

From Our E-mail

Date: 03/30/06

Subject: Starting a Baptist Church.

I just read your article on [Builders Wanted](#). I was greatly helped by it. I have been struggling with these very same thoughts for some time. Thank you for allowing God to use you. May God be praised!

G.P.C.

Date: 03/20/06

Subject: Pastor John

I just wanted to take a few minutes to write and say thank you for your website. It has been a wealth of encouragement and support for myself and a few believers who are working to plant a church. We seem to be surrounded with people who are doing church the way they think it should be done, and not according to God's Word. Keep up the good work, you may never know just how many people you have truly helped.

Watching the Sky / Ready to Fly,

M.K.

Newburgh, IN

Date: 03/12/06

Subject: Love your website

Dear brothers and sisters, I am an independent fundamental Baptist (previously SBC) and I love your website. We need more of them like this. It is hard to find a website among the Baptists which tackles doctrine and apologetics as this one does. (One can go online and find volumes of websites from the church of Christ which do so in promoting their doctrine, but to find a Baptist site which does is refreshing.) Do you know of any literature or periodicals to which I may subscribe? If so my mailing address is ... I will gladly reimburse any expense.

Your friend in Christ,

D.R.

Whitley City, KY

Date: 03/12/06

Subject: mailing list

Hello, I just found your website, It is so great to know there are others who believe the way I do about so many things. I'd like to request a copy of the Baptist Pillar. Please let me know where to send the \$7 for yearly subscription, here is my address:

T.R.

Center, KY

Date: 01/14/06

Subject: THANKS

My THANKS to you for a G R E A T Baptist

web site. I was doing a web search on "Ana-Baptist" and found the article by Norman Wells. I immediately recognized his name as I had his book on the "Myth of the Universal Church ..." (note the title is from memory as I gave the book to our church library.)

The Lord recently opened a ministry to a "cell" of prisoners for me. I had been explaining truths to the leader so he could teach the others when they get together for Bible study. But as I don't believe in "reinventing the wheel" and writing out doctrines, etc. takes so much time I thought I would copy your articles to send them. While I haven't noticed any prohibition to doing this I still would like your ok. Again, you have a really great web site, please accept my thanks.

Because Jesus Lives,

H. S.

Muncy, PA



(The Lord's Supper continued from page 6)

the Passover; and the unbaptized man should not be permitted to partake of the Eucharist."

Dwights says:

"It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance, that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible Church, in full standing. By this I intend that he should be a man of piety; that he should have made a public profession of religion, and that he should have been baptized."

Schaff says:

"The communion was a regular part, in fact, the most important and solemn part of Sunday worship, . . . In which none but full members of the Church could engage."

Coleman says:

"None, indeed, but believers, in full communion with the Church, were permitted to be present."
"But agreeably to all the laws and customs of the Church, baptism constituted membership with the Church. All baptized persons were legitimately numbered among the communicants as members of the Church."

These witnesses to our position, not being Baptists, may command the more regard from those who do not agree with us.

Editor's Note: How could we conclude any other conclusion other than, the true Baptists practiced closed communion. □

"... The church of the living God,

the pillar and ground of the truth."

Apr./May/June 2006

Vol. 14 No. 2

1 Timothy 3:15

THE BAPTIST PILLAR

Canada's Only True Baptist Paper

THE LORD'S SUPPER

By Hiscox, 1893

THE Lord's Supper in its institution, and also as to its symbolic import, as well as in its relation to Christian life and doctrine, has already been considered. It would be useless, in this place, to attempt a history of the rite, especially a detail of the perversions of its uses, the bitter controversies concerning it, or the false claims set up for its sacramental efficacy in working grace in its subjects.

The one question with which we are now concerned is a purely denominational one, having reference to the proper subjects of the ordinance, and the spiritual and ritual qualifications of those who partake of it. Also as to the proper and rightful authority of the Church in restricting its use, and judging of the qualifications of the participants.

Eucharistic Propositions

The following propositions may be stated

PROP. 1.—The Gospel calls on all men, everywhere, to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ unto salvation. This is the first act of submission to divine authority required of men.

PROP. 2.—Such as have exercised saving faith in Christ, and are thus born of the Spirit, are commanded to be baptized, as a declaration of that change, and a profession of the inward washing of regeneration, which has transpired in them. And no one is required to be, or properly can be, baptized till

he has believed.

PROP. 3.—All persons, having savingly believed on Christ, and having been baptized into His name on a profession of that faith, are expected, and required, to unite themselves thereby with the company of disciples as members, in fellowship with Church which is Christ's visible body. And no one can properly become a member of a Church till he has believed and been baptized.

PROP. 4.—It becomes the privilege and the duty of all who have thus been regenerated by the Spirit, baptized on a profession of faith, and are walking in fellowship with the Church, to celebrate the death of Christ in the Supper. Moreover, it is the duty of all who believe they love the Lord to be baptized, and unite with His Church, in order that they may obey His command, "This do in remembrance of me." No true disciple should neglect it.

PROP. 5.—It becomes the imperative duty of the churches, to whom the ordinances are committed, to see to it, as faithful guardians of so sacred a trust, that these regulations be faithfully observed, according to the will of the Master, by all who are members, and by all who desire to become members with them.

PROP. 6.—The pastor as "the chief executive officer" of the Church, acts as its representative under instructions in his sphere of service. But it is not his prerogative to determine who shall be baptized into its fellowship, or who shall enjoy its privileges,

(The Lord's Supper continued on page 4)

Editor and Pastor:

John Reaves Sr.

