

THE

Seven

Baptist

Pillars.

GEIGER.

[2021 Reprint]

d'Antignac 2^o



Very Truly,
W. L. Geiger.

THE SEVEN
BAPTIST PILLARS;

BEING

SEVEN SERMONS
ON THE SEVEN PECU-
LIARITIES OF THE BAPTIST DE-
NOMINATION. TO WHICH ARE ADDED
TWO OTHERS—ONE ON “BAPTIST
HISTORY,” AND ONE ON
“FEET-WASHING.”

BY

W. L. GEIGER.



ST. LOUIS MO.,
C. R. BARNS PUBLISHING CO.,
1888.

[Reprinted by Bryant Knight, 2021]

PREFACE

The following sermons on the *Seven Baptist Pillars* were originally delivered from notes, to the congregations to whom the writer was preaching in the early part of 1887, in Berrien County, Georgia. Churches in other counties requested that they should be repeated for their benefit; and by special arrangement the same sermons were delivered to a half-dozen different congregations in Eastern Georgia.

The writer, at first, had no expectation of writing the sermons, or of attempting to prepare them for the press; but by the urgent solicitations of quite a number of brethren and friends he was led to consider the propriety of such a course.

He was deterred, *first*, on account of the lack of time for the proper execution of the work, having to do writing at intervals between pastoral work and other duties equally incumbent upon him. *Secondly*, he felt his inability to attempt a work of such magnitude. The *Seven Baptist Pillars* occupied a field before

unexplored, so far as was known, by the people for whom they were prepared; and he felt that a better-informed head and a more experienced hand should undertake so great and responsible a work, for a people, especially, who were partially ignorant of the great characteristics of the Baptist denomination. The people however, from the various congregations to whom he had delivered the sermons, still urged him to the work; so that, after due reflection and earnest prayer, he consented to attempt it.

He considered that the large majority of the Baptists in Eastern and Southern Georgia are not well informed concerning the peculiarities of the Baptist denomination, and do not properly appreciate the church to which they belong, but look upon it merely as having *equal* claims with other denominations, to be *a church* of Christ. These Baptists have no well-selected libraries, read but few, if any, denominational papers, and seldom see a standard Baptist book. Nearly all they know about the Baptists is that they believe "immersion is baptism" and advocate "close communion;" while but few can give

any reasons for these practices. While their ministers are good, pious men, many of them do not take the pains to prepare themselves to instruct their people upon the great principles underlying the Baptist faith and practice. Such being the case, the writer believes that if the *Seven Baptist Pillars* are put in a cheap form, by a man whose name is extensively known among those people, they will read them, and perhaps be benefitted by them; while such a production may be the means of opening the way for larger and more useful works on similar subjects. From these considerations he consented, though reluctantly, to undertake the work, but with what success the reader must be the judge.

The book has not been written for the eye of the critic, before whom the very heavens are unclean, but for the searcher after truth. There is some repetition, which seems unavoidable, but which may add to the plainness of the style. No attempt has been made at learning, but the most simple words and expressions at the writer's control have been used to convey the thoughts intended.

No harsh or abusive epithets have been employed in speaking of other religious organizations, the writer being willing for all to enjoy liberty of conscience. When reference has been made to others, it has been done with all due respect; and in every instance the writer has labored not to misrepresent any.

To the *Seven Baptist Pillars* have been added, by special request, two other discourses by the same writer—one on “Baptist History,” and one on “Feet Washing,”—which were delivered after the series on the *Pillars* was closed.

The book goes forth with an earnest prayer that it may be the means, in the hands of God, of teaching Baptists some of the reasons why we entertain, as a people, the peculiar characteristics of our denomination, and of showing Pedobaptists and others the *Seven Baptist Pillars* by which we have, as a denomination, been characterized for more than eighteen centuries. If the book is blessed to the good of others, none will rejoice more than

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

“*Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars.*”—Prov. 9: 1.

The institution we denominate the Church of Christ is known in the Holy Scriptures by different names, such as, “A Vineyard,” “The Bride,” “The Lamb’s Wife,” “God’s Building,” “God’s Husbandry,” “The Kingdom,” “The Kingdom of Christ,” “The Kingdom of Heaven,” “The Kingdom of God,” etc. In the text it is called a house. “*Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars.*”

We think these *seven pillars* have reference to the seven peculiarities of the Church of Christ, which is not like any human institution, but which has God for its builder, and which has certain peculiarities, he has given it, by which it may be known wherever found. These peculiarities are the *seven pillars* hewn out, not by finite man, but by Infinite Wisdom. No human institution is characterized by them. They are the peculiarities of the building Wisdom hath erected.

We do not claim that no human institution possesses any of the marks of Christ’s Church, but we do claim that it is founded upon *seven pillars* peculiar to itself—pillars upon which no other organization is founded.

It shall be our work, in the seven sermons that follow, to consider these seven pillars in the light of the Scriptures; to ascertain if, indeed, Wisdom hath built

her house, and hewn out, by her own hand, the seven peculiar *pillars* upon which the grand and majestic structure rests.

The following are these *pillars*:

1st. *Jesus the Christ is founder and head of his Church.*

2d. *The Bible is the only rule of faith and practice, in all matters of religion, for the members of his Church.*

3rd. *The Bible order of the commandments must be observed:—Repentance, Faith, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper.*

4th. *The immersion of believers in the image of Christ's burial and resurrection, the only Scriptural baptism.*

5th. *Equal rights and privileges in the execution of the laws of the kingdom by all the members.*

6th. *The Lord's Supper strictly a church ordinance.*

7th. *Liberty of conscience for the world,—never to persecute, but always to have been persecuted, and "everywhere spoken against."*

We claim the above to be the "Seven Pillars" peculiar to the Church of Christ. They cannot be found in any other organization, therefore are peculiar to this church. Wherever these *pillars* are found, there, resting upon them, is the Church of Christ. No building to which these *pillars* are not peculiar, can lay any just claim to be called the Church of Christ.

We will now proceed to a scriptural examination of these *pillars*, and see if we can recognize them as the foundation upon which any of the existing religious denominations rest.

FIRST PILLAR.

JESUS THE CHRIST IS FOUNDER AND HEAD OF HIS CHURCH.

“I will build my church.”—Math. 16: 18.

The statement of this pillar naturally divides the subject into two propositions:

I. JESUS THE CHRIST IS FOUNDER OF HIS CHURCH

II. JESUS THE CHRIST IS HEAD OF HIS CHURCH.

We will proceed at once to discuss these two propositions in the light of God’s word.

I. “JESUS THE CHRIST IS FOUNDER OF HIS CHURCH.”

What is meant by the expression *Founder* of his church?

We often speak of the *founder* of an institution—the founder of a school, of a college, or of a seminary. What is meant by this expression? The *founder* of an institution defrays the expenses of establishing the institution. He gives the rules, the laws for its government. This is what Jesus the Christ did. He says in the text; “I will build my church.” I will be its *founder*; I will give all the rules and laws for its government; I will give all the necessary ordinances; I will make provision for the officers necessary for its well-being; I will defray all the expenses.

Jesus the Christ thus founded or built the church.

Let us see what the Bible teaches upon this subject. Now, if you will open your Bibles at Daniel, second chapter, you will see that Nebuchadnezzar “dreamed dreams wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his

sleep brake from him.” He called the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, to show the king his dreams,” but they could neither reproduce the forgotten dreams, nor tell the interpretation thereof. Daniel, the Israelitish captive, “went in and desired of the king that he would give him time, and that he would show the king the interpretation.” Daniel with his companions spent a season in prayer that God would show him the king’s dreams and the interpretation. God was merciful, and revealed the secret “unto Daniel in a night vision.” Now please refer to the 31st verse, and you will see that God had shown to Daniel the king’s vision, which the king had forgotten; but which he remembered when reproduced by Daniel. Surely if God showed Daniel the vision, he showed him the correct interpretation.

Daniel said to Nebuchadnezzar: “Thou art this head of gold.” “After thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.” This kingdom shall be divided, “and it shall be partly strong and partly broken,” for “they shall not cleave one to another.”

Now examine the 44th verse, which is a prophecy concerning the founding of the “kingdom of God.” “And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.”

Here God declares, through Daniel, that he will “set up a kingdom.” In our text Jesus says: “I will build my church.” God says his kingdom “shall never

be destroyed.” Jesus says, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” These two references are sufficient to establish the first proposition in our pillar, that Jesus the Christ, is the founder of his church or kingdom. If *he set up the kingdom*, if *he built the church*, most certainly he is its founder. But let us now proceed to remark:

1st. *Jesus the Christ did not found his church, or set up his kingdom, by proxy, but it was the work of his own hands.*

This is proven by Daniel, 2: 45, “The stone was cut out of the mountain without hands,” It was the work of God. “*I will build my church.*” It was not left to another; God did the work himself.

Suppose a minister has in his possession credentials, furnished him by a presbytery, thoroughly authorizing him to act in behalf of the church. These credentials authorize him to constitute churches and administer the ordinances. Now suppose that for immorality or heresy he should be expelled from his church; would he not thereby forfeit all his rights and claims as a minister and also as a church member? Suppose now, after his excommunication, he should have a number of followers, and he should organize them into a religious organization, and call it a church; whose name should that church bear? Should it be called the church of Christ, or should it bear his name? Verily it should bear the name of its founder, and not of another.

Suppose, again, *before* he is excommunicated, he should obtain a following, and organize upon different principles, and with a different government and different ordinances from those of the church from which he received his credentials; would it not

be *his* church, instead of Christ's church? Would *he* not be the *founder*, instead of Jesus the Christ? God says his kingdom "shall not be left to other people."

The Bible does not tell us that God authorized Abraham, Isaac or Jacob to found his kingdom! Nay, verily, we find no church of Christ in the Abrahamic covenant, in the seal of circumcision, or in any of the types and shadows of the Old Testament dispensation. These only pointed to the reality which began to be fulfilled when Jesus said: "*I will build my church.*"

Mohammed established an organization. He devised rules, rites, ceremonies and laws for its government. But it was not *Christ's* church; it was Mohammed's church; for he was its *founder*.

The dignitaries of Rome brought about changes and corruptions in the then existing Christian organization, which made the organization altogether different from what it was before; and when they had departed from the laws, government and principles of the original organization, and had introduced new rites and ceremonies, and a new class of membership, and a new method of initiation, the institution was different from the original. It was not the *church of Christ*, but the *church of Rome*.

King Henry VIII produced Episcopacy; John Calvin, Presbyterianism; Martin Luther, Lutheranism; John Wesley, Methodism; Benjamin Randall, Free-willism; Joe Smith, Mormonism; Alex. Campbell, Campbellism; James Osborne, Jordan Smith and others, Anti-Missionism. These different organizations still exist. They all had their origin at too late a date to bear the name of the church of Christ. They are the churches of their respective *founders*,

and not the churches of Christ. Jesus the Christ founded *his own* church. He never called upon mortal man, inspired or uninspired, to consult with Him or to aid Him in the great work of founding His church. "*I will build my church.*"

2d. *The work of Jesus the Christ in founding his church was not instantaneous but gradual.*

Moses, the law-giver to national Israel, fasted forty days before he began the work of giving the laws for the government of the people. So Jesus the Christ fasted forty days before he began to give those laws, rites, ceremonies and ordinances, that were necessary for the foundation of his church. This work, which began after a forty days' fasting, ended after the institution of his Supper. During this time he gave every rule, law, precept, example, rite, ceremony and ordinance that would ever be necessary for the well-being of his church; so there would be no need of diminution, augmentation or change in anything pertaining to the kingdom of God. "*Wisdom builded her house*"—she made it *complete*; and everything pertaining to it so plain, clear, and so easily understood, that "the way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein." (Isa. 35: 8).

After Jesus had finished the work of giving the laws, rites, etc., of his kingdom, he called unto him his Apostles, who constituted the only organized body then in his kingdom, and said: "I appoint *unto you a kingdom*, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke, 22 : 29, 30.) The work was now complete. He turned it over to the organized body in His kingdom, as the Father had turned it

over to Him. He did not tell them that it was not complete. He did not say: "It will need additions, diminutions or changes." The plain inference is, it is *complete*. All is done in the founding of it, that is necessary; now I turn it over to you; *the organized body*, "that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

We dedicate our houses of worship when completed. After the temple was finished, Solomon offered the prayer of dedication. So Jesus, after he had completed the kingdom, offered his solemn dedicating prayer, as given by John, 17th chapter. In that prayer (verse 4th) he says to the Father: "I have finished the work thou gavest me to do." At a later hour he said: "It is finished, and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost." (John, 19:30.) What more is necessary? Jesus founded his church—he established his kingdom. He finished the work the Father gave him to do. He established its government, its laws, its ordinances; paid the whole debt! cancelled the entire bond! It was all done by him, and at his own expense. Hence he is the *founder* of his church.

II. JESUS THE CHRIST IS HEAD OF HIS CHURCH.

It is not reasonable to suppose that, if Jesus the Christ founded his church, he would have any earthly head over it.

If he had placed over it a Pope, a College of Bishops, or an Ecclesiastical Council, he would have given plain instruction for their appointment, government, and such limitations of their power as might be necessary. But not a word of the kind is found in the Bible! On the contrary, the Bible teaches that Jesus the Christ is *head* as well as

founder of his church. Let us now spend a short time in the examination of this proposition.

1st. *The churches of Christ have been called the "acephalous."*

This is a fact well known by every student of ecclesiastical history. Why were they long years ago called by this name?

The word means *headless; without a chief*. The churches of Christ were so called because they had no human head—no chief, who should have discipline and government over them. They were acephalous—without a human head, chief or ruler. The wise man doubtless has the same great truth in his mind, when he says: "The locusts have no king, yet go they forth all of them by bands." (Prov. 30:27.)

2d. *God teaches us in various places in the bible, to recognize Jesus as the head.*

A vast multitude had assembled near the river Jordan, in the wilderness of Judea, to hear the preaching of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ. "Then went out to hear him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan." Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him, and the Harbinger took him into the river and baptized him. After which the voice of God, the Father, was heard, to the astonishment of the immense concourse, proclaiming in thunder tones, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," (Math. 3:17.) God recognized Jesus as his beloved Son; which teaches us that we are to recognize him as the Son of God, and as such, the head of the church.

On a certain occasion Jesus took Peter and James

and John into a high mountain, apart, and was transfigured before them. The three apostles saw Elias and Moses talking with Jesus. Peter, being disposed to be dictatorial, and thinking he would be permitted, at least, the privilege of making a suggestion to the Savior, said: "Master, it is good for us to be here; and let us make three tabernacles: one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias; not knowing what he said. *While he thus spake* there came a cloud, and overshadowed them. And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, *hear him.*" (Luke 9:35.) Peter was silenced, and we have no more suggestions from him. The Father declared Jesus shall be heard, not Peter. Jesus alone is the head. No one else is permitted to dictate or suggest.

How much is it to be deplored, that others, who have taken the headship of the church, have not acquired the lesson Peter learned on the memorable night of the transfiguration!

3d.—*The inspired Apostle, Paul, was a strong believer in the doctrine, that Jesus the Christ is the Head of the Church.*

In writing to the church at Ephesus he says: "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be *head* over all things to the church which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." (Eph. 1 : 22, 23.) Again, "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, *which is the head, even Christ.* From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph.4:15,16.) In these quotations Paul plainly teaches us that the church is *the body* and Christ *the head*.

“For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and *for him*; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.” (Col. 1 : 16, 17, 18.) Jesus the Christ is *head* of the *church*, which is *his body*, The Father hath “given him power over all flesh” (John 17 : 2), in order “that in all things he might have the preeminence.”

We might call your attention to other passages equally pointed in teaching that Christ is the head of the church his body, but these must suffice for the present.

4th. *The church being recognized as the body of Christ, it is preposterous to conclude it has a human head.*

The passages we have quoted, and many more, teach that the church, is the body of Christ. This being the case, it is contrary to reason to argue that the church has any human being, or any number of human beings, as its head. A Pope, King or Queen, Council, Presbytery, Synod, College of Bishops, or any other body, civil or ecclesiastical, cannot be the head of the church. If the church is the body of Christ, Christ himself must be the head of the church. We have shown that the first pillar is a scriptural characteristic of the church of Christ. The Bible teaches that Jesus the Christ is *founder* and *head* of his church.

“I love thy kingdom Lord,
 The house of thine abode,
 The church our blest Redeemer saved
 With his own precious blood.

I love thy church, O God,
Her walls before thee stand
Dear as the apple of thine eye,
And graven on thy hand.

For her my tears shall fall,
For her my prayers ascend,
To her my cares and toils be given,
Till toils and cares shall end.”

We wish, in conclusion, to show what Baptists believe and teach upon this subject. This we will do by referring to

SOME STANDARD AUTHORS.

It is a work of supererogation to collect testimony on this point; because all who have even a slight acquaintance with Baptist doctrine ought to know that it is a fundamental principle with Baptists to claim Jesus the Christ as the only founder and head. But as some are prone to pervert Baptist views, it may not be amiss to gather a few authorities upon this important point.

In the Philadelphia Confession of Faith it is said (*Rel. Denom. U.S. and G.B.*, p.51): “The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the Church, in whom, by the appointment of the Father, all power for the calling, institution, order or government of the church, is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner.” This is but the testimony of all of the Baptists in the world. The author of the Religious Encyclopedia testifies as follows on this point:

“They (Baptists) think that the Christian church, properly so called, was not visibly organized in the family of Abraham, nor in the wilderness of Sinai, but by the ministry of Christ himself, and of his

apostles; and that it was constituted of such, and of such only, as made a credible profession of repentance from sin, and faith in the Saviour." (*Rel., Ency.*, p. 188.) On the same subject the Baptist Manual, published by the American Baptist Publication Society, remarks: "We acknowledge no founder but Christ." Thus we find that the Baptists of the present day possess the Bible characteristic, that Jesus the Christ in person set up his own kingdom. (See "Baptist Succession," by D. B. Ray, pages 178 and 179.)

We claim that Baptists have the first *pillar* that characterizes the church of Christ. "Jesus the Christ is founder and head of his church."

May God help his children by grave divine to lay aside all prejudices, and all denominational selfishness, and receive the truth as it is taught in his holy word. AMEN.

SECOND PILLAR.

THE BIBLE IS THE ONLY RULE OF FAITH AND
PRACTICE IN ALL MATTERS OF RELIGION,
FOR THE MEMBERS OF HIS CHURCH.

“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.”
—II Tim. 3 : 6, 17.

All persons claiming to love the Christian religion admit the Bible to be a rule of faith and practice. But many do not admit that it is *the only* rule, for they have creeds, disciplines and confessions of faith as terms of union and communion, in addition to the Bible; and many of them entirely contrary to its precious teachings. We contend that the *Bible* alone is *the* perfect rule by which God’s people are to be governed, both in their faith and practice; that we have no right to take from or add too its rules, laws or ordinances; but we are to take its teachings as we find them, whether or not they meet our approbation. That we have no right in preparing, as articles of faith, or rules of conduct, any things not taught in the Bible. That the rules found in the Bible *are perfect*, and need no improvement. “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 thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*”

1st. *We argue that Jesus the Christ, being founder and head of the church, is the only one who has the right to give the laws for the government of his kingdom.*

Has the head of one nation the right to enact laws for the government of another? Have the citizens of a county the right to make laws, even for their own government? Suppose the parliament of England, by the sanction of the Queen, should enact laws for the government of the people of the United States, would the people of this Republic even respect those laws? Should Congress, by the sanction of the President of this nation, make laws for Mexico, would not Mexico regard it as an encroachment upon her rights and privileges? If a part of the people of this Republic should enact certain laws, contrary to the Constitution of the United States, and say that the people of the nation should be obedient to those laws, they would be denominated rebels and charged with treason against the government.

Jesus the Christ is *head* or law-maker for his kingdom; and no one, be his position what it may in a civil or ecclesiastical sense, has any right to make laws in Christ's stead. God says of Jesus the Christ: "And there was given him dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages *should serve him*. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." (Daniel, 7: 14.)

Jesus the Christ, then, has "a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." If they *serve* him they are not the law-makers but the servants. God says again: "The kingdom shall not be left to other people." (Daniel, 2 : 44.) If the kingdom is given to Jesus the Christ, that he should

be its *head*, he becomes the *law-maker*; and if it is not to be left to other people, he remains the head; and no one else has the right to make laws for the kingdom over which he is head; and if others assume to themselves that right, they are guilty of treason against the King.

God the Father commanded Jesus to be heard at the transfiguration. (Math. 17 : 5.) "*Hear ye him*" implies that he is the *law-making power*. Moses said to the children of Israel: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him *ye shall hearken.*" (Deut. 18: 15.) God says: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." (Deut. 18: 18.) That the prophet here promised is the Lord Jesus the Christ, is proven by what Stephen declares in his last address on earth: (Acts, 7:37, 38.) "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us." The prophet that God promised to raise up unto the Jews, of their brethren, like unto Moses, the law-giver in national Israel, was none other than the Christ of God. As national Israel was required to hear Moses, and to submit to the laws which God gave for its government, through him, without addition or change, so spiritual Israel is required to observe, without diminution, augmentation or change, the laws given by God, through Jesus the

Christ, for its faith and practice. "*Him shall ye hear.*" is a command from God that prohibits even a thought of a change. The command of high Heaven requires us to observe the law of Jesus the Christ, without augmentation, diminution or change.

Jesus the Christ being equal with God, yea, being God.(John 1: 1.) himself, he is the author of the Holy Scriptures, for "all scripture is given by inspiration of God." The scriptures are what is written in the Holy Bible; hence the Bible is the word of God, and the rule of faith and practice for the people. The Bible then, is the law of the great Law-Giver of spiritual Israel, the law by which God's people are to be governed.

The question may here arise, do not all God's people respect and obey the word of God as taught in the Holy Bible? We answer, they do not. God is pure, holy and wise, therefore cannot teach conflicting doctrines. The Bible does not contradict itself, but taken as one great whole, it is perfectly harmonious. The teachings of the religious world are conflicting. Antagonistic doctrines, antagonistic practices, prevail everywhere. All cannot be in accord with the laws of the great Law-Giver; therefore, all cannot be right. We are responsible for our *faith*, as well as for our practice. There is no need of difference. The law is so plain "that the wayfaring men, though fools, (very ignorant) shall not err therein."

But let us remark.

2d. *That very early in the Christian dispensation there was a departure from the principles of the kingdom.*

This departure is plainly foretold by Paul: "Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto

Him, to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand; let no man beguile you in any wise: for it shall not be, except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work; only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of his coming; even he whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power, and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be judged who believe not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.—(*New Version*, II Thess. 2 : 1-12.)

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall *depart from the faith*, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron.” (I Tim. 4 : 1, 2.)

“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their

own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.” (II Tim. 3: 1-4.) You perhaps are ready to say, that those described in this last quotation are vile, wicked persons, who have never made any pretensions to religion—have never joined the church. I admit they were vile and wicked people, but they had made pretensions to religion, and were members, too, of a corrupt church, headed by the man of sin, the son of perdition, “that sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God.” Hear what Paul says in the 5th verse: “*Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.*” This settles the question that they were religious pretenders, who had departed from the faith, “giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.”

In Revelations, 17th chapter, John saw in his vision the fulfillment of the prophecy of Paul which we have read. Please read that chapter carefully. John, who had lived several years after Paul had been taken to his eternal reward, saw the beginning of the fulfillment of the prophecies of Paul. While Paul was yet living, there was one that restrained the energy of the spirit of the anti-Christ (II Thess. 2:7); but now he having departed this life, that “man of sin” is beginning to be revealed; and John, discovering the fulfillment of Paul’s prophecy, says: “Little children, it is the last time; and as *ye have heard that antichrist shall come*, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if

they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.” (I John 2: 18, 19.) We see from these extracts from the letters of Paul and John, two inspired apostles, that there had crept into the church, unawares no doubt, some who were not right at heart, and were disposed to establish a different religion, governed by different laws, from that established by the blessed Son of God, taught by the Apostles and their successors, and believed and practiced by the regenerated that had been added to the churches.

The beginning of a religion which was a “compound of Judaism and Paganism with a seasoning of Christianity,” (*Cramp*, p. 35), now began; which resulted, in after years, in the full development of the “Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.” (Rev. 17 : 5.)

Had it not been for this departure from the principles of the kingdom, which brought all the corruptions that ever poisoned the true principles of the church of the living God, there would have been to this day, among God’s people, a strict adherence to the Bible as our only rule of faith and practice. But alas!

3rd. *This departure brought about other doctrines foreign to the Bible.*

Instead of teaching the true doctrines of the kingdom, those unregenerated men, like Saul of Tarsus, were “exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers” Gal. 1 : 14), “teaching for doctrines the *commandments of men.*” (Mark 7 : 7.) Thus the teachings of God’s word were violated, and men were led to believe for doctrines, things which Jesus never taught, but which were simply the commandments of finite, unregenerated men. Paul admonishes Titus to hold fast “the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he

may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.” (Titus 1: 9) “Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth” (Titus 1:14) “for there are many unruly and vain talker and deceivers.” (Titus 1: 10.)

Paul, in his epistle to the Colossians, addresses those not fully orthodox among them, thus: “If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why as though living in the world do ye subject yourselves to ordinances. Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using) after the precepts and doctrines of men. Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the severity of the flesh.” (*Revised Edition*, Col. 2: 20, 23.)

The apostle condemns our subjecting ourselves “to ordinances after the precepts and doctrines of men.’ They are dangerous; hence we are to “handle not, nor taste, nor touch” them, although they may “have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility.” “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrines; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears: And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” (II Tim. 4: 3, 4.)

