

A Brief History Of The Baptists With Chapters On Baptism & The Lord's Supper

by

Hugh L. Tully

FOREWORD

For the past several years the author has annually delivered a series of sermons on "What Baptists Believe" to his people. This series has also been delivered in other churches. Many have requested these sermons in book form. It is impossible to comply with this request at the present, but four of the sermons are given in this book in brief form. The author was desirous of devoting a few pages to the discussion of the security of the believer but was unable because of the lack of space. He hopes to write a much larger book in the near future.

The unbiased reader will discover from close reading of these notes that Baptists alone have continued from the days of our Lord's earthly ministry. All other denominations have their origin this side of His earthly ministry. All but the Roman Catholics are of comparatively recent origin. Baptists alone fulfill the promise of Christ in **Matthew 16:18; 28:19-20**. This fact should silence these little men-founded denominations which are but a few years old - especially the many branches of the Holiness movement, which are of very recent origin, and the Campbellites - which claim that they are Christ-founded. The backboneless, compromising, Christ-denying Baptists should blush with shame and repent of their unfaithfulness as they read of the loyal Baptists through the ages shedding their blood for the cause of Christ.

If some reader is led to a deeper consecration to Christ and His Word by reading this book, the writer will feel that his feeble efforts are not wholly in vain.

September, 1938. H. L. T.

PART ONE

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTORY

When Jesus said **“Upon This Rock I will build My church and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it” (Matthew 16:18)**, he was either sincere or insincere. Who would dare accuse Him of insincerity? He surely meant what He said. He meant that His Church as a local, independent body, would never cease to exist on earth until His return at the end of the age.

This promise is further confirmed in the Great Commission when He says: **“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, (all the days) *even unto the end of the world* (age)” (Matthew 28:19-20)**. This command was not given to the apostles as individuals, but as a church. He promised His abiding presence with his church “all the days.” If His church were not to abide “all the days” how could He be with it “all the days?” This simply means that churches like the one Christ founded have continued through the ages, and will continue until His return. If they have not, then Jesus made a promise He could not fulfill, or would not fulfill. Failure to make good His promise would prove Him to be the world’s greatest impostor.

They who think that His church as a local, independent body failed to continue through the ages, do not understand that the churches of Christ are purest in doctrines and practices amid persecutions. The storms of persecutions of the past centuries did not weaken but strengthened Christ’s Churches. What the writer in Hebrews said of the Old Testament saints may be said of Christ’s Churches: **“Had trials of mockings, scourgings, bonds, imprisonments, slain with the sword; they went about in sheepskins, being destitute, afflicted, wandering in deserts and mountains and caves and holes of the earth” (Hebrews 11:36-38)**. The fires of persecution of pagan and papal Rome could not overcome Christ’s Churches - **“Unto Him be glory in the church unto all generations forever and forever” (Ephesians 3:21)**. His church has continued “unto all generations.”

Since Jesus instituted His church during His earthly ministry, as we shall later prove, and, since His church has continued on earth until the present time, He then, did not need Luther, Calvin, Henry the Eighth, Wesley, Campbell, and a host of other church founders, to organize or start new denominations. Every denomination that has come into existence since the days of Christ’s earthly ministry is man-founded, and cannot be composed of the Churches of Christ.

An explanation may be in order here.

Whenever the writer uses the term “church,” he always has a local, independent body in mind for this is the etymological and Scriptural meaning of the word; whenever the term “denomination” is used, and it will be used frequently because of its common usage today, the reader will understand that a body of churches (not in the Scriptural sense except when referring to the Baptist denomination) of same faith and practice is meant.

Only one denomination has Scriptural authority for its existence - the one composed of churches like the one Christ founded. The birth of Christ’s Church was during His public ministry. The birth of denominationalism is found in the church at Corinth. In the days of Christ all were of same “faith and order.” Later men departed from the truth and founded denominations.

These men-founded denominations think they have the right to exist because our government gives a man the right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. This is not Scriptural ground. As man to man one has the right to believe and practice any doctrine or join any denomination he desires, but between man and God, he has the right to believe and practice only what the Scriptures teach. Men have founded churches, and many think these men-founded churches are on an equality with Christ’s Churches. These men who have founded organizations called churches, and persons who join them, must answer to God some day for rejecting Christ’s Churches and joining man’s church. Away with this Christ-dishonoring belief that a person has the right to believe and practice any doctrine or join any denomination he desires. Obedience to Christ and His Word is demanded. **“Why call Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things I command you?” (Luke 6:46).** Do you belong to Christ’s or man’s church? If your denomination has an origin this side of Christ’s earthly ministry, you belong to a man’s and not to Christ’s Church. Of the nearly 220 denominations in the U. S. claiming to be the Scriptural one, which one can trace its origin back to Christ’s ministry? This question will be answered in the following chapters.

PART ONE

CHAPTER TWO - THE NAME OF CHRIST’S CHURCH

How is the Church of Christ to be known? It is not to be known by its name as some think. It is the part of divine Wisdom that neither Christ nor His disciples enjoined any one proper name by which His church should be known during the present dispensation. If the terms **“Church of Christ,”** **“Christian Church,”** **“Church of God,”** **“Saints,”** **“Elect,”** etc., had been given as the proper name, the most heretical sects set up by men without authority of God,

could call themselves by one of these names, and make that an argument why they should be recognized as the true church. This is exactly what the Campbellites and the Church of God (Holiness) are doing. They think they are the true churches because they have adopted one of the many names by which the followers of Christ are called in the New Testament.

In the New Testament the followers of Christ are called disciples, believers, saints, brethren, elect, sheep, branches, light, salt, etc. They never called themselves Christians. They were first called “Christians” in Antioch, a heathen city. They received this name not from God but from the heathen. It was a nickname, and, like all nicknames, it stuck. The name occurs in **Acts 11:26-28; Acts 26:28; 1 Peter 4:16**. The term “**sheep**” is more Scriptural than “Christian.” The church is referred to as the “**Church of Christ,**” “**Church of God,**” “**House of God,**” etc. It is more Scriptural to say the “**Sheep Church**” than to say the “**Christian Church.**”

Christ’s Churches are not to be known by their names but by their doctrines and practices. The angel said to John: “**I will show thee the bride (church)**” - not her name. But some argue that the bride should be called by the bridegroom’s name. Not until the marriage is completed. The marriage of Christ and His bride will not take place until Christ comes (**Revelation 19 6-9; Matthew 25:1-10**).

Baptists do not claim to be the Churches of Christ because of their name - although they do have a Bible name. The first New Testament preacher was a Baptist. “**In those days came John the Baptist**” (**Matthew 3:1**). Some claim that Baptist was his surname. Such ignorance! The original text states that he was “the immerser.” He was a Missionary Baptist. Missionary means “ONE SENT.” “**There was a man SENT from God whose name was John**” (**John 1:6**). Then John was a Missionary Baptist. He baptized Christ. Christ was a Missionary Baptist. Christ instituted His Church. Christ’s Church was a Missionary Baptist Church. Churches like it have continued from Christ until the present day. Christ’s Churches have not always been called Baptist Churches, for various names were given them in different countries, through the past centuries, but churches holding the same doctrines and practices of present day Baptists have continued through the ages, and have thus fulfilled His promise that “**the gates of Hell shall not prevail against**” His Churches. It is interesting to note that the old name “Baptist” by which the first New Testament preacher was called, has been restored to the true churches of Christ.

PART ONE

CHAPTER THREE - ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE CHURCH

The Church of Christ was not founded with Adam or Abraham as some claim. The word “**church**” in **Acts 7:38** should be translated “congregation,” referring to Israel. The Old Testament does not give a single direct reference to the Church. It discusses the Jew and Gentile, but not the Church. In **Ephesians 3:1-11** Paul states that the church is a “**mystery, which in other ages (Old Testament times) was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.**” This passage states that the church was unknown before Christ.

Some claim that the church was instituted on the day of Pentecost. This view is unscriptural. In **Matthew 16:18** Christ states, “**I will build My church.**” He left it not to man to build. The church was in existence when Christ gave a rule of discipline in **Matthew 18:17** when He said, “**Tell it unto the church.**” The two ordinances, baptism and the Lord’s supper, were given during His earthly ministry. Do you think He would give the church ordinances before He instituted the church? The Great Commission (**Matthew 28:19-20**) was given before Pentecost. Jesus sang amidst His church during the supper on the night before the Crucifixion. **Hebrews 2:11-12** says, “**For which cause He (Christ) is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare Thy name unto My brethren, in the midst of the church I will sing praise unto Thee.**” When did Christ sing among His brethren (disciples)? **Mark 14:26** says “**And when they had sung an hymn (after Lord’s supper) they went out into the mount of Olives.**” The church was in existence on the night of the supper which was many days before Pentecost.

The record of the institution of Christ’s Church is found in **Luke 6:12-16**. After praying all night Jesus selected twelve apostles. Here His Church began. The apostles were first added to the church. In a sense they are the foundation of the church and Jesus is the chief corner stone (**I Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 2:19-20; Revelation 21:14**). The church in conference selected a successor to Judas (**Acts 1:15-26**) before Pentecost and was in prayer on the day of Pentecost. The church was “energized” and not “organized” on the day of Pentecost.