Email: pillar@baptistpillar.com

Published by Bible Baptist Church
1203 4th St. Brandon, MB R7A 3J7

Phone: 204-726-5806

Fax: 204-728-0995

Web Site:
www.baptistpillar.com

MISSIONARY **KJV 1611** INDEPENDENT

Forget Not The Past

JUDGMENTS ON THE "ANABAPTISTS"

Taken out of, *The Baptist Reporter*, 1851

On the 7th of August, 1536, a diet was held at Homburg, in the dominions of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse Cassel. There were present eight of the nobility, seven delegates of cities, and ten preachers and learned men, when the opinions of several jurists, reformers, and Lutherans divines were laid before them on the question of punishing capitally the so called heresy of anabaptism. The following summary embraces the conclusion of these various parties.

1. The judgment of Melancthon: That the Anabaptists may, and ought to be restrained by the sword. That those who have been sent into exile, and do not abide by the conditions, are to be punished by the sword.

2. The judgment of the Luneburgers: That the magistrate ought to punish heresies with the sword; that subjects ought to be compelled to hear the Word of God; that heretics are guilty of sedition, and are therefore to be put to death; that they cannot be restrained by words alone; that the magistrate cannot discharge his duty without using the sword.

3. The judgment of the divines of Ulm: That none ought to be punished on the account of religion, but that on account of heresy a man may be punished. That those who seduce others, should be beaten with rods.

4. The judgment of the Augsburg divines: That they had not put any of the Anabaptists to death, but had branded them on the cheek, and used other severities.

5. The judgment of the divines of Tubingen: That Anabaptists who seduce others should be punished by the sword; that others should be imprisoned, and, if they do not recant after receiving instruction from the pastors, should be punished.

6. The decision of the chancellor: That there should be a common jail in which the Anabaptists should be imprisoned; that they should be treated severely; that they should be instructed; that if foreigners should return after being banished, they should be put to death. Werner of Waldenstein is of the same opinion.

7. Doctor Isermann: That it is lawful to punish Anabaptists with death. That the more simple should, however, first be instructed. That those who are now

in confinement at Marburg should be examined, and should be punished as a warning to the rest.

8. Otto Hundius: That the Anabaptists ought to be severely punished, as guilty of sedition. That they should first be instructed. That public prayer should be offered to God for their conversion. That if they remain obstinate, their leaders should be punished with exile. That a fixed plan should be adhered to everywhere.

9. M. Adam: That the cause of the increase of anabaptism is, that good laws and constitutions are not maintained, nor those who transgress them punished. That adulteries, revellings, and such like things, are committed with impunity. That by this the Anabaptists are strengthened.

10. Hartmann Schleger: That they should be instructed by the ministers: if they remain obstinate, they should be punished with exile. That those who return should be punished (with death.)

11. D. Tilemann: That they are unwilling to be taught by any man, and that if faithfully instructed and convicted of error, they do not yield. That they ought to be punished. That in Prussia men of this kind are condemned to perpetual hard labour. That that ought to be the case here.

12. Fontius: That they should be kindly instructed by the pastors. That if obstinate they should be punished. That a careful distinction, however, should be made, for they are not all alike in sentiment.

13. Dionysius: That earnest and public prayer should be offered to God, that He would avert the impending pest. That errors should be every where refused from the pulpit. That the wicked should be everywhere severely punished, lest scandal should arise. That the obstinate must be beheaded.

14. : That the magistrate may compel his subjects to hear the Word of God. That the pastors ought to deal kindly with them, in order that they may feel that neither their blood nor wealth is sought. That they ought either to be banished, or to be confined with hard labour.

15. The pastors of Allendorf: That they are not to be tolerated, because they seek the destruction of Christianity; and that more eagerly than do the Turks. That they ought to be banished, and their leaders punished with death.

16. The pastors of Milsungen: That public prayer should be made to God, that the lives of all of

(Judgments on the Anabaptists continued on page 10)

"It was an adventurous spirit, that of old Puritanism; and I honour it not less for its self-martyrdom of exile, than for its unflinching grapple with the dogmas of its enemies.

"But I will not recognize its ferocious intolerance in forcing its own dogmas upon Quakers and Anabaptists in this land, as proving that it offered a true priesthood for the altars of freedom! I will not recognize that its blind uses of power have proved aught to the world in the Science of Liberty, aught save the mental vigour and conscientious hardihood of its stern asserters of narrow doctrine.

"And speaking still of Puritanism in its political aspect, I will recognize its hard-earned triumphs as marking more than one glorious tide in the moving waters of human freedom, but I will not recognize it as the spirit which first released the waves. I will not recognize it as the compelling power which still teaches deep to call unto deep, until the true knowledge of human rights is wide spread as the ocean, and the voices of true liberty are echoed from every shore."

Mr. Hoffman has here spoken the truth, though not the whole truth, on a great subject, yet widely understood. The truth is stated but partially, when it is said that the Dutch in 1620, understood liberty better than the English puritans. There is documentary proof that the Baptists of that time understood liberty far better than the Dutch. It is glory of our church organization that liberty is one of its inseparable principles. This is the cause why all the despots of the Old World, whether in church or state, never could endure it. The well-known maxim, that "tyrants hate those whom they fear," has found its most perfect illustration in the persecutions suffered by Baptists. For infant baptism, that fundamental error that builds up churches by compulsion, what martyr ever died? But for believer's baptism, that great law of Jesus Christ, what myriads in all ages have faced the fiery flame?