The leaders of the departure from the true principles of Christianity found it necessary, in order to establish their new religion, to turn away from the solid truth of Jesus the Christ, and the faith and practice taught by him and his apostles, unto “fables” and “commandments” of men, that would be

congenial with the feelings and unchristian tastes of the unregenerated, whom they hoped to influence to turn from the truth as taught by Jesus. "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," (Rom. 8: 7); hence they turned their ears from the truth and turned them unto fables, that were presented, "having a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility," but devoid of the power of godliness. Thus it was that new laws, new doctrines, new ordinances and new ceremonies were instituted, and houses built, not by infinite Wisdom upon the "Seven Pillars," but by poor unregenerated, finite men, upon a foundation, other than "Christ and his apostles." This way not at all pleasing to the great Law-giver in Zion, for

4th. *God condemns those who despise or repudiate his laws.*

Some people entertain the idea that it makes no difference what an individual believes, so he is honest; or, that we are not responsible for our faith. It is argued by some that if our salvation depends upon a correct faith, then but few, if any, will be saved.

God says: "There is none other name given under heaven, among men, whereby we must be saved." (Act 4: 12.) We are saved through faith in Christ's name. Can we be saved by faith in Mohammed, or in Brigham Young, though we be ever so honest? God says, none other name but Christ's name. Our faith must be in the right object, and of the right kind, or it will do us no good.

Paul declares that when he was persecuting the church of God, "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." (Acts 26:9.) No doubt but Saul

of Tarsus was just as honest in his persecution as he was, after conversion, in preaching the Gospel. Did his honesty make the act a correct one? Was it right for Saul to persecute and try and destroy the church of Christ, because he *believed* it was right, and was *honest* in it? Neither does *our* honesty make *our* faith correct, or our actions which are based upon our faith. If our *faith* is correct, and we act out our convictions, our *actions* will be correct. If our faith is incorrect, our actions will also be incorrect; for our deeds are the fruits of our faith.

Uzzah loved God, and rejoiced that the Ark of the Covenant was being carried to Jerusalem. He walked by the side of the cart that contained it, so he might be near it. He knew it was wrong for him to touch it, not being a priest; for God's law forbade any one's touching the Ark except the priests. But the road was rough and the cart was jolting on "Nachon's threshing-floor," and Uzzah feared the Ark would fall off the cart and be broken. So he put forth his hand to the Ark of God, and took hold of it: for the oxen shook it." (II Samuel 6: 6.) "God smote him there for his error; and then he died by the Ark of God." (v. 7.) No doubt Uzzah believed he was doing right. He thought he ought to prevent the Ark from falling and being broken. He was *honest* in it. But his honesty did not make his faith, or the *act* which was the fruit of his faith, correct; and on account of that incorrect faith, and the incorrect action which grew out of it, "he died by the ark of God." God had Saul anointed king over his people. He had commanded Saul to "go and smite Amelek and utterly destroy all they have, and spare them not; but slay both men and women, infant and suckling, ox and

sheep, camel and ass.” (I Sam. 15: 3.) “But Saul and the people spared Agag and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them; but everything that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly.” (v. 9.) Saul no doubt thought he was doing the best. He honestly believed that it would be better to spare “the best of the sheep, and the oxen, to sacrifice unto the Lord.” (v. 15.) He *honestly* believed God would be pleased with the offering; and claimed: “*I have obeyed the voice of the Lord*, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amelek, and have utterly destroyed the Amekelites; but the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen to sacrifice unto the Lord.” (v. 20, 21.) Was the Lord pleased with Saul’s acts? Was his honest faith accepted of God? Did God love him because he honestly believed that it would be better for him to act as he did, than as God commanded? Was he justified because he honestly believed he had obeyed the voice of the Lord? Hear what Samuel said: “Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” (v. 22, 23.) God rejected Saul from being king, not because Saul was not honest in his faith and actions, but because his faith, the acts which grew out of his faith, were not correct.

“There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death.” (Prov. 14: 12.) What seemeth right unto us, is not always right in the sight of God. We are finite, but God is infinite. We often believe in erroneous doctrines, which seem right to us, “but the end thereof is death.”

God condemns those who despise or repudiate his laws. Paul, prophesying concerning the setting up of antichrist, and the change of the laws incident to that event, says: “And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” (II Thess. 2: 8.) “A man that hath set at nought Moses’ law dieth without compassion, on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much severer, punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace? For we know him who said: Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.” (*New V. Heb.* 10: 28, 30.) It is very clear, from Paul’s declaration here, that those who have “trodden under foot the Son of God” are those who have despised or repudiated the laws of Christ. Now, as those “who set at nought Moses’ law, died without confession,” who can calculate the fearful end of those who disobey the laws of Jesus the Christ? God condemns those who despise or repudiate his laws; it matters not what they believe, or how honest they are in this belief. Let us remark:

5th. *The Bible contains all that is necessary for us to believe and practice.*

If this proposition be true, then there is no need of any additions to the word of God. All the doctrines we are to believe respecting the religion of the Son of God are in the Bible. Every rule necessary to govern our actions as Christians is there. We have use for every word, phrase and sentence of God's word *no more*. It is complete within itself. It is all that is necessary as a rule of faith and practice for the members of his kingdom. To say the Bible does not contain all that is necessary for his people to believe or practice, is to say that God fell short of what he should have done in giving laws to his people. Jesus says: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak." (John 12: 48-50.) Now, if all is not spoken that is necessary for the well-being of his people, the Father failed to give it to the Son. We have no patience with those who deal in modern revelations. If you have dreams, we cannot believe that it is God speaking to you. God has already spoken all he wishes his people to know. To say God is revealing any part of his will in these latter days, is to say, he failed to reveal it during the days of revelation; that he has discovered something new, that he did not know then, and that he is showing it to his people in dreams and visions of the night. If you will learn God's will concerning yourself, or if you will learn his rules for your faith and practice,

you must learn them from the precious Bible, God's holy will to man. But what does our text say? "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." Then all scripture is *true*; for God cannot deal falsely. It is all perfect and complete, for God cannot do an imperfect or incomplete work. And it is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. Why has God given this complete set of rules? "That the man of God may be perfect." The scriptures make the man of God perfect. Does he need more? Does he want to be more than perfect? "Thoroughly furnished unto all good works." To sum it all up we have this: God has given us, in the inspired scriptures, a code of perfect rules covering every necessary ground, by which the man of God is made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work. Surely no more is necessary.

And to prove that God has given all that was necessary, and none too much, he forbids any diminution, augmentation or change, and pronounces a curse upon any who add to or take from his revealed word. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from things which are written in this book." (Rev. 22 : 18, 19; Prov. 30 : 6; Deut. 4: 2 ; 12 : 32.)

"How precious is the book divine,
By inspiration given!
Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine,
To guide our souls to heaven.

Its light descending from above,
Our gloomy world to cheer,

Displays a Saviour's boundless love,
And brings his glories near.

This lamp through all the tedious night
Of life shall guide our way;
Till we behold the clearer light,
Of an eternal day."

Having shown that the Second Pillar is a Bible characteristic, we wish now to show what Baptists believe and teach upon the subject, by referring to

SOME STANDARD AUTHORS.

"The question is frequently asked, what is the creed, and what are the acknowledged standards of the Baptist churches in this country? To this the general answer has ever been given. 'Our rule of faith and practice is the New Testament.' We have no authority to which we all profess submission." (*Prin. & Prac. of Baptists* p. 13.)

"It is important, however, that it should be well understood that nowhere do the churches of this denomination require subscription to this or any other human creed as a term of fellowship. They adhere rigidly to the New Testament as the sole standard of Christianity." (*Rel. Denom.* p. 49.)

"We believe the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried." (*Religious Encyclopedia*, p. 191.)

“We profess to take for our guide, in all matters of religious belief and practice, the New Testament, the whole New Testament, and nothing but the New Testament.” (*Prin. and Prac. of Baptists*, p. 85.)

“But have not the Baptists a Confession of Faith, which they regard as their standard of doctrine? No; *none except the Bible*. But they have at different times, in different countries, given expression to their views of Bible doctrine. And these expressions of Baptists sentiments have usually been called forth in order to correct the false and slanderous charges which have been heaped upon the persecuted Baptists.” (*Baptist Succession* p. 185.)

“One principle which has always been esteemed fundamental by us—*The Independency and Sovereignty of each church*—ought to have convinced any reflecting man, that a denominational creed, as a bond of union and communion, was wholly out of the question, and the charge that we had such, was a foul slander.” (*Western Baptist Review*, p. 135.)

These extracts are quite sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind that Baptists hold to the Second Pillar: “That the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice.”

May God help us to inquire for the truth. AMEN.

THIRD PILLAR.

THE BIBLE ORDER OF THE COMMANDMENTS—RE-
PENTANCE, FAITH, BAPTISM, LORD'S SUPPER—
MUST BE OBSERVED.

“Now I praise you brethren, that ye keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you.” I Cor. 11 : 2.

It is not our object in this discourse to discuss repentance, faith, baptism, or the Lord's Supper—to define these terms, and tell how they are to be observed,—but rather to give you the Bible *order* in the observance of them.

Jesus the Christ being the Founder and Head of the church, and the only Law-Giver in Zion, has the sole right of giving the order in which his commands should be observed; and we have no right to change it. It is our duty to observe the precise order given by the great Law-Giver in spiritual Israel.

The learned and inspired Apostle, Paul, praised the members of the church of Corinth because they kept the ordinances as he had delivered them. Those Christians observed the precise order which Paul had taught them. If he taught them that baptism came first, they practiced it first. If he taught them that the Lord's Supper came first, they observed it first. Or if he taught them that the divine order was—1st, Repentance; 2nd, Faith; 3rd, Baptism; and 4th, the Lord's Supper,—they observed that order. The order

he gave them, whatever that order might be, was the order observed by them, and the apostle praised them for it, evidently claiming that the church had no right to change the order.

To violate the order of a law, is the same as to repudiate the law itself, and to treat the law-giver with contempt. For the officers of a government to claim to enforce the laws of the government by inverting the order of those laws, would be to involve themselves in trouble by the violation of said order, and would result in the forfeiture of their offices.

If we change the order of the laws of Christ, we become rebels against his government, the same as if we were to repudiate any of them.

Now, let us ask, What is the order he requires us to observe? We answer that the order God has given is: 1st, Repentance; 2nd, Faith; 3rd, Baptism; 4th, The Lord's Supper. We will proceed at once to examine the Scriptures, and ascertain definitely the order he teaches.

I. REPENTANCE AND FAITH ARE NECESSARY IN EVERY SINNER IN ORDER TO PARDON.

Were I to preach to people who had not heard of the true God, and who knew nothing of the Bible, I would attempt to convince them that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of all who diligently seek him. I would try to prove to them that the Bible is God's word, and that they should believe and practice what it teaches. But when I come to preach to people who believe that "God is," and that the Bible is his word, I teach them that it is their duty to repent and believe the Gospel, in order to be pardoned of their sins. Hence we claim that:

1st. *An assent to the truth, or an intellectual faith, is a prerequisite to repentance and faith.*

Were I to interrogate all the members of this congregation, who have arrived to the age of accountability, with the inquiries—"Do you believe there is a God?" "Do you believe the Bible is God's word?" "Do you believe Jesus the Christ died for sinners?"—all who are not infidels would answer in the affirmative. Should I inquire again—"Why have you this faith, or upon what is your faith founded?"—I would get an answer something like this: "I believe these things because I have been taught to believe them, and I have no right to dispute them." This is a mere assent to the truth, and not a well-grounded faith. Were I to ask a small child who has studied Geography, "What is the shape of the earth?" I would get the answer, "The earth is round like an orange or ball." "Why do you say the earth is round?" "Because I have been taught so, or because my book says so." This is a mere assent to what has been heard, and not a faith based upon evidence. Were I to ask you, "Who was first President of the United States?" you would say, "Washington." "Why do you say that Washington was first President?" "Because history teaches that fact, and I have no right to dispute it." You see this is a mere assent to the truth, based upon what others say. Do you believe that there is a God, that the Bible is his word, and that Jesus the Christ is the Saviour of sinners? Yes, you believe all these. Why do you believe them? Because you have been taught these truths, and have no right to doubt them. This faith, possessed by the unpardoned sinner, is a mere assent to the truth—an intellectual faith that has

been produced by being taught these things. This faith, or assent to the truth, is necessary; but it, of itself, is not a sufficient channel through which a sinner may be saved by grace. (Eph. 2 : 8.)

All people in a gospel land, who are not skeptics, have this faith. "Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble." (James 2 : 19.) This mere assent to the truth is called a dead faith. "Faith without works is dead." (James 2 : 20.) This intellectual faith, however, is necessary, for without this assent to the truth we cannot come to God. "For he that cometh to God *must believe* that he is, and that he is a rewarder of those that diligently seek him." (Heb. 11 : 6.) The sinner must believe that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, before he can come to God. "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher, and how shall they preach except they be sent? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. 10 : 14, 15, 17.)

2d. *Those who have heard the word and possess this intellectual faith, or assent to the truth, that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him are exhorted to repent and come in possession of faith of the heart.*

When Paul visited Athens, that superstitious and idolatrous city, he preached to the people of the true and living God, reasoning from their own poets that "we are also his offspring." When the people were convinced that "God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," Paul, referring to their condition before they possessed this intellectual

faith, said: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at." But, referring to their condition after they had possessed this intellectual faith, he said: "But now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Repentance was commanded after the people assented to the proposition that there is a God.

This order of preaching was observed by John the Baptist. He said: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Math. 3 : 2.) "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Mark 1 : 4.) But the order is more fully observed in John's preaching in these words: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus." (Acts 19 : 4.)

These quotations are sufficient to teach us that John taught the Jews, who believe that God exists, that they should first repent, then believe. The same order was observed in the teaching of our Saviour. He began his ministry among the Jews, who believed that God exists.

Mark says: "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." (Mark 1 : 14, 15.) He taught the people first to repent, and secondly, to believe. Some time after this, Jesus, in conversation with the chief priests and elders of the people, reproved them because they did not repent and believe at the preaching of John, saying: "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward that

ye might believe him.” (Math. 21 : 32.) It appears from the language of Christ that repentance is a prerequisite to faith. “Repented not that ye might believe.” This is as much to say, you cannot believe until you repent.

Paul observed the same order in his preaching, both to Jews and Greeks. He said: “I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Acts 20 : 20, 21.) In every instance where repentance and faith are in the same connection, repentance is mentioned first, and faith follows as a consequence.

3d. *Faith which is a consequent of repentance, is faith of the heart and moves its possessor to action.*

The Spirit commanded Philip to join the Ethiopian eunuch, when on his way from Jerusalem, whither he had been to worship. The fact that the eunuch was reading the Prophet Esaias, is proof that he had assented to the truth that God exists, and the fact that he had been to Jerusalem to worship, is proof that he believed God is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him. He carefully read what the prophet said about Jesus, and earnestly desired instruction. Philip preaching to him Jesus. The eunuch believed and demanded baptism. Philip said to him, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.” (Acts 8: 37.) The eunuch, as we plainly infer, had repented, and was now in possession of faith of heart. “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the

heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” (Rom. 10 : 9, 10.) The eunuch repented for his sins, believed with his heart unto righteousness, and confessed with his mouth unto salvation. This faith of the heart works by love, (Gal. 5: 6) and purifies the heart (Acts 15: 9) and is the faith through which we are saved by grace. “For by grace are ye saved through faith.” (Eph. 2:8). The forgiveness of sins which produces peace with God is a consequence of the faith of the heart. “Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Rom. 5: 1). The faith of the heart is sometimes called “saving faith;” not that it saves us, but because it is the channel through which the grace of God, that does save, is received. “By grace are ye saved through faith.” It is also called “experimental faith,” because our experience of grace, or “reason of the hope” that is in us (I Peter, 3: 15,) is based upon that faith. It is a live, active faith. Intellectual faith does not affect the heart, and is dead, because it is not accompanied by works of righteousness, but faith of the heart is alive, for it is shown by good works. (James, 2: 18.) It is the “one faith” of the gospel. “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” (Eph. 4 : 5.) As there are many lords, but only one true Lord, and many baptisms, but only one true baptism; so there are many faiths, but only one true faith. This faith is produced by the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart. One office of the Holy spirit is to “reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.” (John 16 : 8.) God has chosen the preaching of the gospel as the means through which he operates upon the hearts of the children of

men by his Holy Spirit, in reproof or convincing them of sin, of righteousness and of judgment. When convinced of sin, they repent; when convinced of righteousness, they trust in the Saviour, or believe with the heart unto righteousness. Those who believe with the heart, or put their trust in Jesus, have repented, and all who have repented trust in Jesus, or believe with the heart; and full and free salvation by grace follows as a consequence.

II. BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER ARE CHRISTIAN ACTS FOLLOWING REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

By reference to the commission we will see the order appointed by the Saviour. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given me in heaven and in earth. 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: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Math 28 : 16, 18, 19, 20.) "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven," etc. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark 16 : 15, 16.)

From the commission as given by Matthew and Mark we learn, 1st, Jesus gave the command to the eleven disciples, who composed the only organized Christian body then on earth. These disciples in their organized capacity became the representatives of Christ's churches in after ages.

2d.—He commanded, first of all, to teach all nations or preach the gospel to every creature.

3d.—The people were expected, through that teaching, to become believers, and if believers they were saved by grace. (Eph. 2 : 8.)

4th.—After they became believers they were to be baptized.

5th.—They were then to be taught all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded.

6th.—Jesus promised to be with them in this work “even unto the end of the world.”

Here is given the very order for which we are contending. No baptism or Lord’s Supper commanded until after the people had been taught and become believers.

The Acts of the Apostles is a living comment upon the teachings of Christ. If we can learn how the Apostles observed Christ’s commands, we can know what Christ meant when he gave them. On the day of Pentecost the people repented and “gladly received his word” before they were baptized, and it was not until after their baptism that “they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” (Acts 2 : 42.) “Breaking of bread” evidently has reference to the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The order observed was: 1st, Peter preached, to or taught the people. 2nd, The Holy Spirit reprov’d them through Peter’s preaching. (2 : 37.) 3rd. They repented and believed (v. 38 and 41.) 4th. They were baptized. (2 : 41.) 5th. They observed the Lord’s Supper and other church privileges. (v. 42.)

In Samaria there were no baptisms until the people believed. “But when they believed, Philip preach-

ing the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” (Acts 8 : 12.)

Philip was very careful to have assurance that the eunuch possessed faith of the heart before he would baptize him. “If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.” (Acts 8 : 37.)

Saul of Tarsus was not baptized until the scales had fallen from his eyes, which did not occur until he had put his trust in Jesus. “There fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized.” (Acts 9 : 18.)

Peter did not baptize the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius until he had preached to them “that through his (Christ’s) name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins,” and the people had “received the Holy Ghost.” (Acts 10 : 43.)

Lydia and her household were not baptized until they were judged by the apostles “to be faithful to the Lord.” (Acts 16 : 15.) Her household were believers, for the apostles recognized them as brethren, and comforted them. (5 : 40.)

The Phillipian jailor and his household were all believers before they were baptized, and were enabled to rejoice, “believing in God.” (Acts 16 : 32.)

“Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.” (Acts 18 : 8.)

We have not found a single place in the Acts of the Apostles that teaches that any one was baptized before he professed faith in Christ. In every instance when baptism is mentioned, the same order that the Savior commanded is observed: Faith first; then baptism.

The Lord's Supper comes after baptism. Jesus and the apostles were baptized before its institution. The Saviour command the apostles to teach the churches to observe it as a church ordinance, and as no one could become a member of the church before baptism, no one could observe the Lord's Supper before baptism. The apostles were commanded to teach baptized believers to observe *all things* Jesus had previously taught in founding his church. He had taught them to observe his supper till his second coming; hence the Lord's Supper was one of the "all things" the apostles were to teach the churches to observe.

But enough here on this subject, as we expect to deliver a sermon in this series upon the subject of the Lord's Supper.

From what we have said, the conclusion is clear that the Bible order of the commandments is: Repentance, Faith, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and no individual or church has the right to change the order.

We propose now to ascertain what Baptists teach upon this "pillar" by examining

SOME STANDARD AUTHORS.

The right and only way of gathering churches according to Christ's appointment, (Math. 28 : 19, 20) is first, to teach or preach the gospel (Mark 16 : 16) to the sons and daughters of men; and then to baptize (that is, in *English*, to *dip*) in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, such only of them as profess repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (*Crosby's His. E. Bapt.*, Vol. II, page 81.)

The above is in a Confession of Faith presented by the English Baptists to Charles II, article eleventh

In the same Confession, article thirteenth, they say: "That it is the duty of such, who are constituted as aforesaid, to continue steadfastly in Christ's and the Apostles' doctrine, and assembling together in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and prayers." (Acts 2 : 42.) This Confession of Faith was signed by the London Baptists and approved by twenty thousand members. We are informed by Mr. Orchard, that in the time of King James I, the English Baptists "Held that repentance and faith must *precede* baptism; that the baptism of the Church of England and the Puritans was invalid, and that the true baptism was among them." (*Orchard*, Vol. II, p. 250.) "We deny sacramental power, maintaining that the soul is renewed and sanctified, not by any outward act performed upon us, or by us, but by the truth of the gospel and the grace of the Holy Spirit. We gather from the teachings of the apostles that a man should be a Christian before he avows himself to be one; and in full accordance, as we believe, with the institutions of the New Testament, we admit none to our fellowship without a profession of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Their baptism is at the same time a declaration of their sole reliance on the Saviour, and a symbol of their union with him in his death and resurrection—a spiritual, vital union. Our churches, so constituted, profess to be societies of believers, congregations of saints." (*Cramp*, p. 586.) "Those who actually profess repentance toward God and faith in, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance—baptism." (*Rel. Denom.*, p 203.)

"We have found that the Baptists preserve the Bible order of the commandments; they teach repent-

ance toward God, and faith towards the Lord Jesus Christ, the burial in baptism of believers, and the breaking of bread in the supper, by those in church fellowship.” (*Ray* 197.)

We deem it unnecessary to refer to other standard authors, to prove that Baptists believe and teach the Third Pillar, for regular Baptists have advocated this order of the commandments ever since their first church was organized in Jerusalem, more than eighteen hundred years ago. “Be it remembered that the Baptists are the only people who advocate the Bible order of the commandments.” (*Ray*, p. 195.)

May God help us search for the truth, and understand it as it is taught in his word.

FOURTH PILLAR.

THE IMMERSION OF BELIEVERS, IN THE IMAGE OF CHRIST'S BURIAL AND RESURRECTION, THE ONLY SCRIPTURAL BAPTISM.

Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” — Rom. 6 : 3-5.

I.—THE GREEK WORD EMPLOYED BY CHRIST TO DENOTE THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM SIGNIFIES IMMERSION.

Words are the signs of ideas. When we wish to advance an idea, if we do not select appropriate words there is danger of leading our hearers or readers astray.

In order to learn the meaning of words we should consult our dictionary. If we desire to ascertain the meaning of an English word we should consult English dictionaries; if we wish to learn the meaning of a Greek word we should consult dictionaries of the Greek language, etc. To-day we propose to discuss the subject of Baptism. In order to learn what baptism means we must go to standard lexicographers of the Greek language, because baptism is a Greek word. When King James' version of the Bible was being

made, the revisers did not translate the Greek word *bapto* or any of its derivatives, when they referred to the ordinance, but simply transferred them into English by giving them an English termination. Hence, the verb *baptizo* was transferred to English by merely changing the termination into *e*, which gives us in the authorized version *baptize*, where we have *baptizo* in the Greek. Now if we would learn the meaning of this Greek word we must consult *Greek*, not *English* dictionaries. Since the word has been Anglicized and adopted into our language, our dictionaries give the common meaning, as used by the masses of the people; and should the masses attach to it a different meaning from what it now has, the dictionaries would be revised since it is thought that words become proper by long usage.

The meaning the people have given this word, since it has been Anglicized, is not what we desire to know, but what the word meant in the Greek language, at the time it was used by the Saviour and his apostles to indicate the ordinance. Take for illustration "The Standard Family Dictionary," and you will find the verb *baptize* is defined, 'to christen.' Now what does "christen" mean? The dictionary says: "to baptize." Can we possibly learn from these definitions what act the Saviour enjoined upon us by the word he used to indicate the initiating ordinance into his church?

In every instance in the Bible where the ordinance is referred to, *baptizo*, or some of its *cognates*, is used by the inspired writer. Can we tell by consulting these dictionaries, whether the act is an *affusion*, an *immersion*, a *sprinkling*, or a *wetting*?

We can not tell, because it is not the business of the author of the dictionary to examine the word in its

origin, but simply to give a definition that will be accepted by the masses who use the word. If we would learn the meaning of *baptizo* with its *cognates*, as understood in the Greek language, to which those words belong, we must consult Greek lexicographers. And if it has a peculiar meaning attached to it when it is used to denote the ordinance to which we refer, we will be able to obtain that meaning by consulting Christian scholars, who have devoted years of study upon the Bible.

1st.—*Testimony of Scholars*.—Some years ago a very learned discussion upon baptism occurred in Lexington, Ky., between the celebrated Dr. N. L. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church, and A. Campbell, the founder of the Campbellites. In that discussion, Dr. Rice quoted from eleven Greek lexicons, and Mr. Campbell from six, in obtaining the definition of *bapto* and its derivatives, which quotations I have in my possession, and will now read in order that we may understand the meaning of those words in the Greek language:

Scapila gives “*Baptizo*—to dip or immerse; also to dye as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing them; also to plunge, submerge, to cover with water, etc.”

Hedoricus—“To dip, immerse, to cover with water.”

Stephanus—“To dip, to immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing; to merge, submerge, to cover with water.”

Schleusner—“To plunge, to immerse.”

Parkhurst—“To immerse in or wash with water.”

Robinson—“To immerse, to sink.”

Scrivlelius—“To baptize, to immerse.”

Groves—“To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge.”

Bretschneider—"Properly, often, to dip."

Suidas—"To sink, to plunge, to immerse."

Ware—"To wash, perform ablution, cleanse secondly, to immerse."

Greenfield—"To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink."

Of those eleven lexicons quoted by Dr. Rice, all except one, give immerse, or its equivalent, as the primary meaning of *baptizo*, and not one of them gives *sprinkle* or *pour* as a meaning. Mr. Campbell in the same discussion, quoted six lexicons upon the meaning of the word, with the following result:

Robertson's Thesaurus, defines it "to immerse, to wash."