What is a New Testament Church? What say the Scriptures? A close study of the New Testament Church reveals it to be a body of baptized believers, of the same faith and practice, equal in rank and privilege, voluntarily joined together to do the will of Christ. Christ is alone the head of a New Testament Church. There are no human bosses in it. The form of government is democratic. Presiding elders and bossy bishops are unknown.

The word for church in the original language is ekklesia. The ekklesia was a body of citizens in a free Greek city possessing equal rights, summoned out by a crier to transact business. Professor Royal of Wake Forest College when

asked to give the meaning of ekklesia, said, "I do not know of any passage in classical Greek where ekklesia is used of unassembled or unassembling persons." This simply means that the word refers only to a local body, and that a New Testament church is a local body.

Joseph Cross (Episcopalian) in a book of sermons entitled *Coals from the Alter* says, "We hear much of the invisible church as contra-distinguished from the church visible. Of an invisible church in the world I know nothing: the Word of God says nothing; nor can anything of the kind exist, except in the brain of a heretic. The church is a body; but what sort of a body is that which can neither be seen or identified? A body is an organism, occupying space and having a definite locality. A mere aggregation is not a body; there must be organization as well." Quoted from H. Boyce Taylor - *Why Be A Baptist* page 51.

Fenton J. Hort in his book, *The Christian Ekklesia* confesses the necessity of finding some other than etymological, grammatical, or historical grounds by which to prove the idea of a universal church. He admitted that the use of the word 'Ekklesia' was always limited by Paul himself to a local organization, which has a corresponding unity of its own; each is a body of Christ and a sanctuary of its own. Quoted from H. Boyce Taylor - *Why Be A Baptist* page 51. Hort, a Greek Scholar, states that ekklesia always refers to a local, independent, body, and that there is no such thing as an invisible or universal church.

Church historians confirm the testimony of the Scriptures and the above scholars that a New Testament Church is a local, independent body under no human head. Edward Gibbons, *The History of the Fall and Decline of The Roman Empire*, Volume 1 page 554, states that for more than one hundred years after the death of the apostles, the churches were local, independent bodies, united only by ties of faith and charity.

Mosheim, a Lutheran historian say: "It was, therefore, the assembly of people which chose the rulers and teachers - rejected or confirmed laws proposed to the assembly - excommunicated unworthy members - restored the penitent - passed judgment upon controversies - examined and decided disputes which happened between elders and deacons; and, in a word, EXERCISED ALL THAT AUTHORITY which belongs to such as are INVESTED WITH SOVEREIGN POWER." (Johann von Mosheim - *Church History of the First Two Centuries* page 21) Waddington, Episcopalian, says, "In the management of its internal affairs EVERY CHURCH WAS INDEPENDENT OF EVERY OTHER." (George Waddington - *A History of the Church: From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation*)

From the above testimony of historians and scholars who were not Baptists, but because of their position as scholars, state the truth, we plainly see that New Testament Churches were local, independent bodies, and no such thing as an invisible or universal church is taught in the New Testament. Alexander Campbell, the founder of the Campbellites, admitted that the Jerusalem Church was a Baptist Church. Baptist Churches of today are New Testament Churches in faith and practice.

Only those who have been regenerated and baptized into a Baptist Church are members of Christ's churches. In order to be a member of Christ's church a person must be baptized into a church after the pattern of the New Testament Churches in doctrine and practice. This does not mean that Baptists alone are saved. The moment a person trusts in Christ for salvation, that moment he is eternally saved. He is then in the "**Kingdom of God,**" but not in the church. One enters the kingdom through the New Birth, and the church through baptism. Therefore all of the saved do not belong to the "**Churches of Christ.**" Those who have joined men-founded denominations do not belong. They may be saved but are not members of Christ's Churches.

The idea of a general or invisible church is unscriptural. Before the rise of Protestantism under Luther, the church was always, referred to as a local, independent body. Luther and others who seceded from the Roman Catholic Church had to seek some grounds for establishing their churches. To justify their actions they hatched up the general or invisible church idea which is wholly unscriptural.

PART ONE

CHAPTER FOUR - THREE DISTINGUISHING BAPTIST PRINCIPLES

There are at least three distinguishing Baptist principles. They distinguish Baptists from all other denominations.

First: Baptists believe that the New Testament is the sole and sufficient rule of faith and practice. This means, too, that Baptists accept no headship but Christ. Only **WHAT HE** commands should His followers do. Other denominations claim that they accept the New Testament as sole rule of faith and practice, and Jesus alone as head, but they do not. They have changed His teachings and follow men who changed them.

The Roman Catholic Church claims that it has the authority to change the teachings of the Scriptures. Haydock's *Catholic Bible and Commentary* in discussing the change from immersion to sprinkling states that the Catholic

Church had the right to do so. He states that “not only the Catholic Church but also the pretended reformed churches, have altered this primitive custom (changed from immersion to sprinkling).” (George Haydock – *Catholic Bible Commentary*) Dean Stanley, Episcopalian, says that “the practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes and feelings of the western world and hence the change from immersion to sprinkling.”

Scholars of all denominations which sprinkle or pour, acknowledge that Christ and His disciples were immersed and immersed others, but say that sprinkling and pouring will do. They are not accepting the New Testament as sole and sufficient rule of faith and practice. If it makes no difference whether immersed or sprinkled, why then did Jesus say “**And why call Me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?**” Again He says, “**Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.**” Baptism is a command. To break a command is to lose a reward and be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.

Of those who substitute man’s doctrine for Christ’s our Lord says, “**This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoreth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.**” Baptists believe and practice no doctrines except New Testament doctrines. Baptists alone practice New Testament doctrines. The Old Testament is the Word of God, but is typical. Baptists do not go back to the Old Testament for laws of the church.

Second: Baptists believe in individual responsibility to God. They do not believe that one person can be saved because of the faith of another. Children are not saved on the merits or faith of their parents, nor are they to be baptized (?) because their parents are Christians. To sprinkle or pour an unconscious infant is a plain violation of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures. Each individual is responsible to God. No person should be compelled to confess his sins to a man called a priest. Baptists believe in the priesthood of all believers.

Before and sometime after the Reformation, “the Christian world was organized upon the lines of persecution. The exception to the rule were the Baptists. They held that every man had the God-given right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; and the larger right that other men had the same privilege. In this contention they stood absolutely alone; and standing alone they paid the price in human blood that every man might worship, or not worship, God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It was a costly sacrifice but it was none too dear for the world’s redemption.

The entire Christian world was engaged in persecution. The Baptists in all lands, by both Protestants and Catholics, were cruelly persecuted by imprisonment, exile, torture, fire, and sword. The Baptists by the thousands were martyred. They alone pleaded for liberty.”

Third: Baptists believe that the Church of Christ is a body of Baptized believers, equal in rank and privilege, administering its own affairs under the headship of Christ. The true Churches of Christ are composed of believers only. There were no infants in the New Testament Churches. The apostles were believers. Those received on the day of Pentecost were believers (**Acts 2:41**). All others received into the New Testament Churches were received upon a profession of faith (**Acts 5:14; 8:12, 37; 10:44-48; 16:32-34**). Not believers only but baptized believers alone were members of New Testament Churches. Dollinger, a Catholic, says, “There is no proof in the New Testament that the apostles baptized infants.”

The members of the New Testament Churches were equal in rank and privilege. This is true of Baptist Churches. There were no ruling elders, presiding elders and bishops as known today. Only two officers were known then, pastors, called bishops or elders, and deacons. A New Testament bishop was simply an overseer, pastor. He was also called elder. In **Acts 20:17** Paul “**called for the elders of the church**” of Ephesus. In giving them a charge he calls them “**overseers**” in verse **28**. This word “**overseer**” is translated “**bishop**” in **1 Timothy 3:1**. So bishop and elder refer to the same person and not to two grades in the ministry.

Waddington, an Episcopalian historian says, “In the earliest government of the first Christian Church, not the elders only, but the whole church was associated with the apostles; and, it is certain for a brief period that the terms bishop and elder were applied to the same person.” (George Waddington - *A History of the Church: From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation*) Mosheim an Episcopalian says, “A bishop during the first and second centuries was a person who had care of one Christian assembly.” (Johann von Mosheim - *Church History of the First Two Centuries*)

Elder is a Hebrew term and bishop a Greek term referring to the same person. Elder originally referred to age, and bishop to the office. As we said above such positions as ruling elders, presiding elders and modern bishops were unknown in the New Testament. How then did they originate? After the apostles, the pastors of the larger churches began to exercise authority over pastors of the smaller churches in the surrounding country. This spirit of superiority and power finally headed up into the office of the pope, and when the reformers withdrew from the Roman Catholic Church, they carried the idea of a graded ministry with them. The offices of ruling elders, presiding

elders, and modern bishops are derived from the Roman Catholics and not from the New Testament. Baptists do not have a graded ministry.