More than ten thousand Baptists suffered death in the Netherlands alone, from 1566 to 1573, under the ferocious Duke of Alva. The sufferings of these martyrs of Jesus Christ evidently touched the heart of the Prince of Orange, and stimulated his exertions for the freedom of his country. Even so early as 1565, he has said to the Regent:

"There are two species of Inquisition. The one is exercised in the name of the Pope, and the other has been long practiced by the bishops. The Netherlands have for several years been a school, in which, if we

have not been extremely inattentive, we may have learned the folly of persecution. Men do not for nothing forego the advantages of life; much less do they expose themselves to torture and death for nothing. The contempt of death and pain, exhibited by heretics in suffering for religion, is calculated to produce the most powerful effects upon the minds of spectators. It works on their compassion; it excites their admiration of the sufferers; and creates in them a suspicion that truth must certainly be found where they observe so much constancy and fortitude."

Only eight years afterwards, at the head of the new republic of the Netherlands, William proved the sincerity of these convictions, by securing for the first time in modern history, the legal toleration of the Baptists. This noble measure, in 1573, was partly the fruit of pity, partly of policy, and partly of gratitude; they having furnished him pecuniary aid in the bloody struggle with Spain, for the liberty of the Netherlands. Holland thus had the honour of being the first country in the world that gave protection to the persecuted Baptists; that protection being extended to entire religious liberty in 1626. No wonder that the Baptists are now the most numerous body of Christians in the "Empire State." Even the laurels of learning begin to flourish on their brow.

It appears then that the Baptists, by the grace of God ever the fervent friends of universal freedom, and for ages its only friends, champions, and martyrs, taught it to the Dutch, and the Dutch, so far as they received it, afterwards (in 1688) taught it to the English. Slowly, but surely, has this Baptist principle pushed its way through the barriers reared by hereditary pedobaptist prejudice, until it has pervaded our whole country and is spreading over the globe. □

Editor's Note

In The Baptist Pillar we use articles taken from many different publications and written by many different authors. Please realize that this does not necessarily mean we agree with the doctrinal position of the publication or the author of the article, but that the particular article presents a scriptural truth we do agree with.

If you would like to receive The Baptist Pillar, please write and request one. Also, feel free to copy it and hand it out.

(Judgments on the Anabaptists continued from page 2)

them may be changed for the better. That all expedients must be tried, put to death by the sword. That there ought to be, however, a distinction in the punishments.

17. The delegates of the cities: That the states were prepared to carry out whatever was determined, while that pestilence might be averted. That they wished the laws about that matter should be amended.

18. The vicars of the Prince conclude: That the laws concerning this matter ought to be amended. For this purpose the chancellor, Dr. Walther, Fontius, M. Adam, R. Schenk, Sigismund von Bainauburg, Cassel, and Marburg are deputed. That public prayer ought to be offered, and the wicked person severely punished.

19. The summary of the law that was passed: That the ministers ought before every sermon to exhort the people to pray for the anabaptists. That wicked persons, adulteries, drunkards, gamblers, and such like, should be severely punished, that there may be no scandal. That perjurers should be noted, brought to trial, and punished. That those that strive who can drink the most, ought to be punished according to former custom. That the hosts should be fined ten florins. What follows is simply designed for the removal of abuses which seemed to give the anabaptists a pretext for schisms.

British Baptists! See what your fathers in faith endured. Should we not value and improve our privileges? □



(Baptist Principles and History continued from page 9)

Gravesend) on Long Island. To which island Thomas Ffarrington, John Townsend, William Lawrence, John F. Ffirman, and others, were compelled, in the next twenty months, to remove with their families from New England, and after accepting a grant of land from the authorities of New Netherlands, enrolled themselves as liegemen of that province. The historian De Laet says, in speaking of this period of history of New Netherlands, "Numbers, nay, whole towns, to escape from the insupportable government of New England, removed to New Netherlands, to enjoy that liberty denied them by their own countrymen." It is worth stating in this connection, adds Mr. Hoffman, that the Dutch language is at this very day still spoken in many of the localities of Long Island, by some of the descendants of these English emigrants.

How many of the above emigrants were Bap-

tists, we have not the means of knowing precisely; but Knollys, Throgmorton, and the Lady Moody it is known were so, and these were the heads of three separate companies. Why Throgmorton should have left Providence from Long Island, is uncertain. It might be from the difficulty mentioned by Roger Williams, as ground of his appointment, in September of that very year, to go to England for a charter, the "frequent exceptions against Providence men, that had no authority of civil government."

How wonderful are the ways of God! Roger Williams, as a banished man, was denied the privilege of sailing on that occasion from the port of Boston. Obligated thus, in the spring of 1643, to go to Manhattan, now New York, to find a passage, he came there just in season, by his generous mediation, to put an end to the was then raging between the Indians and the Dutch, in which the famous Mrs. Anne Hutchinson and her family perished, and the dwelling of Lady Moody assailed.

Of the last named excellent woman, who so mercifully escaped destruction, and of whom it would be gratifying to know more, we have this honorable account from Winthrop's Journal, colored, of course, by the strong prejudice of the age against the Baptists. "The Lady Moody, a wise and anciently religious woman, being taken in the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the church of Salem, (whereof she was a member) but persisting still, and to avoid further trouble, she removed to the Dutch, against the advice of all her friends. Many others, infected with Anabaptism, removed thither also."

It thus appears that the "precious seed" of Baptist principles was early sown in Long Island; whence, in due time, it has spread over the world fruitful soil of the "Empire State." In two centuries, more than 800 Baptist churches have there sprung up!