Pason—"To dip, to immerse, to dye, because it is done by immersing."

Donegon—"To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge, to sink."

Jones—"Plunge, dip, baptize, bury, overwhelm."

Bass—"To dip, immerse, plunge into water. *Baptisma*, immersion, dipping."

Stokins—"To dip, to immerse in water."

To these we might add *Michælis*, *Schaff*, *Guido Fabricius*, *Schindler*, *Buxtorf*, *Paschal Auscher*, *Mikitar Vantabed's Armenian Dictionary*, *Encyclopedia Americana*, Article *Baptism*; *The Edinburg Encyclopedia*, *Kitto's Cyclopedia*, *Altstadius*, *Wilson's Christian Dictionary*, *Dr. Wm. Young's Dictionary*, *Bailey's Dictionary*, *Butherworth*, *John Ash's Dictionary*, *Brande's Encyclopedia of Science, Literature, and Art*,—all of which give immerse, or its equivalent as the primary meaning of the word *baptizo*, and none of them give affusion as a meaning. These thirty-four standard Lexicons and Encyclopedias, covering the whole field of Biblical literature, made by learned

scholars in different countries and in different ages, all agreeing that *baptizo* means to immerse; but never to *sprinkle* or *pour*, should satisfy any one, of the act the Saviour requires when he speaks of the initiating ordinance of his church.

These men were Greek scholars, and gave the meaning of a Greek word in English, irrespective of religious views, or prejudices. They wrote as scholars, and not as advocates of some religious dogma. The testimony of learned scholars of different nations and ages is united in giving this word the meaning for which we contend.

2d.—*Let us now consider the testimony of Christian scholars of Pedobaptist denominations, whose learning compelled them, contrary to their practice, to admit that "baptize" literally means "immerse."*

DR. GEORGE CAMPBELL, the eminent Presbyterian divine, of Scotland, and President of Marischal College, says in his note on Math. 3 : 11: "The word *baptizien*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse; and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitable to this meaning."

MARTIN LUTHER, the founder of the Lutheran Church, says: "The term baptism is a Greek word: it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*, when we immerse anything in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water), nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out

again, for the etymology of the word seems to require it.”

PROF. MOSES STEWART, D. D., of Andover, in his work on Baptism, (Nashville ed., p. 51), says: “*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into an liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note *are agreed in this.*”

CALVIN, the founder of Presbyterianism, says: “The word *baptize* signifies to *immerse*, and the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient Church.”

DR. CHALMERS, of Scotland, in his Notes on Rom. 6 : 4, says: “The *original meaning* of the word baptism is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet *we doubt not* that the prevalent style of administration in the apostles’ days was by *an actual submerging* of the *whole body* under water.” Dr. Chalmers, as a scholar, is compelled to admit that the Bible means *immerse* when it says *baptize*, yet as a Christian he regards it as a point of indifference whether he obeys the Bible or is sprinkled.

In COLEMAN’S “Ancient Christianity Exemplified,” p. 372, we have this: “The term *baptism* is derived from the Greek word *bapto*, from which term is formed *baptizo*, with its derivatives, *baptismos* and *baptisma*, baptism. The primary signification of the original is to dip, to plunge, immerse. The obvious import of the noun is immersion.”

MELANCTHON, the companion of Luther, in his Confession of Faith, written by him in 1551, and adopted by the Saxon churches, says: “Baptism is an entire action, to suit a dipping and a pronouncing the words. —I baptize,” etc.

CHRYSTOSTOM, born A. D. 347, and who became patriarch of Constantinople in 398, says: "To be baptized and to submerge, then to emerge, is a symbol of descent to the grave, and of ascent from it." (*Stuart on Bap.*, p. 147.)

These extracts, copied from "Bailey's Manual of Baptism," might be extended almost indefinitely, but we do not think it necessary to add the testimony of others at this time. Those from whom we have quoted are all leading Pedobaptists, and two of them, CALVIN and LUTHER, founders of churches. They all agree with the thirty-four standard lexicographers we have already quoted, that the primary meaning of the word *baptize* is to immerse, to dip, to plunge, to submerge, etc.; not a single one of them giving *sprinkling* or *pouring* as a meaning. In this DR. STEWART says: "All *lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed.*" All scholars, whether Catholics, Protestants, or infidels, unite in saying *bapto* and its derivatives never mean affusion or sprinkling, but should always be rendered by immerse or its equivalent. But lest some are not yet satisfied in regard to the meaning of the word, seeing there are so many who practice sprinkling and pouring, calling those acts baptism, we will

3d.—*Refer to the word in other places in the Bible, where it has no reference to the ordinances, and ascertain, if possible, in what sense it is used.*

The Old Testament was written originally in Hebrew, but about 270 or 280 years B. C , it was translated into Greek by seventy, or rather seventy-two, translators. From the number of translators employed, this version has been called the "Septuagint." The same Greek word used by our Savior to denote

baptism occurs several times in the Septuagint Old Testament. An examination of the passages containing this word, and seeing in what sense it was understood by the people of that day, may aid us in learning the meaning of the word.

DR. BARNES, a noted Presbyterian divine, says: "The Hebrew word (*tabal*), which, rendered by the (Greek) word baptize, occurs in the Old Testament in the following places:—Lev. 4 : 6; 14 : 6, 51 ; Num. 19 : 18; Ruth 2 : 14; Ex. 12 : 22; Deut. 33 : 24; Ezk. 23 : 15; Job 9 : 31; Lev. 9 : 9; I Sam. 9 : 27; II Kings 5 : 14; 8 : 15; Gen. 37 : 31; Joshua 3 : 15. It occurs in no other place, and from a careful examination of these passages, its meaning among the Jews is to be derived." ("Theodosia," Vol. I p. 42.) I wish now to refer to each of these fifteen passages, in our version, to ascertain how the Greek word *baptizo* is translated in the Old Testament. The first is Lev. 4 : 6. "And the priest shall *dip* his finger in blood." Lev. 14 : 6, "And *dip* them in the blood." Num. 19 : 18, "And a clean person shall take hyssop and *dip* it into the water." Ruth 2 : 14, "And Boaz said unto her at meal time, come thou hither, and eat of the bread, and *dip* the morsel in the vinegar." Exodus 12 : 22, "And ye shall take the bunch of hyssop and *dip* it in the blood." Deut. 33 : 24, "And let him *dip* his foot in oil." Ezek. 23 : 15, "Exceeding in *dyed* attire." Job 9 : 31, "Yet shalt thou *plunge* me in the ditch." Lev. 9 : 9, "And he *dipped* his finger in the blood." I Sam. 14 : 27, "And *dipped* it in the honey comb." II Kings 8 : 16, "And *dipped* it in the water." Josh. 3 : 15, "The feet of the priest that bare the ark were *dipped* in the brim of the Jordan." II Kings 5 : 14, "And he went down and *dipped* himself seven times in Jor-

dan." Gen. 37 : 31. "And they took Joseph's coat and *dipped* the coat in the blood." Dr. Barnes says the word occurs in no other place in the Old Testament. In all these fifteen passages it is translated, "dip," "plunge," or "dyed," (which is done by *dipping*) and not "sprinkle," or "pour," in a single instance.

"The passage in II Kings, 5 : 14, is very remarkable, since it corresponds precisely, in the Septuagint, to the text in Matthew. The Septuagint says of Naaman, "*Ebaptizato en to Jordane.*" Matthew says of the people baptized by John, "*Ebaptison en Jordane.*" Nobody has ever questioned the correctness of the translation in Kings, "He *dipped* himself in Jordan;" and had Matthew been translated by the same rule, it must have read, "they were *dipped* by John in Jordan." (Dayton, p. 47.) All seem perfectly willing that the word should be rendered "dip," or "immerse," in every place where it does not refer to the ordinance of the church; but where it has reference to the ordinance it is not translated at all, but merely transferred to our language; and many contend that it means "sprinkle" or "pour," as well as "immerse" or "dip." Whave seen that all scholars of any note are agreed that the word baptize does not mean sprinkle or pour, and that it is never thus translated in our version of the Bible.

The Greek language was perhaps even more copious in words of this sort than the English. It had a word to express almost every manner of using water. "Cheo" signifies to pour, "raino" means to sprinkle, "brecho" signifies to wet, that is, to apply water in any form, "lono" was used to signify a general washing, as by bathing; "nipto" a partial washing, as of the hands alone. "Bapto" and "baptizo" are just as

properly and as commonly rendered by dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, dye, etc., as “cheo” is by pour, “raino” by sprinkle, “lono” by a general washing, or “nipto” by a partial washing. Evidently our Saviour used such words as conveyed the precise idea he intended to convey. If he had meant *sprinkle* he would have said “raino” and not “bapto;” if he had intended the ordinance should be administered by *pouring* he would have used “cheo” or “eccheo;” if he meant to signify a general washing, as by bathing, “lono” was the word he should have used; if he had meant a partial washing, as the application of a little water to the forehead or some other part of the body, he would doubtless have used “nipto;” if he had meant a wetting in any way, whether by immersion, pouring or sprinkling, as it was contended by some, he would have used “brecho.” But as Jesus meant *immerse* or *dip*, he used “bapto” or “baptizo” in every instance where reference is made to the ordinance.

II.—THE CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED WITH THE BAPTISMS MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT NEVER CONDEMN THE IDEA OF IMMERSION, BUT GENERALLY FAVOR IT.

We notice, 1st, *John’s baptism*.

We are apprised that many, writing on the baptismal question, claim that John’s baptism was not “Christian baptism.” We do not know what they mean by the term “Christian baptism,” unless it be that he did not baptize under the gospel or Christian dispensation. With other arguments to prove that John’s was not Christian baptism, they claim that those baptized unto John’s baptism were re-baptized and refer as proof to Acts 19 : 5.

We do not think that any whom John baptized, or any who were baptized unto John's baptism after his death, were re-baptized. Those referred to in Acts 19: 5, were baptized unto John's baptism, probably by Apollos, who had been preaching in Ephesus, and who knew "only the baptism of John." Apollos, after preaching some time in Ephesus, and probably baptizing those that believed, went to Corinth. While he was in Corinth Paul came to Ephesus; "And finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts 19 : 1-5.) The text does not say they were *re*-baptized, or baptized *again*, and we do not believe they were. They had repented and believed, but had not been fully instructed in the way of the Lord. Apollos, their teacher, did not at the time of their baptism know the way of the Lord perfectly, and how could they know more than their teacher? Paul came and explained to them clearly the nature of John's baptism, and when they heard his explanation, they knew, "they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." If they had understood the nature of John's baptism, when Paul first asked the question, as they did after his explanation, they would not have said they were baptized "unto John's baptism," but "were baptized in the name of the Lord

Jesus.” Now, if John’s baptism had been so defective that it was necessary to *re-baptize* those who had been baptized unto his baptism, all of his disciples would have been *re-baptized*; and it would have been done not “in the name of the Lord Jesus,” which was probably the formula John used, but “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” which was the formula given by the Saviour. (Math. 28 : 19). Again, if they had been *re-baptized* in order for the reception of the Holy Spirit, that gift would have been received immediately after the baptism. (Acts 2 : 38.) But in this case Paul laid on his hands before they received the Holy Spirit. (v. 6.) Whether John’s be Christian baptism or not, is not the question that concerns us at this time. The act administered by John was the same act performed by others in baptism after John’s time; because the same word is used in every instance. In Math. 3 : 5, 6, we have this language: “Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him *in Jordan*.” If *baptized* according to the testimony of all scholars, they were *immersed*. It was *in Jordan*. We have often seen people go into a river for the purpose of immersion but never for the purpose of sprinkling or pouring. “And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan.” (Mark 1 : 5.) If possible, Mark is more explicit than Matthew. He says, “John baptized (*immersed*) in the river of Jordan.” The place was suitable for immersion, but not so suitable for sprinkling or pouring. And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salem because there was much water there.” (John 3 : 23.) It would have not required “much water” for sprinkling or pouring. All the places where John baptized

were suitable for immersion, and the act was an immersion, for the word used to denote it means *immersion*.

2d. *How was Jesus baptized?*

“Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him. And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water.” (Math. 3 : 13, 16.) “Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, etc.” (Mark 1 : 9, 10.) These accounts of the baptism of Jesus teach us, 1st, that Jesus went with John in the Jordan; 2d, John baptized (immersed) him; 3d, after the immersion Jesus came up straightway out of the water. If Jesus had been sprinkled or poured upon, the inspired penman would not have used the word “baptized” to denote the act, and it would not have been necessary for him to have gone “in the Jordan,” and “come up out of the water,” as the sprinkling or pouring could have been done on the dry land just as well.

3d. *We will notice the burials in baptism mentioned in the New Testament.*

“Therefore we are *buried with him by baptism* into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in the newness of life. For if we have been *planted* together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” (Rom. 6 : 4, 5.)

“Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” (Col. 2: 12.)

“Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they

then baptized for the dead?" (I Cor. 15 : 29.) I shall offer but little comment upon these plain declarations of God's word, but will give you instead, the testimony of several noted divines; some of whom were Pedobaptists, who lived in different ages of the Christian dispensation.

JUSTIN MARTYR, who flourished about A. D. 140 says: "We represent our Lord's suffering by baptism in a pool." (*Adkins*, p. 127.)

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, A. D. 200: "You were led to a bath as Christ was conveyed to the sepulchre, and were thrice immersed, to signify Christ's three days' burial." (*Adkins*, p. 127.)

ATHANASIUS, Bishop of Alexandria, A. D. 328: "To immerse a child three times in a bath or pool, and to *emerge* him; this shows the death and resurrection on the third day, of Christ." (*Stuart*, p. 148.)

GREGORY NYSSEN, born A. D. 328: "Coming into water, the kindred element of earth, we hide ourselves in it, as the Saviour did in the earth." (*Stuart*, p. 147.)

THEODORET, Bishop of Cyrrhus, A. D. 423, on Rom. 6 : 4. "Baptism is a type of our Lord's death." (*Adkins*, p. 128.)

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS, within the fourth century: "Immersion denotes dying with him, (Christ) emersion, a resurrection with Christ." (*Stuart*, p. 148.)

CHRYSOSTOM, born A. D. 347: "To be baptized and to *submerge*, then to *emerge*, is a symbol of *descent* to the grave, and of *ascent* from it. And therefore Paul calls baptism a burial when he says: We are therefore buried with him by baptism unto death. (*Stuart*, p. 147.)

JOHN DAMASCENUS, born at the end of the seventh century: "Baptism represents the death of our Lord. It is a type of his death,—the first baptism was the flood—the old man is entirely buried in water." (*Adkins*, p. 128.)

Thus we see, the early Christian writers interpreted baptism to be a burial and resurrection, and to symbolize Christ's burial and resurrection, also the burial and resurrection of our bodies.

Let us now examine what more modern writers say upon the meaning of these passages:

WM. TINDALE: "The plunging into the water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is in Adam. And the pulling out again signifieth that we rise again with Christ in a new life." (*Westlake*, p. 5.)

RICHARD BAXTER, author of the "Saint's Rest": "It is commonly confessed by us of the Anabaptists, as our commentators declare, that in the apostles' times the baptized were *dipped over head in the water*, and that this signified their profession both of the believing the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, and of their own present renouncing of the world and flesh, or of dying to sin, and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ, as the apostle expoundeth in the fore cited texts." (*Westlake*, ch. 5.)

WESTMINISTER ASSEMBLY of Divines, consisting of fifty eminent ministers, in Annotations on Rom. 6 : 4: "Buried with him in baptism. In this phrase the apostle seemeth to allude to the *ancient manner* of baptism, which was to *dip* the parties baptized, and as it were bury them under water." (*Judson*, p. 24.)

MARTIN LUTHER, founder of the Lutheran Church, "Baptism is a sign of both death and resurrection. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth express, and the mystery doth signify." (*Ut. Supra*, pp. 109, 110.)

JOHN WESLEY, the founder of the Methodist Church: "Buried with him—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." (Notes on Rom. 6:4.)

GEORGE WHITEFIELD, the great Methodist Evangelist: "It is certain that in the words of our text Rom. 6 : 4, there is an allusion to the manner of baptizing, which was by immersion." (*Pengilly*, p. 47.)

ADAM CLARKE, the great Methodist commentator on Rom. 6 : 4: "When he (the person baptized) came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life. He was therefore supposed to throw off his old Gentile state, as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments."

MACKNIGHT, the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly of Scotland in 1769: "In baptism the baptized person is buried under water, as one put to death with Christ on account of sin, in order that they may be strongly impressed with a sense of the malignity of sin, and excited to hate it as the greatest of evils." (*On Epist.*, Vol. I, p. 259.)

DR. WALL, a noted Episcopalian, and author of "Infant Baptism.": "St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a burial" (*Defense of Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, p. 131.)

SAMUEL CLARKE, on the passage, "We are buried with Christ by baptism," etc., says: "In the primi-

tive times the manner of baptism was by immersion or dipping the whole body in water. And this manner of doing it was a very significant emblem of the dying and the rising again, referred to by St. Paul in the above mentioned similitude.”

CONYBEARE and HOWSON, in the “Life and Epistles of Paul,” Vol. I, p. 429, say: “Baptism was immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water, to represent his death to sin, and then raised from this momentary burial, to represent his resurrection to a life of righteousness” Also on Rom. 6 : 4, “This passage cannot be understood unless it is borne in mind that the *primitive baptism was by immersion.*”

DODDRIDGE’S Family Expositor on Rom. 6 : 4: “Buried with him in baptism. It seems to me the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion.” Doddridge was more honest to confess the truth than many of his brethren of the present day.

ALBERT BARNES’ Notes on Rom. 6 : 4: “It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion.

WHITLY’S Commentary on the New Testament, note on Rom. 6 : 4: “It being so expressly declared here, Rom. 6 : 4, and Col. 2 : 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being *buried under water*; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death being taken hence, and this *immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and observed by our church, and the *change of it into sprinkling*, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the church, being that which the

Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of the clinici, or present danger of death.” (*Pengilly*, p. 47.)

We might continue these quotations from distinguished Pedobaptist writers almost indefinitely; for (says *Bailey*, p. 219): “It would be difficult to find any passage of scripture on which there has been a greater unanimity of views than on this. The recent efforts of Pedobaptists to pervert it from its proper meaning, because it is such positive proof that immersion was the baptism of Christ and his apostles, show how closely they have been pressed with the Papist argument. Paul says: “We are buried with him in baptism;” that is, he and all others who have been baptized. That was baptism as it was delivered to them by Jesus. That is what is meant by baptism. No mortal has a right to change the ordinances of God. It is our duty then to be “*buried in baptism.*” It is easy to see how we may be *buried* or *planted* by immersion, but is right difficult to see how either can be done by sprinkling or pouring. Then the same word is used here, that is used elsewhere to denote the ordinance, and “all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed” that *that* word means immerse.

4th. *We next notice the baptisms on the day of Pentecost.*

We would not refer to this circumstance, had we not learned that it is denied that so many could have been immersed in the time allotted for their baptism on the day of Pentecost. The inspired writer says “They that gladly received his word were baptized.” (Acts 2 : 41.) I believe every word of what is asserted

about it. If three thousand or ten thousand “gladly received his word,” that many were baptized (immersed); and should I deny it, I would be denying the word of inspiration, and would be an infidel. But let us briefly examine the passages referring to it. The word does not say three thousand were *baptized*, but it says: “And the same day there *added unto them* about three thousand souls.” (2 : 41.) Some of those added might have been previously baptized by John, or by the apostles, or the seventy disciples who had been sent out by Jesus to preach and baptize. None were baptized but those who “gladly received the word.” What number that was we are unable to say. But suppose we admit three thousand were baptized, was there any difficulty so far as time was concerned? Matthias had been elected to fill the place of Judas; so there were twelve apostles present. Jesus had sent out seventy disciples fully commissioned to baptize, who were probably present at this time. That made eighty-two administrators. But suppose they were not all present, and there were but seventy-five administrators, then they would have had but *forty* candidates to the administrator in order to have baptized *three thousand*. Now if we allow two minutes to the candidate, it would have taken but eighty minutes, or one hour and twenty minutes, for the seventy-five administrators to have baptized them. Surely they had quite time enough for the baptisms.

But was there water enough to baptize so many people? God says: “They that gladly received the word *were baptized*.” Therefore there was water enough. But what places of water were about Jerusalem? “In the temple were ten lavers of brass, each holding about ten barrels of water.” “The pool

of Bethesda” was near the temple, and covered more than an acre of ground. (John 5 : 2-4.) “The King’s Pool or Pool of Solomon.” (Neh. 2 : 4.) “The Pool of Siloam.” (John 9 : 7.) “The Old or the Upper Pool.” (II Kings 18 : 17). “The Pool of Hezekiah.” (II Kings 20 : 20.) “The lower Pool of Gihon.” (II Chron. 32: 3, 4, 30.) Also many smaller places of water. The Pool of Bethesda, with its five porches, would have furnished an ample supply of water for baptizing the people on the day of Pentecost, had there been no other watering places in the city.

But why do Pedobaptists say there was not time or water enough to baptize the people that were baptized on the day of Pentecost? Evidently to make the impression they were sprinkled. But it takes as much time to administer to sprinkling or pouring, if the formula is repeated for each candidate, as it does to baptize. But we are told that the people that were baptized on the day of Pentecost, and those that John baptized while preaching in the wilderness, were not sprinkled one at a time, but that the administrator used a bundle of hyssop, or something of that kind, and causing the people to pass “before him in ranks,” he sprinkled them while passing.

“The Jews in Jordan were baptized,—
Ergo ingenious John devised,
 A scoop, or squirt, or some such thing,
 With which some water he might fling
 Upon the long extended rank
 Of candidates that lined the bank:
 Be careful, John, some drops might fall
 From your rare instrument on all;
 But point your engine, ne’ertheless,
 To those who first their sins confess:

Let no revilers in the crowd
 The holy sprinkling be allowed.
 The Baptist had not *time*, we dream,
 To *dip* the people in the stream."

5th. *We will now notice the baptism of the Eunuch.*
Acts 8 : 32-40.

"And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," etc. (v. 38, 39.)

Three thoughts claim our attention: 1st. Both the administrator and the candidate "went down into the water." 2d. The administrator baptized (*immersed*) him. 3d. They both "came up out of the water." If Philip had *sprinkled* the eunuch, they would not have gone *into* the water, or came up *out* of it, because both acts would have been unnecessary, and the text would not have said "he *baptized* him," but "he *rant-ized* him.

6th. *We will now consider the baptism of the jailor.*
(Acts 16 : 29-35.)

It is claimed that the jailor was baptized in the prison, therefore could not have been immersed. The Bible says he was *baptized*, "and all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed" that baptize means *immerse*; therefore we feel sure he was immersed. But was the jailor baptized in the jail? All will admit that Paul and Silas were in the jail, when the earthquake came. "Then he (the jailor) called for a light, and sprang in." In where? In the jail where Paul and Silas were, "And brought them out." Out of what? The jail of course. "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to *all that were in his house.*" Then Paul and Silas were in the

jailor's house, "And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes: and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." It seems they left the jailor's house for this washing and baptized, for it was after they were baptized that the jailor brought Paul and Silas "into his house," a second time, "and set meat before them." So it is probably the baptizing was done neither in the jail or in the jailor's house. It makes but little difference, however, where it was done, since God says it was done. We know there was a sufficient quantity of water, because that is clearly implied in the word used by the inspired writer, *baptizo*.

In looking over the various places in the New Testament where baptism is mentioned, we find none that condemn the idea of immersion, while nearly all seem to favor it. We should always be disposed to take the *plainest* and most *simple* meaning of God's word. Like the negro slave who said: "The reason why so many negroes are Baptists, while their masters are Methodists, Presbyterians or 'Piscopalians, is, th negroes are not smart enough to *twist queer meanings* out of the Bible, but have to take it just as it reads.

We come now to consider

III.—WHEN, AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES POURING AND SPRINKLING WERE INTRODUCED

In every instance in the Bible where the ordinance is mentioned, the same word is used. That was plain word, understood by the masses of the people and practiced by all the churches in the same way. They all immersed for more than two hundred years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation and during all that time not a *single instance* of

sprinkling or pouring, in lieu of baptism, is upon record.

1st. *The first instance of affusion, in the place of baptism, was that of Novatian, in the third century after Christ.*

Upon this subject, A. C. Dayton, Vol. 1, p. 180, says: "It appears that a certain man by the name of Novatian, was taken sick and was apparently nigh unto death. In this condition he became, as many others have done, greatly alarmed about his condition; and, professing faith in Christ, desired to be baptized. But he was too weak to be taken out of bed, and put into the water. The water was, therefore, *poured around him in his bed*. He afterward recovered, and devoting himself to the ministry, applied for priestly orders, and the question arose, whether one thus poured upon in his bed could be accounted a Christian." Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, Africa, A. D. 248-257, was written to upon the subject, and he replied, giving it as his opinion that the grace usually conferred in baptism might be received by such pouring. In other words, for it is not called baptism, but *perichism* ("perichutheis") from *peri* around, and *cheo* to pour, yet he considered it a valid substitute for baptism. Bailey says: "Pouring was first permitted by the African Bishop, Cyprian, A. D. 253, as a substitute for immersion in the cases of the sick, or clinics; but was regarded as an abridgement of the divine institution (immersion), by those who introduced it." (*Manual of Baptism*, p. 319.)

"Dr. George C. Knapp, Professor of Theology at Halle, from 1775 to 1825. His Theology is translated by Dr. Woods, of Andover, and is a standard work. In Vol. II, pp. 516, 517, he says: '*Immersion* is

peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ, and to the practice of the Apostolic Church; and so even John baptized, and immersion remained common for a long time, except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, baptism of the sick was performed by sprinkling, or affusion; still some would not acknowledge this to be baptism, and a controversy arose concerning it; so unheard of was it to baptize by simple affusion. Cyprian first defended baptism by sprinkling, when necessity called for it; but cautiously and with much limitation. It would have been better to have adhered to the ancient practice, as even Luther and Calvin allowed.” (*Bailey*, pp. 305, 306)

It appears that the *pouring* of Novatian was the first departure from the apostolic baptism. This was defended by Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in Africa but he regarded it only a “half perfect baptism,” and said it “needed God’s indulgence.” It was practiced only upon “clinics,” or those who were so sick that they could not be immersed.