Jesus taught that His followers were equal. See **Matthew 23:8-12; 1 Peter 5:1-3**. A careful study of the Jerusalem Church reveals it to be a democratic body, equal in rank and privilege. The whole church is to exclude a member for disorderly conduct (**Matthew 18:15-17; 1 Corinthians 5:1-5, 9-13**). The whole church is commanded to receive an excluded member back into fellowship if he repents (**2 Corinthians 2:5-8**). The whole church is to receive a person if he shows sufficient evidence that he is saved (**Acts 10:44-48; Romans 14:1**). The whole church is to select officers (**Acts 1:26; 6:5**). No minister or group of persons is to possess authority over a church of Christ. Baptist Churches have no such authority over them. Associations and conventions are not in authority over the churches, but the churches over them. Baptist Churches alone have the marks of New Testament Churches.

Baptists alone have the Scriptural order of the commandments - repent, believe, be baptized and observe the Lord's Supper. Campbellites place faith before repentance, but they do not have a single Scripture to confirm their view. For proof of this statement see **Mark 1:15; Matthew 21:32-33; Acts 20:21**. Faith (heart faith) always follows repentance. Baptists alone place baptism after regeneration. This is the scriptural order. Methodists, Presbyterians, and Catholics sprinkle or pour water on infants who know nothing about regeneration. Campbellites baptize to save. All denominations but Baptists are what some are pleased to call "open communionists," and give supper to persons not scripturally baptized. In the New Testament Churches baptism always precedes the supper.

In Baptist Churches baptism always precedes the Lord's Supper. New Testament churches were Baptist Churches.

PART ONE

CHAPTER FIVE - BAPTISM

Baptists claim that believers alone should be baptized. Their belief is based on the Word of God. Read **Matthew 3:5-6**. John baptized only those "**confessing their sins**." He did not baptize a single infant. In **John 4:1** we read that "**Jesus made and baptized disciples**." He did not baptize to make them disciples as Campbellite brethren claim, but first "**made**" and then "**baptized**" them. On the day of Pentecost none but those who "**gladly received His word were baptized**." No infants were baptized. Philip "**baptized both men and women**" (**Acts 8:12**), and in verse **38** he baptized the Eunuch. Paul was baptized by Ananias (**Acts 9:18**).

Peter baptized the household of Cornelius as recorded in **Acts 10:43-48**. There must have been babies in this household some might think. No! Every member of his household heard, understood, believed, and received the Holy Spirit and spake “**with tongues**”. Lydia and her household were baptized in **Acts 16:14-15**. No babies mentioned in her household. She and her household were many miles away from home engaged in her chosen profession. Verses **29-34** of the same chapter record the baptism of the Philippian jailer and his household. Was there an infant in his household? No! Verse **34** says that he was baptized and his household, “**believing in God with all his house.**” Every member of his house believed. An infant cannot believe. Crispus and his household believed and were baptized (**Acts 18:8**). In **Acts 19:1-5** about twelve men who had not been scripturally baptized, were baptized by Paul. They had received John’s baptism, but John’s baptism pointed to Christ. Christ and the Holy Spirit had come, and the administrator of their baptism knew it not.

Not a single infant was baptized by Christ or His apostles. The advocates of infant baptism refer to **Matthew 19:13-15** to prove their point, but they have no ground whatever on which to base infant baptism. **John 4:1** says that Jesus did not baptize. He only laid His hands upon them. Dr. Schaff, Presbyterian, says, “There is no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament.” Hofling, a Lutheran, says, “The sacred Scriptures furnish no historical proof that children were baptized by the apostles.” Dollinger, a Catholic, says, “There is no proof in the New Testament that the apostles baptized infants or ordered them to be baptized.” None but those who are ignorant of the Scriptures or, who wilfully misrepresent the truth, believe, teach and practice infant baptism (?).

Scholars, historians and leaders of denominations that practice sprinkling or pouring infants admit that such practice is unscriptural. Why then practice it? Because they say it is a beautiful ceremony. But the Scriptures pronounce a curse upon those who add to or take from the Scriptures. The earliest evidence of infant baptism is found in Tertullian who opposed it in 185 A. D. The early church councils were against it. Its growth was slow. Its origin and growth were due to the idea that baptism was essential to salvation. Since baptism was essential to salvation, it was necessary then to baptize infants, for unbaptized infants who died were lost. This unscriptural belief gave rise to infant baptism. At first only the weak and sick infants were baptized (?). No provision was made for infants in good health. Charlemagne, A. D. 789 issued the first law in Europe for baptizing infants. Immersion was the form for baptism. Infant baptism was not practiced by Christ and His disciples, but the invention of man. Those who practice it today do so in the original belief that it washes away the sins of the infant.

At first Martin Luther and John Calvin opposed infant baptism and defended Baptist views concerning it, but later both of these reformers adopted it.

Luther at first immersed.

The requirements for Baptist baptism are Scriptural. In order to administer Baptist and Bible baptism “**much water**” is required. **John 3:23** says John “**baptized because there was much water there.**” Sprinkling and pouring require little water.

Another requirement for Baptist and Bible baptism is going down into the water. **Acts 8:38** says “**And they went down both into (not to) the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.**” Sprinkling and pouring do not require going down into the water.

Baptist and Bible baptism require a burial in water. Sprinkling and pouring do not. **Romans 6:4** says, “**Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death.**” Baptism is a burial. You do not sprinkle or pour a little dirt on a person’s head and call him buried. Verse **5** says that is a “**likeness of His death** - resurrection.” In other words baptism is a picture of Christ’s burial and resurrection. You cannot make a picture of His death, burial and resurrection out of pouring or sprinkling. The picture of a dog is not a mule’s picture, call it a mule’s picture all you may. Sprinkling and pouring can never represent a burial and resurrection regardless how much one may think they do. In **1 Corinthians 10:1-2**, a perfect burial is set forth. The cloud above, ground beneath, and water on either side completely entombed the Israelites. **Colossians 2:12** says “**Buried with Him in baptism.**”

The Hebrew words nahzah and zahrak translated sprinkle in the Old Testament are never used to sprinkle clear water on any person. **Ezekiel 36:25** is often quoted by those who sprinkle to prove that sprinkling is baptism. Read carefully verses **21 to 38**. The Lord is speaking of the time when He will gather the Israelites out of the heathen countries or Gentiles (Israel is scattered among heathen or Gentiles now) and restore them to Palestine. This restoration is yet future. When restored to their land in the future He says, “**Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and idols, will I cleanse you.**” He refers to ceremonial cleansing of the Jews when they are restored. The “**clean water**” is water mixed with the ashes of a red heifer. It does not refer to baptism at all. He has in mind the Jews and does not have reference to the church age.

In the New Testament the Greek word for sprinkle is rhanizō. It occurs four times. Rhanizō, the noun, occurs twice, but refers to blood in both instances. Proskesis occurs once referring to blood. All references to sprinkling are found in following scriptures: **Hebrews 9:13, 19, 21; Hebrews 10:22; Hebrews 11:28; Hebrews 12:24; 1 Peter 1:2**. None of those refer to baptism. The word “**pour**” occurs in New Testament 24 times, but never refers

to pouring water upon a person. In every reference to baptism, baptizo or baptisma is used. What does baptizo mean?

Below we produce the testimony of scholars, church founders and historians, none of whom are Baptists.

1. Liddell and Scott, *Standard Greek Lexicon* says, "Baptism means to dip in or under water."
2. *Thayer's Greek Lexicon* says, "Baptism means to submerge."
3. *Smith's Dictionary* says, "Baptism means immersion."
4. Fisher, historian, says, "The ordinary mode was by immersion."
5. Luther, founder of Lutheran denomination, says, "Baptism is a Greek word and may be translated immerse."
6. Calvin, founder of Presbyterian denomination, says, "The word baptize signifies to immerse."
7. Wesley, founder of Methodist denomination, says "**Buried with Him by baptism (Romans 6:4)** alluding to the ancient manner of baptism by immersion.
8. Wall, Episcopalian, says, "Immersion was in all probability the way in which our blessed Saviour was baptized."
9. Brenner, Catholic, says, "For 1300 years was baptism an immersion of the person in water."

Scholarship has agreed that Scriptural baptism is immersion. For a person to believe or teach that Scriptural baptism is sprinkling or pouring is to reveal his ignorance of the teaching of Scriptures and scholarship, or willful misrepresentation, of the truth.

Bible and Baptist baptism require coming "**up out of the water**". Sprinkling and pouring do not. "**And Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water.**" See **Acts 8:39**.

Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 196, says, "The practice of immersion was universal (in England) in the reign of Henry VIII (1509-47). It was the form of baptism of all parties. The Church of England practiced immersion. The Catholics practiced immersion. The Baptists practiced immersion." Schaff, a Presbyterian, states that the change from immersion to pouring, then sprinkling, was due to the Presbyterians. He says, "This change in England and other Protestant countries from immersion to pouring and from pouring to sprinkling was encouraged by the authority of Calvin." (Philip Schaff – *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* pages 51, 52.) (Calvin was founder of Presbyterianism.) Wall, Episcopalian, says, "Sprinkling properly so called, it seems it was in 1645 just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 294).