True Source of Modern Liberty

C. F. Hoffman, Esq., in his anniversary discourse, delivered at New York, Dec. 6, 1847, thus discriminated between the true and the false claims of the puritans.

"It was a brave spirit, that of old Puritanism; and I yield to none in honouring its undaunted antagonism to older forms of despotism over the rights of conscience, but it was not less a despotism!

BAPTIST PRINCIPLES AND HISTORY

Taken from, *The Baptist Reporter*, October, 1851

So early as the first of September we received a copy of "The Baptist Almanac," for 1852, and glancing over its contents we were gratified on finding several well-written paragraphs on Baptist principles and Baptist history in the United States, which will form a very appropriate supplement to our last month's leader.

Spontaneous Growth of Baptist Principles

Baptist principles have nothing sectarian in them, they are simple principles of the New Testament, which offer themselves at once to the mind of every reader. They tally with the results of the most rigid grammatical and historical interpretation; but, though corroborated by philological science, they speak for themselves to every believer in Christ. Abandoned, with the Bible itself, in the night of the great apostasy, by the ruling powers and priest-ridden masses of Christendom, they still gleamed out like the changeless stars of heaven in the midst of surrounding gloom, steadfast and glorious witnesses for God.

Wherever men have been for any length of time favoured with the Word of God, and the ability to read it for themselves, whatever the previous prejudices entertained, or custom established, or proscriptive laws enacted, there Baptists begin to appear. Witness the Cathari, the Paulicians, the Paterines, and the Albigenses and Waldenses of the middle ages. The argument of polemics, the anathemas of councils, and the bloody edicts of princes, from the fifth century downward, while "the whole world wondered after the Beast," show clearly how spontaneous and how strong was this tendency to recover lost truth, and what antichristian methods were resorted to, to repress and exterminate it.

This virtual tendency reappeared at the Lutheran Reformation. Baptists, or as they were then opprobriously called, Anabaptists, instantly sprung up in all directions. The chief reformers themselves at first felt the conscious impulse, impelling them by a logical necessity to advance to Baptist ground, as the true issue of their own principles; but alas! The fatal tie of Church and State still bound them. The excesses of a few fanatics were imputed to the Baptists as a body, and the "Martyr's Mirror" reveals the result. The reformers made many concessions to Baptist principles in theory, but clung to infant baptism in practice. This vital inconsistency checked the ref-

ormation. It was irresistibly urged against it then, as it is now, by its keen-sighted antagonists. This stumbling-block remains to this day, to frustrate the efforts of Pedobaptists against Romanism. Hear the decisive language of Moehler, the ablest Roman Catholic writer of our age. "That infant baptism, according to the protestant view of the sacraments, is an act utterly incomprehensible, cannot be doubted; for if it be through faith only that the sacrament takes effect, of what value can it be to an unconscious child? The anabaptists, against whom Luther was so incensed, drew but the natural inference from the premises which he had laid down, and could not be refuted by him, without him proving unfaithful to his own principles." This simple fact, independent of all other causes, explains why the arm of civil power was everywhere invoked against them. Baptist principles were never yet put down by argument. Instances innumerable are on record where the attempt has issued in the conversion of the opponent, or at least of many of the hearers. So self-evident is their scriptural character. So spontaneous is their energy of growth.

Another era marked by the same triumphant tendency of our principles is that of the English Commonwealth. In 1611, Thomas Helwys and his church had returned from Holland, to support then into the face of persecution on heir native soil. In 1612, the masterly treatise, "Religion's Peace; or, a Plea for Liberty of Conscience," was addressed by Leonard Busher, a (General) Baptist, to James I and the High Court of Parliament, and renewed at the next meeting of Parliament in 1620-21, even while the Pilgrims were seeking refuge over the ocean amid the snows of Plymouth Rock. These are traces of the rising influence of our principles in England before the time of the Commonwealth. Then came their beautiful efflorescence, like a sudden and startling spring, bursting from the cold bosom of winter. Take the testimony of a Presbyterian, sagacious and sharp-sighted. The Scotch Commissioner Bailie, writing on the spot, says of the Baptists in 1645, "Under the shadow of independency they have lifted up their heads, and increased their numbers above all the sects of the land. They have forty-six churches in and about London." He adds this characteristic note: "They are a people very fond of religious liberty, and very unwilling to be brought under bondage of the judgment of any other." This is important testimony. And its importance is heightened by recollecting the names of some of the men who then embraced our principles. Besides man educated ministers, as Han-

(Baptist Principles and History continued on page 8)

(The Lord's Supper continued from page 1)

including a right to the Supper. The right and responsibility of deciding those questions belong to the Church itself, and not to its officers.

PROP. 7.—The pastor, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, is not under obligation to baptize any, though the Church may approve, unless he believes they are fit and suitable subjects. Nor can he baptize any into the fellowship of the Church without its consent.

Open and Close Communion

The difference between Baptists and other Christian denominations on this question has principal reference to what is usually known as open and close communion. These terms do not very accurately define the distinction, but they are in common use in popular discussions on the subject, and are quite well understood.

Open, free, or mixed communion, is, strictly speaking, that which permits any one who desires, and believes himself qualified, to come to the Lord's table, without any questions being asked, or conditions imposed, by the Church where the communion is observed. But ordinarily the term open communion is applied to the practice of the greater part of Pedobaptist churches, in which they permit and invite, not all persons, but the members of other evangelical churches to their Communion, whatever may be their views of doctrine, or Church order, in other respects.

