've asked literally thousands of people, "What do you mean by the gospel," and it is not one out of a hundred that can give me a clear-cut definition. For instance, I asked a man who is a leader in a church, (not a Baptist church however, but it could have been true in a Baptist church) how men are saved. He said, "Well, by believing the gospel." And I asked him, "Well, what is the gospel?" And he hemmed and stuttered, and finally came up with "Well, I guess the gospel is doing right with God and your fellowman." This ignorance of the gospel is appalling in this country.

Then again, there are some who confuse a picture of the gospel with the reality. We have a picture of the gospel. We might call it the pictorial gospel, which is baptism. Baptism is a picture of the death, the burial, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ for our sins. The reality is the good news of the fact that Christ died for our sins and that He was buried and that He rose again on the third day. That is the reality. We have a picture of it in baptism.

There are many people who are attempting to be saved or who think they are saved by the picture rather than the reality.

There are three parts of the gospel. Christ died for our sins; He was buried, He rose again according to the Scriptures. Now man must believe in Jesus Christ in order to be saved. He must believe that Jesus Christ loved him and died for him upon Calvary's cross; that through the blood that Jesus Christ shed upon the cross, salvation comes to the individual and he must believe that Jesus Christ is alive today; that He came forth from the grave a resurrected Savior. The facts of the gospel then are three: the death, the burial, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ for our sins.

Is it possible to believe in vain? Paul says that it is. There is a false or a spurious belief. When we turn to the word believe in the Bible, we find that believe and its various forms are used 471 times. Let me show you what I mean.

Speaking just of the New Testament, the Bible refers to the word believe, just the simple word believe, 123 times, "believed" which is past tense, 94 times, "believes," two times, which is a total of 278 times. We find the word faith used 193 times. So the word faith and believe are used 471 times in the New Testament. There is no excuse for the ignorance that prevails in the world today concerning God's plan for salvation, which is by faith in Jesus Christ. In Acts 16:31 we read, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

Because of this confusion, there are multitudes in our churches today that have never been born again; that have never been saved. I'm convinced that more than three-fourths of the membership of all the churches in the United States is composed of unsaved men and women; men and women that never have been truly born again; men and women that sometimes are very religious and yet do not have a new life planted within them by the Holy Spirit of God.

There are three reasons for that. First, infant baptism. Did you know, infant baptism is one of the biggest curses this world has ever known. It is not found in the New Testament. It is absolutely foreign to the Bible. Believer's baptism is in the New Testament. There is not one record, of one incident, of a single baby or infant, being baptized. Only those who were old enough to be convicted of sin and to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ were considered fit candidates for baptism in the New Testament. This business of infant baptism has deceived multitudes of people into thinking that...they are saved. They say, "Well, when I was a baby I was dedicated to the Lord and they baptized me by sprinkling, and I guess everything is all right. I'll take my chances with the rest." Infant baptism cannot be a substitute for personal repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Then, the matter of child evangelism. Speaking of Baptists as a whole, we are just as guilty of infant baptism as all our Protestant friends, because we have turned away from the preaching of repentance and faith today to those who are old enough to be saved, and we are putting emphasis on little children. We are urging that we get them into the church.

There are many little children baptized into the fellowship of Baptist churches today that are not old enough to be saved. Some preachers take them in their arms and carry them down into the baptistry. The children are too small to know what it is all about, and even too small to walk down into the baptistry and out again. Oh the terrible curse (unsaved pastors, officers, and church members) of the last fifty years that has come upon Baptist churches because we have filled our churches with little children and there is no more scripture for the baptism of little children than there is for infant baptism. In fact, one is as scriptural as the other. Neither of them are found within the covers of the Word of God.

The third reason why our churches are filled with unbelievers today is because of false doctrines. Satan has deceived multitudes on the basis of salvation. He has deceived them about sin, about faith, about salvation, and as a result, multitudes in our churches have never been saved. They have a false evidence of salvation. They have believed in vain.

Why do so many people think they are saved and yet show no evidence in their lives that they have been saved? The Bible is very clear and very distinct on it. It won't hurt each one of us to examine the basis of our faith. It won't hurt each one of us to look into our own lives to see, in the light of the Word of God, whether we have been saved or not. Remember, the Bible says that in the last days many shall have a form of godliness but deny the power thereof. The form of godliness in a Baptist church is to walk down the aisle, make a lip profession, submit to the ordinance of baptism, but without salvation.

Now certainly we ought to have the form. There is nothing wrong about the proper form, but the form alone will not save anybody from their sins. My wife has a dress model that she makes her dresses by. It is patterned after her; that is the form. But I don't love that form. It may look like her, but it isn't her. There is no life on the inside of it. Many of you may have the form of religion, the form of godliness, but unless the Holy Spirit has put life within the form, it is but a dead form. May God help you to see what we are talking about when we talk about believing in vain because to believe in vain never results in salvation.



## Cooperation Among Baptists ---

Norman H. Wells

From *The Church That Jesus Loved*, 1973 (Chapter 20)

*Can two walk together, except they be agreed.*" (Amos 3:3)

**T**here is a great need for cooperation among Baptists. The dictionary tells us that cooperation is to "operate together for a common object." Before there can be cooperation there has to be some basis of agreement. Before Baptists can successfully walk and work together they must be agreed!

Sometimes this striving for cooperation leads to some peculiar agreements! The price for cooperation can come high! Baptist churches sometimes have to agree to still their voices on distinctive Baptist doctrines for the sake of cooperation. This is a fearful price! Many times Baptists are called upon to support causes and institutions to which they normally would object — all for the sake of cooperation! It develops to where modernism and liberalism are tolerated for the sake of cooperation! This kind of cooperation has become so objectionable to real Baptists that a great host of them have gone to the other extreme. All over this country are thousands of Baptist preachers and churches who have withdrawn from all such organizational ties and unscriptural cooperation and stand as real, true, independent, New Testament Baptist churches. We praise God for this group!

A great number of these Baptist preachers and churches who paid such a tremendous price to break away now find themselves again involved in the same kind of unscriptural organizations, only under a different name. Many of these are having to repeat the operation of separation in order to stand as real, independent Baptist churches. All this has had a tendency to create another undesirable situation.

Real, independent Baptist churches and preachers find themselves cut-off and isolated from other Baptists. I have received letters from many Baptists who find themselves in this position. Baptist churches and preachers who refuse to cooperate with the existing Conventions, Associations, and Fellowships of Baptists are shunned and ridiculed. Organized Baptists do their best, it seems, to promote the idea that the "independents" are a mere handful of disgruntled, thwarted, disappointed, non-cooperative, non-missionary, self-seeking, interdenominational, glory hunters. In reality, it could probably be easily established that a tremendous percentage of real Baptist fall in this despised group of "independents."