The Presbyterians of England lacked one vote adopting immersion for baptism. Of this account David Brewster says, "From Scotland this practice (sprinkling) made its way in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established Church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, it was keenly debated whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted; 25 voted for sprinkling and 24 voted for immersion; and even this small majority was obtained at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that Assembly." Quoted by Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 94. The Presbyterians passed a law making immersion unlawful in England.

Why was baptism changed from immersion to sprinkling by some? Haydock's *Catholic Family Bible and Commentary* says that the Roman Catholic Church had the right to change from immersion to sprinkling. He admits that Christ was immersed but states that the Catholic Church has the right to change the form.

Dean Stanley, Episcopalian, says, "The practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes and feelings of the western world, and hence the change from immersion to sprinkling." Quoted from James Frost – *The Moral Dignity of Baptism*, page 222. Such outright perversion of the Word of God! Unsuitable to tastes! Inconvenient! No Scriptural ground for sprinkling and pouring; simply a matter of convenience. Man has ever sought an easy path. **"Why call Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46). "But in vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matthew 15:9).**

Man has changed from immersion to sprinkling and all persons believing or teaching such doctrine, or belonging to a denomination that teaches and practices sprinkling or pouring, are following men and not Jesus Christ. This may seem to be a hard saying but it is true. Jesus walked 80 miles to be immersed, and He says **"Follow Me."**

What is the purpose of baptism? Baptists have been either ignorantly or wilfully charged of teaching that a person must be immersed to be saved. This is a gross misrepresentation. Baptists are almost alone in teaching that a person does not need to be baptized in order to be saved. **"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works lest any man should boast" (Ephesians 2:8-9).** Since salvation is **"the gift of God"** a person does not have to do a thing to be saved except to repent and trust in Christ for salvation. No church membership, no baptism required - faith in Christ alone.

Baptists preach that the saved only should be baptized, whereas other denominations baptize (?) before persons are saved. Of course this is not baptism, for only the saved can be baptized, but they go through the motion. Baptism is an act of obedience symbolically setting forth great doctrines. There are a few Scriptures, which, if taken alone, seem to teach that baptism is essential to salvation. Let us glance at them.

Turn to **John 3:5**. “**Born of water and of the Spirit.**” Does “**water**” refer to baptism? If it does, this is in harmony with the Scriptures which often use symbolical language. But “**water**” here does not refer to baptism. Scripture must be interpreted in the light of other Scripture. We know that “**salvation is the gift of God**” and requires no works. Baptism is a work. Over 100 Scriptural references make it clear that salvation is “**by grace through faith.**” We must interpret this passage in the light of the clear teachings ‘of these Scriptures.

Water washes, cleanses. The Jews constantly referred to the Word of God as water. **Psalms 119:9** reads, “**Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to Thy word.**” The Word cleanses like water according to this passage. **John 15:3** says, “**Now are ye clean through the word which I have spoken to you.**” The Word cleansed the disciples. **Ephesians 5:25-26** says, “**Christ loved His Church and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.**” “**WASHING OF WATER BY THE WORD.**” The Word cleanses like water.

These passages state that water is a symbol of the Word. The Word of God is essential to regeneration and sanctification. How is the Word employed in the New Birth? Turn to **I Peter 1:23-25** which says, “**Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by THE WORD OF GOD, which liveth and abideth forever ... and this is the WORD which by the gospel is preached unto you.**” Peter says “**born by the Word.**” “**Born of water**” and “**born by Word**” have the same meaning. The Word is essential in the New Birth. **Romans 10:17** says, “**So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the WORD of God.**” The Word must be preached before you can hear and believe. The Word is the Sword of the Spirit (**Ephesians 6:17**) and is used of the Spirit in regeneration. The “**water**” of **John 3:5** refers to the Word which is used by the Spirit in regeneration.

Acts 22:16 is also figurative. It says, “**And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.**” Paul is relating his experience here. He was saved when the Lord met him on the road to Damascus. We have seen above that “**salvation is the gift of God**” without works. Baptism is not essential to salvation. To prove that

this language is figurative turn to **John 6:48-58**. Does Christ mean that a person must actually eat His flesh and drink His blood to be saved? Of course not. When Jesus said in **Matthew 26:26** at the Supper that the bread was His body and the wine His blood, did he mean it literally or only symbolically? Symbolically of course. Yet, the Roman Catholics claim that the actual flesh of Christ is eaten and actual blood is drunk, but this is a great error. It is just as preposterous to attribute to baptism the power to wash away sins, as it is to claim that one actually eats Christ's flesh and drinks His blood. Such perversion of the Scriptures has led the Catholics to the erroneous views of the supper and the Campbellites as to baptism.

Advocates of baptismal regeneration use **Acts 2:38** as the mud sill of their unscriptural views on baptism. This Scripture, like the others referred to, as rendered in the King James Version, is figurative, but as given in the original text may be accepted as literal. The preposition "**for**" used in phrase "**for remission of sins**" is a translation of the Greek preposition "**eis**". This preposition "**eis**" is translated "**in**" in **Mark 1:5** which says, "**Baptized of him IN the river of Jordan.**" Not baptized to get in the river but because they were already "**in**" the river Jordan. This preposition is translated "**at**" (because of) in **Luke 11:32**. "**For they repented at (because of) Jonah's preaching.**" Therefore, it is grammatically correct to translate this passage as follows: "**Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, because your sins have been forgiven.**" This interpretation is confirmed by approximately 100 references which teach salvation wholly "**by grace through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.**"

Baptism then, is only symbolical, setting forth Christ's death, burial and resurrection for our sins; our death to sin and alive unto God; and the resurrection of the, sleeping saints when Christ comes.

Who has the authority to administer baptism? Have all denominations equal authority to do so? It is commonly believed that one denomination has as much scriptural authority for its existence as another. This is untrue. Only one has authority. The question is which one? Christ founded His Church while upon earth and said that churches like it would continue until His return. We saw that a New Testament Church was a local, independent body, and not composed of all believers scattered through a certain district or throughout the world. All denominations that have come into existence since the days of Christ do not have Scriptural authority to baptize. In the following chapters we shall prove that New Testament Churches were Baptist Churches, and that Baptists alone have continued from days of Christ, and consequently alone have authority to baptize. If you have not been baptized into a Missionary Baptist Church, your baptism is unscriptural.

This popular Christ dishonoring belief that it makes no difference as to what denomination you join, or whether sprinkled, poured or immersed, is playing havoc with professing Christians today. Loyalty to Christ and His Word are almost a thing of the past. "We must not hurt another's feelings" is the attitude today, while at the same time we are running rough shod over Christ and His Word. As to the difference it makes read **Matthew 5:19; 7:21-23; 15:7-9; Luke 6:46; 1 Corinthians 3:9-15**. Our baptism does not affect our salvation but it does our rewards, and many of God's children will have a hard time explaining why they rejected Christ's baptism and accepted man's.

PART ONE

CHAPTER SIX - THE LORD'S SUPPER

According to the Scriptures, scholarship and history, Baptists alone have the authority to administer the ordinances of baptism and the supper. Their views of the supper are alone Scriptural. "**To the law and to the testimony.**"

The supper does not belong to the Churches of Christ except as guardians of it. It is the Lord's Supper and He alone has the right to say who shall eat and who shall not eat. Away with this Christ dishonoring belief that any who desires may eat of the supper. Christ has placed certain restrictions on the supper, and demands that those who eat shall possess certain qualifications.

The supper is not a Christian ordinance but a church ordinance. It is not for all Christians. The apostles alone were members of His church during His earthly ministry, and they alone ate with Him. Not even His mother was present.

In order to partake of the supper, a person must first of all be a believer in Christ - born again. All of the apostles, except Judas, were believers, and, if all gospels are carefully read, it will be seen that Judas left before the supper. **Acts 2:41-42** shows that only believers partook of the supper in the early church.

Not only must person be a believer, but a baptized believer. The apostles were baptized. John the Baptist baptized most of them for he came to "**prepare the way**" - get ready the material. Two of the apostles were John's disciples at first (**John 1:35-37**). The qualifications of an apostle required baptism (**Acts 1:21-23**). Jesus was baptized and commanded baptism (**Matthew 28:19-20**). He surely then would not permit the apostles to be unbaptized. In the commission He placed baptism before the supper. In New Testament times baptism immediately followed confession of Christ. There is not a single Scriptural reference where an unbaptized person partook of the supper.

Practically all denominations place baptism before the supper. In this sense all denominations are close communionists. We shall quote a few denominational leaders.

Wall, Church of England, says: “No church ever gave the communion to any person before he was baptized; among all absurdities ever held, none ever held this that a person should partake of the communion before he was baptized.”

Doddridge, Presbyterian, says: “It is certain that so far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity extends, no unbaptized person received the supper.” Griffin, Congregationalist, says: “I agree with the advocates of close communion that we ought not to commune with those who have not been baptized, and of course are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians.”