Close, strict, or restricted communion is properly that which does not invite all, indiscriminately, who may choose to come to the Lord's table, but restricts the invitation to a particular class. But ordinarily the term close communion is applied to the practice of Baptist churches, which invite to it only baptized believers, walking in orderly fellowship in their own churches. And by baptized believers, they mean, of course, immersed believers; since they hold that, nothing but immersion is baptism.

Nearly all Baptists in the United States, and a large part of those in foreign lands, are strict communion in practice, as are also a few smaller denominations; while the Latin, Greek, and Oriental churches, and the greater part of Protestant churches practise free communion. Which are right? Let us compare them by the infallible standard.

Editor's Note: In those days there was no such thing as close communion, only open or close(d) communion, like a door, it was either open or closed.

The Open Communion View

Those who favor and practice open or free communion justify their course by various and somewhat divergent reasons. The following constitute, in the main, the arguments they use:

1. Sprinkling Held to be Baptism

The first class of open-communionists are those who hold that none but baptized persons should be invited to the Lord's table, and that the Church is the rightful judge of the fitness of persons to be received to its privileges; yet they assert that sprinkling is lawful baptism, and that persons sprinkled only, and not immersed, should, therefore, be admitted to the Supper. This, Baptists deny, and have, as they believe, proven the contrary, that sprinkling is not scriptural baptism.

2. Baptism not Prerequisite

The second class of open-communionists assert that the ordinances sustain no necessary relation to each other; that baptism can claim no priority over the Supper, and, therefore, it is not a condition, nor prerequisite to it. Consequently, unbaptized persons, if believers, for they do make faith a condition, may partake of the Supper as lawfully as baptized persons. Therefore immersion or sprinkling, either or neither, is equally indifferent. This theory virtually denies the memorial and symbolic character of the ordinance, and regards it chiefly as a sign and service of Christian fellowship. This course of argument, however plausible, is rejected and condemned by the great body of Christians the world over, both Baptists and Pedobaptists.

3. The Church is Not to Judge

The third class of open-communionists are those who claim that the privilege of the Supper is based on no ground of prescribed conditions, on no ritual preparation, but entirely upon one's own sense of fitness and duty. That the Church has no right of judgment in the case, and no responsibility concerning it, but is simply to "set the table," and leave it to each and all to take or to refrain; whoever wishes, and judges himself fit, may eat and drink in that holy service without hindrance or question.

To this attitude as to the ordinance, and to this mode of reasoning, Baptists strenuously object; as do the great majority of Pedobaptists themselves. It is not only the right, but the duty of each Church to guard the sacred trusts committed to it, and to judge whether candidates for its privileges are, or are not, scripturally qualified to receive them. Each Church must be its own interpreter of truth and duty. It

facts of increase has been greatest where they were previously most persecuted, and also where the greatest degree of general activity and culture prevails. These facts are important, as showing that patient suffering, a spirit of self-sacrifice, and the advancement of society in general knowledge, are alike favorable to the prevalence of out principles.

The Obstacles Overcome by Baptists

Let it be remembered that Baptist principles have had everything to contend with, even in this country, except God and Truth. On the one hand were the Quakers, denouncing all the visible ordinances of Christ; on the other, every class of Christians, with customs and creeds stereotyped in the Old World, denouncing the baptism of believers only, as re-baptism, as the renunciation of God's covenanted mercies, as the rejection of little ones from the kingdom of heaven here and hereafter. Foul slanders all, but nevertheless fully believed and industriously propagated. The very mode in which the Son of God in the river Jordan "fulfilled all righteousness," was then as now, either stoutly denied, or stigmatized as no example for his followers, as unnecessary, indecent, presumptuous, bigoted, vulgar, murderous, idolatrous! Men of learning, men of power, men of wit, men venerable for wisdom, eloquence, and piety, frowned upon them, warmly opposed, coldly neglected, caustically satirized, or contemptuously pitied them as dupes of ignorance and fanaticism; while they had only here and there a man qualified by education and acknowledged ability, to repel these assaults, and vindicate dishonoured and discredited truth. Their own children were often overpowered by the number, subtlety, and force of opposing influences, and without conviction, from mere weakness, impatience, pride, and worldliness, went over to the pedobaptist ranks. No wonder that many Pedobaptists here, thought with Dr. Wall in England, that the Baptists would die out in seventy years, or at least cease to spread.

But such men mistook the matter. What they deemed a superficial, transient error, was a deep-rooted, vital, vigorous truth. And in this republic it has at last found a congenial soil. Unaided by power or policy, or any considerable extent by emigration, it has leaned on Heaven for support and prospered. At every point of our Union it has penetrated, wrestled with all opposition, and overcome. It has conquered "by the blood of the Lamb and the Word of His Testimony." The only converts of which it boasts are converts not to a form or creed, but to Christ. These it now counts by myriads, only "as God gives to every man;" though its adherents are

not less than four or five millions. This almanac will show our present position, our progress in numbers, institutions of learning and benevolent effort, and prospects of advancement towards a still brighter future.

It is not generally known that, next to Rhode Island, New York, under the rule of the Dutch, was an early asylum for the persecuted Baptists. The first settlers of the "Empire State," then a small Dutch colony, brought with them from Holland those principles of toleration, which forty years before, (1573) William I., Prince of Orange, the Father of Belgic liberty, and friend of the Baptists, had succeeded in introducing into the constitution of the republic, in spite of the strenuous resistance of the clergy and nobles. Hence, as the puritans, when driven by persecution from England, first sought refuge in Holland, so the persecuted Baptists and others in New England, sought refuge in "New Netherland," now New York. Long Island, from its greater convenience, or supposed security, was the part of New York especially settled by these fugitives from New England puritan intolerance.