There is a great need for cooperation among these truly, independent Baptist churches. The chief criticism hurled our way is that we can't get the job done without using an organization other than the church. They did in New Testament times and it can be done now! There needs to be cooperation among Baptists who are agreed! There needs to be agreement on three things — our mission, our message and our method!

#### **COOPERATION IN OUR MISSION**

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: —" Matt. 28:19-20.

The mission of Baptist churches is to "teach all nations" or "disciple" all nations, that is, get folks saved!! The churches are to carry this gospel to "all nations." Secondly, they are to baptize those who get saved! What a tremendous importance this places on baptism. Thirdly, the churches are to teach the baptized converts "to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you."

Thus we see that the mission of Baptist churches is to get sinners saved, baptize them and teach them the commandments of Jesus. All this is to be done to the glory of God! It is not too difficult to see that before there can be cooperation there must be agreement as to mission. All Baptists should be cooperating in this effort.

#### **COOPERATION IN OUR MESSAGE**

Surely it will be readily agreed upon that all churches calling themselves Baptists should be proclaiming the same message. However, as anyone can see, this is not the case! Because of a laxity in doctrinal teachings and because of the spirit of "unity at any cost" that prevails the name "Baptist" has been diluted so as to spread over a multitude of conflicting messages!!

It is an amazing thing to see the real Baptist message cause such discomfort to many who are using the name. It is interesting to note how many good old Baptist doctrines are taboo among modern organized Baptists. They can't be preached because they would offend some of the churches in the group who have drifted from the Baptist position. Great truths are stifled in order to keep all the brethren cooperating.

As these organized groups of Baptists meet there is a noticeable lack of preaching on the great historical doctrines for which Baptists preached, fought and died. The message has softened.

The world needs to hear the Baptist message — all of it! The command to each Baptist church is "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded thee." Real Baptists should never get themselves in an organization where this message is throttled! Baptists all over the world who are still clinging to the true historic Baptist message should be sending it into all the world. They should stand shoulder to shoulder!

### **COOPERATION IN METHOD**

Jesus Christ only left one organization upon this earth to carry out the Great Commission. That organization is a local church! One can search the New Testament from beginning to end and the local church is the only organization found to carry out this task!

No Conventions, Associations, Organized Fellowships, Mission Boards, etc. are to be found. It should be the simplest thing in the world to understand that the local church is God's method of getting the job done. The only organization Christ Himself gave was the local church — all others are manmade! True Baptists have always recognized this! This local church is God's way and glorifies God — huge organizations of Baptist churches are man's way and glorifies man!

True Baptists need to cooperate in method! It is possible for Baptist churches to cooperate without benefit of organizational ties binding them together. It is not only possible but necessary! It is time that real Baptists identified themselves and stood together in scriptural cooperation to get the message out to a lost world for the glory of our God.

God gave the churches their mission and nothing else should be substituted! God gave the churches their message and it should not be changed. The mission and message, given by God, should be accepted as the will of God. Who would be so presumptuous as to try to improve the mission or the message God gave the churches?

What is true of the mission and the message is also true of the method God has given us! How many times Baptists have been guilty of stating, "Yes, that's the way it was done in the New Testament but it won't work now!" It would seem that it is believed that God's method can be improved!

God's method cannot be improved! Baptists who accept God's mission and God's message should also accept God's method! It will work! It is possible for independent Baptist churches to carry out the Great Commission without man-made, extra-scriptural organizations.



## **Did Ancient Baptists Refuse to Recognize Pedobaptist Societies as Scriptural? \_\_\_\_\_**

J. R. Graves

From *Old Landmarkism: What Is It?*, 1880

It is asserted with the utmost assurance by Affiliationists that our policy of the non-recognition of human and unscriptural societies as churches of Christ, and of their teachers as ministers of the gospel, and our non-acceptance of their ordinances as valid, is not sustained by the history of our denomination, and is, therefore, not an old but a new landmark, and we, ourselves, are heretics and schismatics.

This is a serious charge, and if it can be sustained by the word of God and the facts of history, the most effectual means should be employed to bring us to the knowledge of the truth, and this failing, Old Landmarkers should be excluded as incorrigible and dangerous offenders. Let us, then, patiently inquire:

#### **WHAT ARE THE TEACHINGS OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY?**

It will be admitted by the most "liberal" of our brethren that all the churches of Christ, before the "apostasy," which took place in the third and fourth centuries, and gave rise to the Greek and Latin Catholic hierarchies, were what are now called Baptist churches. It must then be granted that the falling away foretold by Paul (2 Thess. 2:3), was a falling away from the doctrine and church form established by Christ and his apostles, and which characterized all the scriptural churches in the first century, and as a general thing a part of the second—consequently, it was a falling away from Baptist doctrines, principles, form of church organization and fellowship.

All history unites in testifying that a general defection from the primitive faith and church order did take place throughout the entire Roman Empire, East and West, in the third century, and a general withdrawing, according to the directions given by Paul, of the pure and uncorrupted portions of the churches that adhered to the faith at first delivered; and these steadfastly claimed, though often in the minority, and often ruthlessly excluded by the corrupt majority, to be the scriptural church, and pronounced the corrupt majority the "apostasy" or apostates from the truth.

These uncorrupted witnesses of Jesus were called "Cathari" at first, the Pure, and afterwards by the names of their most prominent ministers and leaders, as Novatians, Donatists; and after they fled to the valleys of the mountains from the face of their implacable persecutors, where for ages they were hid as in a "wilderness," they received the general name of "Waldenses" and Vaudois, which meant the inhabitants of "valleys" or "valley-men." Robinson says: "From the Latin 'vallis' came the English 'valley,' the French and Spanish 'valle,' the Italian 'valdeci,' the Low Dutch 'velleye,' the Provencal 'vaux,' 'vaudois,' the Ecclesiastical 'vallences,' 'valdenses,' 'Waldenses.'"

Peter of Lyons, a rich merchant, embraced the doctrinal sentiments of these valley-men, and from them he received the name "Waldus," valley-man, and not, as some have supposed, they from him. While originally it only designated the inhabitants of certain valleys, yet it ultimately was applied to all those Christians in all countries who held the faith of these original valley-men. These persecuted saints who, in the third and fourth centuries, fled into these valleys of the mountains—places "prepared by God, that they"—i. e., these rich valleys—"may nourish her," I believe are the successors of the apostolic churches, and from them received their constitution, their baptisms, and ordinances. I can only give here the testimony of a few distinguished and standard historians.