Dr. Hibbard, Methodist scholar, says: “It is but just to remark that in one principle the Baptists and Pedobaptists agree. They agree in rejecting from the table of the Lord and in denying the rights of church fellowship to all who have not been baptized. Valid baptism, the Baptists hold as essential to church membership. This we (Methodists) hold. The only question that divides us is, then, what is valid baptism.”

An Episcopalian paper says: “No Christian Church would receive to its communion even the humblest and truest believer in Christ who had not been baptized. With Baptists, immersion alone is baptism, and they, therefore, of necessity, exclude from the table of the Lord, all who have not been baptized. It is an essential part of the system - the legitimate carrying out of the creed.”

Baltimore Christian Advocate, Methodist, says: “Baptists believe in adult immersion and should decline communion with the unbaptized - to be offended because they refuse to commune with us is absurd; to reproach them for it is unjust and unjustifiable.” Dr. Beecher (non-Baptist), says: “If our Baptist brethren are right on the mode of baptism they are right on communion.

These denominational leaders state that all denominations require baptism before supper, and that Baptists should not be reproached for declining to eat with others, since they, according to Baptist belief, are not baptized.

The Supper is to be eaten only by those who continue in the New Testament teaching. **Acts 2:42** “**and they continued steadfastly in the apostle’s teaching.**” They were of the same faith and practice. There were no doctrinal differences. The Corinthian brethren were divided into different denominations or sects. See **1 Corinthians 1:10-13; 11:17-20**. Paul tells them

in **1 Corinthians 11:20**, “*This is not to eat the Lord’s Supper.*” In the margin of the King James Version, and in the Revised Version it says “**Ye cannot eat the Lord’s supper.**” Why? Because they were divided into sects or denominations. Persons of different denominations cannot eat the supper.

A person must not only possess the foregoing qualifications but must be in fellowship with the brethren of the church. The Jerusalem church was in fellowship. **Acts 2:42**, “**Continued ... in fellowship.**” An excluded member of the church cannot eat. **1 Corinthians 5:11** says, “**With such a one (excluded member) no not to eat.**” A person should be excluded for immorality, etc. (**1 Corinthians 5th** chapter). Also for heresy or false doctrine (**Romans 16:17**). A person then excluded for immoral conduct or believing false doctrine cannot eat the supper. Therefore Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, Campbellites, Freewills, Hardshells, and Missionary Baptists cannot eat together, for they are greatly divided, and being divided as Paul said, “**Ye cannot eat the Lord’s supper.**”

Bishop Holding of the Methodist denomination, says: “No person shall be admitted to the table of the Lord among us, who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member.” A member is subject to exclusion “who holds and disseminates, publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our articles of religion, or inveighs against our doctrines.” Inasmuch as Baptists hold doctrines that are much contrary to Methodist doctrines, they cannot eat with them.

When a person possessing the above qualifications comes to the table, such one must discern the Lord’s body. To discern the body simply means that the person must realize that the bread and wine are pictures of Christ’s body and blood, broken and shed for us. One must not think of the supper as communing with others but as with Christ (**1 Corinthians 10:16**). The Bible does not state how often the supper should be observed, but as oft as it is observed it shows forth His death until His return.

PART TWO

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

As we have seen, Jesus promised that His churches would continue on earth from the day He instituted His Church during His earthly ministry, until His return at the end of the age. He did not mean that an invisible church would continue, for such a belief is unscriptural, but that local churches of same doctrines and practices as the Church He founded, would continue. This promise is being fulfilled. Of the nearly 220 denominations in the United States, which one is composed of the genuine Churches of Christ, and can trace its origin to the days

of Christ's earthly ministry? Every denomination whose origin dates this side of Christ's earthly ministry cannot Scripturally and historically claim Christ as its founder.

On account of lack of space dates of origin of very few denominations will be given. Suffice it to say that all but one have human founders and are not composed of Christ's Churches. Roman Catholics claim apostolic origin, but this big denomination did not begin as such until the beginning of the seventh century, when Boniface the Third became the first universal pope. There is not the least bit of likeness between the Roman Catholic and a New Testament Church. The Greek Catholic Church split off from the Roman Catholics in 1054. Henry VIII, king of England, wanted to divorce his wife, Catherine, and marry her maid, Anne Boleyn. The pope of Rome objected. Henry married Anne anyway. The Pope excommunicated him. Henry thereupon organized the Church of England (Episcopal) in 1530. John Calvin, a reformer, founded the Presbyterian Denomination in 1541.

John Wesley is the founder of the Methodist Denomination. *The Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church* (1904 pages 30-31) states that certain persons came to Mr. Wesley, a minister of the Church of England, for spiritual advice. They met weekly on Thursday. Soon many other such prayer meetings or societies sprang up. Finally these societies developed into the Methodist Denomination. Mr. Wesley did not want these societies to become a separate denomination from the Church of England, but they did. The Methodists began in 1739, 1700 years after Christ founded His Church. The Wesleyan Methodists represent the original body of Methodists.

In 1780, Benjamin Randall, an excluded Baptist minister, founded the Freewill Baptist Church. The Freewills are over 1700 years too late to be the true Churches of Christ.

The Disciples, or better known as Campbellites, came into existence not on the day of Pentecost as they earnestly contend, but in the beginning of the 19th century. Their founder is not Jesus Christ but Alexander Campbell and his father. They lack 1800 years being the Church of Christ historically, and more so Scripturally. Let us seek the testimony of history with reference to their origin. Newman's *Church History*, Volume 2, page 700, and *Handbook of All Denominations*, page 96, state that Thomas Campbell, a seceding Presbyterian minister, came from north Ireland and settled in Pennsylvania in 1807. In 1811, his young son, Alexander, joined him

in a reformation. They adopted immersion. In 1813, Alexander having become the leader, their independent church united with the Redstone Association, and, in 1823, owing to a controversy, joined the Mahoning. Because of Campbell's views on baptism – he believed baptism was essential to salvation - he and his church were excluded from the Baptists in 1827. Later a division occurred in this denomination which resulted in the formation of another denomination or body known as “The Christian Church”

There are about thirty branches of the Holiness movement. Each branch or denomination declares itself to be composed of the true Churches of Christ, yet their origin is of recent date. In the latter part of the 19th century, many became dissatisfied with the spiritual conditions of the Methodist Denomination in the west, and withdrew, forming organizations which have developed into the Holiness Denominations. Their origin is of recent date and yet they declare themselves to be the true Churches of Christ. If their claim be true, then Christ failed to found His Church as He claimed, and left it to men of the 19th and 20th centuries to institute.

The Christian and Missionary Alliance was formed in 1916. It is not a distinct denomination, but several denominations combined for missionary purpose. It cannot be a church. It cannot Scripturally administer the ordinances. Its members are not of the same faith and practice. There is no need for such organization. For those who are unfaithful to Christ and His true churches, this organization is a substitute for the Church of Christ. Russellism, Christian Science, Seventh Day Adventism and all other denominations except one, have human founders.

The Hardshells left the Missionary Baptists in 1832. This is the statement of one of their own ministers, James Watson. He says: “After our painful separation from the Missionaries in 1836, a number of churches met together and formed the Stone River Association. We had then as what was generally supposed, a strong and happy union, but alas, there was an element of heresy incorporated in that body as bad as that from which we had withdrawn.” David B. Ray - *Ray's Baptist Succession* page 94. Here is an admission from one of their own members that the Hardshells left the Missionaries. The first separation took place in 1832.

The date of origin and the human founder of every denomination can be named except that of the Missionary Baptists. No date or person this side of Jesus Christ can satisfactorily be proved as time or founder of the Missionary Baptists. If

Missionary Baptists have a human founder like all other denominations, then Jesus failed to carry out His promise in **Matthew 16:18**. We shall now prove that Missionary Baptists were founded by Jesus Christ.

The Missionary Baptists did not originate with the Hardshells separation as some claim. We have just quoted a Hardshell minister who stated that the Hardshells left the Missionaries. To prove that Baptists were Missionary Baptists before the Hardshells withdrew, we shall cite the reader to history. Eighty four years before the Hardshell separation, the Philadelphia Association was a missionary body. In 1784 we find in its report that “all donations for the spread of the gospel among the Hindoos be forwarded to Brother William Rogers.” *Philadelphia Baptist Association* page 298, quoted by David B. Ray - *Ray's Baptist Succession*. Of the Philadelphia Association, H. G. Jones, editor of the minutes, says: “The Philadelphia Association, from the first, has engaged earnestly in efforts for the proper education of its ministers and spread of the Gospel IN THE WORLD.” Hardshells oppose education and missions. American Baptists were Missionary Baptists before the Hardshells left them.