The Monks of Cressy, A. D. 754, asked Pope Stephen II: “Is it lawful, in case of *necessity*, occasioned by sickness, to *baptize* an infant by *pouring water on its head*, from a cup, or the hands?” Pope Stephen in reply, said: “Such a baptism, performed in *such case of necessity*, shall be accounted valid.” (*R. Fuller* p. 82.)

It is a well-known fact to students of ecclesiastical history, that immersion was regarded as baptism and was the only baptism administered, except in cases of sickness or weakness, until a few years ago.

Mr. John Wesley, who was the founder of the Methodist, the most numerous of the Pedobaptist sects in this country, says in his notes on Romans

4: “The allusion is to the *ancient manner* of baptism by immersion.” And he relates in his journal, Vol. 3, p. 20: “That Mary Welch, *aged eleven days*, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion.” According to Mr. Wesley’s account, it was the *rule* of the *Church of England* to immerse babies, even as late as the year 1736, which was the year in which he visited Savannah, and in which Mary Welch, a baby *eleven days old*, was immersed. Another account in Mr. Wesley’s journal throws light upon this subject: “Wednesday, May 5, I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker’s, second bailiff of Savannah, but Mrs. Parker told me, ‘Neither Mr. Parker nor I will consent to its *being dipped*. I answered, ‘If you certify that your child is *weak*, it will suffice, (the Rubric says to *pour* water upon it). She replied: ‘Nay, the child is not weak, but I am resolved it shall not be dipped.’ The argument I could not confute, so I went home, and the child was baptized by another person.” This shows that as late as 1736 baptism was administered by *immersion* in the Church of England, except in cases of sickness or weakness.

2d. *When and where was sprinkling introduced in lieu of baptism?*

We have seen how pouring come in lieu of baptism, but we have no account of any cases of sprinkling for baptism until many years after the introduction of pouring. “Sprinkling was first introduced into Scotland in 1559, and was subsequently introduced into England.” (*Bailey*, p. 320.) “The way that (sprinkling) is ordinarily used, we cannot deny to have been a novelty, brought into this church (English) by

those that learned it in Germany, or at Geneva. And they, not contented to follow the example of *pouring* a quantity of water, (which had been introduced instead of immersion) but improved it, (if I may so abuse that word) from pouring to sprinkling, that it might have as little resemblance to the ancient way of baptizing as possible." (*Judson*, p. 31.) "The bowl and sprinkling are strictly Genevan in their origin, *i. e.* were introduced by Calvin at Geneva" (*Bliss' Letters*, p. 24.) "The ordinance has been changed from immersion to sprinkling." (*Bliss' Letters*, p. 27.)

Encyclopedia Britannica, Art. Baptism: "The custom of *sprinkling* children instead of *dipping* them in the font, which was first allowed in case of the weakness or sickness of the infant, has so far prevailed that immersion is at length quite excluded. What principally tends to confirm the practice of affusion or sprinkling, was, that several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; having observed that at Geneva and some other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the Church of England a greater favor or piece of service than by introducing a practice dictated by so great an oracle as Calvin." (*Bailey*, p. 311.) From this we learn that John Calvin, the founder of Presbyterianism, introduced sprinkling; and those English divines who refuged into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, borrowed

Calvin's institution and carried it into England, and thus sprinkling was carried from the Presbyterians to the Episcopalians.

3d. *When and by what authority were pouring and sprinkling made equivalent to immersion?*

"It was not till 1311 that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases until after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI, immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there gradually imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556 a book was published at that place containing the form of prayers and ministrations of the sacraments, approved by the famous and godly, learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and, returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church." (*Edinburg Encyclopedia, Art Baptism.*)

Dr. Wall, author of the "History of Infant Baptism," and Vicar Shoreham, England, in his "History of John the Baptist," Part 2 and Chap. 9, says: "France seems to have been the first country where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. It being allowed

to weak children (in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,) to be baptized by aspersion, many fond ladies and gentlemen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water." (*Judson* p. 30.) Thus first pouring and afterwards sprinkling were allowed for the weak and sickly by the Bishop, Pope, Calvin, Knox and other leading spirits among both the Catholics and Protestants. Eventually "*fond ladies and gentlemen first and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weakly children*" in order that they might be sprinkled according to the desire of the Council of Ravenna or the edict of the Pope or other leaders. "If you will consult the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*, the *British Encyclopedia*, and the *Encyclopedia Americana*, Article Baptism, you will find a complete history of the whole subject, the truthfulness of which you will not feel disposed to question. You will learn that in England the Westminster Assembly of Divines had a warm discussion whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted. But by the earnest efforts of Dr. Lightfoot, who had great influence in the Assembly, sprinkling was adopted by a majority of one. The vote stood twenty-four for immersion, and twenty-five for sprinkling. This was 1643 years after Christ. The next year an Act of Parliament was passed, requiring the parents of all children born in the realm to have them sprinkled; and in 1648, some four years afterward, an Ecclesiastical Council held at Cambridge, Massachusetts, adopted sprinkling in the place of immersion; and in May of the same year, the Legislature of that

State passed a law making it a penal offence for any one to say that infant sprinkling was not good and valid baptism." (*Theodosia*, vol. 1, p. 179.)

From these extracts you learn that Bishop Cyprian of Carthage, Pope Stephen II., John Calvin, John Knox, the Council of Ravenna, the Westminster Assembly of Divines, the Ecclesiastical Council of Cambridge, Mass., all claimed the right to change the ordinance from *immersion to pouring or sprinkling*. The Parliament of England, and the Legislature of Massachusetts, both claimed the right to *enact laws* binding all parents to have their children sprinkled; and making it a penal offence to even say infant sprinkling was not valid baptism. Thus it was that pouring and sprinkling, the inventions of men, were substituted for baptism, which God instituted. The Methodists to-day hold the right to change; and in view of this, many of them are boldly denying immersion's being baptism at all. Refer to their Discipline, Twenty-second Article of Religion: "Every particular church may *ordain, change or abolish* rites and ceremonies, so that all things be done to edification."

We will close this lengthy discourse by adding the words of the great and good Bailey, p. 320: "It is plain that this change of the ordinances, or rather this departure of men from the ordinances, is wholly unauthorized of God. It is disobedience to his command. It teaches for doctrines the commandments of men. It makes God's commandments of none effect by human traditions. It cannot be harmless or innocent thus to disobey the positive commands of our Saviour.

"Math, 5: 19. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but

whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

“John 14 : 21. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him.

“John 14 : 15. If you love me, keep my commandments.

“John 15 : 14. Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.

“I John 2 : 3. Hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments.

“Let your love to Jesus prompt your obedience, and as you love him and his holy cause, do not consent to set aside his holy ordinance of baptism, and substitute therefor commandments of men.”

“If you love the Saviour, and have not yet obeyed his command by being baptized, then why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized.”

FIFTH PILLAR.

EQUAL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES IN THE EXECUTION OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH BY ALL THE MEMBERS.

“If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.” John 8 : 36.

Our object in this discourse is to show that all the members of Christ’s church are free, and have equal privileges in the transaction of the business pertaining to his kingdom.

I.—THE TEXT WE HAVE SELECTED FOR THIS OCCASION PROMISES FREEDOM TO ALL WHOM THE SON HATH MADE FREE.

In what sense are we to regard this? Do men make themselves free by their own actions; or are they born free? We think the text implies

1st. *Freedom from the power of sin.*

All men in a natural state are carnal, “sold under sin,” (Rom. 7 : 14), have sold themselves “to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord,” (I Kings 21:25); are “in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity,” (Acts 8:23), “without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world,” and are “born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward.” (Job 4 : 7.) Like David, all are “shapen in iniquity” and conceived in sin, (Psalms 51 : 5), for “who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.” (Job 14 : 4.) “Wherefore, as by one

man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” (Rom. 5 : 12), “and come short of the glory of God.” (Rom 3 : 23.) So then, none in a state of nature are free, but all are in bondage to sin, (Gal. 4 : 9), and are “by nature the children of wrath,” (Eph. 2 : 3), being already condemned because they believe not in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” (John 3 : 18.) How, now, can men in a state of nature become free from sin? How can they be reinstated in God’s favor? Can they lay aside their old sinful nature, and assume a pure heart and clean hands? “Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil.” (Jer. 13 : 23) “The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” (Psalms, 14 : 2, 3.)

It is impossible for the children of men, by their own free will or ability, to place themselves in God’s favor, or rid themselves of the sins they have committed. Could they have done this, there would have been no need of a Saviour. If men could have saved themselves, Jesus died in vain, and the text would not have read, “If the Son shall make you free,” but “If ye make yourselves free,” ye shall be free indeed. “There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4 : 12), but the name of Jesus. “God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn

the world, but that the world through him might be saved.” (John 3 : 16, 17.) Faith does not save. It is Jesus that saves. Yet faith is the channel, “For by grace are ye saved, through faith.” (Eph. 2 : 8.) Jesus the Christ is the gift of God, hence he is the grace of God, and he enters the heart through faith and becomes “the hope of glory,” (Col. 1 : 27), for if we are “without God in the world,” we have no hope. (Eph.2: 12.) “You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and in sins.” (Eph. 2 : 1.) “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.” (Col. 2 : 13.) “Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.” (John 3 : 5.) Regeneration or the new birth is necessary. “Which were born not of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God,” (John 1 : 13), “being born again not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” (I Peter 1 : 23.) It is the spirit or soul of man that is born again. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” (John 3 : 6.) They who are born of God overcome the world, and sin not. “For whatever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith,” for “we know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not,” (I John 5 : 4, 18,) “for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.” (I John 3 : 9.) Being thus quickened by the power of God, and regenerated by the Holy Spirit, you are *freed from* sin, and made equally the heirs of God and joint heirs with the Lord Jesus the Christ, through

faith in his name. Those thus regenerated are proper subjects for baptism and church membership.

2d. *The text implies equality among the membership.*

If the Son make you free, you shall indeed be free from sin, and be set at liberty in the household of faith, becoming equal with all others whom He hath released from the same great bondage.

The mission of John the Baptist was "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." (Luke 1 : 17.) Matthew says: "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." (Math. 3 : 3.) By reference to the prophecy of Isaiah you will readily discover how John prepared "the way of the Lord," and "made his paths straight." "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isaiah 40 : 3, 4, 5.) The expression, "*every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low,*" teaches that in the preparation of the way, equality was the aim. None shall be above or below the level, but all shall be equal.

It is a well-known fact that ever since the fall, people have manifested a spirit of pride, and a desire to usurp authority over others. This led to the patriarchal and kingly governments of the nations at a very early period in the world's history. The same disposition may be seen even in families of children,

at the present day. Some have a desire to dictate and even rule others, who are their equals in every sense of the term. This disposition, manifested among the disciples in the early days of Christianity, was condemned by our Savior, on more occasions than one. "But Jesus called them to him and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister. And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." (Mark 10 : 42, 43, 44.) Here the Saviour teaches the doctrine of equality in his kingdom. The Son having made the members of his kingdom free, they are indeed free in the sense of equality. Those that were "great" among them should be their ministers, and the "chiefest" should be servant of all; yet there should be equality. Your officers are your "chief men,"—your "great" men—yet they are all equal with you, and are to *serve* you in the capacity in which you place them. The President of the United States is the chief of the nation, made so by the vote of his equals, and he is servant of the people. He has no rights more than the common citizen, except those guaranteed to him by the constitution and laws, by which he is to be governed as the *servant* of the people, who made him such. So the officers in Christ's kingdom are equal with the other citizens of the kingdom. They are made the *servants* of his people by their actions. The Saviour instructed them to make those their servants who are best qualified to fill the positions in which they are

placed; that is, the “great” or “chiefest” among them are to *serve them*.

I wish here to offer a rebuke to some of my brethren who seem to feel that the ministry and deaconship are a little superior to the common membership in the church. Some deacons seem to feel that their office gives them some superiority over the membership, and they appear to wish to exercise some lordship over the church. This is wrong. The deacon’s office requires him to *serve* the church as *treasurer* or *financier*. He is to attend to the temporal or financial business of the church according to the rules laid down in the Bible, and then, as a deacon, his work ceases. He may have other duties to perform as a member, but not as a deacon.

The pastor, or bishop, is to look after the spiritual interests of the church; yet some seem to think that his office gives him some superiority over the membership, and in some sections of the country we find among pastors a disposition to exercise lordship over the members. This disposition is manifested in many ways. One way is to denote their authority by using a home-coined word, “pastoring.” We have heard the question propounded by one pastor to another, “How many churches are you pastoring?” “I am pastoring” one, two or three, as the case may be. This home-made participle, “pastoring,” being coined contrary to the idiom of our language, is not the only objection to its use, but it seems to be used to convey the idea of lordship or ruling over the church. I am “pastoring” one church, or four churches; *i. e.* I am exercising the lordship over one, or four churches. We much prefer the more humiliating, but less used

scriptural term of "*servng.*" I am *servng* one or four churches.

After the Saviour instituted his supper, the disciples entertained the idea that he was soon going to establish a kingdom, which they thought was to be a temporal kingdom. "There was a strife among them, which of them should be accounted greatest." (Luke 22 : 23.) The disciples having a disposition to claim superiority, each one desired the highest office in the kingdom. Jesus reprov'd them by repeating the very same language he had used on a former occasion, which we have already quoted. He conveyed to them the idea that they should all be *great*, but yet equal. They should all eat and drink at his table in his kingdom, which was equality. It is not stated that some superiors in his kingdom shall eat and drink at a higher or better furnished table; but he says: "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." This evidently teaches equality. Then they were to "sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke 22 : 30) They were to be equal in the government of the kingdom. All to be judges, and not those who were *chiefest* or *great*. The chief and great, who were to differ from the others only in the extra *service* rendered by them, were to be equal with the others in enjoying the provisions of the kingdom, and in sharing the responsibilities of its government.

The laws of the United States make our boys citizens of the United States, when they have arrived at the age of twenty-one years. They are then allowed to exercise their own judgment in the right of suffrage.

Being made free at that age, they are equal with their fathers, and with other citizens of the nation, and are entitled to all the privileges of citizenship.

In the kingdom of Christ, people are not made citizens by arriving at a certain age. But such as the Son shall make free, irrespective of age or sex, are eligible to citizenship in his kingdom; and those not made free by the Son are not eligible; it makes no difference as to other qualifications or age. If the young child is made free from the bondage of sin, by the imputed righteousness of Jesus the Christ, he is eligible to citizenship in the kingdom of Christ, and no one has the right to debar him of any of the privileges of the kingdom or from sharing in the responsibilities of its government.

Some Christians seem to think that very young members should not be permitted to share in the government of the church. This is obviously wrong; for if the Son hath made them *free*, they shall be *free indeed*, No one has the right to debar them of their privileges. "Whenever it is proved that any class of members have no right to assist in the transaction of church business, then it will have been proved that the same class have no right to church membership at all." (D. B. Ray.)

Some contend that, for various reasons, too numerous to consider to-day, the sisters in our churches should not be permitted to share any of the responsibilities of church government. It is true that Paul gives certain rules by which sisters are to be governed in praying and prophesying, (I Cor. 11 : 5-15), and that he says: "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak." (I Cor. 14 : 34, 35.) Yet I have failed to find any

passage where they are forbidden to cast their votes or take part in the government of the church. They having been made free by the Son, and having become citizens of the household of faith, are entitled to share in its blessings and responsibilities.

3d. *The ministry is upon an equality with the laity.*

If it can be proved that the ministry and laity are equal, then it will follow that the government of the kingdom is placed in the hands of the citizens, both ministry and laity, of the kingdom. Jesus says: "But be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master even Christ; and *all ye are brethren*" (on an equality). "And call no man your father, upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ." (Math. 23 : 8-10.) The Saviour forbids any of the citizens of his kingdom recognizing any man on earth as master or father in a spiritual sense, and with equal force he forbid any of the citizens submitting to that appellation themselves. We see sometimes the various unscriptural titles given to church dignitaries, such as Rev., Rt. Rev., Father, Rev. Father, Rt. Rev. Father, etc., which we are not ourselves to receive, or give to others; for no such titles are known in the church of Christ. Jesus says we are not to make this distinction, for we are all brethren; that is, all are upon the same equality.

Paul teaches us that ministers are not church *dignitaries*, but *servants*. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." (II Cor. 4 : 5.) He classes himself with other ministers, and calls them *servants*.

4th. *The churches being the makers of the officers, the officers cannot be above the churches.*

“That which is created cannot be greater than the thing which created it,” is an indisputable maxim. Now, if the church is really the power that creates and ordains ministers, then the ministers cannot be greater than the church. By reference to Acts. 1 : 26, we find that an apostle was needed to supply the place of Judas, who by transgression had fallen. So, after prayer to ascertain whom God had chosen to the work, “they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.” We see from this, that even the appointment of an apostle was left to the citizens of the kingdom. They elected him from their own midst to fill the office.

In Acts. 6 : 1-7, we learn the church in Jerusalem was in need of persons to take charge of her financial interests. The admonition of the inspired apostles to the church was, “Brethren, look ye out among you seven men,” etc. “And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and *they chose*,” etc. “Whom *they* (the church) set before the apostles, and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them.” We learn from this that the church selected the men she needed as deacons. We find nowhere in the Bible where there was some great head of the church who made the appointment of ministers of lower grades, to attend to certain duties in the church, but in all instances the elections were made by the membership of the churches. The churches were the creators of the ministers or servants, in the same sense that the people of the United States are the creators of the officers or servants of their Nation, State or County.

But some may say: Do not the scriptures speak of ruling elders? If the churches had elders to rule,

the government must have been in their hands, and not with the church. But let us examine this subject in the light of the scriptures. In I Timothy 5 : 17 we have this language: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." And in Rom. 12 : 8, "He that ruleth with diligence." From these quotations we learn that in the apostle's days there were *ruling* elders, and they were required to rule with diligence, and when they did so, were counted worthy of double honor. What did those elders do when they ruled? or in other words, how did they rule? The latter part of I Tim. 5 : 17, gives us some idea of how the elder was to *rule*. "Especially they who labor in word and doctrine." If he rules well, he will labor in word and doctrine. That is, he will give those whom he rules the bread of eternal life. The Saviour gives us more light upon the subject in Luke 12 : 42-46: "Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season." The steward is made ruler for the purpose of giving the household their *portion of meat in due season*. To prove that the discipline of the church was not intrusted to his hands we refer you to verse 45: "And shall *begin to beat* the men-servants and maid-servants, and to eat and drink and to be drunken,"—showing that he is not amenable to the church. "The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." The work of this steward was not to rule by disciplining the men-servants and maid-servants, but

by taking charge of his lord's goods and *giving the servants their portion of meat in due season*; which if he failed to do, his lord would discontinue him as his steward.

Jesus had called Peter to the work of the Gospel Ministry, and had made him an elder, but when the Saviour was crucified and the disciples were scattered abroad, Peter, abandoning the work given him by the Master, had gone back to his old occupation of fishing; when Jesus visited him, and reminded him of his duty as an elder. He inquired of Peter three times, saying: "Lovest thou me?" and as often gave the command, "Feed my sheep." Peter's work, as a ruling elder, was to feed the sheep. This he did not forget in after years; for when he gave his charge to the elders among "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia," he said: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who also am an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: *feed the flock* of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." (I Peter 5 : 1-3.) The whole matter as gathered from these quotations might be thus enunciated: A "ruling elder" is one of God's ministers, who has been installed pastor or servant of a church. He is to take the oversight of the church,—feed the flock of God; which he does by preaching to them the wholesome doctrines of the Bible, and by laying before them such examples as are worthy their emulation,—but never to attempt to be "lord over God's herit-

age.” He has nothing to do with the discipline of the church, more than any other member. He is upon an equality with the others, and has no right to “rule,” except in his proper, pastoral sphere, the duties of which are enumerated by Peter.

5th. *The church is a democracy, having full control of all its affairs.*

It receives or restores members. Paul, in writing to the church at Corinth concerning a member the church had expelled, that he thought he should be restored, says: “Sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which was inflicted *of many*. So contrariwise you ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with over much sorrow.” (II Cor. 2 : 6, 7.) You will observe that his punishment, or expulsion, was “inflicted of many”—*the church*, for it was *the church* Paul was instructing to forgive and restore the excommunicated person.

The church expels members for personal offences. “If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.” (Math. 18 : 15-17.) You notice it was to be told unto the *church*, not to the pastor, or “ruling elder,” and the church was to take the final action—expel the disorderly member,—if he would not be reconciled through their labors.

Paul clearly teaches that it is the duty of the church, not a part of it—not of the pastor or “ruling elder,”—to exclude disorderly members. “In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened.” (I Cor. 5 : 4-7.) You observe in this quotation that Paul requires the church to be *gathered together*, then to act in delivering the disorderly member unto Satan; that it was the *church* that was to purge out the old leaven, by excluding the member guilty of immorality.

In Acts 15 : 22: “Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas: namely Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren.” Here we see the *whole church* elected those delegates to Antioch. Paul says: “Or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ.” (II Cor. 8 : 23.) Observe here the missionaries sent out to preach the gospel, “were the “ messengers of the churches.” They were sent out by the churches as the called of God to that work.

From the few quotations we have made, which might be greatly increased, we learn that the apostolic churches were democratic organizations. The members acted in the transaction of all their business, and in the execution of the laws governing the kingdom. They received and excluded members; they forgave offences; they elected and sent delegates,

and they chose and sent out missionaries; which they could not have done, as churches, had not their government been purely democratic.

6th. *What is done by the church, is an act of the church, and the church is responsible, as a body.*

This is a principle that seems not to be fully understood by a great many of our less informed members. Some seem to think that the pastor is responsible for every action of the church; hence, we often hear the expressions: "The preacher turned such a one out of the church;" "The preacher received such a one into the church;" "Such a one joined such a preacher,"—having reference to some one's joining the church. These expressions, which are common in some localities, clearly indicate great lack of knowledge upon the powers and government of the church.

Again, it is sometimes the case that all the business is transacted by a few members, the others taking no interest. A few vote, while the majority sit quiet, offering no suggestions, and casting no vote on any business coming before the church. This is decidedly wrong. The government is with the body, and it is the duty of every member to take an active interest in all matters pertaining to it. Often, resolutions are passed in churches, and the vote is *said* to be unanimous, while perhaps a majority of the membership did not vote at all. Some brother or sister who has taken no part in the transaction of the church, in speaking of it afterwards, is heard to say: "*They* did so and so;" "*They* passed such a resolution;" "*They* received such and such a member," "*They* expelled such a one," etc. Persons thus acting seem to be trying to shirk the responsibility of acting with the church. We claim that the entire membership is

responsible for all actions of the church, and a member should not say, “*They*,” but “*We*,” or the “*Church*” did this or that act. If a question comes before the church on which the member is unprepared to cast his or her vote, the church might be asked to postpone the matter until that member has his mind fully matured concerning it; or the church may, by an *unanimous vote*, excuse that undecided member from voting at all; in which event the member should acquiesce with the majority, and say “*we*,” not “*they*,” passed the act. In order to obtain unanimity of action, church members should discuss all church matters of importance in the private circle, and pray for God’s directing Spirit to influence them when they come together to transact the business.

Young members should be brought into these private discussions, and great care should be taken, by the more experienced, to train them in the proper way of thinking and acting.

These informal and private conferences, which may be held at different times, at private homes, or in the church yard before the hour of service, will tend to enhance the interest in church business, as well as to expedite the work after the church has assembled in her conference meeting.

We propose now to examine into the practice of the Baptist Denomination, to ascertain how this pillar is received by them. This we will do by examining

SOME STANDARD AUTHORS.

“Religious liberty is a *Baptist watchword*, a kind of talisman, which operates like a charm, and nerves every man for action.” (*Joseph Belcher, in the Christian Review.*)

“Hence, also, they (Baptists) reject all claims of the civil magistrate to any but civil jurisdiction; though willing and peaceful subjects to civil authority, where the rights of conscience are not involved. Hence, in every age, their strong attachment to liberty, especially to *religious liberty*; these principles they were the *first to proclaim*, and the first also to exemplify. Their principles have subjected them to persecution from age to age, and to such principles they have counted it a glory to be martyrs. Though their own blood has flown freely, they have never shed the blood of others. Indeed civil persecution of any kind, on their principles, is impossible.” (*Rel. Ency.*, p. 188.)

“In the prospectus of the Hansard Knollys Society it was stated that to the Baptists belong the honor of first asserting in this land, and of establishing on the immutable basis of just argument and Scripture rule, the right of every man to worship God as conscience dictates, in submission only to divine command.” (*Tracts on Lib. of Con.*, p. 5.)