Dr. Alexis Muston, therefore, truthfully says:

"The Vaudois (Waldenses) of the Alps are, in our view, primitive Christians, or inheritors of the primitive church, who have been preserved in these valleys from the alterations successively introduced into the church of Rome into evangelical worship. It was not they who separated from Catholicism; but Catholicism which separated from them in modifying the primitive worship."(*The Israel of the Alps*, p. 1, quoted in *Baptist Succession*)

With him agrees Waddington in his *History of the Church*, who speaking of the Novatians, whom he calls "Sectaries," says: "And those rigid principles which had characterized and sanctified the church in the first century, WERE ABANDONED TO THE PROFESSION OF SCHISMATIC SECTARIES in the third." (p. 70)

This is precisely what is meant by the falling away—i. e., abandoning the scriptural principles of the gospel of Christ, and adopting a corrupt policy, order of government, and human traditions. Those scriptural minorities in all those countries, though overborne and excommunicated by corrupt majorities, constituted the true and primitive churches of Christ.

Dr. Allix, in his *History of the Churches of Piedmont* gives this account:

"For three hundred years or more, the Bishop of Rome attempted to subjugate the church at Milan under his jurisdiction; and at last the interest of Rome grew too potent for the church of Milan, planted by one of the

disciples; insomuch that the bishop [pastor] and people, rather than own their jurisdiction, retired to the valleys of Lucerne and Angrogna, and thence were called Vallenses, Waldenses, or "the people of the valleys." (Encyc. Rel. Knowl. p. 1148)

Cramp says: "We may safely infer that the Novatian churches were what are now called Baptist churches, adhering to the apostolic and primitive practice." (p. 59)

These puritan churches were known as Donatists in North Africa, and they were designated as Cathari and Paulicians by the Council of Nice, A. D. 325. These despised, oppressed, and persecuted Cathari, Novatians, and Waldenses of the third and fourth and following centuries, were our historical ancestors, and not the dominant and corrupt hierarchies at Rome and Constantinople, which called themselves "Catholics."

Now these pure and primitive churches did not in any way recognize other denominations than their own, as scriptural churches, and, therefore, they did not acknowledge their ministers as having any authority to preach or administer the ordinances; nor did they receive their immersions as valid, but invariably baptized all who came over to them, and from this fact they became known by the general name of Anabaptists (Rebaptizers).

Cardinal Hosius, president of the Council of Trent (A. D. 1550), declared that the Anabaptists had for 1,200 years past suffered generally, and the most cruel sorts of punishments. "The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect, of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem also to have been. Nor is this heresy a modern thing; it existed in the time of Austin." (*Rus. Reply to Wall*, p. 20)

This concedes that as Rebaptizers we had a separate church existence in the fourth century, and were most cruelly persecuted. We claim these suffering Rebaptizers as our historical ancestors, and not those who bathed their hands in blood. Whom do you claim, dear reader?

Zwingle, the Swiss Presbyterian, said (A. D. 1534): "The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for thirteen hundred years has caused great disturbance in the church," [i. e., the apostate part of it].

This concedes to us an organized existence as Rebaptizers in the days of Novatian, and even before ; and it is a fact that fifty years before Novatian's separation from the church at Rome, the withdrawal of the Old Landmarkers from the churches that had become corrupt had commenced. Says Robinson:

"They call Novatian the author of the heresy of Puritanism; and yet they know that Tertullian had quitted the church near fifty years before for the same reason; and Privatus, who was an old man in the time of Novatian had with several more, repeatedly remonstrated against the alterations taking place, and, as they could get no redress, had dissented and formed separate congregations." (*Ecel. Res.*, p. 127)

Sir Isaac Newton, the great astronomer, but still greater student of the Scriptures and ecclesiastical history, declared to Whiston: "The modern Baptists, formerly called Anabaptists, are the only people that never symbolized with the papacy." (See *Life of Whiston*)

Mosheim's testimony is to the point, both as to the origin of our name and our great antiquity:

"The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion...is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, therefore, extremely difficult to be ascertained." (Vol. 4, p. 427)

That the prime reason the Anabaptists would not recognize the ordinances of the Catholic and other sects was that they did not admit them to be churches, and consequently utterly without any authority to baptize or to preach, no intelligent man will doubt.

Dr. John Owen, who was born A. D. 1616, says:

"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. XIII, p. 184)

Our "liberal" brethren are extravagant in their praises of the reformers Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and Knox, and they speak of them as evangelical ministers; and of their societies, now called Protestants, as evangelical churches; and it is with these "churches," and these evangelical ministers, they have so great a desire to affiliate, and in every way recognize, and seem to prefer them to their own brethren, especially if their own brethren are Landmarkers. But not so did our fathers—the hated Anabaptists of the days of the Reformation.

Let the reader mark well the testimony of a Presbyterian, who lived cotemporary with Calvin, and succeeded him, and wrote a history of the Reformation, and knew whereof he testified, and then decide who are the "Old Landmarkers" of this age—Affiliationists, or those strict Baptists they denounce as schismatics.

Henry Bullinger, the successor of Calvin, who wrote in the sixteenth century, says:

"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 any communion [fellowship] with [those called] evangelical, or any other whatsoever: for that our [i. e., evangelical Protestant, or reformed] churches are not true churches, any more than the churches of the Papists."

And he bears this testimony to the purity of these Anabaptists:

"Let others say what they will of the DIPPERS: we see in them nothing but what is excellent; and hear from them nothing else but that we should not swear or do wrong to any one; that everyone ought to live godly and holy lives; we see no wickedness in them."

Professor J. S. Reynolds, D.D., of the University of South Carolina, prepared, in 1843, an elaborate paper upon the practice of Baptists in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the conclusion I copy.

"The conclusion is irresistible, that they did not consider even immersion 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. Hence, in a vindication of the *Baptists of London*, published in 1615, the ground is taken, that 'all baptism, received either in the church of Rome or England, is invalid because received in a false church and from ANTICHRISTIAN MINISTERS.' (Crosby, vol. 1, p. 273) 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."