Baptists were missionaries before they came to America. The English and Welsh Baptists were missionaries. In 1689, nearly 200 years before the Hardshell separation, the English Baptists raised money for ministerial education and missions. The General Assembly of English Baptists met in London in 1689. At this convention it was “resolved to raise a fund for missionary purposes, and to assist feeble churches; also, for the purpose of ministerial education.” (David Benedict – *A General Description of the Baptist Denomination* page 336). The Dutch Baptists established a college for ministers at Amsterdam, nearly 250 years before the Hardshell separation. The ancient Waldenses, who were Baptists, had ten schools in Valcomoncia alone in 1229. They were great missionaries. The church at Antioch was a missionary church. The Jerusalem Church was missionary. In fact the true churches of Christ have always been missionary. The Hardshells are anti-missionary and cannot be the Churches of Christ. They are, therefore, not the “Primitive” Baptists. “Primitive” means first; and the first Baptists were missionaries. Missionary Baptists are the true Primitive Baptists, and did not originate with Hardshell separation.

Other denominations know that they cannot trace their history back to Christ, and hence, have no succession back to Christ. They know that some man founded them. Many have attempted to prove that Baptists, too, have a human founder, and therefore do not have an unbroken succession back to Christ. Certain dates have been set for Baptist origin. We shall give brief attention to these dates and supposed human founders in the following chapters. All who have attempted to set the date and founder of the Baptists do not agree. This shows that they have no absolute proof as to when and who founded the Baptist

Denomination. As to the origin and human founders of all other denominations there is no doubt.

PART TWO

CHAPTER TWO - AMERICAN BAPTISTS

In the study of Baptist History we shall go up stream - beginning with the American Baptists and tracing the Baptists back to Christ.

Whence came the American Baptists? Some ignorantly claim that Roger Williams is the founder of American Baptists, and, since Williams was baptized by an unbaptized person, Baptist succession back to Christ has been broken. As to Williams' baptism we find that he was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, and in turn immersed Holliman. Williams organized "a thing like a church," but after four months he renounced his baptism (?) and his church "came to nothing." Mr. Backus, the historian, says, "Mr. Williams - in March, 1639, was baptized by one of his brethren, and then he baptized about ten more. But in July following - he refrained from such administrations (baptizing) among them." (Isaac Backus – *A History of the Baptists* page 50).

In discussing this affair Cotton Mather, Pedobaptist, says, "He (Williams) settled at a place called Providence. There they proceeded not only unto the gathering of a thing like a church, but unto renouncing their infant baptism. After this he turned Seeker and Familist, and the church to nothing." (Thomas Crosby – *Baptist History* Volume 1, page 117). Mr. Lech-ford, Episcopalian, who visited in New England at the time of the Williams' affair says of Williams: "At Providence, which is twenty miles from the said Rhode Island lives Master Williams and his company of divers opinions - They hold that there is no true, visible church in the world, nor any true ministry."

After a careful study of Williams and his church (?) Mr. Adlam remarks: "Among the evils that have resulted from the wrong date of the Providence Church, has been the prominence given Mr. Williams. It is to be regretted that it ever entered into the mind of any one to make him, in America, the founder of our denomination. In no sense was he so a man only four months a Baptist (?), and then renouncing his baptism forever, to be lauded and magnified as the founder of the Baptist denomination in the New World!"

Shortly after Williams' church was disbanded. Thomas Olney, a member of the "thing like a church," organized another church (?). Later this church disbanded, and the present First Baptist Church at

Providence, was organized by Wickenden, Dexter, and Brown, in 1652. These ministers were ordained in England. No preacher ever came out of the Williams and Olney churches; no persons or churches owe their baptism to these churches.

Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 374, says, "In any event, the Baptists of America did not derive their origin from Roger Williams. Benedict mentions the names of fifty-five Baptist Churches, including 1750, in America, not one of which came out of the Providence Church." On the same page he quotes J. P. Tustin, who says, "From the earliest period of our colonial settlements, multitudes of Baptist ministers and members came from Europe and settled in different parts of this continent ... It is a fact generally known, that many of the Baptist Churches in this country derived their origin from Baptist Churches in Wales, a country which has always been a nursery for their peculiar principles. In earlier settlements of this country, multitudes of Welsh immigrants, who left their fatherland, brought with them the seeds of Baptist principles, and their ministers and members laid the foundation of many Baptist Churches in New England."

David B. Ray - *Ray's Baptist Succession* pages 121-5, gives the names of twenty Baptist ministers ordained in England and Wales who came to America. A whole Baptist Church from Wales came over in the same boat. Roger Williams was never a genuine Baptist. For only four months he posed as a Baptist, and then renounces his church and baptism. As a valiant advocate of religious liberty we pay him homage, but as founder of the American Baptists, NEVER! Persons who go around bleating like a calf that Williams was the founder of American Baptists show themselves to be ignorant of the truth.

The First Baptist Church in America was founded by John Clarke at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638, one year before the Williams' affair. Minutes of the Philadelphia Association read as follows: "When the first church in Newport, Rhode Island, was one hundred years old, in 1738, Mr. John Callender, their minister, delivered and published a sermon on the occasion." Quoted by *Ray's Baptist Succession* page 116. This date is confirmed by the inscription on John Clarke's tomb. It reads as follows: "To the Memory of DOCTOR JOHN CLARKE, one of the original purchasers and proprietors of this island, and one of the founders of the First Baptist Church in Newport, its first pastor ... He came to this island in March, 1638 ... shortly afterward gathered the church aforesaid, and became its pastor." (*Ray's Baptist Succession* page 116).

We thus see that the church at Newport, Rhode Island, is the oldest Baptist

Church in America. The First Baptist Church at Providence, R. I., was not organized by Williams or Olney, but by preachers ordained in England. Roger Williams was never a Baptist; Baptists in America do not owe their existence to him; neither is Baptist succession broken by the Williams' affair.

PART TWO

CHAPTER THREE - ENGLISH AND WELSH BAPTISTS

We saw in the foregoing chapter that the American Baptists did not originate with Roger Williams, but that English and Welsh Baptists came to America, thus founding the great Baptist Denomination in America. Whence came the English and Welsh Baptists? Did they originate with some human founder? Baptist enemies have attempted to prove that they did, and have set certain dates for their origin and certain men as their founders. We shall listen to the voice of history.

Some claim that Baptists did not begin to immerse until 1641, and hence, their beginning was 1641. Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, Chapter 15, goes into this question very thoroughly and proves that Baptists were very numerous in England from 1509 to 1547, the period covered in this chapter. This was from 150 to 100 years before 1641, the date set for Baptist origin. On page 191 Christian states that "there was then an organized Baptist Church in London, in the practice of believers' immersion in the year 1525." On page 193 he states that "there were more Baptists there (in England) at the period under survey (1509-47) than there were in America at the beginning of the Revolutionary War."

As to baptism during this period he states on page 194 that "Immersion was the universal rule for baptism in the reign of Henry VIII. The Church of England practiced immersion. The Catholics practiced immersion. The Baptists practiced immersion." Turner, a Baptist enemy, said these Baptists practiced "over baptism which is the dipping into the water." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 202). Floyer, a non-Baptist, says, "The above references prove that all immersed in England until the seventeenth century; that sprinkling did not become popular until 1644; and that Baptists have always immersed.

It is claimed by some that John Smyth founded the English Baptists, and, since he is reputed to have baptized himself in 1609, and formed a Baptist Church, Baptist succession back to Christ has been broken.

What if he did baptize (?) himself? We saw above that Baptists were numerous in England 100 years before Smyth. He was not the founder of Baptists in England. Thomas Crosby, a historian, says, "If he (Smyth) were guilty of what they charge him, tis no blemish on English Baptists - for they did not receive their baptism from him." Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 225 says, "After prolonged investigation, we are unable to find evidence that any Baptist Church grew out of this one."

English Baptists did not begin to immerse in 1641, nor did they originate with Smyth in 1609. Whence came they? Ivimey, a historian says of the origin of Baptists in England and Wales: "We have shown that persons professing similar sentiments with these of the present English Baptists have been found IN EVERY PERIOD of the English Church." Quoted by Christian's *A History of the Baptists*, Volume 1, page 226. Thomas Crosby, a historian, says, "It being agreed on all hands, that the plantation of gospel here was VERY EARLY, EVEN IN THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES." Barclay, a Quaker, says, "The rise of the Anabaptists took place long prior to the foundation of the Church of England (1530) - There are reasons for believing ... many of the opinions of the Anabaptists (Baptists) HAVE EXISTED FROM THE TIMES OF THE APOSTLES." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 174).

Richard Davis, Bishop of Monmouth, said: "There was a vast difference between the Christianity of Ancient Britons (English) and the mock Christianity introduced by Austin in England in 596; for the ancient Britons received it FROM THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST." President Edwards of Princeton University says, "God was pleased to maintain an uninterrupted succession of many witnesses THROUGH THE WHOLE TIME IN BRITAIN, as well as in Germany and France." (Edwards - *A History of Redemption* page 205).

Historian Davis says, "The vale of Carleon (in south Wales) is our valley of the Piedmont (in which valley God preserved the Waldenses); the crevices of the rocks, the hiding places of the lamb of the sheep of Christ, where the ordinances of the Gospel to this day have BEEN ADMINISTERED IN THEIR PRIMITIVE MODE." Robison, a non-Baptist, in referring to a Baptist congregation in England in 1457, says, "I have seen enough to convince me that the present dissenters (Baptists) contending for a sufficiency of the Scriptures and for Christian Liberty may BE TRACED BACK TO THE APOSTLES."