The first notice of this sort we have seen, relates to the celebrated Hanserd Knollys, the persecuted pastor of Dover, N.H., in 1641. Just before that good man was recalled to England, it seems, from Backus's History, that he and others like-minded, had already purchased a plantation on Long Island, to which it is presumed they went without him.

From Hoffman's "Pioneers of New York" we learn the following facts. "In 1642, a band of religionists, led on by the Rev. M. Doughty, Richard Smith, and others, who had followed the pilgrims from Old England to New England, were compelled to withdraw from the latter country by the persecution they received there, and after making formal application to the authorities of New Netherlands, they had a grant of land assigned to them, endowed with the usual privilege of free manors, free exercise of their religion, powers to plant towns, build churches, nominate magistrates, and administer civil and criminal jurisprudence. Six months later, Throgmorton, who had already been driven with Roger Williams from Massachusetts by the fiery Hugh Peters, procured permission to settle thirty-five families on the lands in Westchester County, now known as Throg's Neck, which the New Netherlanders at the time named Vredeland, or "land of Peace." In the same year the Lady Moody, with her minor son Sir Henry, and many followers, fled in a similar manner from New England to the asylum of New Netherlands, and founded the town of Gravezend, (now

(Baptist Principles and History continued on page 10)

(Baptist Principles and History continued from page 3)

serd Knollys, and Dr. De Veil, there were in civil life Sir Henry Vane, John Milton, Major Generals Harrison and Lilburne, Colonels Mason and Hutchinson, Admiral Penn, and that stalwart soldier of Christ, whose fame as a religious writer runs parallel with the English language on every shore, the immortal thinker of Elstow, John Bunyan. These are among the names that England will not willingly let die. That such men, at such a time, should appear as Baptists, in one cluster, like the luxuriant grapes of Eschol, is proof positive of the vitality of the stock, and is a sure pledge of spontaneous growth in the future.

American Tendency to Baptist Principles

The number of Baptists in this country, with their relative progress, and rapidly growing power, is one of the most singular facts of the age. As such it may challenge the attention of the philosophical historian and statesman, no less than of that thoughtful Christian.

If we go back to the settlement of this country, it is not explained by ordinary principles. Not one of all the colonies, not even Rhode Island, was originally planted by Baptists; as Virginia was by Episcopalians, Maryland by Catholics, Delaware by Lutherans, Pennsylvania by Quakers, New Jersey and New York by Presbyterians, and all New England by Congregationalists. Nor was their original introduction and spread the result of any energetic missionary system, like that of the Methodists. No other body of Christians owes so little as the Baptists to emigration from Europe. And then they alone have religiously rejected the entrapping policy of infant baptism, on which all other sects rely on for the perpetuity of religion.

All the more prominent Baptists of that period became such after their arrival in the New World. Roger Williams became a Baptist, for example, eight years after his arrival, and three years after his banishment from Massachusetts for his view of liberty of conscience, which were truly thought to "tend to Anabaptistry." When he became convinced of the truth of our views in 1639, there was not a Baptist minister in the country to administer the ordinance. The little Baptist church formed in Weymouth, Mass., that same year, was broken up by the civil power: by fines, imprisonment, and banishment. Yet the year following, Hanserd Knollys, then first pastor of Dover, N. H., embraced Baptist principles, and returning to England, spent a long and glorious life in their defense; dying, at last, as Cotton Mather tells us, "a good man, in a good old age." The Lady

Moody, of Lynn, became a Baptist in 1642; and Dr. John Clarke, the founder of the first Baptist church in Newport, and one of the ablest and best men of the age, in 1644. Mr. Painter, of Boston, the first to bear our principles to the test of the public whipping-post, embraced then and suffered for them the same year. Obadiah Holmes, the second sufferer for the same cause, in the same cruel manner, in 1651, became a Baptist in 1648. President Dunstar, of Cambridge, who was roused to the investigation by the sufferings of Mr. Holmes, became a convert to our principles in 1652, a noble climax to these triumphs of persecuted Truth! It was thirteen years later, before the sentiments led to the formation of the first Baptist church in the city of Boston; where now their relative standing and influence are probably not inferior to those of their orthodox Congregational brethren.

The remark of Cotton Mather in his *Magnalia*, therefore, that "some of the first planters of New England were Baptists," needs qualification. It is more exact to say, that some of the first settlers became Baptists. And assuredly they were men, and women too, of whom we need not be ashamed. Who can claim among the pilgrims a nobler ancestry than we? Wherever Baptists pitched their tent, or rose to power, there in its highest sense Liberty was sacred.

"Aye, call it holy ground!

The place where first they trod:

They have left unstained what there they found,

Freedom to worship God."

Besides these venerable confessors, whose names are now inspiring watchwords of our history, it illustrates the early tendency of the American mind to our principles, to hear Cotton Mather confess, "that a multitude of holy, watchful, faithful, heavenly people among the first settlers of New England, had scruples as to infant baptism." Were all hearts laid open now, how few conscientious Pedobaptists would be found free from such "scruples!" This is not mere conjecture. There are many facts by which hearts are even now revealed, were this the time to tell them.

The history of the Middle, Southern, and Western States might supply other facts illustrative of this point. But we mention only one. The great religious awakening under Whitefield (1740-1770) multiplied converts to Baptist principles from Maine to Georgia. Even Whitefield's Agent in his Orphan House at Savannah, Mr. Bedgewood, with several of the Assistants, became Baptists in 1758, and Mr. Bedgewood afterwards became a useful Baptist minister.