Wall testifies that there was a body of Baptists in England as early as A. D. 1587, who would have no religious intercourse with those teachers who perverted the faith of the gospel. He says:

"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 to the house and accompany the corpse with the rest of the people to the door, but there they retreat—they call it the Steeple House. They seem to judge thus: Those that are not baptized are no Christians [this is Wall's misrepresentation, for always, and ever, we have held that a man must be a Christian before he is baptized], and none are baptized but themselves [this is so]. So that they make not only baptism itself, but also the time, or age, or way of receiving it a fundamental [to a church or church membership, we do]." (*Wall's History*, chapter VIII, section 7, part II)

Wall, like multitudes of Pedobaptists, we fear, was but too willing to attribute wrong motives to these English Baptists for not witnessing the religious ceremonies of these church and state ministers. Those ministers did not pray with the sick, but

read prayers to them, and for this mummery they had no fellowship. They did not visit their Steeple Houses, because they did not believe God was worshiped in them, but his holy name and service profaned by the priests, by their senseless and popish forms and ceremonies; for Christ had said, "Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Mark 7:7) Baptists of that day thought they would be regarded as countenancing, in some sense, the priests of the church of England should they attend upon their administrations. And if we will only consider the influence of acts closely, we shall be forced to conclude that they acted consistently.

That our historical ancestors did not affiliate with Catholics, who, for twelve hundred years, endeavored to exterminate them with fire and sword, no one will claim. That they could not, if they had desired, affiliate with the early Protestants, Dr. Winkler has shown in a ringing article in the *Alabama Baptist*:

"They came into contact with the Reformers everywhere. And they were reviled and persecuted by them all—by Lutherans, and Episcopalians, and Puritans, and Presbyterians. Even the Romanists did not denounce them so bitterly as did Melancthon and Luther, Calvin and Zwingle, and Knox, Cranmer, and Ridley and Latimer. When Bishop Hall sneered at them as 'sectaries, instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, and such like trash,' he gave expression to the Protestant feeling of his own and of previous ages toward the Baptists. There was no sect among which these outraged and long-suffering believers could find refuge. They had to meet apart, baptize apart, commune apart. Their independent church organization was necessitated by the spirit of the age. In all the world 'none were so poor as to do them reverence.' "

J. Newton Brown, of Philadelphia, for many years editorial secretary of the American Baptist Publishing Society, in an historical essay, says of the policy of the Baptists, with respect to the Catholics and all corrupt churches:

"They held that the Catholics had so departed from the original constitution of the church, in this respect, as to have forfeited their claim to that honor; and hence invariably baptized all who joined them from the Catholic churches. Hence, they are the first in history who are called Anabaptists, that is, rebaptizers, although, of course, they denied the propriety of the appellation, as they believed the baptism administered by a corrupt church to be null and void."

So we say today, and, therefore, should no more invite the ministers of corrupt "churches" —human societies—into our pulpits to preach for us than we would papistical ministers.

The Donatists baptized all persons coming from other professing [Christian] communities. This conduct Augustine [Catholic] disapproved, and observed: "You [Donatists] say they are baptized in an impure church, heretics." (*Orchard's History*, p. 95)

These authorities indicate the faith and practice of the Baptists for the first ten centuries. In the year 1120, we find a *Treatise Concerning Antichrist*, etc., among the writings of the Waldenses. In defining Antichrist, they say:

"It is not any particular person ordained to any degree, or office, or ministry, 'but a system of falsehood,' [as a false 'church,' or ecclesiastical system, etc.,] opposing itself to the truth, coveting itself with a show of beauty and piety, yet very unsuitable to the church of Christ as by names and offices, the Scriptures and the sacrament, and various other things may appear. The system of iniquity thus completed with its ministers, GREAT and small, [as we now find in the Romish, Episcopal, and Methodist societies], supported by those who are induced to follow it with an evil heart and blindfold—this is the congregation, which, taken together, composes what is called 'Antichrist or Babylon,' etc.

"Christ never had an enemy like this; so able to pervert the way of truth into falsehood, insomuch that the true church, with her children, is trodden under foot."

One of the marks of an Antichristian system, or Antichrist, these Waldensian Baptists declare to be: "He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this [baptism] the work of regeneration, thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration, with the external rite of baptism."

Do not all Pedobaptist sects do this, as well as the mother church, of which they are branches, or the daughters?

- The Romish church says that "baptism is necessary to salvation."
- The Greek, or Eastern church, which finally separated from the Roman, or Western church, about 1054, maintained that whoever is baptized by "immersion, is regenerated, cleansed, and justified."
- The Swiss church says that, by baptism, we are "received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God."
- The Bohemian church says that in baptism the Lord "washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation."
- The Confession of Augsburg says, "Baptism is necessary for salvation."
- The Confession of Saxony says, by this dipping the sins be washed away.
- The Episcopal Church of England says, by baptism we are "made members of Christ and children of God."
- The Westminster Assembly say, in their confession, baptism "is a seal of grace, of our engrafting into Christ—of regeneration, adoption, and life eternal."
- The Confession of Helvetia says that, by baptism, the Lord "doth regenerate us and cleanse us from our sins.
- The Confession of France says that by baptism "we are engrafted into Christ's body."
- The Methodist church, through Mr. Wesley, says, "By baptism, we who are by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God."
- The Campbellites teach that regeneration and immersion are synonymous terms, and that actual remission of sins, conferred in the act, is but too notorious.

Now, how do these Baptists think it became them to treat every such Antichristian sect? Hear them: "And since it hath pleased God to make known these things to us by his servants, believing it to be his revealed will, according to the Holy Scriptures, and admonished thereto by the command of the Lord, we do, both inwardly and OUTWARDLY, depart from Antichrist."

Had these Baptists affiliated with Papists, by calling them "brethren", and recognizing their priests as Christian ministers, by inviting them into their pulpits, or "stands," to preach for them, would they have appeared to the world to have "outwardly" departed from them as the ministers of an Antichristian society?

What the descendants of these Waldenses considered as "outwardly" departing from Antichrist, we learn even after Luther, and Calvin, and Henry VIII had set up their divisions or kingdoms, by referring back to the testimony of Ballinger, (p.173).

The descendants of those very Protestants who joined with the Catholics, in the attempt to exterminate our churches from the earth, as too vile and pernicious to exist, today authoritatively demand that we shall recognize their societies as scriptural churches; their doctrine and ministers as evangelical; and their ordinances as valid and scriptural as our own. I say they do not reason to convince us; they do not courteously request it; but they imperiously, arrogantly, and dictatorially demand it of us.

We quote but a paragraph from a work on *Exclusivism*, written by Albert Barnes, the "great" Presbyterian, and author of *Barnes' Notes*, which so many Baptists delight in:

"We claim and demand of the Baptists that they shall not merely recognize the ministry of other denominations, but their membership also [i. e., infants, seekers, sinners and all]; that while, if they prefer it, they may continue the practice of immersion in baptism, as a part of their Christian liberty, they shall concede the same liberty to others (i. e., to practice adult and infant sprinkling and pouring for baptism)

"And while they expect that their acts of baptism shall be recognized by others as valid, they shall not offer an affront to the Christian world by rebaptizing all who, enter their communion, or by excluding from their communion all who have not been subjected to the rite of immersion. And we claim and DEMAND of the Baptist churches that they shall recognize the members of other churches [every sect in Christendom that claims to be a church] as members of the church of Christ. We do not ask this as a boon, we claim it as a right."—pp. 66, 67.