These men of authority; most of whom are not Baptists, state that the gospel was preached in England and Wales during days of the Apostles; that the

gospel as preached by the disciples of Christ, has been kept pure through all the centuries, and that the persons who kept the gospel pure were Baptists. What a concession to Baptists by scholars who were not Baptists! They simply state that Baptists have been in England and Wales since the days of the apostles. And yet, in light of this knowledge, some wilfully or ignorantly claim that Baptists did not begin in England until 1609 or 1641. Genuine evidence is to the contrary. So says Dr. R. K. C. Howell. He says, "The prevalence of Baptists in Great Britain from the earliest times and in no small numbers will be questioned by no one who is at all familiar with the religious history of the land of our fathers." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 175).

It is admitted that the gospel was preached in Britain during apostolic times. The gospel spread rapidly. Lucius, the first king converted, was baptized in 180. Under the Roman Emperor, Diocletian, in 300, the British suffered fierce persecution. Their churches and books were burned and many were put to death. Says Thomas Crosby the historian concerning these martyrs, "Whom I must regard as Baptist martyrs till the Pedobaptists convince me to the contrary." He further says, "It is more than a probability that the first English Christians were Baptists." He further states that the doctrines and form of worship delivered by the apostles were maintained in England during this early period. There is no mentioning of baptism of infants for at least 300 years.

Saint Patrick, a native born Briton, who preached among the Irish, Scotch and English, was doubtless a Baptist. The exact time of his ministry is unknown, but probably at the close of the fourth century. He practiced immersion upon profession of faith. His opinions on the Lord's Supper were scriptural. The Roman Catholics claim him, but that church was then unknown.

In 597, Augustine was sent into Britain to convert the people to the doctrines of the church of Rome. He found a people (Baptists) who held to the simple teachings of the Word of God. They did not practice infant baptism. They would not acknowledge the supremacy of the church of Rome. Because they would not, Augustine made war upon these simple Baptists and nearly 1,200 of them were slain while attending a prayer meeting.

The native English and Welsh Baptists were reinforced by Baptists from other lands. W. J. E. Bennett, who hated Baptists, said that the Waldneses, called Paulicians by some, infested northern Germany and spread all over England. About 1000 A. D. the Paulicians, who were Baptists, made their appearance in England. In 1154, a body of German Waldenses (another name for Baptists as we shall later prove) were driven into England through persecution. These Paulician and Waldensean Baptists were followed by other Paulician Baptists in

1160. Henry II, King of England, ordered them to be branded on the forehead with hot irons, dresses cut short, to be whipped through the streets and then turned out into the open country to starve. No village would receive them, and they perished with cold and hunger. Why? Simply because they were Baptists following the teachings of the Bible.

A Baptist Church was located at Hill Cliffe. Its origin is unknown, but doubtless in existence in 1357. It was probably founded by the Lollards. Who were the Lollards? Walter Lollard, a preacher among the Waldenses came into England, in 1315. He was a great preacher. Knighton, the English chronicler, says that "more than one half of the people of England became Lollards." Lollard was a Waldensean preacher. The Waldenses were Baptists. Lollar was a Baptist preacher, but his followers in England were called Lollards. Soon one half of England became Baptists. This was in the fourteenth century, and yet, there are those who claim that Baptists did not begin until the seventeenth century!

Bishop Burnett says, "At this time (1549) there were many Anabaptists (Baptists) in several parts of England. They were generally Germans." (Ray's *Baptist Succession* page 137). During the persecution of the Albigenses in France by the Roman Catholics, many fled to England. These Albigenses were the same people as the Waldenses. They were Baptists.

During the Reformation period in England, Baptists suffered intense persecution. Henry VIII broke with the Catholic Church (1530) and organized the Church of England (Episcopal). He hated the Baptists and many were put to death. Henry joined in a general attempt to suppress the Baptists. On May 15, 1533, 14 were burned. Fraud, the English historian, says of them: "Fourteen who by no terror of stake or torture could be tempted to say what they did not believe." He says that they died not in vain, for in their deaths they were helping England to purchase religious liberty. Some of their enemies stated that so many Baptists were burned that the price of wood for fuel was increased. Yet, like the Israelites, the more they were persecuted, the more rapidly they increased. There were more Baptists in England during this period (1509-47) than were in America at the beginning of the Revolutionary War.

As to baptism during this period Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 196, says, "The practice of immersion was universal. It was the form of baptism of all parties and there is no known

testimony to the contrary. The Church of England practiced immersion. The Catholics practiced immersion. The Baptists practiced immersion.” This was 100 years before some claim the Baptists began to immerse.

Under Edward VI (1547-53) persecution of the Baptists continued. All other denominations were protected. Criminals were pardoned but to be a Baptist was a great crime. Despite this bitter persecution, Baptists increased. At this time the influence of John Calvin, founder of Presbyterian Denomination, had begun to be felt in England. He was responsible in a great measure, for the demon of hate and fierce hostility which the Baptists of England had to encounter. He advised that Baptists be put to death. Immersion continued to prevail among all denominations. However, at the close of this period, a slight concession was made to sprinkling among all denominations except Baptist because of Calvin’s influence.

“Bloody” Mary Tudor (1553-58) was a Catholic. Baptists suffered greatly under her. She was succeeded by Queen Elizabeth. Although the Catholics were constantly plotting against her, she showed them more favor than she did to the Baptists. During her reign the word “Baptist” was first used when referring to the Anabaptists. The word “Anabaptist” however, is still used in England to designate the Baptists of today.

Of the prevalence of Baptists in England during Queen Elizabeth’s reign (born 1553, died 1605) Christian’s *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 206 says, “There were at this time a number of Baptist Churches in England and the Baptists had a great following.” This was many years before the dates 1609 and 1641, at which time some have endeavored to prove that Baptists began. Says Christian on same page: “England under a protestant queen (Elizabeth) appealed to them (Baptists) as a land of freedom, and many Baptists hoped there to find at least partial liberty of conscience. Third, there were also in England numbers of native Baptists. At the prospects of liberty they came from their hiding places ... The native Baptists were reinforced by shoals of Baptists abroad.”

Whitgift, an enemy of the Baptists, said that the Baptists in England were to be feared by the Church of England, because Baptists follow the preaching of the gospel. Christian states that there are now in existence in nine counties outside of London, Baptist Churches founded during Queen Elizabeth’s reign. This was before 1600.

The character of the Baptists during the Reformation period, and during all periods, has been grossly misrepresented. They were declared to be the most turbulent of all men. Every hostile movement was ascribed to the Baptists. They were charged with being the cause of earthquakes, famines, pestilences, sickness, etc. Their enemies thought God sent these calamities because of the stubborn Baptists who would not prove disloyal to Christ and His Word.

The Baptists were the most peaceful of all men. They loved peace and quietude. They wanted no one persecuted because of religious belief. They were the champions of religious liberty. Because of their peaceful lives, and contention for religious liberty, many were burned, drowned in rivers, and killed by many other devices. Their women were outraged; they were hunted down like wild beasts. Yet they never persecuted, although they had it in their power to do so.

Says Christian concerning them: “Earnest and evangelical as were the Baptists it would seem natural to suppose that they would at least be tolerated by the government, but their views were too radical and their principles too far reaching, to fail to challenge the hatred of the persecuting era. The whole Christian world was organized upon the lines of persecution. The exception to the rule were the Baptists. They held that every man had the God-given right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; and the larger right that other men had the same privilege. In this contention they stood absolutely alone; and standing alone, they paid the price in human blood that every man might worship, or not worship, God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It was a costly sacrifice but it was none too dear for the world’s redemption.”

The Baptists appealed directly to the New Testament as sole authority in matters of religion. They rejected earthly councils as favored by the Catholics, etc. They almost exclusively read the Bible. Many among them could read. Those who could not read would gather around those who could read and listen. The Waldensian Bible was used by them. They welcomed Luther’s translation of the Bible.

PART TWO

CHAPTER FOUR - THE DUTCH AND GERMAN BAPTISTS

In the preceding chapter on the English Baptists we saw that Baptists had been in England and Wales since the days of the Apostles. These native Baptists were reinforced by Baptists from foreign countries, especially Germany and Holland. We give one other testimony. Fuller,

the church historian, in giving the reason why so many Dutch Baptists flocked to England during the sixteenth century, says, "A match being now made up, by Cromwell's contrivance, betwixt King Henry and Lady Anne of Cleves, Dutchmen flocked faster than formerly into England - and soon after began to broach their strange opinions, being branded the general name Anabaptists."

We have seen that the Baptists were called Anabaptists before they received the name Baptists. Anabaptist was their general name in Germany and Holland just prior to and during the Reformation Period. They were first called Waldenses in these countries. The Baptists who followed Simon Menno, a great Baptist preacher, were called Mennonites by their enemies.