The new impulse given to the spirit of liberty by the revolutionary war, was followed by the rapid spread of Baptist principles, particularly in Virginia, where our brethren had suffered severe persecution. Our chief prosperity dates from that era. And two

would be absurd to claim that the convictions of an individual must be the authoritative standard by which the body is bound to act.

If the judgment of the Church must yield to the convictions of individuals in one thing, it may in all, and then all order, government, and discipline would be prostrated before an anarchy of conflicting personal opinions. If the privilege of the Supper becomes common, all others may be, since this is the highest and most sacred of all. It would be a criminal indifference to the Master of the household to allow safeguards with which He has surrounded the sanctity of His institutions to be broken down.

The Baptist View

The following will express with general accuracy the view held by Baptists as to the condition of the communion, and the qualifications of the communicants.

1. Baptists hold that there are three scriptural conditions to the privileges of the Lord's Supper, which are imperative on the part of the Church to be observed:

A. Regeneration; being born of the Spirit, and thus becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus. Without this, no one can be a member of His spiritual family, or can rightfully be a member of His visible body, the Church.

B. Baptism; an upright Christian life, orderly walk, and godly conversation as a Church member. For though one may have been truly converted, and rightly baptized, if he be a disorderly walker, violating his covenant obligations, living in sin, and openly disobeying his Lord, he has no claim on the Lord's Table.

2. Baptists claim that the Communion, strictly speaking, is a Church ordinance to be observed by churches only. That it cannot be administered, or received by those outside the Church; that members, in their individual capacity, cannot administer or receive it. Nor can the Church authorize individuals to administer, or receive it. The body must act in its organic character in the use of it; and persons must be within the Church legitimately to enjoy it.

3. Baptists insist that they neither may, nor ought to, invite to the Supper any except persons converted, baptized, and walking orderly according to gospel rule. They believe the Church is bound to judge of the fitness of those admitted to its ordinances as well as those admitted to its membership. To invite, or permit persons to receive the Communion without conditions, is to allow the vile and the profane, the carnal and the impure, to drink, unworthily, the symbolic flesh and blood of Christ. For, the rule be allowed, to this extent will the abuse be sure

to go.

4. Baptists are firmly convinced, that, to maintain the purity and spirituality of the churches, it is absolutely needful to restrict the Communion to regenerated persons, baptized on a profession of faith, and walking orderly Christian lives in Church fellowship. To adopt any other rule, or allow any larger liberty, would break down the distinction between the Church and the world; would bring in carnal and unconverted membership, with which to overshadow the spiritual, and control the household of faith; would virtually transfer the Communion from the house of God to the temple of Belial. To keep the churches pure and unperverted, both as to their substance and their form.

5. Baptists give the following reasons in justification of their course in the following cases:

A. They do not invite Pedobaptists to their Communion, because they do not regard such persons as baptized; they having been only sprinkled. The fact that they think themselves baptized, does not make it so. If they desire to commune, let them be baptized according to Christ's command.

B. They do not accept invitations from Pedobaptists to commune with them, for the same reason; they do not consider them baptized Christians. Therefore their churches are irregular churches according to the New Testament standard, both in the misuse of the ordinances, and in the admission of infant Church membership. Therefore to commune with them would be disorderly walking, and would encourage them in disorderly walking, by upholding a perversion of the ordinances.

C. They do not invite the immersed members of Pedobaptists churches to their Communion, because, though such persons may be truly converted and properly baptized, they are walking disorderly as disciples, by remaining in churches which hold and practice serious errors as to the ordinances, as such persons themselves judge. These churches use sprinkling for baptism, and administer the ordinance of infants; both of which are contrary to Scripture, as such persons themselves allow. And yet, by remaining in these churches, they give their countenance and support to uphold and perpetuate what they confess to be errors, and thus help to impose on others what they will not accept for themselves. This is not an orderly and consistent course for Christian to pursue.

Baptism Is Prerequisite

If the Supper was intended to be limited to those converted, baptized, and brought into fellowship of the churches, it may be asked, Why was not this fact made plain and explicitly stated in some command or

precept of Christ or His Apostles? Why was not his command as positively given as that which enjoined baptism? The reply must be, It was plainly and explicitly enjoined. The form of the ordinance was exhibited when instituted by Jesus; the command enjoined its observance was, "This do, in remembrance of me." The qualified subjects were those before Him, baptized believers. But not the following considerations.

1. The example of our Saviour at the institution of the Supper. Whom did He invite to partake of the symbols of His body and blood? Not an indiscriminate company; not all who deemed themselves fit, and chose to come; not all of His professed disciples even. But a small and very select company, who had received John's baptism, or His own, not including His own mother, brethren, and other family connections. That first Communion service, at the close of, or during the paschal supper, was a very strict one. Certainly no unbaptized person were present in that upper chamber to receive the elements.

2. The language of Christ in the Great Commission, and other similar forms of speech, if not conclusive proof, are very short of it, in favor of the necessary priority of baptism to the Supper. He commanded to teach all nations, baptizing them; His promise is to those who believe and are baptized. This order is uniform; teaching, believing, baptizing, and thus being "added to the Church." There is no room for it before. But if it comes before, then where is before? Before the teaching, and before the believing? Why not? If the divine order is to be changed, then why not have the Supper come before the teaching and believing, and be given, as Pedobaptists give baptism, to infants incapable of either instruction or faith. Infant communion, as practiced from the third to the ninth century by the Latin Church, and still practiced by the Greek Church, is equally scriptural with infant baptism, as now practiced by all Pedobaptists, whether Catholic or Protestants. Nor would infant communion after baptism be any more inconsistent than adult communion before baptism.