Can any Baptist read this, and doubt for one moment that Dr. Barnes, and all Presbyterians who endorse him, would, by imprisonments, fines, and flames, attempt to compel us to recognize their societies and human traditions, as Calvin and Luther, Zwingli and Knox, did in the sixteenth centuries, and their ancestors—the Catholics—did for twelve hundred years before?

In order to propitiate the opposition of the Protestants of today, and to become popular with them and the world they influence, our affiliating brethren are endeavoring, "by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple," (Rom. 16: 18), and to influence them to grant this claim, and yield to this arrogant and intolerant "demand" of Dr. Barnes, who speaks for all the sects of the age, and for the Evangelical Alliance. Brethren, will you—can you yield to it? Liberal Anti-Landmark Baptists say you ought, and must, or they will make friends with your foes to persecute you. "Old Landmark Baptists" say the claim is preposterous, and the demand opposed, both to the teachings of the Scriptures and spirit of Christianity—is the very spirit of Antichrist, and we will resist it unto blood if it is necessary.

Reader, with whom do you stand? And which of these two classes of Baptists—do you think occupies the ground held by our fathers from the third to the sixteenth century?

I think that even Dr. Jeter and his "Pike" man will admit that there was very little affiliation or open communion of any sort practiced in those ages. Those saintly Reformers, the ancestors of modern Protestants, who burnt, and drowned, and imprisoned without mercy our fathers, were not quite so anxious to exchange pulpits, and hold union meetings with Baptists as their children now are. And why? They are the same, and Baptists hold the same principles today as then. What can the reader think of the historical information or candor of the man, who will assert that Baptists recognized those Protestant societies as churches, and their preachers as ministers of the gospel of Christ, any more than they did those of the Catholic Church and her priests?



## Hansard Knollys (1598-1691)

---

J. Newton Brown, D. D. Philadelphia, January 18, 1859  
From *Annals of the American Baptist Pulpit*, 1860

**D**ear Sir: The sketch which I am about to furnish you of one of the earliest pioneers of Baptist principles, was originally prepared for the New Hampshire Historical Society, and in its original form appeared in one of the volumes of their collections. I have since found new materials, of which I have availed myself, to make it more perfect, and am not aware of any remaining sources of information which I have not explored.

The name of HANSARD KNOLLYS is eminent among the English Baptists of the seventeenth century. Of late years it has been widely spread, in connection with the issues of the Baptist "Hansard Knollys Society," an historical society in London, which has felt itself honoured by the selection of his name, and which, since 1845, has been nobly engaged in publishing, by subscription, accurate and annotated editions of the first Tracts on Liberty of Conscience, and other rare Baptist works of that early period—works rarer and more precious than the purest pearls of ocean.

The life of Hansard Knollys embraced nearly a whole century,—from 1598 to 1691 and that century is the most interesting and momentous in *English Annals*. With most of the religious movements of that remarkable age, his biography is woven. His influence, like that of his great contemporary, Roger Williams, was felt both in England and America. In many points a striking resemblance might be traced were this the place and time. One point of difference among others, is, that while the chief obscurity in the biography of Williams rests on his residence in England, the chief obscurity in that of Knollys rests on the years of his residence in America. My object, in this communication, is to throw light upon this dark period of his history.

Some preliminary statements may be necessary to do this effectually. It is important to know what he was before he came to this country, and happily Crosby has preserved all the facts necessary. (Crosby, I. p. 334-3444) Mr. Knollys was born in Chalkwell, Lincolnshire, 1598. His parents were pious. They "took good care," as Crosby says, "to have him trained up in good literature, and instructed betimes in the principles of religion." While at the University of Cambridge, he was converted, and his Christian character became of the highest order. "Happy would it be for this nation," says Crosby, "if our universities and private academies were filled with such students." After his graduation he was chosen master of the free school at Gainsborough.

In June, 1629, he was ordained as a Deacon, and then as a Presbyter, of the Church of England, and the Bishop of Lincoln gave him the living at Humberstone. His diligence was great. He preached three and four times a day on the Sabbath at Humberstone and Rohm, besides other seasons, as well to the poor as to the rich. About 1632, he began to doubt the lawfulness of conformity to the Church of England, and resigned his living, but continued to preach several years longer, with the consent, or rather connivance, of the good Bishop, though without surplice or prayer book.

In 1636, he was arrested at Boston, in his native county of Lincoln, by a warrant from the odious High Commission Court, and thrown into prison, but his keeper being conscience-stricken, connived at his escape, and he went up to London to find a passage to America. There he was detained so long, with his wife and child, that, when he embarked, as he tells us himself, "he had but just six brass farthings left, and no silver or gold."

A little money of his wife paid their passage. They arrived in Boston, Massachusetts, early in 1638. As he returned to London about Christmas, 1641, his residence in America must have been somewhat less than four years. But he was no common man. He was in the full vigour of life,—from the fortieth to the forty-fourth year of his age. Where did he spend these four years, and how? What influence did he exert? What character did he sustain? Why did he return? Did he leave his mark on the rising institutions of this country, and engrave his name on the foundations of American History? These are the questions I shall attempt briefly to answer.

All the early historians of New England mention Hansard Knollys. Winthrop. Morton, Hubbard, Hutchinson, Mather, Prince, Neal, Backus, Belknap, Eliot, Adams, Winslow, though the last four or five are comparatively modern. Opinion is divided about him. We must sift the facts out of them all, and make due allowance for the diversity of opinion. Some hints may be gleaned from his brief autobiography, and some from the early New Hampshire Court Records, preserved at Exeter, in that State, to which, through the courtesy of a friend, John Kelly, Esq., I have had access.

Mr. Knollys arrived at Boston, a persecuted fugitive, in a state of utter destitution. He had sacrificed everything for conscience sake. His child had died on the passage. His wife's money was all expended. Governor Winthrop calls him a "poor man." Hubbard, who generally copies Winthrop, has ventured to translate this "a mean fellow." This shows the prejudices of the time in a minister of the Pilgrims. Knollys himself says, "Being very poor, I was necessitated to work daily with my hoe for the space of almost three weeks. The magistrates were told by the ministers that I was an Antinomian, and desired they would not suffer me to abide in the patent." At that time all Boston was in a ferment on the question of Antinomianism, and hence the readiness to attach suspicion even to Cotton and Vane, much more to all new comers.