“All standard historians unanimously affirm that the government of the apostolic churches was purely democratic, (that is, vested in the people or membership), and all the churches independent republics. All religious societies having legislative powers, and clerical or aristocratical governments (that is, in the hands of the clergy, or a few, as a session) are anti-scriptural and anti-republican tyrannies, which no Christian can lawfully countenance, or republican freeman ought to support.” (*J. R. Graves, in Tenn. Baptist.*)

“That a body of immersed believers is the highest ecclesiastical authority in the world, and the only

tribunal for the trial of cases of discipline; that the acts of a church are of a superior binding force over those of an association, convention or presbytery; and no association or convention can impose a moral obligation upon the constituents composing them.” (*Ibid.*)

“They (the Baptists) are a people very fond of religious liberty, and very unwilling to be brought under the bondage of the judgment of any.” (*Orchard’s Hist. Vol. II, p. 277.*)

“This fondness for religious liberty among Baptists has generally inclined them to favor a republican form of government in the State. Such was the force of Baptist influence brought to bear in the formation of the American government, that the Baptist doctrine of ‘Soul Liberty’ was enstamped upon the government in such a manner, that both religious and political liberty has been secured to a continent through Baptist instrumentality. We do not mean to teach that none except Baptists were in favor of these glorious principles. Many others embraced the same sentiments with the Baptists, and stood firm in their support against every foe; but it is a historic fact that Baptists have ever understood and advocated the doctrine of liberty of conscience, and it is certain that *they took the lead*, both in England and America, in the cause of freedom.” (*Bap. Suc., pp. 224, 225.*)

It is said of Roger Williams, who entertained the Baptist views of “liberty of conscience:” “In accordance with these principles, Roger Williams insisted in Massachusetts, upon allowing entire freedom of conscience and upon entire separation of the Church and State. But he was obliged to flee; and

in 1636 he formed in Rhode Island a small and new society, in which perfect freedom in matters of faith was allowed, and in which the majority ruled in all civil affairs. Here, in a little State, the fundamental principles of political and ecclesiastical liberty practically prevailed before they were even taught in any of the schools of philosophy in Europe. At that time people predicted only a short existence for these democratical experiments—universal suffrage, universal eligibility to office, the annual change of rulers, perfect religious freedom,—the Miltonian doctrine of chisms. But not only have these ideas and these forms of government maintained themselves here, but precisely from this little State have they extended themselves throughout the United States. They have conquered the aristocratic tendencies in Carolina and New York, the High Church in Virginia, the Theocracy in Massachusetts, and the Monarchy in all America. They have given laws to a continent, and, formidable through their moral influence, they lie at the bottom of all the democratic movements which are now shaking the nations of Europe.” (*Rel. Denom.*, p. 153, *quoted by Belcher.*)

“Though Roger Williams was not fully a Baptist, he advocated the Baptist doctrine of ‘Soul Liberty,’ for which he was persecuted and banished from Massachusetts. As soon as he began to proclaim this doctrine, he was charged with the heresy of the Anabaptists. While it is true, as stated by Gervinus, that the principles of religious and civil liberty were established in Rhode Island before they were taught in any of the schools of philosophy in Europe, it is also true that the Baptists of England had suffered, long prior to the time of Williams, for the advocacy

of the same principles. It is an error into which some have fallen, who suppose that Williams was the first to advocate the doctrine of entire freedom of conscience in matters of religion. In this quotation we have the fact brought out that these Baptist principles have given laws to a continent, and are shaking the nations of Europe by their moral power." (*Bap. Suc.*, p. 226)

"The love of religious and civil liberty induced the early Baptists of this country to side with Washington in the struggle for American independence. President Washington acknowledged the service of the Baptists in the time of the revolution of seventy-six; for, in answer to the letter of the Virginia Baptists, congratulating him on his honors, he replied that the denomination 'Have been throughout America uniformly, and almost unanimously, the *firm friends of civil liberty*, and the persevering promoters of the glorious Revolution.'" (*Rel. Denom.*, p. 190, *quoted by Ray.*)

"Up to the time of the achievement of American liberty, as the result of the Revolution, State religion was established in most of the colonies except Rhode Island. Baptists were taxed, imprisoned and whipped because of their advocacy of religious liberty, in preaching contrary to the laws regulating religion. But, from the very first, they made determined efforts to secure full liberty to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. They did not merely ask this liberty for themselves, but they plead for perfect religious liberty to all. In the first Continental Congress, which was held in 1774, in Philadelphia, the Baptists sent their messengers to memorialize Congress, by beseeching them to 'secure at once the

recognition of the inalienable rights of conscience;’ and though nothing then could be accomplished, yet, at the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, which met in the same year, the Baptists laid their grievances through Isaac Backus; and they succeeded in securing the following resolution, as given by Mr. Curtis:

“IN PROVINCIAL CONGRESS, December, 9th, 1774.

“On reading the memorial of Rev. Isaac Backus, agent of the Baptist churches in this government,

“*Resolved*, that the establishment of civil and religious liberty to each denomination in this province is the sincere wish of this Congress; but being by no means vested with powers of civil government, whereby they can redress the grievances of any person whatever, they, therefore, recommend to the Baptist churches, that when a General Assembly shall be convened in the colony, they lay the real grievances of said churches before the same; when and where that petition will most certainly meet with all that attention due to the memorial of a denomination of Christians so well disposed to the public weal of their country.

“By order of the Congress.

“JOHN HANCOCK, *President*.

“Accordingly, the Baptists memorialized the next session of the Massachusetts legislature (1775). In doing so, they said: ‘Our real grievances are, that we, as well as our fathers, have, from time to time, been taxed, on religious accounts, when we were not represented, and our causes have been tried by interested judges. For a civil legislature to impose religious taxes, is, we conceive, a power which their constituents never had to give, and therefore, going entirely out of their jurisdiction. We are persuaded that an entire freedom from being taxed by civil

rulers, in religious worship, is not a mere favor from any man or men in the world, but a right and property granted us by God, who commands us to stand fast in it. We should wrong our consciences by allowing that power to men, which we believe belongs to God.

“Although but little was accomplished at this time, the Baptists continued to plead the cause of liberty of conscience before the various legislatures and Congress, until religious liberty was fully established throughout the United States.

“Members of other denominations have, more or less, advocated religious liberty since it became popular in this country; but when liberty of conscience was unpopular, and its adherents were called upon to suffer for their views, there was found no denomination except the Baptists to stand up boldly in favor of this boon of Heaven - religious liberty. True, some individuals among other parties arose above their systems, and advocated a partial liberty of conscience, or a toleration. But Baptists have understood the principles of religious liberty from the first, because this doctrine lies at the foundation of the Baptist system. It is an interesting fact, that the true idea of a free constitution for the American government, was derived from the Baptists.” (*Bap. Suc.* pp. 227-229.)

“We maintain, what authentic and received history so abundantly affirms, that Baptists were the first asserters of religious liberty in New England, or on the American Continent. The *first* blood shed on these shores for religious liberty was Baptist blood, and it followed the excoriating lash, driven by Pedobaptist hands, by the order of a Pedobaptist court, under the direction of a Protestant State Church in

New England. The last persons imprisoned in America, for preaching the Gospel, were Baptists. We maintain that Baptists, singly and alone, severed the Church and State in Virginia, and in the face of the opposition of Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Methodists, abolished all laws oppressive to the conscience, and thus secured in the Old Dominion the triumph of religious and civil liberty. We maintain that America is indebted to Baptists, first, for the *idea* of a pure democratic form of civil government, and then for having prepared the popular mind, by the molding influence of their principles, to receive such a government, as well as for its present strength and sole hope of its perpetuity." (*Trilemma*, pp. 143, 144.)

"The following facts were communicated to the *Christian Watchman*, several years ago, by the Rev. Dr. Fishback, of Lexington, Kentucky:

"Mr. Editor: The following circumstance, which occurred in the State of Virginia, relative to Mr. Jefferson, was detailed to me by Elder Andrew Tribble, about six years ago, who since died when ninety-two or three years old. The facts may interest some of your readers.

"Andrew Tribble was the pastor of a small Baptist Church, which held monthly meetings at a short distance from Mr. Jefferson's house, eight or ten years before the American Revolution. Mr. Jefferson attended the meetings of the church several months in succession, and after one of them, he asked Elder Tribble to go home and dine with him, with which he complied. Mr. Tribble asked Mr. Jefferson how he was pleased with their church government? Mr. Jefferson replied, that it had struck him with great force, and had interested him much; that he considered it the only form of pure democracy that then existed in the world, and had concluded that it would

be the best plan of government for the American colonies. This was several years before the Declaration of Independence." (*Ibid*, p. 144, 145.)

"From this it appears," says D. B. Ray, "that Mr. Jefferson, the writer of the Declaration, gathered his idea of pure democracy from a Baptist church. To my mind, it is evident that the doctrine of religious liberty incorporated in the American Constitution and government, is attributable, under God, to Baptist influence. It is no idle dream to announce that Baptist principles have given liberty to a continent." (*Bap. Suc.*, p. 230.)

We think a sufficiency has been said to show that the "Fifth Pillar" is a characteristic of the Baptists of the present time.

We will close our remarks at this time by repeating the language of a worthy brother "Anabaptist":

"We feel no blush of shame mantling our cheeks as we trace the history of our fathers. True they were not great according to the world's estimation of greatness. They were not noble after any human standard of patent nobility. Our church did not spring into existence at the mandate of royalty. Our doctrines were not warmed into life by the sunshine of court favor. Our people did not occupy the high places of worldly dignity. They were the outcasts of the outcasts. They were the persecuted of the persecuted. They were counted unworthy to dwell with those who were themselves the victims of proscription. But they were among the moral heroes whose characters brightened under the searching light of history; and they have left to their descendants a name which they may be proud to bear, and an example which they should be zealous to emulate.

They have swelled that list of confessors and martyrs to whom the world is slow to render its acknowledgment. But their record is on high, and their time is sure.

“Their blood was shed
In confirmation of the noblest claims,—
Our claims to feed upon immortal truth,
To walk with God, to be divinely free,
To soar and to anticipate the skies.
Yet few remember them. They lived unknown,
Till persecution dragged them into fame,
And chased them up to heaven. With their names
No bard embalms and sanctifies his song,
And history, so warm on meaner themes,
Is cold on this.” (*Trilemma*, pp. 150, 151.)

SIXTH PILLAR.

THE LORD'S SUPPER STRICTLY A CHURCH ORDINANCE.

“Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another.” I Cor. 11 : 33.

Our pillar says the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance. We cannot discuss this proposition intelligently until we answer the question:

I.—WHAT IS A CHURCH ORDINANCE?

By examining Webster's Dictionary, you will learn that the common meaning of the term ordinance is: “A rule established by authority; a permanent rule of action,” etc. According to this definition every rule of action in the church is a church ordinance, which we know is not true. There are many rules of action which are established by authority that cannot be considered church ordinances. We are commanded to pray, to repent, to believe, etc. These are all rules or laws given us by the great Law-Giver. Are we to regard them as church ordinances? If so, none can pray or repent or believe, but those appointed to administer the ordinances of the church. Permit us to give you a definition that we think all will readily accept: Church Ordinance, a rule, a rite of the church, appointed by authority of the Head of the Church, which requires an ordained minister to administer. An ordinance of the State is a rule or law of the State that no one can administer, unless he is set apart by the laws for that purpose. An oath is

State ordinance that none can administer legally except those who are ordained, or set apart for that purpose. Marriage is a State ordinance, that must be administered by one of those ordained or appointed to that work, or it will not be legal. To make any ordinance legal it must have a legal administrator, and if it has no administrator it is no ordinance, because no one has been *ordained* to administer it. With this definition of ordinance before us, let us inquire:

II.—IS THE LORD'S SUPPER A CHURCH ORDINANCE?

If we find upon examination of the Scriptures that Jesus the Christ instituted his Supper, and commanded that it should be observed by his churches, and retained within his kingdom, it follows that it is a church *rite* or *rule* appointed by him; and if we find that, from its nature, a certain class of individuals were ordained to administer it, for the benefit of the members of the church, it follows that it is a church ordinance. If, on the other hand, we find that it was given by the Saviour to the world, and not to the church, it follows that it is an ordinance belonging not to the church, but to the world. Our position is, that the Lord's Supper is strictly a church ordinance. Let us now proceed to examine the Scriptures upon the subject.

1st. *It is a church ordinance, because Jesus, after administering it, commanded his disciples to observe it in the kingdom.*

By reference to Luke 22 : 29, 30, you will see that Jesus appointed unto his disciples a kingdom, as the Father had appointed unto him. Now, if he appointed unto them a kingdom, they, and not the world, were

to enjoy the benefits of this kingdom. What were some of those benefits? "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." (v. 30.) The pronoun *ye* evidently refers to the disciples unto whom the kingdom was appointed. The *disciples* were then the ones to enjoy this blessing. The blessing was to be enjoyed *in* the kingdom, not *out* of it. Hence, it follows very clearly, from this plain passage, that the Lord's Supper is a rite belonging exclusively to those who are members of his kingdom, and they are required to observe it *in* his kingdom; that is, when assembled as a church. In the discussion on the "Third Pillar," it was shown that the Bible teaches that none are members of this kingdom until they have repented, believed and been baptized. Then, if the Supper is an institution belonging *in* the kingdom, none are entitled to it but such as have repented, believed and been baptized; and as it is to be observed *in* the kingdom, those who have repented, believed and been baptized are not entitled to it until they are sitting together as members of the kingdom or church.

2d. *It is a church ordinance, because Jesus instituted it with none present but the apostles.*

Jesus with his twelve apostles formed the only organization in his kingdom at the time of the institution of his Supper. They were organized and officered, Judas being the treasurer. The Seventy who had been sent forth to preach and baptize all those John baptized, except the twelve Jesus had organized, and all who had been baptized by the disciples, did not belong to the organization, hence were not present at the institution of the Supper.

“And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the *twelve apostles* with him.” (Luke 22 : 14.)

Why were none present when the Supper was instituted but this organized body of disciples? Was it not to teach us that the Supper was to be observed only by an organized body in the kingdom? Some people claim that women should not be allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper, because there were none present when the Saviour instituted it. Why were there none present? Evidently, not because there were none who had complied with the terms of admission into the kingdom, repentance, faith and baptism; but because no women had come into the Saviour's organization. There were none belonging to that organization but the twelve apostles; hence, none partook of the Supper at its first institution but those composing that organized body. Jesus, immediately after administering it to that organized body, taught them that it must be kept *in the kingdom*; that is, it can only be observed as a church rite, or ordinance.

3d. *That the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance is implied in the commission.*

“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.” (Math. 28 : 19, 20.) The people were to be taught, or *made disciples of*, (*New Version*), then baptized, after which they were to be taught “to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.” They could not become disciples until they had repented and believed. Hence, the first work of the organized body in Christ's kingdom, in order for the extension of the

kingdom, was to teach all nations, and to continue that teaching until the people of the nations believed; then to baptize them. That brought them into the kingdom, and they, becoming members with those that were already in the organization, were to be taught “to observe *all things* I have commanded you.” This organized body having received all the necessary instructions concerning the church, and its ordinances, were required to teach those new converts to observe all those things. The Lord’s Supper was one of the institutions of the church Jesus had given the organized body, and is embraced in the “all things” that these newly-made disciples were to be taught to observe. So we see that the Lord’s Supper is to be observed as a church rite; that is, it is not to be observed by an individual until he becomes a disciple by repenting for his sins, and believing in Jesus the Christ, and has been baptized, and becomes a member of the organization. Whether or not this construction be correct we may learn from the way those very disciples, who composed the organized body, to whom this instruction was given, observed it in their teachings afterward. If they taught the people to observe the Lord’s Supper before they became members of the church, our construction of the commission is incorrect, and the Lord’s Supper is not a church rite, but an ordinance belonging to the world. But if they taught that it should be observed by those only who had become citizens of the visible kingdom, and members of some particular organization or church, then our construction of the commission is correct, and the Lord’s Supper is a church ordinance.

4th. *The first church observed it as a church rite.*

Please refer to Acts 2 : 41, 42, and you will see the order in which it was observed. The first thing on that occasion was the preaching of Peter. Peter was one of the apostles who received the commission; and being divinely inspired could not have made a mistake. The people were reprov'd "of sin, and of righteousness and of judgment" (John 16 : 8), by the Holy Spirit, through Peter's preaching. This led them to "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," (Acts 20 : 21,) which made disciples of them, after which they were baptized and added to the church (v. 41). This all being done, they were ready to enjoy the privileges of church membership. The forty-second verse tells us they did this: "And they (those added to the church) continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Their duties and privileges as church members were observed after they became church members, and not before. The Lord's Supper or the "breaking of bread," being a church ordinance, was not observed by them until they were added to the church. If you will closely follow up the teachings of the inspired apostles, who were acting under the commission of our blessed Saviour, you will find that they nowhere taught that the Lord's Supper was to be observed by any except church members, and that none being eligible to church membership but those who had been made disciples, or who had repented, believed and been baptized, none were allowed to partake of this ordinance until after they had repented, believed and been baptized, or become church members.

5th. *Our text teaches the Lord's Supper is a church rite.*

It appears that the church at Corinth had forgotten, or had failed to understand the instructions Paul had given them upon the correct observance of the Lord's Supper, and had gone into the habit of observing it separately, and not in a church capacity. Paul sharply reproveth them, by saying: "This is *not* to eat the the Lord's Supper, for in eating every one taketh before other *his own* supper." (I Cor. : 20, 21.) The apostle here seems to condemn them for not observing it in their church capacity, and closes with the admonition of our text: "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, *tarry one for another.*" If the Lord's Supper was not to be observed as a rite, there would be no need of the church "coming together" to partake of it. The sense seems clearly to be that it must be observed by the church coming together as a church, or in a church meeting. If this is done, then evidently it is a church rite, and he that "eateth and drinketh," otherwise, "eateth and drinketh" unworthily, because he does not discern the Lord's body, but his own body. The church is the body of Christ (Eph. 1 : 22, 23; Col. 1 : 24); and if we do not partake of the Lord's Supper as a church rite, we do not discern the church, the body of Christ, in its proper sense, and thereby eat and drink "judgment, (*New Version*) unto ourselves, "not discerning the Lord's body" (v. 29).

In I Cor. 10: 17, the apostle says: "For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." A better rendering is this: "Seeing that we, who are many, are on bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." (*New Version.*) The apostle in this passage teaches that

the "one bread"—that is, one loaf, (churches in celebrating the Lord's Supper should have *but one loaf*),—represents the church in its entirety. The bread, or one loaf, is broken into various pieces, which represent the individual members. Now, if we partake of the ordinance in any other than a church capacity we do not discern the Lord's body—the church. "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body." (*New Version*, I Cor. 11 : 29.) Then we should never partake of it, except as a church rite.

6th. *We claim the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, because the church is required to guard it.*

The apostle teaches that the church is to judge those within its pale, and not allow even their own members, who are disorderly or immoral, to partake of the Lord's Supper. "But now I have written unto you *not to keep company*, 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; with such a one *not to eat*. Do not ye judge them that are within?" (I Cor. 5 : 11, 12.) Those that are without the pale of the church have no right to the Lord's Supper, while those that are within are to be judged by the church, and if they are wicked or immoral, the church is not to keep them in her company, but is to expel them, that the ordinance may be properly guarded and observed only by those who have complied with the laws of God governing it. This shows that it is a church rite, to be guarded and defended by the church against the encroachments of those who would intrude.

We think we have clearly shown, from these considerations, that the Lord's Supper is a church ordi-

nance, to be observed only by a church while sitting in a church capacity.

III.—SEVERAL THINGS OF INTEREST FOLLOW THIS CONCLUSION AS A NATURAL CONSEQUENCE.

1st. *Every church should have stated times for the observance of the Lord's Supper, and every member in good standing should be strict in observing it.*

It is to be feared that many churches are remiss in the observance of the Lord's Supper. Most churches have stated times, but are often careless in making the necessary preparations for it, and when the appointed day arrives for the church to celebrated the Lord's Supper, the deacons report "not ready." This should not be. The deacons, or others who may be appointed by the church to make the necessary preparations for the Lord's Supper, should not neglect the duty, but have every thing ready when the time arrives, that the service may have its proper place and time in the worship of God's house.

The members sometimes neglect the duty of engaging in this service, from erroneous ideas concerning it. Some feel a sense of unworthiness, and therefore decline to engage in the service. This is wrong. If we feel our unworthiness, it is well for us, for then are we likely to come in the worthiness of Christ. Some fear they will eat and drink unworthily, and thus eat and drink damnation to themselves. You cannot do this "if you discern the Lord's body" in your eating and drinking, which you are likely to do, if you partake of it as a church ordinance. Some entertain unpleasant or malicious feelings toward some brother or sister,—therefore refuse to engage in the service. The Lord's Supper is not a test of church fellowship,

neither is it a Christian communion. What another does has nothing to do with you, as an individual member. If he is in good standing in the church, and partakes, or does not partake, of the Lord's Supper, it should not affect you. You should partake, if you are in good standing, irrespective of the actions of others.

2d. *Has one church the right to invite a member of another church of the same faith and order to partake with them of the Lord's Supper?*

Upon this subject the scriptures seem to be silent. We know of no instance where any New Testament church extended such an invitation, neither do we know of any passage prohibiting such a course. We are sure that no member has the right to attend another church, under whose watchcare he has not placed himself, and demand of said church the privilege of engaging with them in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But if the church sees proper to invite, by an unanimous vote, a brother to participate with them in any church meeting, whether it be in the celebration of the Lord's Supper or some other meeting, provided they know said brother to be in good standing in his church, and that the church extending the invitation is in fellowship with his church, we know of nothing in the Bible that prohibits it. If the invitation is extended, it is left to the option of the invited brother to accept or not, as the church has no control over him. If he accepts, he virtually places himself under the watchcare of that church, and is amenable to that church for the time being.

Many churches, to save themselves the trouble of voting in every case that comes before them at their church meetings, authorize their pastor, by unani-

mous vote, to extend at their meetings for business, as well as at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, an invitation to all brethren and sisters present, who are in good standing in churches of the same faith and order, to seats with the church during that special meeting. We see nothing contrary to the Bible in such a course, and have never heard of any harm's growing out of it.

Other churches refuse to extend any invitation at all, either for business meetings or for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. This is their privilege, and no one has the right to complain at the exercise of their privilege.

3d. *Has a minister the right to administer the Lord's Supper to any person privately?*

Most emphatically no. The Lord's Supper being a church ordinance, as the scriptures plainly teach, no one has the right to administer it under any circumstances, unless the church is sitting in a church capacity, and it is commemorated by their direction.

If a member of a church is unable to attend the meetings of the church, and desires to celebrate the Lord's Supper, the church may with propriety sit in a church meeting at the house of said invalid, and celebrate the ordinance. But no minister has any right to administer it under any circumstances except in a church meeting.

4th. *Have conventions, associations and union meetings any right to celebrate the Lord's Supper?*

None whatever. The Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, and conventions and associations and union meetings, not being churches, have no right to celebrate it. A church may celebrate the Lord's Supper at the time of an association, convention, or

union meeting, and extend an invitation to all, or a part, of the members constituting the association, convention or union meeting, to participate with her, provided she knows them to be in good standing, etc.

We repeat, that the Lord's Supper is a *church*, and not a *denominational*, ordinance, and therefore it is never to be administered in any way, under any circumstances, or to any people, that would hinder its being guarded by the church, into whose hands it has been delivered by the Proprietor of the table and Founder of the kingdom.

IV.—WHY WILL WE NOT ADMIT THOSE OF OTHER DENOMINATIONS, WHOM WE BELIEVE TO BE CHRISTIANS, INTO OUR MEETINGS OBSERVING THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND INVITE THEM TO PARTAKE WITH US?

An erroneous idea prevails in some sections of the country, which we wish here to notice. The Lord's Supper is generally called "communion," and as communion signifies fellowship, unity, concord, etc., those who have not carefully examined the subject conclude that by celebrating the Lord's Supper together, Christians say, virtually, they have fellowship, or Christian feeling for one another; and if they will not unite in the celebration of the Lord's Supper they deny that fellowship. This is evidently an error. The Lord's Supper is called a "communion" in only one place in the Bible (I Cor. 10 : 16), and in that place *participation* would be a better word. It is very evident from the context that communion in that passage does not refer to Christian fellowship. The New Version renders it thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of" (the margin says partici-

pation in) “the blood of Christ? The bread (loaf) which we break, is it not the communion of” (participation in) “the body of Christ?” The word signifies a *participation in*, and not *fellowship for*.

Social communion, Christian communion and sacramental communion are not the same, but either of the three may be in full exercise, and the other two absent. Social communion is social fellowship or intercourse between individuals, who may or may not be Christians, may or may not be church members. It may exist where no other communion exists.

Christian communion is Christian fellowship, which is in full exercise among those who have confidence in the Christianity of each other, and engage together in the worship of God, or labor for the advancement of the Master’s cause. Christian communion may exist, when there is no social communion. It may be in full exercise when the parties having the communion are members of different denominations, or members of none. It is created by persons speaking to each other upon religious subjects, and gaining confidence in each other as believers in Christ Jesus.

Sacramental communion is a joint participation in the emblems of the broken body and spilt blood of the Saviour. The laws by which it is governed do not necessarily imply Christian or social communion. It may exist when neither of the others are in existence.

From what we have said, the celebration of the Lord’s Supper is *not* a Christian communion, but a participation in the emblems of his broken body and spilt blood, by a church, the members of which have repented, believed and been baptized.

Our brethren of other denominations, for some of whom we have strong Christian fellowship, and with

whom we can labor and pray, having not complied with the laws of *sacramental communion*, are not privileged to partake of the emblems of his broken body and spilt blood; therefore we do not invite them.

We sometimes meet Christians who are not members of any denomination, and for whom we have Christian fellowship, but we dare not invite them to our Master's table, because he has not authorized us. His table is spread in his kingdom, and all who enter his kingdom are privileged to partake of it, and we have no right to take it out.

2d. *By engaging in the Lord's Supper with the various sects we indorse their errors.*

We know of no denomination of Christians who will invite to their communion board those whom they consider heretical in doctrine or immoral in practice, for by so doing they would indorse their erroneous doctrines and practices. Please refer to the Methodist Discipline, p. 234, in foot notes, and you will find this: "But no person shall be admitted to the Lord's Supper among us who is guilty of *any practice* for which we would exclude a member of our church." So you see our Methodist brethren cannot, according to their Discipline, invite a sound Baptist, Presbyterian, or Lutheran to the Lord's Supper, because those of other denominations are guilty of many practices contrary to their Discipline, and as such they should exclude them were they members with them. What is true of our Methodist brethren in this respect, is true of all, so far as we know. Then we feel that we would not only be violating God's law to engage in the celebration of the Lord's Supper with Pedobaptists, but that we would thereby be endorsing their errors. "In vain do they worship me,

teaching for doctrines the *commandments of men.*" (Math. 7 : 7.) The Saviour in that passage was referring to the Jews, but his remark is applicable to all who have human creeds, rituals, etc. "If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances. Handle not, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using) after the precepts and doctrines of men." (Col. 2 : 20-22, New Version.) Here is a plain command to have nothing to do with them in any way that will endorse their errors.

"If there came any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God's speed? For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (II John 10 : 11.)