3. The New Testament history affords no instance which can be supposed to favor the theory of communion without baptism. But abundant evidence is furnished, in facts and circumstances mentioned, to show that all communicants were baptized persons. Apostolic instruction, with reference to the Supper and reproofs administered for an abuse of that sacred ordinance, all are addressed to churches and Church members. Those who believed, and gladly received the Word, were baptized, then added to the Church; then they continued steadfast on the Apostles' doctrine, and in the breaking of bread, and prayer.

4. The almost unvarying testimony of Christian

history through all its ages should be accepted as important evidence in this case. Both Catholics and Protestants, Baptists and Pedobaptists, with singular unanimity, declare baptism to be prerequisite to the Communion.

Justin Martyr, one of the early Christian Fathers, about A. D. 140, says of the Supper:

"This food is called by us the Eucharist, of which it is not lawful for any one to partake, but such as believe the things taught by us to be true, and have been baptized."

Mosheim, in his Church History, says:

"Neither those doing penance, nor those not yet baptized, were allowed to be present at the celebration of this ordinance." "The sacred mystery of the service was deemed so great as to exclude the unbaptized from the place."

Neander, the great Church historian, says:

"At this celebration, as may be easily concluded, no one could be present who was not a member of the Christian Church, and incorporated into it by the rite of baptism."

Cave, one of the most reliable writers on Christian antiquities, says the communicants in the primitive Church were those

"That had embraced the doctrine of the Gospel, and had been baptized into the faith of Christ. For, looking upon the Lord's Supper as the highest and most solemn act of religion, they thought they could never take care enough in dispensing it."

Bingham, in his able work on the antiquities of the Christian Church, says of the early Christians:

"As soon as a man was baptized he was communicated," that is, admitted to the Communion. Baptism, therefore preceded the Supper.

Wall, who searched the records of antiquities for facts illustrating the history of the ordinance, says:

"No Church ever gave the Communion to any before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the Communion before he was baptized."

Doddridge says:

"It is certain that, so far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity reaches, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper."

Baxter says,

"What man dares go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath full consent of both? Yet they that will admit members into the visible Church without baptism do so."

Dick says:

"An uncircumcised man was not permitted to eat
(The Lord's Supper continued on page 12)

THE SCRIPTURAL WAY THE STORY OF THE BAPTISTS

By B. Bogard, 1945

The Bible is the all sufficient rule of faith and practice and is as much a rule of practice as it is of faith.

The commission given by our Master in Matt. 28:19-20, commands the church to "teach all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The specification of one thing in law is the prohibition of everything else. Since what the church is to teach is specified, viz., "all things whatsoever I have commanded," it follows that all things not commanded are forbidden. It follows that the church is shut up to the things commanded. There is therefore no place for the exercise of private opinion except it be in our effort to understand the things commanded. Any doctrine or institution that is outside of the purview of the Scriptures is wrong. In 2 Tim. 3:16-17 we read: "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

If this is true, and to dispute it is to contradict the words of inspiration, it follows that we are "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Then we do not need to invent plans for work, since we can learn all about it in the Scriptures for "the man of God is thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

From these passages we are compelled to conclude that there must be a "thus saith the Lord" for all we do. We dare not organize a church, a school, a board, a committee, an evangelistic movement, or anything else without a "thus saith the Lord," because the Scriptures "thoroughly furnish is unto all good works," and we are to "observe all things whatsoever the Master has commanded," no more no less.

By the Scriptures, the all sufficient rule of faith and practice, must every doctrine and every truth be tried. If it be allowed that reason or sanctified common sense shall determine in matters of faith and practice, it shall still be an open question as to whose reason and whose sanctified common sense shall make the decision. If reason or common sense shall be the rule of any part of faith and practice then it is certain that we shall see division, contention, and strife. Let the Bible be the rule of faith and practice and our only difficulty shall be understanding our

By Richard Cook, 1887

It is not known at what period the gospel was introduced into Great Britain. It is certain, however, that Christianity was carried into England at a very early period, probably as early as the close of the first, or beginning of the second century, and as far as baptism is concerned it must have been at that time scriptural. The "Nonconformists," an English paper, says, "In England there can be no doubt that Baptists existed so early as the third century. We are warranted in saying that the early British Christians held the distinctive principles of Baptists. Austin, in Canterbury, in the sixth century, had great trouble with a colony of Baptist, in Wales, and used such repressive measures against them as to load his name with infamy. Toward the close of the seventh century, 692, Ina enacted a law, that all children should be baptized within thirty days of their birth, thus indicating that Baptist ideas largely prevailed." Infant baptism was introduced into Britain at an early date, but immersion was the prevailing mode, from the first until the Reformation.

Mr. Spurgeon has expressed himself upon English Baptist history. He says, "It would not be impossible to show that the first Christians who dealt in this land were of the same faith and order as the churches now called Baptist. All along our history from Henry II to Henry VIII, there are traces of the Anabaptists, who are usually mentioned either in connection with the Lollards or as coming to Holland." □

rule.

The primary difference between Baptist and Roman Catholics is that Baptists contend that the Scriptures are the all sufficient rule of faith and practice, while Catholics deny this and claim that reason, or sanctified common sense, of the church should be the rule of faith and practice.

If Baptists forsake this cardinal and fundamental principle, it shall not be long until they shall cease to be Baptist. They shall be at sea without chart or compass. □