This was at the very year that Mrs. Ann Hutchinson, and her brother, the Rev. John Wheelwright, with their friends, were banished on the same charge. Providence interposed to save Mr. Knollys from perishing under this chilling reception from the Puritans—among whom, at the very head of the ministers indeed, was John Cotton, from that very Boston in Lincolnshire, where Knollys was first arrested for preaching the Gospel of the Son of God. God had a work for Mr. Knollys to do in America.

Two gentlemen from Dover, N. H., (then a new settlement called Piscataway, of fifteen years standing,) being at that time in Boston, invited Mr. Knollys to go with them, and preach in Dover. He, accordingly, went, but, on his arrival there, Capt. Burdet, who had usurped the government, forbid him to preach. He meekly submitted to this tyrannical interdict, and resorted to manual labour again for his subsistence. But, on Burdet's removal in September, "the people," says Winthrop, "called Mr. Knollys, and, in a short time, he gathered some of the best minded into a church body, and became their Pastor." (Winthrop, I. p. 326) This was about the time that Roger Williams was baptized at Providence.

Were it certain that Hansard Knollys was a decided Baptist, when he gathered the First Church in Dover, it might be maintained with some reason that he was the first Baptist Minister in America. But there is room now to doubt. True, he is called an "Anabaptist" by Mather and Belknap, but they were not contemporary, and Winthrop, who was contemporary, neither affirms nor denies it at the time. This makes it most probable that he was not a Baptist when he arrived in Dover. Indeed we know not where, when, or by whom he was baptized. In the absence of direct testimony, it may be inferred, from various circumstances that he became a Baptist while in Dover. It is, however, possible, that he embraced Baptist sentiments, and was baptized in London, while waiting for a passage to America.

We have seen, from Winthrop's *Journal*, that the Church in Dover was founded by Mr. Knollys, soon after September, 1638. This was the first Church in Dover, if not in New Hampshire. It was then a Congregational Church. The First Congregational Church in Exeter, founded by John Wheelwright, claims the priority by a few months, and is probably right in doing so. (Winthrop I., p. 211) This would make Knollys' Church the second in New Hampshire.

Mr. Knollys continued in the peaceful discharge of his duties as a Christian Pastor at Dover for about two years, without interruption. The settlement, during that period, in consequence of Capt. Mason's death, and the giving up of his patent by his widow, was a little independent Republic, of which Mr. Knollys was, beyond doubt, the most enlightened and accomplished citizen, aiding, by his fine powers, in moulding its principles and institutions at the foundation. Up to this period his character appears to be established as that of a pious, learned, laborious minister of the Gospel, willingly suffering poverty, imprisonment, exile, and reproach for Christ's sake, and for conscience sake.

He appears, also, to be a man of peace. He did, indeed, write a letter from Boston, soon after his arrival there, reflecting severely upon the manner in which things were then managed in Church and State, but, for the severity of this letter, he afterwards made an ingenuous and satisfactory confession. Few living men now would blame him for writing sharply to his friends of the oppressive system under which he suffered on his first arrival in Boston. There is yet another charge of this nature, which is not true. Both Governor Hutchinson and Dr. Belknap have, by mistake, imputed to Mr. Knollys the insolent language of Capt. Underhill, as recorded by Winthrop. • This blot does not belong to the character of Hansard Knollys, and should be wiped away from his history.

The arrival of Mr. Thomas Larkham at Dover, in 1640, changed the peaceful current of affairs, and put the peaceable character of Mr. Knollys to the strongest proof. Mr. Larkham had been a minister in Northam, England. He was a man of wealth, and popular talents. He soon formed a party, who determined to remove Knollys. Dr. Belknap says that "Knollys generously gave way to popular prejudice, and suffered Larkham to take his place."

He further says that Larkham, when once in power, "soon discovered his licentious principles, by receiving into the church persons of immoral characters, and assuming, like Burdet, the civil as well as ecclesiastical authority. The better sort of people were displeased, and restored Knollys to his office, who excommunicated Larkham." Of course, this language of Dr. Belknap can only mean that the church under Mr. Knollys excommunicated Mr. Larkham for his disorderly course. Upon this, Larkham and his adherents raised a riot, in April, 1641, and, according to the reliable testimony of Winthrop, "laid violent hands upon Mr. Knollys." This was just before the union of New Hampshire with Massachusetts, which was already negotiating, and was ratified in the course of the following month.

The whole town was thrown into confusion. In these exciting and critical circumstances, either the solicitation of his fellow-citizens, or his own sense of duty, impelled Mr. Knollys to appear in public at the head of a body of citizens, with a flying banner, seeking to restore order. Larkham's company sent down the river to Portsmouth for help, and a body of armed men came up, under Williams, and, without any legal authority, assumed control, sat as a Court, and pronounced sentence against Mr. Knollys, "fining him £100, and ordering him to depart the plantation." (Winthrop, II, p. 27)

It is worthy of consideration here, how far Mr. Knollys' sentiments as a Baptist affected this question. That he was, at this time (April, 1641) a Baptist, is quite clear, not only from the language of Cotton Mather and Dr. Belknap, before referred to, but from the testimony of an unimpeachable witness, who visited Dover within a year of the time,—Mr. Thomas Lechford, an Episcopalian, who has left us some valuable information on the state of affairs throughout New England at that period. The origin of the controversy between Larkham and Knollys is attributed by Lechford chiefly to their different views on

baptism and church membership. His own words are these: "They two fell out about baptizing children, receiving of members, &c."

Winthrop says, "there soon grew sharp contention between him (Larkham) and Mr. Knollys, to whom the more religious still adhered; whereupon, they were divided into two churches." (Winthrop, II. 27. Note by Judge Savage) This testimony is important and decisive. It proves that Mr. Knollys had embraced Baptist views, at least so far as infant baptism and the purity of church membership are concerned; that the more pious church members agreed with him; in short, that the First Church in Dover became a Baptist church, and that a second church was thereupon formed by the disaffected members, who, under the lead of Larkham, stirred up the prejudices of the people against Mr. Knollys, and even resorted to violent measures to put him down.