V.—WE PROPOSE TO ANSWER A FEW OBJECTIONS TO RESTRICTED COMMUNION.

1st. *It is said that restricted communion shows a lack of love.*

We repeat that the Lord's Supper is not Christian communion. If it were, the objection would be a valid one. We know it is said: "Charity covereth the multitude of sins." (I Peter 4 : 8), and it is also said: "Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." (I Cor. 13 : 6.) Love delights in obeying the commands of God, more than following the traditions of men. Too many look upon the Lord's Supper as a kind of love-feast, in which we are to show our love for another; instead of commemorating the suffering and death of Christ. They say, You don't love us, or you would commune with us. Are we to go to the Lord's table to show our love?

God commands us to love our wives, husbands, children, neighbors and enemies. Are we to take all these with us around the Lord's table, to show that we love them? We feel sure it is better to show our love for God by strict observance of his commands. "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

2d. *If we cannot commune here, how can we commune in heaven?*

The Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, that is to be observed only until the end of time. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye show the Lord's death *till he come.*" (I Cor. 11 : 26.) We will have no need of showing his death in heaven.

"Do this," he cried, "*till time shall end,*
In memory of your dying friend,
Meet at my table, and record
The love of your departed Lord."

VI.—IN CONCLUSION, WE WISH TO MAKE AN APPEAL TO YOUR REASON.

1st. *If the Lord's Supper is a church ordinance, how can we participate in it with those with whom we cannot engage in other activities?*

We hold our business meetings, but people of no denomination think of inviting a person belonging to another Christian denomination to aid them in their business. We never heard of the Masons inviting the Patrons of Husbandry, or Odd Fellows, to participate with them in any of their business meetings, or *vice versa*. We never heard of the Catholics, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists or Baptists inviting those of other denominations to take part in their business; and how can they invite them, with any degree of pro-

priety, to take part in the Lord's Supper, if not in any other church meeting?

This practice of inviting others to partake of the Lord's Supper with a church, has grown out of the idea that the Lord's Supper is not a church ordinance, but merely a kind of Christian rite, in the celebration of which, Christians, whether church members or not, show their love and fellowship one for another. This we have seen to be wrong, from the very nature of the ordinance, and also from God's word.

2d. How can we, with any degree of propriety, participate in the Lord's Supper with those whom we have expelled from our fellowship?

Suppose we have a member guilty of immorality or heresy, and exclude him from our fellowship, can we with any propriety invite him to a seat with the church, in any of her meetings as a church, until he has made acknowledgements and been restored? If one of our ministers should advocate, preach and practice infant baptism, and we should exclude him for the heresy, could we after his exclusion invite him to a seat in our church meetings? Suppose he should connect himself with the Methodist church, could we then invite him to a seat? No reasonable person will answer in the affirmative. If a preacher in the Methodist church should preach against infant baptism, and refuse to baptize or sprinkle infants brought to him for that purpose, the church should, according to the Discipline, exclude him. Can they after exclusion invite him to a sit with the church in any church meeting? But the excluded brother connects himself with the Baptists. He teaches what the Baptists believe and practice, and they can receive him into their fellowship. Can the Methodists, now, ad-

mit him into their church meetings? Can they invite him to participate with them in the Lord's Supper? Well, if they cannot admit him without endorsing his heresy, how can they admit one who has never been connected with them, who is guilty of the same heresy?

Their Discipline rightly prohibits their admitting him to any church privilege. The Bible rule is the safest and best rule, in every thing. Let us ever adhere to the teachings of God's holy book on all matters of faith and practice, and the way will be smooth and even, and the reward sure.

In order to show what Baptists teach upon this pillar, we will quote a few

STANDARD AUTHORS.

"It is wholly unnecessary to array many proofs on this point. The standing charge of 'close communion' is enough to settle the point, that the Baptists are strict in their terms of communion. Because of this peculiar feature in Baptist practice, they are called 'uncharitable,' 'selfish,' 'bigoted,' and 'narrow hearted,' with many other ugly names of reproach. It would seem that our opponents suppose that they have a perfect right to fix any terms of communion which they may deem proper. They have overlooked the fact, that Jesus Christ has fixed the terms of approach to the table, and we have no more right to change his order than we have to establish infant baptism or any other Popish ceremony. The complaint ought not, therefore, to be made against Baptists, but against Him who made the terms 'narrow.' In fact, the reproach of what the world calls, 'close communion,' falls upon Him

who said 'Straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.' Baptists are called to suffer reproach for the sake of Jesus Christ; for it has already been abundantly proved that the Saviour instituted the Supper as held by the Baptists. Restricted communion is practiced by about *fifteen thousand* Baptist churches in America; and the Baptist pulpit and press advocate the same divinely instituted order. Strict communion is distinctly stated in the various expressions of faith published by Baptists. Quite a number of books and tracts have been written in defense of the Bible order of the Supper. Brethren Kiffin, Booth, Fuller and Orchard in England, and in America nearly all our writers, have wielded their pens against 'open communion.' Amidst the multitude of writers in America on the communion question, we mention the names, Curtis, Howell, Waller and Gardner, who have produced books in defense of restricted communion. The 'Church Communion,' by the last named author, is a newly published work of great value. It is conceded that some persons called Baptists have adopted the popular system of *open* communion; but, by the admission of nearly all, they are inconsistent with their own professions, and they stultify themselves by the endorsement of the things which they do not believe. Professor Curtis affirms, truly, that: 'The principle upon which mixed communion rests, *involves a breach of trust*; because baptism and the Lord's Supper are committed to the custody and guardianship of the visible churches of Christ, as such, which are the trustees, the administrators of these ordinances by divine appointment.' We are commanded to 'mark

them which cause divisions contrary to the doctrine of Christ,' and 'avoid them'; but our open communion brethren would say, commune with them! The views of Baptists are expressed in the twenty-second article of the Confession of Faith, published by Joseph Belcher in the 'Religious Denominations.' This article expresses the Baptist doctrine of communion as follows: 'The Supper of the Lord Jesus was instituted by him the same night he was betrayed, to be observed in his churches unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance, and showing forth the sacrifice of himself in his death.'" (*Bap. Suc.*, pp. 263, 264.)

SEVENTH PILLAR.

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE FOR THE WORLD—
NEVER TO PERSECUTE, BUT ALWAYS TO
HAVE BEEN PERSECUTED, AND
“EVERYWHERE SPOKEN
AGAINST.”

“For as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against. Acts 28:22.

Though the churches of Christ have in all ages of the Christian dispensation been opposed, spoken against, and persecuted by wicked men and pretending religionists, they have never persecuted others, but have always, and in every country, contended for liberty of conscience for the world. They have never made an effort to have laws enacted in any nation, that would give them advantage over their brethren of other persuasions, but have asked on every suitable occasion to have such laws placed upon the statute books, as would guarantee to all the right to worship God as conscience might dictate; and prayed that “they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid.” (Micah. 4 : 4.)

We propose in this discourse to notice

I.—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST HAS IN ALL AGES OF THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION BEEN PERSECUTED.

Its doctrines, laws, ordinances, ceremonies and rites of every kind are so different from what the world would be pleased to recognize, that it has been spoken against, and even persecuted by those who

could not discern those things that are to be spiritually discerned. This is not to be wondered at, when it is remembered

1st. *Jesus, its founder, was persecuted.*

“Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him, stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.” (Isaiah 53 : 4, 5.) “For they persecuted him whom thou hast smitten; and they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.” (Psa. 70 : 26.)

At the pool of Bethesda lay a poor impotent man, who had been afflicted thirty-eight years, and was unable, when the angel troubled the waters, to get in the pool before some one else would step in. Jesus saw him, had compassion on him, and healed him of his sore affliction upon the Sabbath day. This was so different from what the Jews had been taught, that, not being able to discern from a spiritual stand-point the real necessity of such a course, it is said: “And, therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the Sabbath day.” (John 5 : 16.)

Follow the life of Jesus through, and you will find that it was a life of trials, hardships, and persecutions, from the manger to the cross. Hear what he says to the multitude that were following him to the cross, bewailing and lamenting him: “If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?” (Luke 23 : 31.) As much as to say, If they persecute and ill treat me, the founder and head of my church, what may the church itself expect?

2d. *The prophets declared that the church should be persecuted.*

Daniel says: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them." (Dan. 7 : 21.) "And a host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground." (Dan. 8 : 12.) "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." (v. 24.) "And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." (Dan. 11 : 31.) "The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them." (Rev. 11 : 7.) "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them." (Rev. 13 : 7.) "And I saw the women drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." (Rev. 17 : 6.) "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them." (v. 14.) "But before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake." (Luke 21 : 12.)

We might add many similar passages to show that the prophets declared that the church should be persecuted, did time and space permit. But we now wish to notice that,

3d. *Jesus promised persecution to his people.*

Persecution is a part of the heritage Jesus promised to his people. They should not complain at their lot

It is best for them, or Jesus would not have promised it to them. "All things work together for good, to them that love God, to those who are called according to his purpose." (Rom. 8 : 28.) If Jesus promised persecution to his people, those who are not persecuted may doubt their claim to be called the people of God. "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." (Math. 5 : 19.) Persecution being promised to the church of Christ, all organizations that have not been persecuted may reasonably conclude they are not the church of Christ.

"Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundred fold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers and children, and lands, with persecutions, and in the world to come, eternal life." (Mark 10 : 29, 30.) Jesus makes great promises to those who make sacrifices for him; but with the promises, persecutions are mentioned. God's children need not expect peace in this world, if they zealously "contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," (Jude 3), because that faith is at variance with the world. Upon this point Jesus says: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Math. 10 : 34-36.) When Jesus sent out his ministers to proclaim the everlasting gospel, he said to them, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in

the midst of wolves: be ye therefore, wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. But beware of men; for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in the synagogues. And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles.” (Math. 10 : 16 18.) No peace with the world is promised to the church, for “all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecutions,” (II Tim. 3 : 12), and they who discharge the duties enjoined upon them by Jesus the Law-Giver of Zion, “will live godly in Christ Jesus.”

Jesus, the founder of the Church, was persecuted; the Prophets declared that the church should be persecuted; Jesus promised persecution to his followers; and the very genius of Christianity demands persecution at the hand of the world; for “the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be.” (Rom. 3 : 7.)

Let us now briefly take up the history of Christ’s church, and follow it on in its persecution, to the present.

4th. *Persecution began quite early in the history of the church of Christ.*

Shortly after the crucifixion of our Saviour, the disciples were gathered together in one place to worship, but for fear of the Jews, “the doors were shut.” (John 20 : 19.) The little band were persecuted from place to place, so that while Christianity was in its very infancy, God’s children were compelled to worship him in secrecy. You all remember that pious, godly Stephen disputed with the learned men of the synagogue, and when “they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake, then

they suborned men, which said: We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God. And they stirred up the people and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council, and set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law," (Acts 6 : 10-13), and they gave him a mock trial, cast him out of the city, and stoned him to death. (Acts 7.) Thus, Stephen, a short time after the organization of the Jerusalem church, suffered martyrdom at the hands of the enemies of the church of Christ.

Saul of Tarsus breathed out threatening and slaughter against the people of God. He went to the high priest "and desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." (Acts 9 : 2.) At the time of the martyrdom of Stephen, "there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout Judea and Samaria, except the apostles," and it was to apprehend these fugitive members that Saul had obtained letters of authority from the high priest. To what extent God permitted him to go, and how he was arrested, you have all learned. But Paul declares that, in what he did, he "persecuted the church of God." (I Cor. 15 : 9.)

Herod the king "stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take Peter also. And when he had apprehended him, he put him in

prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him.” (Acts 12 : 1-4.) Through persecutions James was killed and Peter cast into prison, in order that certain of the church might be vexed.

For preaching in Antioch, Paul and Barnabas were persecuted and expelled from their coasts. (Acts 13 : 50.) Paul and Silas, for preaching in Philippi, were whipped and cast into prison in the most cruel manner. (Acts 16.) Paul, in speaking of his own persecutions, says: “Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one, thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned.” (II Cor. 11 : 24.)

This state of affairs lasted throughout the apostolic age. Christians were persecuted by both Jews and Gentiles, But we cannot now mention more instances, but proceed to remark,

5th. *Persecutions became rife after the Catholics came into existence.*

It was about the year 250 that Fabian, bishop or pastor of the church of Rome, died. The church, previous to this event, had become very lax in discipline, and two parties had come into existence. The majority of the church called on Cornelius to serve them as pastor, while the minority, who held the apostolic doctrines, and were strict in discipline, made choice of Novatian as their pastor.

The majority, led by the ambitious Cornelius, went, step by step, into what is now known as Catholicism, while Novatian, and the party of which he was the recognized leader, “carrying out their governing principle in all details, they baptized all who joined their churches, even though they had been already baptized by ministers of the orthodox body, deeming the baptism of a corrupt church invalid. They were,

therefore, the first 'Anabaptists' in the strict and proper sense of that word." (*Cramp*, p. 57.)

Novatian churches were very numerous throughout the empire, and their purity in discipline, and strict adherence to the apostolic teaching, gave them the name of "Cathari," or Puritans. They were not, however, to be left to the enjoyment of their religious liberties in peace. It was but a short time after the two parties came into existence, before the party under the leadership of Cornelius waged a war of persecution against the Novatians, in which all their documents and books were destroyed; on account which we are to-day deprived of much valuable information concerning them.

Some time after the "Cathari" under Novatian became known in Rome, other churches, under the leadership of Donatus, in Africa, advocated the same views, and "Anabaptists" became numerous over all the land where Christianity was known; and persecutions became more common wherever the Catholics were in power.

"Both the Novatians and the Donatists suffered severely for their dissent—especially the latter. The celebrated Augustine taught the unchristian doctrine that heresy should be suppressed by the civil magistrate, and invoked the imperial sword against the Donatists. Their property was confiscated, the prisons were crammed with them, and great numbers lost their lives by the hands of the executioner. A sanguinary law was enacted, that the rebaptized and the rebaptizer should be put to death. That so atrocious an enactment should excite tumults, in a country where the separatists constituted one half of the Christian population, cannot be considered surprising.

Other persons, not connected with them, took advantage of it, and great disorder ensued. But Augustine and his party were the aggressors.” (*Cramp*, pp. 61,62.)

The doctrines taught by those Anabaptists were called, by the Catholics, heresy, and every means their ingenuity could devise was brought into requisition to prevent the spread of those principles. In *Cramp's History* we find their

“INFALLIBLE RECIPE FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF
HERESY.

“If it is propagated by preaching, silence the preacher; if he *will* preach, put him out of the way.

“If it is propagated by writing, burn the books; should the author still persist, burn him too.” (*Probatum est*, p. 88.)

We will next call your attention to the persecution and martyrdom of Peter of Bruys, who spent several years preaching, in the south of France, with great power, and whose labors were abundantly blessed.

“Peter was not merely what is now called a ‘Baptist in principle.’ When the truths he inculcated were received, and men and women were raised to ‘newnessness of life,’ they were directed to the path of duty. Baptism followed faith. Enemies said this was Anabaptism, but Peter and his friends indignantly repelled the imputation. The rite performed in infancy, they maintained, was no baptism at all, since it wanted the essential ingredient, faith in Christ. Then, and then only, when that faith was professed, were the converts really baptized.” (*Cramp*, p. 129.)

“Baptism and the church were contemplated by Peter in the pure light of Scripture. The church should be composed, he constantly affirmed, of true

believers, good and just persons; no others had any claim to membership. Baptism was a nullity unless connected with personal faith, but all who believed were under solemn obligations to be baptized, according to the Saviour's command." (*Ibid.*)

For twenty years great success attended his labors. His preaching was at first in sparsely settled communities and small villages, but he could not be concealed. Large multitudes flocked to hear him, "and the towns and cities of Narbonne and Languedoc were enlightened by his ministry." (*Ibid.*)

In consequence of his proclaiming the truth as it is in God's word, pure and unadulterated, he was denominated by the enemies of God a heretic. "Labbe, the Jesuit, evidently regarded Peter of Bruys as a man by whose labors great injury was inflicted on Romanism. These are his words: 'Almost all the heretics who came after Peter of Bruys trod in the steps of his heresy; hence he may be deservedly called the parent of heresies.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 131.)

"Martyrdom awaited him. Having preached with his accustomed fervor at St. Gillis, in Languedoc, the infuriated populace seized him and hurried him to the stake. It was like the murder of Stephen—the act of a lawless mob. Nor can we doubt that the Lord, whose presence cheered the first martyr, comforted Peter of Bruys, and enabled him to meet death, even in that terrible form, with the composure of faith. Such was the end of a Baptist minister of the twelfth century. Peter's martyrdom is supposed to have occurred about the year 1124." (*Ibid.*, p. 131.)

We can in a sermon refer you to only a few instances, selected from the hundreds upon record, to prove that the enemies of God were continually upon

the alert, to persecute, even unto death, the humble followers of Jesus, and the truthful expounders of his word. During the dark ages, or in other words, from the rise of Catholicism till the dawn of the reformation in the fifteenth century, the apocalyptic woman, who sat "upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns," was "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." (Rev. 17.) The true followers of Jesus were driven upon the mountain tops, into caves and dens of the earth, into fodder-lofts, cellars, or the other places of security, where there was a probability that they might have the privilege of worshipping together unmolested by their vigilant persecutors. But in many instances they were hunted down like mad-dogs, cast into prison, or met the martyr's fate.

But how was it during the Reformation period? Cramp says: "When Luther blew the trumpet of religious freedom, the sound was heard far and wide, and the Baptists came out of their hiding-places, to share in the general gladness, and to take part in the conflict. For years they had lived in concealment, worshipping God by stealth, and practiced the social duties of Christianity in the best manner they could, under the most unfavorable circumstances. Now they hoped for peace and enlargement, and fondly expected to enjoy the co-operation of the Reformers in carrying into effect those changes which they knew were required in order to restore Christian churches to primitive purity. They were doomed to bitter disappointment. The Reformers had no sympathy with Baptists, but strove to suppress them—Papists and Protestants, Episcopalians and Presby-

terians treated them in the same manner. The Baptists travelled too fast and went too far; if they could not be stopped by other means, the fire must be lighted or the headsman's axe employed. Thus *the men* were silenced; the Emperor, Charles V, whom historians have delighted to honor, ordered *the women* to be drowned, or burned alive. Hundreds were sent out of the world by these methods; thousands more lost their lives by the slower processes of penury and innumerable hardships. The demon of persecution reaped an immense harvest in those days." (pp. 151, 152.)

Thus we see that the Reformation brought no protection to the churches of Christ; but the very denominations brought into existence by the Reformation, joined their parent, "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth" (Rev. 26 : 5), in persecuting the saints of the Most High.

We will now notice a few instances of persecution in Germany and elsewhere. "Nearly three hundred and fifty persons suffered in various ways in the Palatinate, in the year 1529. These persecutions were the fruits of imperial edicts. Ferdinand, king of Hungary and Bohemia, issued an edict in 1527, denouncing death to the Baptists. The priests were commanded to read it publicly in the churches four times a year for ten years. By the edict in which the decisions of the diet were embodied, it was clearly ordained that all and every Anabaptist, or rebaptized person, whether male or female, being of ripe years and understanding, should be deprived of life, and according to the circumstances of the individual, be put to death by fire, sword or otherwise." (*Cramp*, pp. 167, 168.)

There were nine brethren and three sisters in Alzey prison when this edict was published, and without further trial, they were put to death, "the brethren by the sword and the sisters by being drowned in the horse-pond." (*Ibid.*)

Leonard Bernkop was burned to death in 1542. His last words were: "Through the power of God, the suffering I feel is but little, and it is light compared with everlasting glory."

Two young Christian girls, after being severely tortured in prison, were led out to be executed; and when, in mockery, their diabolical persecutors placed crowns of straw on their heads, one said to the other: "Since Christ wore a crown of thorns for us, why should we not in return, and for his honor, wear this crown of straw?" And in this way they went cheerfully to the stake and were burned.

Johannes Bair, of Lichtenfels, met the martyr's fate, after lying in prison about twenty-three years.

Hans Tichner, after being racked, tortured and made to hang for hours on the ropes, was bound hand and foot, and confined in a dark dungeon for more than half a year, then bound to a stake and beheaded.

During this period there were many Baptists in Italy who attained the honor of martyrdom. Among that number we will mention Julius Klampherer, who was drowned at Venice in 1561. Franciscus van der Sack, with another brother, was drowned in the same city in 1564. Hans George was thrown overboard on his voyage from Germany to Venice, and drowned. We might mention many more who met a similar fate, at the hands of the enemies of Christ, in Italy, but these must suffice.

In England, soon after Henry VIII became head of the Episcopal church, "ten were burned in pairs in different places, in 1535, and fourteen more in 1536." The king gave orders that all Baptist books be burned, and if Baptists did not recant, they too, should be burned. On Nov. 24, 1538, three men and one woman escaped the flames at Smithfield, by bearing fagots at "St. Paul's Cross," and afterwards renouncing their supposed errors. Three days afterward a man and woman were committed to the flames, and thus bore testimony for Jesus.

"The hatred of Baptists was further shown by excepting them from general acts of pardon. Thieves and vagabonds shared the king's favor, but Baptists were not to be tolerated." (*Cramp*, p. 234.)

"Let Cæsar's dues be ever paid
To Cæsar and his throne;
But consciences and souls were made
To be the Lord's alone." (*Watts*.)

Time would fail us to speak of even a tithe of the sufferings inflicted upon the righteous for Jesus, in the Old World, during those troublous times. We cannot, however, close this part of our discourse without referring to the execution of the young Hewlings, grandsons of that noted and pious minister, W. Kiffin; of Thomas Delaune, who was shut in the filthy dungeon of Newgate prison, until death brought relief to the pious sufferer; of the devoted and charitable Elizabeth Gaunt, who was burned at the stake on account of her works of love; of the world-renowned John Bunyan, who lay for twelve long years in Bedford jail, because he would preach the gospel. Indeed were the sufferings of God's people great in those days! Defoe, in speaking of

the death of Delaune, says: "I am sorry to say, he is one of near *eight thousand* Protestant Dissenters that perished in prison in the days of that merciful prince, King Charles II, and that merely for dissenting from the church in points which they could give such reasons for as this (Delaune's) Plea assigns; and for no other cause were stifled, I had almost said murdered, in jails for their religion." (*Cramp*, p. 364.)

6th. *We will now call your attention to the persecution of God's people in the United States, by Catholics and Protestants.*

"While other denominations," says D. B. Ray, "dispute among themselves, they unite in opposing the Baptists. The Baptists are the objects of derision and persecution among both Catholics and Protestants. They are accounted as the common enemy of sects, creeds and formularies of the whole Catholic and Protestant world. They are also looked upon with suspicion and contempt by the kings and tyrants of the earth, as the enemies of all governments." (*Bap. Suc.*, p. 271.)

In the year 1644 the Legislature of Massachusetts passed a law to punish all Baptists for rejecting infant baptism. A Baptist by the name of Painter, who refused to have his child baptized, believing it to be an "unchristian ordinance," was tied up and severely whipped.

While Dr. John Clarke was preaching in a private house July 19, 1651, he, with Obadiah Holmes and John Crandall, was arrested and committed to Boston jail. On the last day of that month he was fined twenty pounds, Holmes thirty and Crandall five, or each to be well whipped. Clarke and Crandall were

released on paying the fine, but Holmes was whipped the following September, receiving thirty strokes "with a three-corded whip."

Just as Shubael Dimoch was closing a sermon in a school-house in Mansfield, he was arrested by the sheriff and committed to Windham jail.

It is said by truthful historians that as many as thirty Baptist ministers were imprisoned and ill-treated in Virginia for preaching the gospel to sinners. Of these sufferers we will mention James Ireland, who was committed to jail in Culpepper. His enemies devised every plan in their power to destroy him, but God preserved his life. They tried to blow him up with gunpowder, to suffocate him by the fumes of brimstone; and finally attempted to poison him. The only charge preferred against him was, "Preaching the Gospel of the Son of God."

Every historian is familiar with the circumstance of Patrick Henry's riding sixty miles, in the State of Virginia, to please the cause of three Baptist ministers who were indicted for "Preaching the Gospel of the Son of God."

We have abundance of proof that the people of God were persecuted in the New, as well as the Old World. Protestants and Catholics persecuted each other in Europe, Asia and Africa. Whenever the Catholics were in the ascendancy, they became the persecutors, and *vice versa*. In many instances, as in the case of the Pilgrims, the persecuted sought an asylum of safety on the shores of America. And what is strange, they who ran from persecutions became themselves persecutors, whenever they were in the ascendancy; and the Baptists were in the New, as

well as in the Old World, the victims of persecution, at the hands of both Catholics and Protestants.

7th. *Did the laws allow it, the churches of the living God would be persecuted still.*

The principle of a State church carries with it the germ of persecution. The tendency of infant baptism is to unite Church and State. In this day of great religious enlightenment, in all nations where the State supports an established church, there is more or less tendency to persecution. The churches of Christ have ever contended against the union of the Church and State, on account of the germ of persecution hidden therein. "The *British Banner*, of July 10, 1850, states that a petition was presented from one hundred and twenty ministers and delegates of the associated Baptist churches of Yorkshire, praying for the *separation of Church and State*, and that the national property, hitherto engrossed by a few sects, might be devoted to secular and really useful purposes." (*Trilemma*, pp. 148, 149.)

We do not claim that every man who advocates a different religion from the true principles of Christianity, taught in the Bible, would become a persecutor, nor do we claim that persecutions would be carried on to the same extent they were in the dark ages of superstition and ignorance; yet we do believe that the leaders of the various sects would, if they had the power, compel men and women by law, to advocate, join and support their particular organization. This is proven by their great anxiety to get members into their churches, and train them in their peculiar Confessions of Faith and Discipline. When they baptize an infant they make it a member against its own free will, and if they had the power, there is

no doubt but that they would make grown men and women members too, against their wills. The principle is the same in both cases, and underneath it is hidden the germ of persecution.