And this testimony is further confirmed by the fact that, when commissioners were sent from Massachusetts, (which then claimed jurisdiction over Dover, both as included in their patent and now agreed to by the Colony) they adjusted the difficulty by releasing Mr. Knollys from the fine and the censure of an illegal and *ex parte* court, and requiring the church to revoke their sentence of excommunication against Larkham. (Winthrop, I, p. 27)

The whole testimony, thus far, is in Mr. Knollys' favor. But at this juncture arose the cloud that, in this country, to a great extent, has overshadowed his fair fame. Both Winthrop and Belknap say that "a discovery was made of his failure in point of chastity," and that he himself confessed it before the church, at least to the extent of some improper "dalliance" with two young women that lived in his family, and that on this account he was dismissed by the church and removed from Dover. This charge, against such a man, is a grave one. It has been reported by Hubbard in an exaggerated form; and more recently in a History of the First Church in Dover, published in 1830. I cannot, therefore, do less than examine it in this connection.

How much is meant by the term "dalliance" in the language of the Puritans of that age, we know not. But we do know that there are several circumstances which render the truth of this whole accusation very doubtful. In the first place, it rests altogether upon the testimony of prejudiced historians, who regarded him, to use the language of Dr. Belknap, as "an Anabaptist of the Antinomian cast." Even Winthrop, with all his general candour, was not free from this prejudice, and his knowledge of the case was wholly second-hand, perhaps from the Massachusetts Commissioners, perhaps only from vague and prejudiced reports of some of his enemies, glad of an opportunity to put down the then odious and dreaded Baptists.

But, in the second place, (aided by an antiquarian friend, John Kelly, Esq., of Exeter) I have had access to the Judicial Records of New Hampshire for 1641, and there find the name of Hansard Knollys entered as plaintiff in an action of slander, which, though never prosecuted, in consequence of his return to England, at least implies that he regarded himself as an injured man. (*Exeter News Letter*, May 1, 1832)

Thirdly, in the "Account of his own Life," published in England, he gives this as the immediate reason of his return "Being sent for to England, by my aged father, I returned with my wife, and one child about three years old."

Fourthly, Cotton Mather, who wrote within about fifty years after the time, when the first reports had been more thoroughly sifted, and having full access to Winthrop's *Journal*, where the accusation in question is found, expressly excepts Hansard Knollys from the number of "scandalous" ministers, and places him in a class "whose names," he says, "deserve to live in our book for their piety, although their particular opinions were such as to be disserviceable unto the declared and supposed interests of our churches. Of these," he says, "were some godly Anabaptists, as namely, Mr. Hansard Knollys, of Dover, and Mr. Miles, of Swansea."

(John Miles was the founder of a Baptist church in Swansea, in Wales, 1649, and was ejected from his place, by the "Act of Uniformity," in 1662. He came to this country in 1663, accompanied by several of the members of his church, who were, immediately after, organized as the First Baptist Church in Swansea, Mass. Of this church he continued the Pastor until his death, which took place in 1683. Tradition gives him the reputation of having been an eminently useful man.)

But what seems particularly to touch the point in hand, Mather adds, "Both of these have a respectful character in the churches of this wilderness." (*Magnalia* I. Book III. p. 221) And to crown all, in speaking of the then recent decease of Mr.

Knollys in London, Mather says he died "a good man, in a good old age." We know that there are spots on the sun, and that even great and good men have sometimes fallen in an evil hour, but I think that he who duly weighs these facts and testimonies, and compares them with all the antecedent and subsequent life of Hansard Knollys, will be slow to credit any injurious imputation on his character during the time of his residence in America.

This is not the place to follow Mr. Knollys back to England, and trace his eventful life for the next fifty years, through the most agitated period of English History. The theme is most inviting, and, at some other time, might be pursued with the greatest pleasure and profit. We should see in him one of the brightest lights of his age, one of the ablest preachers of the Gospel, one of the most accomplished teachers of youth, one of the oldest pioneers of religious liberty, one of the meekest, yet most heroic, sufferers for the truth, one of the purest and best of men. We have the testimony of Neal, in his *History of New England* that "he suffered deeply in the cause of Nonconformity, being universally esteemed and beloved by all his brethren." (Neal, Vol. I. p. 216)

We may be permitted to cite from a sermon preached at Pinner's Hall, London, on occasion of his death, (which took place September 19, 1691) the following testimony to the eminent purity of his character, a character which his long and venerable life had elevated above all suspicion. "I do not say," says Mr. Harrison,

"that he was wholly free from sin: sinless perfection is unattainable in a mortal state; but yet he was one who carefully endeavoured to avoid it. He, with the Apostle Paul, did herein exercise himself to have always a conscience void of offence towards God and towards men. He walked with that caution, that his greatest enemies had nothing against him, save only in the matters of his God.

"That holy life which he lived did command reverence even from those who were enemies to the holy doctrine which he preached. He was a preacher out of the pulpit as well as in it; not like those who press the form of godliness on a Lord's day, and as openly deny the power of it the remainder of the week; who pluck down that in their conversations, which they build up in their pulpits...He loved the image of God wherever he saw it. He was not a man of a narrow and private, but of a large and public spirit; the difference of his fellow Christians' opinions from his, did not alienate his affections from them...He embraced them in the arms of his love on earth, with whom he thought he should join in singing the song of the Lamb in Heaven.

"It would be well," continues Mr. Harrison, "if not only private Christians, but also ministers, did imitate him therein, there would not then be that sourness of spirit which is too often (with grief be it spoken) found among them. He was willing to bear with and forebear others, and to pass by those injuries which he received from them." (Crosby, I. p. 340)

Such was Hansard Knollys. Is it wonderful that God blessed him? Short as was his residence in America, the fruit of his labours remains to this day. The church which he planted in Dover, though divided on baptism, did not perish. The Pedobaptist body now flourishes in the large Congregational church of Dover, the fruitful mother of many others, with Baptist sisters side by side. The Baptist body, composed, as Winthrop says, of "the more religious" adhered to Mr. Knollys, and, to avoid the oppressive Church and State jurisdiction of Massachusetts, under which they now came, removed to Long Island in 1641.

After Long Island fell under the power of the English, in 1664, and the Episcopal establishment succeeded that of the Dutch, under Stuyvesant, they, as soon as possible, sold out their property there, and settled on the East side of the Raritan, N. J., opposite New Brunswick, where, under Lord Carteret, they could enjoy religious liberty. To the town which they there planted, they transferred the dear old name of Dover,—Piscataway, (according to the original orthography) in memory of their first home in the wilderness, where they had enjoyed, for three years and more, the ministrations of their first loved Pastor, Hansard Knollys.

The church, when fully organized, and favoured again with pastoral care, under Mr. Drake, in 1689, flourished anew, bearing much and blessed fruit. So deeply did it strike its roots into the new soil, that, to this day, no better kind of

Christians grow than in Piscataway; and not only do they fill the town, but, in the towns around it, new churches are continually springing as shoots from the parent tree, planted by Hansard Knollys, in America.

Affectionately yours in the Lord Jesus, J. NEWTON BROWN.

Since the date of this communication, its author has found reason to modify somewhat the views here expressed, as will be seen by the following extract from a letter dated April 28, 1859, which he wrote in reply to an inquiry whether Knollys or Williams was the first Baptist minister in this country:

If the opinion of the Rev. Dr. Belcher, (to which I now incline,) could be proved, that Knollys was actually baptized in London, while awaiting his passage to America, it would settle the question of priority by some months in his favour. The chief probabilities for this opinion are that Baptist views were rapidly gaining ground in London, at the time, among the class with which Knollys would be thrown for sympathy and safety; that Dr. Belknap calls him an Anabaptist at the time of his arrival; that he took Baptist ground in the trouble with Larkham, and ever maintained it afterwards; and that we have no account of his Baptism after his return to this country, nor while he was here.

I have thought, hitherto, that it was a strong negative evidence against this view,—that neither Winthrop nor he himself should mention the fact, as the ground of his rejection by the Boston ministers and magistrates. But it now seems less unaccountable than formerly, first, because the Antinomian controversy, raised by Mrs. Hutchinson, then overruled every other consideration; and second, that the clergy of Boston, in their reply to Mr. Saltonstall's remonstrance, claim to have "tolerated peaceable Anabaptists" from the beginning (or something to that effect). Of course, if they regarded Mr. Knollys as belonging to the "Antinomian" side in that exciting controversy, they would put their objection to him on that ground emphatically, if not solely. The laws against "Anabaptists" were not enacted until 1664, that is, six years later.

It is, then, more than possible,—it is rather probable, on the whole,—that Mr. Knollys was already a Baptist on his arrival in America, in the spring of 1638; and if so, then he was the first minister in this country.



## Contending for the Ancient Faith ---

Jabez Burns  
From *The Pulpit Cyclopedia*, 1851

*"Ye should earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered to the saints."* (Jude 3)

In the introduction of our discourse we cannot do better than define the terms of which the text is composed. By faith, it is clear we are to understand the doctrines of the gospel, the great principles of Christian belief. By "contending" is meant a firm maintenance of those doctrines and principles against opposers and adulteration. By "saints" are meant the sincere and holy disciples of Jesus Christ. Now the duty specified is that of the church earnestly upholding and maintaining the great doctrines and principles of the gospel. This was necessary in Jude's time, see ver. 4; and it has been necessary in all ages of the world. The truth has never been long unassailed; it is the very design of Satan and crafty men to deceive, mislead, and then destroy. Let us then consider more fully:

**I. THE DUTY SPECIFIED.** This duty,

**1. Has respect to the faith.** That gospel system which is the object of every Christian's faith. Now the gospel system includes facts detailed by evangelists. These form the very basis of the Christian structure. The life, miracles, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Doctrines which relate to the fall and depravity of mankind, their utter helplessness, their recovery by the

mission and death of Christ. Salvation through grace by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The sanctification of the heart by the Spirit and blood of Christ. The doctrine of the supreme Godhead of the Saviour and of the Holy Ghost. Now each of these is essential to the very vitality of the Christian religion. The commandments of the gospel system are of two classes moral and positive; the moral includes all our duties to God, to the church, and to the world. The practical, obedience of faith. The positive includes attention to the ordinances of the gospel. Now these facts, doctrines, and ordinances are evidently implied in the faith or gospel system. Observe,

**2. This faith has been committed to the saints.** Especially in two respects. Heb. 1:1, 2; 1 Cor. 15:1. Also by the teaching and epistles of the apostles, who were inspired to teach and write infallibly, for the instruction, edification, and comfort of the first churches, and whose writings are contained in the New Testament scriptures. In being committed to the saints, is meant their being deposited to the vigilant care and guardianship of the first churches, and by them handed down to the generations following. We remark,

**3. That this faith is to be contended for by us.** The word contend, is literally to agonize for it; the same word is employed in reference to the Saviour's agony, or as the wrestlers and racers agonize for the prize. Now this signifies much more than extreme care to possess the faith, highly to esteem it ; it is to be solicitous for its purity, to live and labor extensively for this to employ all our powers, and influence, and energies, in its defence, and, if necessary, to suffer and die for it. Observe,

**II. THE MANNER OF DISCHARGING THIS DUTY.** We must take care,

**1. That it be the faith once delivered to the saints.** Not a faith professing to be it, but the identical faith. Not some learned man's definition or system of the faith, but the faith itself. Not our notions and opinions, but the faith. Not respecting this conjecture or that having to do with it, and therefore we must have and hold, as sacred and essential to this, the very words of the faith as when delivered, the very Scriptures which contain them. To these we must appeal, and for these we must contend always,—"to the law and to the testimony." Always, what saith the Scripture?

**2. The contending for the faith must be in the spirit of faith.** Not in the spirit of proud and vaunting bigotry, but with enlightened candor. Not in the spirit of personal uncharitableness, but in the spirit of love to the mistaken,—compassion for them. Not in the spirit of wrathful denunciation, but in the spirit of affectionate prayer. Not in the employment of carnal weapons, as acts of parliament and the sword of state, but clad only in the armor of righteousness. Not in anger, calumny, and wrath, but in the spirit of tenderness and love. See an example presented in the 9th verse. Yet we notice,

**3. The contending for the faith must be firm and unyielding.** We must conflict for it, and not be indifferent, cold, and careless. We must be earnest and ardent, devoted and persevering. We must confess the faith, hold it fast, witness for it, buy it at any price, and never, never sell it. And this contending must respect the whole faith, there is nothing valueless or indifferent. Its author, its originator, bespeaks its value and excellence. Indifference to minor parts has ever opened the floodgate of error.

**III. THE REASONS WHICH SHOULD OBLIGE US TO THIS DUTY.**

**1. For the faith's sake.** This is the mystery of heaven, the plan of salvation, the system of eternal benevolent truth. Who would not be anxious for pure light, pure air, pure water? This is the light of the soul, the atmosphere of the Spirit, the water of life.

**2. For our own sake.** There is an obligation, it is a duty, and therefore connected with conscience, with peace of conscience, with the smile of God, with the enjoyments of religion. We are to war for this, "fight the good fight of faith." "I have kept the faith."

**3. For the church's sake.** Purity and prosperity connected. Love, truth, and peace. "I have no greater joy," &c. Be valiant for the truth. Our forefathers did this for us. We are to do it for the present and the next generation. Remember too, the prosperity of the church and the salvation of the world are necessarily linked together. This is therefore united with the conquering car of the Saviour. "Ride on gloriously because of righteousness and truth."