“Circumstances indicate that many sectarian leaders would now lay violent hands on faithful Baptist ministers as in former times. This persecuting spirit is developed from day to day in the sectarian papers, pamphlets and books that are scattered broadcast over the land. The following is found in the *Banner of Peace*, of November 26, 1868, a Cumberland Presbyterian paper: ‘I think the Baptist Church is a clear despotism, if there is one on earth; and they ought to cover their lips and bury their faces in everlasting shame, and cease to abuse the papacy of Rome, and other sects, as they call them.’ Elder N. H. Lee, of the *Methodist*, says: ‘It is not the Baptist people, as such, that I oppose, but the false principles and bigotry of their priesthood.’ No doubt, such Baptist-lovers as Elder Lee, and the *Banner of Peace* (!), if they had the power, would attempt to force Baptists, not only into ‘everlasting shame,’ but to prison and death, on account of their ‘false principles and bigotry,’ as their Pedobaptist ancestors, the Catholics, have always done when in power.” (*Ray*, pp. 279, 280.)

II.—THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST HAVE NEVER PERSECUTED.

When Jesus promised persecution to his people as a part of their heritage, he never gave them permission to persecute in return. When he was reviled he reviled not again, laying an example worthy the emulation of his people. “Blessed are ye, when men

shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad." (Math. 5 : 11.) He forbade their reviling and persecuting: "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which spitefully use you, and persecute you." The laws of the kingdom of God forbid persecutions. The Churches of Christ cannot persecute, and remain his churches. The day they begin to persecute they become apostate. The Churches of Christ, instead of being persecuting bodies, have always advocated soul liberty. This principle was plainly manifested among the Donatists, as they were called in the early ages of the Christian dispensation. When the differences between them and the rapidly corrupt-growing Catholics were submitted to imperial decision, the Donatists said: "What has the emperor to do with the church? What have Christians to do with kings, or bishops at court?" (*Cramp*, p. 61.) They claimed that the judicial authorities have nothing to do with church matters. They labored for soul liberty, in the worship of God, for all mankind. They contended that "all men might believe and act in religion as they please, without the interference of the civil magistrate. His duties, they said, were confined to the preservation of good order and the protection of property and life; God had not given him the power to regulate religious affairs, nor authorized him to impose any mode of worship, or to punish such as might refuse to admit his usurpations." (*Ibid*, pp. 153, 154.)

Shelden and Willard say: "The Baptists have

ever been the firm friends and supporters of religious liberty. The right which they claim for themselves of professing their own religion, they cheerfully concede to all. To punish men for religious opinions peaceably asserted, without injury to civil society, they consider as persecution." (*Trilemma*, pp. 147, 148.)

There cannot be a single instance found in the history of the church of Christ, where it ever became a persecuting body. Some say that the reason why Baptist churches never persecuted is that they never had the power. Let us look into the matter.

In 1636 Roger Williams, who had adopted the Baptist principle of soul liberty, established a colony in Rhode Island upon the principle that, in matters of religion, men should enjoy freedom of conscience, and that the union of Church and State was contrary to the true principles of the gospel; and that colony never did persecute any religious people, but became an asylum for religionists of all persuasions.

In 1785, through the influence of the Episcopalians, a law was passed in Georgia, for the establishment and support of religion, which embraced all denominations, and gave all equal privileges. The Baptists being more numerous in members and ministers than any other, might have received a State support, and occupied the entire State. But not so. They saw in the measure the germ of persecution, and knew that the principles underlying their denomination forbade any such alliance. They sent two messengers to the next legislature and had the obnoxious law repealed.

Sometime about the commencement of the present century, the privilege of becoming the established church was tendered the Baptists of Holland, which they at once respectfully refused.

The Baptists never coveted the power to persecute. They have been always persecuted and “everywhere spoken against,” but have never, in any age of their history, or in any country, persecuted others.

We have now closed our sermons on the “Seven Baptist Pillars.” From our investigations we have learned that all the *Pillars* are Scriptural, and are peculiar characteristics of the Baptist Denomination. Such being the case, we feel safe in saying that the institution now known in the world by the name of the “Baptist Church,” is the kingdom or church that Jesus the Christ established in the world. It was built upon “this rock;” had given it the seven peculiar marks, or characteristics, we have considered in these discourses; and the gates of hell have not prevailed against it. “This is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.” (Psalm 118 : 23.)

With reverence to His great name, we will conclude this service with the words of the celebrated Cowper:

“ God moves in a mysterious way
 His wonders to perform;
 He plants his footsteps in the sea,
 And rides upon the storm.

Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
 But trust him for his grace;
 Behind a frowning providence,
 He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,
 Unfolding every hour;
 The bud may have a bitter taste,
 But sweet will be the flower.

Blind unbelief is sure to err.
 And scan his works in vain;
 God is his own interpreter,
 And he will make it plain.”

BAPTIST HISTORY.*

“The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”—
Math. 16 : 18.

Every Christian denomination, as well as every institution, of whatever character, had its origin at some time in the world's history, and under some circumstances. Where the history of an institution has been kept faithfully, it is not difficult to trace it to its origin. We can easily trace Methodism to John Wesley, its founder; Presbyterianism, to John Calvin; Lutheranism, to Martin Luther; Campbellism, to Alexander Campbell; Episcopalianism, to Henry VIII; Mormonism, to Joe Smith; etc. But the question is often asked, “Where and when did the Baptists originate?” And it is often answered, by those ignorant of Baptist history, that they originated with Roger Williams, or with the “Mad men of Munster.” The question is important, and the answer should be of interest to, at least, every Baptist. We will now proceed to examine the history of the Baptists sufficiently to ascertain their origin and principal characteristics.

Before commencing, however, we wish to disabuse the minds of those who entertain the idea that the Baptists originated, either with Roger Williams, or at the “Munster Riot,” by saying that such is not the historical fact.

*This sermon, and the one that follows, on “Feet-Washing,” were delivered after the series on the “Seven Pillars” was closed; and by the urgent request of many brethren they are both appended.

Roger Williams entertained Baptist views, so far as baptism and soul liberty were concerned, but was never identified with the Baptists in church relationship. He was never baptized by order of any church, or by an authorized minister, and so never became a member of any Baptist church, and was never recognized by the Baptists as a minister. His society came to nought, without turning out any ministers, or any church ever growing out of it. (For full history see "Trilemma," by J. R. Graves.)

Baptists, as a denomination, never had anything to do with the "Munster Riot," though some disorderly members might have been associated with the rioters. As has been shown in the preceding discourses, Baptists could never take up the sword to enforce their principles, and still be Baptists. Their enemies, we are frank to admit, claimed that the rioters were Baptists, but the facts of history show to the contrary. The charge was denied by the Baptists of that day.

We will make one quotation to vindicate the Baptists of the charge: "Were they not your people," said the lady of the Governor of Friesland, to Jaques Dosie, "that disgracefully and shamefully took up the sword against the magistrates at Amsterdam and Munster." "Oh no, madam," Jaques replied; "those persons greatly erred. But we consider it a devilish doctrine to resist the magistrates by the outward sword and violence. We would much rather suffer persecution and death at their hands, and whatever is appointed us to suffer." (*Martyrology*, 357.) Those wishing further information are referred to Cramp, 249-257.

We come now to answer the question, "Where did the Baptists originate?" We answer, they originated

with the Saviour. The churches planted in Jerusalem, Rome, Thessalonica, Corinth and other places, in the apostles' day, were Baptist churches. That institution against which Jesus declared "The gates of hell shall not prevail," was what is known at this time as the Baptist Church. We claim that the denomination of Christians now known by the name of Baptists, had their origin in the days of Christ's nativity on earth, and, preserved by his mighty power and grace, have lived to the present day. In arguing this line of church succession, we do not contend that our people have always been called Baptists. Our enemies have at different ages and in different countries, called us by many different names. We are not contending for the name, but for the institution that now bears that name.

After the party in Rome were led out by Cornelius, they assumed the name of "Holy Catholic Church," and gave us, in Italy, the name of Novatians, and in Africa, that of Donatists. In some places we were called "Cathari," or Puritans, sometimes "Acephali," or Headless; at other times and places we were called Piedmontites, Paulicians, Petrobrussians, Waldenses, Mennonites, Anabaptists, Immersionists; and in many localities at present we are called Missionaries. These names, given us by our enemies, indicated sometimes the locality we occupied, sometimes the doctrines we preached, or the practices we observed; and at other times they were given in honor of ministers of note in our ranks. We do not contend for any name, but answer to whatever name our enemies give us.

We will proceed now briefly,

I. TO TRACE THE BAPTISTS BACK TO THEIR ORIGIN AS A SOCIETY OF CHRISTIANS.

“Baptists claim that they are successors to the ‘witnesses of Jesus,’ who preserved the faith once delivered to the saints, and kept the ordinances as they were originally committed to the primitive churches. They claim to be the lineal descendants of the martyrs who, for so many ages, sealed their testimony with their blood. They claim that they can trace the history of communities, essentially like themselves, back through the ‘wilderness’ into which they were driven by the dragon, and the beast that succeeded him, and the image of the beast, by *a trail of blood*, lighted up by a thousand stake fires, until that blood mingles with the blood of the apostles, and the Son of God, and John the Baptist. They believe that they never did, ecclesiastically, symbolize with Papacy, but repudiated it as Antichrist, and withdrew from it, and refused to recognize its baptisms or ordinances, or its priests as the ministers of Christ. These are bold claims, we admit; yet, if we can sustain them successfully against those of any other communion, it is not only our right, but our imperative duty to do so.” (*Trilemma*, p. 119.)

The first witness we introduce to testify in favor of these claims is Mosheim, the Lutheran historian, and one of the most bitter enemies the Baptists ever had. His honesty as a historian compelled him to say: “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, and derived that of Mennonites from that famous man to whom they owe the greatest part

of their present felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, extremely difficult to be ascertained.” (Vol. IV, p. 427.)

Mosheim admits that the origin of the Anabaptists, know in this day as Baptists, is not of recent date, but “*is hid in the remote depths of antiquity.*” He also tells us that they were called “Mennonites.” Hear again what he says: “It may be observed that the Mennonites (Anabaptists), are not entirely mistaken when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrussians and other ancient sects, who were usually considered as witnesses of the truth, in the times of universal darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrines, which the Waldenses, Wicliffites and Hussites had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more public manner, viz: ‘That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church he had established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors.’” His description of those people shows they were Baptists. He says they existed long before Luther’s and Calvin’s day.

Our next witness is Zwingle, a Swiss reformer, contemporary with Luther and a follower of Calvin. Here is what he says: “The institution of Anabaptism is no novelty, but for thirteen hundred years has caused great disturbance in the church, and has

acquired such a strength, that the attempt in this age to contend with it, appeared futile for a time." *Thirteen hundred years* from Zwingle's day carries our history back to about the year 225. Well might Mosheim say that our origin, as a Christian organization, "is hid in the remote depths of antiquity." This was about the time that Cornelius, at the head of the popular party in Rome, went into Catholicism, and Novatian and others led the Apostolic party on in the doctrines of the Bible.

We have had one Lutheran and one Presbyterian to testify to the antiquity of the Baptists; now we will put a noted Catholic upon the stand. Cardinal Hosius, the most powerful Catholic of his day, (1650), says: "If the truth of religion were to be judged of by the readiness and cheerfulness which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of Anabaptists, [Baptists], since there have been none, for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more generally punished, or that have more cheerfully and steadfastly undergone, and even offered themselves to, the most cruel sorts of punishment, than these people."

"These Anabaptists are a pernicious sect, of which kind the Waldensian brethren seem also to have been. Nor is this heresy a modern thing, for it existed in the time of Austin." (*Rees' Reply to Wall*, p. 20, as quoted in *Trilemma*.)

"Austin was born in A. D. 354. This gives Baptists a high antiquity." (*Trilemma*.)

The "History of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands," written by Drs. Ypey and Dermomt, two distinguished Pedobaptist scholars, contains a chap-

ter on the Dutch Baptists, from which we quote this: "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in latter times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long, in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. ON THIS ACCOUNT THE BAPTISTS MAY BE CONSIDERED THE ONLY CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY WHICH HAS STOOD SINCE THE APOSTLES, AND AS A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY WHICH HAS PRESERVED PURE THE DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES." (See *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* – Art. *Mennonites*.)

These facts, given by eminent Pedobaptist historians, no scholar will deny. We are now called "Baptists"—were formerly called "Anabaptists" or "Mennonites," who were called "Waldenses," who extended back to the "Donatists" and Novatians," who originated with the Apostles.

To make the matter still plainer, we will say: 1st. American Baptists originated with the Baptists of England, Wales and other countries. 2d. English Baptists are descendants from German Baptists. 3d. German Baptists descended from the ancient Waldenses. 4th. Here we are connected, by the chain of historic succession, to the ancient Novatians. 5th. And the Novatians were the pure Apostolic Churches. So, we see, the Baptists originated with Christ. He is their *founder* as well as their *head*.

For fear some may not be fully satisfied respecting our origin, we will make quotations from two other authentic historians before we pass.

"During the first three centuries, Christian congregations, all over the East, subsisted in separate, independent bodies, unsupported by government,

and consequently without any secular power over one another. All this time they were *baptized* (Baptist) *churches*, and though all the fathers of the first four ages, down to Jerome, were of Greece, Syria and Africa; and though they give great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not one record of the baptism of a child till the year 370, when Galates, the dying son of the Emperor Valerius, was baptized, by order of a monarch who swore he would not be contradicted." (*Rol's Eccl. Res.* p. 55.) Roberson tell us positively that the churches of the first three centuries were Baptist churches. They had a republican form of government, and were independent bodies. They baptized none but adults.

Mr. D. B Ray, who has spent much time in making historical researches, and has written a book on Baptist Succession, has the following: "From the shores of America we have followed the footprints of the Baptist denomination back through England, Holland and Germany, to the valley of the Piedmont, and thence to Italy and the land of Judea, in the apostolic age. In all our examinations we find no flaw or break in the chain of our denominational succession. But it is admitted that our ancestors were called by different names in different ages of the world. We now find ourselves connected with the primitive churches of the first and second centuries. And it is admitted by all that these churches bore the apostolic character. They were modelled after the original church founded by Christ himself, at Jerusalem."

"Thus we have reached the fountain-head of that mighty stream of spiritual churches flowing down from Jerusalem through the desert gloom of more

than eighteen centuries, and watering the famished world with the pure gospel of the River of Life. Here is found the light-house of the world, erected upon the Rock of Eternal Ages, casting its beams of heavenly light far over the stormy seas, while gross darkness envelops the world, and the multitudes were wandering after the beast." (*Baptist Suc*, pp. 169, 170.)

These extracts from authentic history, written by men, both Baptist and Pedobaptist, of undoubted integrity, teach us clearly the truthfulness of the text, that "the gates of hell" have not prevailed against the Church of Christ; but that it has existed in all ages, from the time of its establishment till the present; and though it has been called by different names, it has remained the same institution, and is now known by the common name of the Baptist Church.

We propose now to show that,

1st. *This Institution has ever had a Baptistic Creed.*

We mean by a "Baptistic creed," that those churches, in this long line of succession of over eighteen hundred years, have all the time been characterized by the "*Seven Pillars*," which we have discussed in the preceding sermons.

Baptists have always recognized Jesus the Christ as founder and head of the church; hence their enemies called them the *acephali*, or headless.

Because they adhered tenaciously to the Scriptures as their only rule of faith and practice, and never observed men-made Confessions of Faith, Disciplines and Rituals as binding upon them, was one reason why they were so sorely persecuted, even to the dungeon, the rack and the stake.

That they taught, believed and practiced the *Bible order* of the commandments, is proven by the decided stand Novatian, Donatus and others, in Italy, Africa and elsewhere, took when Catholic corruptions began to taint the church. Also, by the baptism of believers only. The baptism of the first child was in 370, and that occurred amongst the Catholics.

That they have always taught that immersion in water is the only baptism, is proven, beyond a doubt, from the fact that they always baptized those coming to them from Catholic and Protestant ranks; claiming, like Peter of Bruys and all other true Baptists, that Catholic and Protestant baptism (so called) was no baptism. For this reason their enemies named them "Rebaptizers," or "Anabaptists."

That they claimed equal rights and privileges in the execution of the laws of the church, by all the members, is proven from the fact that they were free and independent bodies, holding to a democratic form of government, not being amenable to pope, priest or king. A great part of their persecutions was attributed to their tenacious adherence to this Pillar.

That they believed the Lord's Supper was strictly a church ordinance, is proven from the fact that their history and established principles compelled them to recognize all other denominations as heretics or schismatics. For this they have ever been called "selfish," "narrow-minded," "bigots," etc., and have been "everywhere spoken against."

That they have ever advocated "Liberty of Conscience," for all mankind, is proven from the fact that they were the first, and the only ones for hundreds of years, to contend for that boon of heaven. History

teaches, on almost every page, that they were persecuted by Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, Catholics, Protestants and Infidels, but never persecuted any.

They have been, in all ages of their history, firm advocates of the "Seven Baptist Pillars," and as such have always been what is now called the "Baptist Church."

Cramp, the historian, in speaking of the churches in Novatian's time, says: "The Novatian churches were what are now called Baptist churches, adhering to the apostolic and primitive practice." (p. 59.)

The same author, quoting from the Waldensian Articles of Faith, gives the following: "We acknowledge *no* sacraments, as of divine appointment, but baptism and the Lord's Supper" (p. 146.) And he adds: "The use of the sacrament is limited to believers." Their doctrines were thoroughly Baptist. They recognized no church ordinances but baptism and the Lord's Supper, and admitted none to these but believers, just as true Baptists have done in all ages of their history.

Again, Mr. Cramp, in speaking of the Baptist churches in the days of Peter of Bruys, says: "Peter of Bruys and his successors formed the baptized into churches, after the apostolic pattern; that the churches were presided over by pastors, regularly chosen and ordained, as far as circumstances would allow, by whom the ordinances were administered." (p. 147.)

Were we to follow up the researches of the various historians, we would find a vast amount of evidence proving that the Novatians, Donatists, Petrobrusians, ancient Waldenses, Mennonites and Anabaptists were all advocates of the peculiar doctrines that characterize the Baptists of the present day. We

have not time, however, to pursue the thought further.

2d. *Those churches, in all ages of the Baptists, were advocates of Missions.*

Dr. Howell says, in his letters to Dr. Watson, p. 3: "From the days of the apostles to the present time, the true, legitimate Baptist church has ever been a missionary body"; and the facts of history fully sustain his declaration.

During the dark ages, when the people of God were persecuted, and all they did was done as by stealth, they carried on their mission work. A minister, with a package of goods on his back, would start out under the disguise of a peddler. After showing his goods, and making such sales as he could, he would begin to teach his customers of those things that pertained to eternal life, and as he advanced, step by step, he unfolded the great truths of Christianity to ignorant, perishing souls. Finally, praying for their salvation, and leaving them some part of God's holy book, he would pass on to find another famishing soul, to whom he would break the bread of eternal life. Thus, making his support upon the sale of the goods, which probably the church had given him for a remuneration, he went forth in obedience to that command which says: "Preach the gospel to every creature." Success crowned the labors of those worthy missionaries, and thousands were added to the people of God. This manner of mission work was practiced for many years among the Waldenses and other ancient Baptists. (*Cramp*, p. 109.)

Notwithstanding the sore persecution of those days, by which mission operations were much retarded, God

abundantly blessed their labors, and gave them many precious souls. It is said that in the little State of Bohemia the Baptists numbered eighty thousand; and in 1533 the Waldenses claimed more than eight hundred thousand members. (*Trilemma*, 131.)

Had the Baptists of those days been Anti-Missionaries, they could have kept concealed, and not have been so subject to persecutions. But their great desire to propagate the gospel to fallen men and women, often led them into full view of their persecutors. "In the year 1525," says Mr. Cramp, "many of the Baptists took refuge in the Netherlands, hoping to be able to serve God there in quietness. They might have done so, perhaps, if they could have refrained from preaching the gospel, and had forborne to propagate their distinctive tenets. But that was impossible. In the spirit of apostolic Christianity, they 'went everywhere preaching the word.' Numbers listened, were converted, baptized, and joined the persecuted sect" (p. 195.)

After printing became common, the Baptists had many books published, which they circulated among the people by their missionaries, who have often acted as colporteurs. These books, with the colporteurs, whenever they could be found, were destroyed by the enemies of the Baptists. We will give one instance.

"At the martyrdom of Joriaen Simons and Clement Dirks, at Haarlem in 1557, there was a great burning of books. Joriaen was colporteur, and had circulated a large number of Baptist works. But when it was observed that the books began to blaze, such a tumult arose among the people that the magistrates hastily departed. The people then threw the

books amongst the crowd, who most eagerly caught them. Thus, through the providence of God, instead of the truth being extinguished, as was intended, it was the more spread by the reading of so great a number of these books.” (*Cramp*, pp. 205, 206.)

To show the spirit of missions that characterized the primitive Baptists, we will make another quotation from Cramp’s history. “Menno Simon and other bold-spirited men risked their lives continually in the service of the gospel. They were always travelling from place to place, and by their itinerant labors an immense amount of good was accomplished. Converts were baptized and added to the churches in every part of the country. The servants of God were confirmed in the faith, useful publications were scattered abroad, and Anabaptism, as it was called, like the bush which Moses saw, though it was ‘burned with fire, it was not consumed.’” (p. 211.)

Those churches held their meetings for business and worship, as the present Baptists do, except that they were compelled to meet in secret. Mr. Cramp, after giving their way of conducting services, says: “Sometimes they sent out brethren on missionary tours, and to gather together scattered disciples or comfort afflicted churches. This proved not unfrequently a perilous task. Several instances of martyrdom are recorded, resulting from the discharge of the duty.” (p. 226.)

The churches, you see, *sent* out the missionaries as we do at the present time, and as the churches did in the apostles’ day. (II Cor. 8 : 23.) Many of the missionaries sent out in those days suffered martyrdom. We will give the names of a few. Jorjaen Simon and Clement Dirks were martyred at Haarlem. Je-

ronimus Kels, Michiel Zeepsieder and Hans Overacker “were commissioned to go into the earldom of the Tyrol,” but were seized and martyred in Vienna, Austria. Juriaen Vaser was sent to Pogstall, in Austria, where he labored for some time, but was finally beheaded. Brother Hans Blietel was sent by the church to Riet, in Bavaria, where he was apprehended and committed to the flames.

The churches in those days being so enthused with the mission spirit, and the ministers so filled with the love of God, and a desire for the salvation of souls, they would go forth, at the request of the churches, when all knew their lives were in imminent danger.

During these days of persecutions, the Baptists could not well operate together in their mission work. Hence it was not until after the severest of their persecutions had ceased that they united their efforts by the organization of Associations and Mission Boards. In the year 1792, “The Particular Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel amongst the Heathen,” was organized in England, and five years later “The Baptist Home Missionary Society” was formed.

We will close this part of our discourse with a quotation from J. R. Graves, in the *Trilemma*:

“1. The Regular Baptists of Europe were Missionary Baptists.

“2. The first Baptists of England were Missionary Baptists.

“3. The first association ever formed in England was a Missionary Baptist Association.

“4. The first Baptist Church in America, at Newport, R. I., was a Missionary Baptist Church.

“5. The first Baptist Association ever organized in America, the Philadelphia, which included all

known Baptist Churches, was a Missionary Baptist Association, and annually raised money for ministerial education and missionary operations. That Association has ever been a missionary body.

“6. The first Association that was organized in New England, the Warren Association, which embraced all the Baptists in New England, was a missionary body, and is to this day.

“7. The first Baptist Association ever formed in Virginia was a Missionary Baptist Association.

“8. The first Associations ever organized in North Carolina, in South Carolina, in Georgia, in Tennessee, and every Southern State, were Missionary Baptist Associations.” (pp. 204, 205.)

Let us now consider briefly,

II.—THE ORIGIN OF SOME OTHER DENOMINATIONS THAT GREW OUT OF THE BAPTISTS.

We have seen, from undoubted historical sources, that the Missionary Baptists of the present day have existed ever since Christ's nativity on earth, and have always advocated and practiced missions. From whence, then, came the Anti-Mission (Primitive) Baptists, Campbellite (Disciples) Baptists, and Free Will (Open Communion) Baptists. We claim that all these have departed from the faith, becoming heretics or schismatics, and have no right to claim in the line of succession with the Regular, or Missionary Baptists. We will now consider the origin

1st. *Of the Anti-Mission Baptists.*

Judson and Rice were sent to Burmah, as missionaries, by a Pedobaptist society. On their way they were converted to Baptist views, and espoused the Baptist cause. By their change of views they for-

feited all claim upon the Pedobaptist society that had sent them. Judson went on, trusting in God. Rice returned to enlist the attention of Baptists in the United States to the Foreign Mission Work. The Baptists of the United States were supporting no missionary in a foreign field, yet many of them were contributing largely to English Boards for the support of Carey and others. Rice laid the matter before the Baptists North and South.

Three parties soon came into existence. Party No. 1 said: "This is a call from God to engage in Foreign Mission work, and we will help." Party No. 2 said: "We have as much Mission work as we can do on our frontiers amongst the Indians." Party No. 3 said: "We are not disposed to aid in either the Foreign or Home Mission work. We are opposed to Missions any way." Nos. 1 and 2 claimed that it should be left to the conscience of the people, whether or not they contribute. If No. 1 will contribute to Foreign Missions, No. 2 to Domestic Missions and No. 3 is not disposed to contribute at all, each one shall have the right to liberty of conscience. How could it have been otherwise? Had not Baptists always contended and fought for liberty of conscience? Had it not always been one of their distinguishing principles? Should one party among them attempt, now, after the laws and Constitution of the United States guaranteed liberty of conscience to them, to trample upon the conscience of others? But, alas! Party No. 3 was not willing to allow No. 1 and 2 liberty of conscience, to contribute of their goods for the advancement of the cause, as they felt the Bible taught them. They agitated the matter in the churches and associations, and in 1827 began to

draw off from the great Baptist family, simply because *they were not willing for their brethren to worship God by contributing of their goods as they felt the Bible directed.*

It was in 1827 that the Kehukee Association, and in 1832 that the County Line Association, both influential Missionary bodies many years previous to that time, declared themselves Anti-Missionary, and passed the immortal non-fellowship article. Both these associations are located in North Carolina.

In 1836 the Baltimore Association, which had from its organization advocated missions, passed a resolution by a vote of *sixteen to nine* to withdraw fellowship from churches favoring foreign missions, Sunday-schools, etc. Elder James Osborne was the main leader in the heresy in all three of these associations. These people, after this secession, gave themselves the name of "*The Reformed Baptists*, in North Carolina, and then the *Old Baptists*, the *Old Sort of Baptists*, *Baptists of the Old Stamp*, and finally adopted the name of the *Primitive Baptists.*" (*Trilemma*, p. 204.)

In Georgia they seceded, in 1828, from the Hephzibah Association, because that association would not pass the non-fellowship article, and in 1829 they formed themselves into an organization known as the "United Baptist Conference." A few years after, this conference merged into what is now known as the Canoochee Association. Jordan Smith, James Gray and others were the leaders in this secession.

In Virginia the separation took place in 1832, and in Tennessee, in 1836. Elder S. Trott, one of their ministers, in speaking of their secession from the Regular Baptists, says: "This brought brethren, churches and associations that had been groaning

under the burdens of human inventions and impositions in religion, to *separate themselves*, some sooner and some later, from the whole mass of the popular religion and religionists, and to *take a stand as a distinct people* upon the Old Baptist standard.” (*Rel. Denom.*, p. 87.)

Mr. Trott acknowledges that they “*separated themselves*” from us and took “*a stand as a distinct people.*” Further on he says: “*We took*, as a distinguishing appellation, the *name*, ‘Old School Baptists.’” Here, according to Mr. Trott, was a denomination *just brought into existence*, and of course, without a name; so, having no one to name them, they “*took the name, Old School Baptists.*”

Can we honestly, with these facts before us, call the Anti-Missions by the name they have adopted—“Old School,” or “Primitive”—without falsifying history, and doing injustice to the great family of Regular Baptists, who have existed during the primitive ages of church history? We can not. Let us, then, call them by their proper name—*Derivative, New-School, or Anti-Mission Baptists.*

These people, in order to justify themselves in the course they were pursuing, soon began to pervert the doctrines of grace respecting God’s purposes in the salvation of men, and ran election and predestination into dire antinomianism, preaching the eternal fate of all creatures, and making God the author of all things, both good and bad. This position was taken to show that there is no necessity for missions, Sunday schools, or any other means that God has ordained for the accomplishment of his purposes.

These ultra doctrines have caused splits among themselves almost without number; so that to-day

we have no correct idea of the number of religious denominations opposing missions, all calling themselves "Old School," or "Primitive" Baptists. We cannot recognize any of them as belonging to the line of succession from the apostolic churches.

2d. *Origin of the Campbellite (Disciples) Baptists.*

Alexander Campbell was founder of this sect, in 1827. "He was *born* a Presbyterian in Scotland, and was educated for the ministry in the University of Glasgow." In 1809 he came to America, became a citizen of West Virginia, and formed a small society at Bush Run. Thinking that he might be better enabled to carry his plans of reform into effect by being immersed, he stipulated with one Elder Luce to perform the rite, without having any church present, or being required to relate any experience. On June 12, 1812, Mr. Luce immersed him in a deep pool in Buffalo Creek.

"Mr. Campbell and his father continued members of the Bush Run Society, which he had organized previous to his immersion by Mr. Luce, until the next year, when its members, with all the Campbells, upon the presentation of a satisfactory creed or confession, were received as a Baptist Church into the Red Stone Association. Not until 1823 did Mr. Campbell commence putting forth his peculiar views of baptism in order to the remission of sins, and his new system of Christianity. In 1827 the Baptists *expelled him* and all who embraced his unscriptural views.

"Campbellites of this day deny this, claiming that they 'withdrew' from the Baptists; but Mr. Campbell declares that he, with all the brethren of the reformation, were *excluded*, not of their choice, but by constraint. 'They (the Baptists) declared non-

fellowship with the brethren of the Reformation; thus BY CONSTRAINT, NOT BY CHOICE, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the apostolic doctrine.' This is Mr. Campbell's own testimony. It was out of those who, like himself were excluded for heresy, that Mr. Campbell originated his scheme he calls a church." (*Trilemma*, pp. 192, 193.)

Whether Mr. Campbell's baptism was valid, or whether the church to which he belonged was a gospel church, coming in regular succession, does not concern us. It is evident that the church was recognized by the Baptists, or it would not have been received into the Red Stone Association. Mr. Campbell was also recognized as a Baptist minister. But for heresy he was *expelled* from the Baptists, and in that expulsion he *forfeited all rights* the Baptists had given him, and after that time he had no authority to baptize persons, or organize churches. We cannot, therefore, recognize the Campbellites as being churches of Christ.

We will now briefly examine the history

3d. *Of the Free-Will (Open Communion) Baptists.*

This sect is older than either of the two we have considered, it having originated more than a century ago. Benj. Randall of New Hampshire, a licensed Baptist preacher, was its founder. He was a very eloquent speaker, and possessed great powers of persuasion, though an uneducated man. He adopted views contrary to the doctrines the Baptists had received from Christ and the apostles, such as the Arminians advocate; also, he became an open communionist. His powers of persuasion were so great that a number of Baptist ministers adopted his Ar-

minian and open communion views, and were expelled from the Baptist Church. These excommunicated ministers proceeded to ordain (?) Mr. Randall, in the year 1780. Shortly afterward, he organized in New Durham, N. H., a society which he called a church. "This was the first Free-will Baptist Church in America and perhaps in the world." (*Churches and Sects*, p. 141.)

Mr. Randall, like Mr. Campbell, had *no authority* to organize a church. He was expelled from the church, after which some ministers went through with a solemn farce, which they *called* ordination; then he began his new denomination. We cannot recognize the Free-will Baptists as churches of Christ, because they do not belong to the line of church succession. Their founders were expelled from Christ's church for heresy, and in that expulsion they lost all rights as ministers and even as members.

We have briefly shown you something of the history of the Baptist Denomination. From authentic sources we have seen that it originated in the time of Christ, and has existed in an unbroken chain of churches till the present. There has never been a time, since the planting of the first church, that God has not had churches upon earth, to look after and guard the doctrines and ordinances of his house. The instructions given the first churches have been observed by their successors. The kingdom has not been left to other people, and God has kept "the gates of hell" from prevailing against his church.

We have seen that these three strongest denominations that have grown out of the Baptists, in modern times, were the work of heretics or schismatics, who,

by being excommunicated, were deprived of all authority to administer the ordinances or organize churches.

Let us, brethren, “hold fast to our profession” and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints”; for by so doing we will please our Heavenly Father, and be instrumental in building up his cause.

FEET-WASHING.

“If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet.” John 13 : 14.

In these latter times there is some excitement in some sections of the country upon the subject of “feet-washing.” Some good, honest brethren claim that the injunction of the Saviour, “wash one another’s feet,” is not at all obligatory upon Christians of the present day. Others, just as good and honest, contend that “feet-washing” is a church ordinance, while there others still, who hold that it is a private duty, and should be observed mainly as an act of hospitality.

We propose, this morning, to consider the subject of “feet-washing” in the light of the Scriptures, to ascertain, if possible, where and under what circumstances it should be observed.

I.—IS FEET-WASHING A CHURCH ORDINANCE?

We answer, it is not.

1st. *Because it cannot be observed as a church ordinance, and the injunction of the Saviour, “wash one another’s feet,” be carried out.*

All Baptists are agreed, so far as we know, that a church ordinance is a church rite, requiring an ordained minister to administer. All admit that baptism and the Lord’s Supper are church ordinances, because none but the offices set apart by the church, for that purpose, can properly administer them. When the minister administers the ordinance of

baptism, he takes the candidate in the water, and immerses him, upon a profession of his faith, into the name of the Trinity. This is what Christ and his inspired apostles did when they administered the ordinance of baptism. Also, in the administration of the Supper, he consecrates the emblems, breaks the bread and pours the wine, as Christ did in the institution of it. We, therefore, argue that, inasmuch as the administrator of an ordinance must do, in administering that ordinance, what the Master did in instituting it, any right or ceremony in which this *cannot* be done is not an ordinance. If feet-washing were administered as a church ordinance, the administrator would have to pour water in a basin, lay aside his garments, and wash the members' feet, for these are the acts of our Saviour when he washed the disciples' feet. This would be doing something Christ did not command. His injunction was, "wash *one another's feet.*" If the minister washes the feet of all, it is *observed as an ordinance*, because that is what Jesus did. But if the disciples "wash one another's feet," it *cannot* be regarded as an ordinance, because it has no administrator who is ordained for the purpose of administering it. To carry out the injunction "wash one another's feet," all must be administrators and all recipients. For this reason, "feet-washing" cannot be observed as a church ordinance without violating the injunction of the Saviour to the disciples.

2d. *It is asserted by those who claim that it is an ordinance, that the feet-washing was in connection with the Lord's Supper, and should be observed by us immediately after we partake of the Supper.*

Let us examine this thought. When did the Lord's Supper occur? By reference to Mark 14 : 12-24, you will learn that it was immediately after he had eaten the Passover with his disciples, that he instituted what is called the Lord's Supper. By reference to I Cor. 11 : 23, you will find that it was on the night of his betrayal. We have not found one word in the Bible to lead us to the belief that the Saviour washed the disciples' feet between the time he closed the services of the Supper and his betrayal in the Mount of Olives; but on the contrary the Scriptures teach the reverse.

3d. *We claim that the feet-washing took place prior to the Passover.*

It must be borne in mind that John gives no account of the Saviour's eating the Passover with his disciples, or of his instituting his Supper. Yet John is the only evangelist that mentions his washing the disciples' feet. This is owing to the fact, probably, that John wrote many years after the others had written, and it was the will of God for him to record, mainly, the important events which the others had omitted. In order to bring those events in their proper places in the narrative, he frequently hints at records made by others. Such is the case in his narrative of the feet-washing. Hence, we can fix the time and place of the feet-washing by analogy.

By reference to Math. 26 : 4, Mark 14 : 12, and Luke 22 : 3, we learn that Satan entered into Judas Iscariot, and he conceived the idea of betraying the Saviour *before* the Passover. Now, by reference to John 13: 27, you will see that he conceived that idea *after* the feet-washing. So the feet-washing took place before

the Passover, and it was before the institution of the Lord's Supper.

Again, after the Supper was ended, there is no mention of any further service in the room, except the singing of a hymn. We have heard ministers, at the close of the Lord's Supper, saying: "And supper being ended, He washed the disciples' feet, and they sang a hymn and went out." There is no such thing in the Bible. Math. 26 : 30, and Mark 14 : 26, both say, after giving an account of the Supper: "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Not one word is said about feet-washing, but both mention the singing as having taken place immediately after the Supper. Hence, we claim that no feet-washing was practiced in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper.

The construction the disciples placed upon the language of Jesus to Judas shows that the feet-washing occurred *before* the Passover. After he had washed their feet and sat down again to the table, he said, "One of you shall betray me." John, leaning upon the breast of Jesus, softly inquired who it should be. The Saviour gave a signal by which he might know. Satan entered into Judas, and Jesus said unto him, "That thou doest, do quickly. Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him. For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of *against the feast.*" (John 13 : 27-29.) If the feast had been past, those people would not have thought that Jesus had commanded Judas to buy those things necessary for the feast. We regard this as very strong proof that the feet washing occurred *before* the Passover, and if before

the Passover, it was *before* the institution of the Supper.

At the Passover they ate the paschal lamb, and unleavened bread, with bitter herbs. (Exodus 12 : 28.) But at the supper during which the Saviour washed the disciples' feet, they had "sop" or soup, (John 13 : 26); therefore it could not have been the Passover.

Another, and a very conclusive reason, why we claim the feet-washing took place before the Passover, is, that the inspired writer tells us it was before. "Now *before the feast of the Passover*" (John 13 : 1), is the way John introduces his account of the feet-washing. If it was "before the feast of the passover" that the Saviour washed the disciples' feet, as John's narrative shows, then it was before the institution of the Lord's Supper, as that did not take place until after, or at the close of the Passover supper.

Those who claim the feet-washing took place at the close of *any* supper are mistaken, as the Scriptures plainly teach otherwise. It is true that our common version of the Bible makes John say, in the 13th chapter and 2d verse: "And supper being *ended*," but by reference to the New Version, and to the context, any one may readily see that it was *during* the time of the supper that he washed their feet. The New Version renders it: "And *during* supper." The 4th verse says: "He *riseth from* supper," which teaches that the supper had not ended. Verse 12th: "So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and *was set down again*," etc. Where did Jesus sit down again? We claim he sat down *again* at the supper-table. Verse 26th says: "When

he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot.” We conclude he was at the table when he dipped the sop. Verse 28th says: “Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake,” etc. This seems to make the argument conclusive. Jesus sat down to supper with his disciples, and perhaps others, (see John 13 : 28, 29), at some place not specified by John, and at some time before the feast of the Passover; and during the time of supper, from some cause, Jesus arose from the supper-table and washed the disciples’ feet. Afterward he went back to the table with the disciples, and perhaps others, to finish the meal, and while here, during the latter part of the meal, he gave Judas the “sop,” and Judas went out and contracted with the chief authorities to betray Jesus into their hands *after the feast* of the Passover. (Mark 14 : 2.)

4th. *An important question for us to consider, at this juncture of our discourse, is, Where and when did the feet-washing take place?*

We can come at the time and place only by analogy. After a careful investigation of the writings of all the evangelists, we come to this conclusion: The feet-washing took place in the town of Bethany, nearly two miles from Jerusalem, in the house of a Pharisee named Simon the Leper, two days before Jesus ate the Passover with his disciples, and instituted his Supper in Jerusalem. Let us examine the Scriptures on this point: After the resurrection of Lazarus, the Jews took counsel together to kill Jesus. So Jesus took his disciples and went into a city called Ephraim, near the wilderness (John 11 : 54), where he remained until six days before the feast of the Passover, at which time he returned to Bethany,

to the house of Lazarus. (John 12 : 1.) There they made him a supper at Simon's house. John teaches that the supper, during which the Saviour washed the disciples' feet, was the same at which Satan entered Judas (13 : 27), and *that* supper was *before* the Passover; but neither John nor Luke tell us how long before. Matthew and Mark both tell us it was *two days* before the Passover that this supper occurred, at which Satan entered Judas; which John says was the supper at which the feet-washing took place. (See Math. 26 : 2, 14, and Mark 14 : 1, 10, 11.) This supper was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the Leper (Mark 14 : 3; Math. 26 : 6), about fifteen furlongs, or nearly two miles, from Jerusalem. (John 11 : 18.) This supper was prepared for the Saviour and his disciples, by their friends in Bethany. (John 12 : 2.) Let us notice, now, some of the events that occurred at this remarkable supper. 1st. Mary anointed the Saviour with spikenard, a very costly ointment, and *washed* his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. (John 12 : 3, Luke 7 : 36-38; Mark 14 : 3; Math. 26 : 7.)

2d. Simon the Leper, who was a Pharisee, decided in his own mind that Jesus was not a prophet, or he would not allow this woman, Mary, who was a sinner, to come so near him. (Luke 7 : 39.)

3d. Judas, who was a thief, had indignation at what he considered the waste of the precious ointment Mary had poured upon the Saviour. (John 12 : 4, 5.)

4th. The Saviour reproved Simon for his neglect of Jesus and his disciples, as his guests. He had failed to extend even the common hospitalities of the day. "I entered thy house, *thou gavest me no water*

for my feet.” “Thou gavest me no kiss.” “My head with oil thou didst not anoint.” (Luke 7 : 44, 46.)

5th. The Saviour reproved Judas and the others who claimed that the act of Mary, in anointing Jesus, was a waste of the precious ointment, spikenard, which might have been “sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor.” (John 12 : 7; Mark 14 : 6, 9; Math 26 : 10-13.)

6th. There was a strife among the disciples, probably at the same supper, “which of them should be accounted the greatest” in the kingdom of heaven, which they understood Jesus was soon to set up. (Luke 22 : 24.)

7th. Jesus washed the disciples’ feet. (John 13 : 5.)

8th. Judas, being insulted at the reproof Jesus had given him, concerning the waste of the ointment, decided to go and make arrangements with the authorities to betray Jesus into their hands. (John 13: 27; Luke 22 : 3-6; Mark 14 : 10-12; Math. 26 : 14-16.)

These eight events, it seems very clear to our mind, occurred at the same supper, in the house of the Pharisee, Simon the Leper, in Bethany, two days before the Passover.

Upon the Saviour’s entering the house of Simon the Leper, the common hospitality of that day and country demanded that there should, at least, have been water furnished him and his disciples to wash their feet (Gen. 18 : 4; 19 : 2; 24 : 32); and if he and his disciples had been *noted* guests, a servant should have been called to perform that duty. (I Sam. 25 : 41; Luke 7 : 38.) This custom of hospitality originated from necessity. The country was usually very dry and dusty. The people, who wore sandals instead of shoes, usually travelled on foot, and when

they stopped, in order to be comfortable, the sandals were laid aside and their feet washed. This common act of hospitality, the proud Pharisee, Simon the Leper, had from some cause neglected. Mary, who loved dearly to sit at the feet of Jesus (Luke 10 : 39), for she was an humble, devoted Christian, stole in as he reclined at the table, and “*began to wash his feet*” with her tears, and perform other acts which would show her love for him. Simon muttered that Jesus allowed her to come so near him. Jesus reprovved Simon sharply, and at once arose from the table and washed the disciples’ feet. The disciples had already been disputing about who should be greatest in his kingdom, hence, the feet-washing occurred just at that time, to teach Simon that he had neglected an act of common hospitality, and to teach the disciples equality in the kingdom of Christ. “If I, then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash *one another’s feet*.” That is, ye ought not to be disputing about who should be greatest, but be content to be equal one with another. This ye can show by washing *one another’s feet*. Judas, with his corrupt, thievish heart, was becoming more and more insulted with the Master. He didn’t like the reproof Jesus had given him about the ointment, and now Jesus teaches him that he must be equal with the others, when he had hoped to occupy some high position in the kingdom; and his wrath increases as the Master proceeds to give instructions concerning his kingdom. They again recline at the table. Judas is ruminating in his mind how he will be revenged of this insult. He resolves to go at once and make arrangements to betray the Master into the hands of the enemy. Thus did that notable supper pass off

in the house of Simon the Leper, two days before the Passover.

When the time came, Jesus sent two of his disciples into Jerusalem to make ready for him to eat the Passover with his disciples. Judas, having completed his contract with the chief priests, returned and joined Jesus and the disciples. They together went on to eat the Passover, after which Jesus instituted his Supper. Judas, learning that Jesus and his disciples were going to the Mount of Olives, went away and procured the band of soldiers, and at their head went to the Mount of Olives, and betrayed the Saviour into their hands as he had promised to do.

5th. *We do not believe that feet-washing is a church ordinance, because the New Testament churches never observed it as such.*

The Acts of the inspired apostles are to be regarded as a comment upon the teachings of our Saviour. We find in the Acts, and in the Epistles of the apostles, many accounts of baptism and the Lord's Supper by the churches, but not a single instance is given where any church in the apostolic age ever observed feet-washing, in any sense, as a church rite. If it had been observed by the churches in those days, or if the apostles had considered it a duty incumbent upon the churches, we are sure some mention would have been made of it, either in the Acts of the Apostles, or in some of their Epistles. The omission, to our mind, is a strong proof that the Saviour did not intend that feet-washing should be regarded as a church ordinance.

6th. *We cannot look upon it as a church ordinance, because it was never observed as such by the churches until a few years since.*

As we have remarked, no mention was made of it, as a church ordinance, during the apostolic age. Neither did any of the early writers, so far as we have learned, mention it in that sense. We have nowhere seen it stated that any of the Novatians, Donatists, Waldenses, Anabaptists, Mennonites, or Baptists of past centuries, ever practiced it as a church ordinance before our Anti-Mission brethren made their advent into the world. In the creeds of the old Baptists, given in history, the two ordinances, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are frequently mentioned, but not one word is said of feet-washing. (*Cramp*, pp. 146, 226, 227.) The first associations organized, such as the Philadelphia, Charleston, Georgia, Hepzibah, etc., never have mentioned feet-washing with the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, in their Articles of Faith. It was not until after the Anti-Mission secession in 1827-1832, that mention was made of it. And our Anti-Mission brethren did not adopt it as a church ordinance immediately upon that secession. In the Canoochee, the oldest Anti-Mission association in Georgia, it was not added to the Articles of Faith until about 1845. About that date, a query was sent to the association, about as follows: "Should not feet-washing be *added* to the ordinances?" which the association answered in the affirmative. From that time, among the Anti-Mission Baptists, it is found *added* to the ordinances that characterized the churches of Christ from the days of the apostles. Amongst the regular Baptists of the present day, we do not find it observed, except in some isolated communities, where the Baptists are more or less under the Anti-Mission influences.

We have shown in this discourse that feet-washing *cannot* be observed as a church ordinance, and the injunction, “wash one another’s feet,” be carried out. We have also proved that it has no connection with the Lord’s Supper, having been done two days before, in the private house of Simon the Leper. We have also shown that it was not observed by the apostolic churches as an ordinance, or by the churches in after years, until the establishing of our Anti-Mission brethren, during the present century, after which time they *added* it to their ordinances. God commands us not to *add to* or *take from* his word. (Rev. 22 : 18, 19.) This is one reason why we *cannot* observe feet-washing as a church ordinance. He never gave it as such; he never connected it with his Supper; but it has been *added*, with the other corruptions that characterize the secessionists of 1827 to 1832.

II.—IF IT IS NOT A CHURCH ORDINANCE, WHAT IS IT, AND WHERE SHOULD IT BE OBSERVED?

In answer to this, we sat it is a private duty, and should be observed where other private duties are observed. Some contend that it is an act of humility. We confess that we can see no more humility in it, than we can in baptism, the Lord’s Supper, prayer, preaching, visiting the sick, or any other Christian duty. Neither can we see from the scriptures one particle of authority for saying that it was intended to teach humility. We can see, however, from the circumstances connected with its first observance by our Saviour, a lesson of hospitality, of kindness and equality.

We therefore claim:

1st. *That it is the representative of a whole class of necessary duties.*

Our Saviour, after washing the disciples' feet, reclined again at the table, and while finishing the meal taught the disciples. With the instructions, he said: "If ye know *these* things, happy are ye if ye do them." (John 13 : 17.) What things were meant? If he had only meant feet-washing he would not have said "these things," but *this thing*. If but one thing had been meant, he would have used the singular, *this thing*, and not the plural "these things." Then, evidently, there was something more than feet-washing meant. The feet-washing was simply a representative of a whole class of necessary "things." Now, what are those necessary things? Follow up the references to Titus 3 : 14, and you will get some information: "And let us also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful." Then "these things" that the Saviour referred to are "the good works for necessary uses," mentioned by the apostle. Now what are those good works? Follow your references to I Timothy, 5 : 10: "Well reported of for good works: if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed *every good work*."

Here the apostle names some of the "good works for necessary uses," which are "these things" of which Jesus says, "happy are ye if ye do them"

1st. "If she have brought up children," whether her own, or the children of another, it was a good work for a necessary use, to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph 6 : 4.)

2d. "If she have lodged strangers" This too was a good work for a necessary use, "for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." (Heb. 13 : 2.)

3d. "If she have washed the saints' feet." Another good work for a necessary use. The travelling saint was tired with his long day's journey. In order for him to feel comfortable, his sandals must be laid aside and *his feet washed*. The widow who did this for a "necessary use," and not for a mere form before a congregation in a church-house, was "happy" in the discharge of her duty.

4th. "If she have relieved the afflicted." This truly is a "good work for a necessary use." Now says Jesus: "If ye know these things," these good works for necessary uses, "happy are ye if ye do them."

Unfortunately for us in the present day, we want to make all our "good works" public, so we can have praise of men. We will not wash the saints' feet when it is of "necessary use," but wait till we go to the church-house, and, though the washing is not "necessary," we will perform it so the world can see us and exclaim: "How humble those Christians are." Paul, who evidently understood the Saviour's meaning, makes feet-washing a private duty, to be done when necessary. To do it otherwise is to practice a mere form, that symbolizes nothing.

Baptism symbolizes the burial and resurrection of Christ, and the Lord's Supper symbolizes his suffering and death; but feet-washing, like "bringing up children," "lodging strangers," and "relieving the afflicted," symbolizes nothing, but is merely a "good work for a necessary use." We should practice it as such, never as a church ordinance.

ABOUT THE 1888 EDITION


The only known extant copy of the original, 1888 edition of *The Seven Baptist Pillars* is at the James P. Boyce Centennial Library at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky.

Unfortunately that copy is in somewhat deteriorated condition. Many of the pages have come loose from the binding. Other pages stick together. All of the pages have become yellowed and fragile due to age.

ABOUT THIS REPRINT

Preparing the text for reprinting was time-consuming. First the 1888 copy of the book was photographed page by page using a high-quality digital camera, and later the text was manually transcribed and formatted in LibreOffice. The artwork (e.g., the floral design on the front cover and the sketch of Washington Geiger near the beginning of the book) was enhanced using Adobe® Photoshop® and other software to make it suitable for reprinting.

The reprinter has taken great effort to ensure that this 2021 reprint resembles the 1888 edition as closely as reasonably possible. Page and line breaks occur at the same positions as in the 1888 edition. Misspellings, misuses of grammar, inconsistencies, and other errors and oddities have been left uncorrected.

Throughout this reprint the reader occasionally will see the symbol . This symbol represents characters (or potential characters) in the 1888 copy that are missing or illegible and cannot be deduced.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Virtually all works published in the United States prior to 1923 are in the public domain. Therefore, the 1888 edition of *The Seven Baptist Pillars* is in the public domain.

I, Bryant Knight, forfeit all rights I may have to all other portions of this work. This 2021 reprint may be copied, redistributed, adapted, edited, etc. for any purpose—commercial or noncommercial—by anyone in any country.