The Baptists preferred to be called Catabaptists instead of Anabaptists, for they did not consider their baptism of persons coming from other denominations to them as a re-baptism, but the first and only baptism. Ana means "again." When they baptized persons coming from other denominations they were said by their enemies to rebaptize - hence they were called Anabaptists (rebaptizers). Baptists in Germany immersed. Baptists have always immersed. Some out of ignorance have attempted to prove that Baptists did not begin to immerse until 1641, but such a false claim has long been exploded. The reformers one hundred years before 1641, had a controversy with Baptists on baptism. Christian says, "At first the reformers were disposed to take the Baptist side of the controversy and to deny infant baptism - even when the reformers practiced, or permitted, pouring or sprinkling, they generally affirmed that the primitive rite was by dipping." Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 105. Luther immersed at first and testified that the Baptists immersed. Calvin, founder of Presbyterian denomination, testified that the Baptists immersed and that the Greek word "baptizo" means to immerse.

Back to origin of the German Baptists. Whence came they? We shall let Mosheim, a Lutheran historian, who hated Baptists, answer this question. He says, "The origin of the sect - called Anabaptists - are not altogether wrong, when they boast of a descent from these Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled witnesses for the truth before Luther. Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, very many persons, in whose minds, were deeply rooted the principle which the Waldenses maintained." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 83). On this statement Christian page 83 remarks, "This origin of Mosheim, expressed in 1755, of the ancient origin of

Baptists and their intimate connection with the Waldenses and many other witnesses of the truth, meets with the approval of the most rigid scientific research of our own times.”

This learned Lutheran historian says that the Baptists were known as Waldenses, Petrobrusians, and others, before the time of Luther, at which time they were called Anabaptists. Barclay, a Quaker, says, “We shall afterwards show the rise of the Anabaptists took place prior to the Reformation - (and some call Baptists Protestants, as if they, too, came out, of the Roman Catholic Church) - and there are reasons for believing that on the continent of Europe small hidden Christian societies, who have held many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have EXISTED FROM THE, TIMES OF THE APOSTLES.” (Christian’s *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 85).

On the same page Christian remarks: “Roman Catholic historians and officials in some instances eye witnesses, testify that the Waldenses and other ancient communions were the same as Anabaptists.” Baronius, a learned Catholic historian, says, “The Waldenses were Anabaptists.” Cardinal Hosius (Catholic) 1560, dated the Anabaptists back to 360 A. D. He says, “The Anabaptists are a pernicious sect. Of which kind the Waldenses brethren seem to have been - many have united with the Anabaptists.” The Catholic writers state that the Anabaptists and Waldenses are the same people - the Anabaptists sprang from the Waldenses. They should know for they persecuted the Baptists for centuries.

Luther, who hated Baptists, said in 1522, “The Anabaptists have been for a long time spreading in Germany.” Christian says, “In those places where the Waldenses flourished there the Baptists set deep root. In all those places where the Waldenses in Medieval times; in all of them were the Baptists in Reformation times.”

To further prove that the German Baptists sprang from, or rather were, the same people as the Ancient Waldenses, we introduce the statement made by a committee appointed by the King of Holland to write a history of the Dutch Reformed Church. In this history there is a chapter devoted to the Baptists. This history was published at Breda in 1819, by Dr. Ypeif, Professor of Theology at Gronigen, and I. J. Dermout, Chaplain to the King, learned Pedobaptists. These men had access to all of the libraries and archives of Germany and Holland. After a careful study of the Baptists they made this statement:

“We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called

Anabaptists, and, in latter times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and 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 DAYS OF THE APOSTLES, AND AS A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY, WHICH HAS PRESERVED THE PURE DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL THROUGH ALL AGES.”

They further state that the Reformation was unnecessary, because the Baptists, then known as Anabaptists, Waldenses and other names, were preaching the Gospel in its simplicity, long before Luther; yea, even from the days of the apostles. They further state that the existence of Baptists through all the ages since Christ “refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics that their communion is the most ancient.” (The *Religious Encyclopedia* page 786). This is not the language of narrow Baptists, but of learned Pedobaptists, and is worthy to be embalmed in the memory of every lover of the truth. BAPTISTS HAVE A SUCCESSION BACK TO CHRIST!

To the above statement by the learned Pedobaptist historians as to Baptist origin, Newton Brown, editor of the *Religious Encyclopedia* says, “This testimony from the highest official authority in the Dutch Reformed Church, is certainly a rare instance of liberality toward another denomination, conceding all the Mennonites or Baptists claim.”

The German Anabaptists sprang from the Waldenses. Some claim that the Anabaptists or Baptists sprang from the Munster Riot, but the above testimony proves that such claim is false. Mr. Brown, editor *Religious Encyclopedia*, a non-Baptist, in answering this claim says, “It is but just to observe also that the Baptists in Holland, England and the United States, are entirely distinct from these seditious and fanatical individuals.”

The Waldenses entered Holland in 1182 and by 1233 Holland was full of them. These persecuted Waldensian Baptists fled into Germany and Holland from other countries to escape persecution at the hands of the Catholics. In Holland and Germany they found more liberty than in other countries. These Waldensian Baptists enjoyed liberty granted them by the Prince of Orange. Other sects endeavored to arouse the anger of the Prince against these Baptists, but he accorded them the same religious liberty granted to others. The Baptists spread rapidly.

A great Baptist preacher among these Waldensian Baptists of Germany

was Simon Menno. He was at first a Catholic, but became converted, and joined the Baptists or Anabaptists, in 1531. He became a great leader among them. His immediate followers were called Mennonites, not because he was their founder, but leader. To prove that the Baptists called Mennonites did not originate with Menno we give testimony of Mosheim, learned Lutheran historian, who says, "The true origin of that sect which acquired the name Anabaptists - administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man to whom they owe their greatest felicity, is hid in the depths of antiquity." (*Church History*, page 490). Mosheim states that the Baptists or Mennonites of Germany did not begin with Menno but far before his time.

Christian, in his *A History of the Baptists*, Volume 1, pages 142-144, proves that the Baptists or Mennonites of Holland immersed, and that Menno was a strong advocate of immersion. The modern Mennonites pour, but the ancient Mennonites were Baptists and immersed. Says Christian, "The Mennonites of our day reject infant baptism and practice believer's baptism by affusion (pouring). Menno and his immediate followers were in the practice of dipping, but later the Mennonites did not strenuously insist upon this form of baptism." He further states that at the close of the 16th century and beginning of the 17th, immersion was the practice.

We have seen that a people called Waldenses, who were bitterly persecuted by the Roman Catholics, fled into Germany and Holland for protection in the early part of the 12th century. By the 13th century Holland was full of them. These Waldenses baptized all who came to them from other sects; hence, they were called Anabaptists (rebaptizers). One of their great Preachers was Simon Menno. He preached the gospel with power. Many were saved under his ministry. His immediate followers were called Mennonites, but they were simple Waldenses or Anabaptists. We saw above that Menno did not originate the Mennonites, but his followers who were Anabaptists, were called Mennonites after their illustrious leader.

A quotation from Ray's *Baptist Succession* will serve as a fitting conclusion for the chapter we are now closing. He says, "We have traced a regular succession of Baptists from the shores of America to Wales, England, and Germany, and to the valleys of the Alps, long before the Munster rebellion. We have now entered upon a period of our history prior to the Lutheran Reformation. In this period, prior to the year 1520, we find no Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, nor Methodists, and, of course, no Campbellites. But the Baptist denomination stands alone here as **'the pillar and ground of the truth,'** as the mighty pyramid of Gospel

light, whose apex touches heaven, and whose rays light up the dreary pathway of the dismal ages upon which we are now entering.”

PART TWO

CHAPTER FIVE - THE WALDENSES

The American Baptists originated not with the Hardshell separation, nor with Roger Williams, but with the English and Welsh Baptists who came to America in large numbers. The English Baptists originated not with John Smyth in 1609, nor in 1641, but evidence has been given showing that Baptists have been in England and Wales since the days of the Apostles; and, that these native Baptists were reinforced by Baptists abroad - especially from Germany and Holland. These German and Dutch Baptists did not originate at the Munster Riot, but were the original Waldenses. To dispute these statements is to deny the testimony of men of authority. The Baptists sprang from the Waldenses. Whence came the Waldenses?

The valleys at the foot of the Alps are called Piedmont. This district is “an extensive tract of rich and fruitful valleys, embosomed in mountains which are circled again with mountains higher than they, intersected with deep and rapid rivers, and exhibiting in strong contrast, the beauty and plenty of paradise, in sight of frightful precipices, with lakes of ice, and stupendous mountains of never-wasting snow. The whole country is an interchange of hill and dale – traversed with four principal rivers which contribute to the fertility of the valleys.”

Part of this territory is “strongly fortified by nature on account of the many difficult passes and bulwarks of rocks and mountains; as if the all-wise Creator had from the beginning, designed that place as a cabinet, wherein to put some inestimable jewel, or, in which to reserve many thousand souls, which should never bow the knee before Baal.” The fields are fertile; in the mountains are mines of gold, silver, brass and iron; rivers abound in fish, and the forests and fields in game.

For centuries God had a company of faithful witnesses in these valleys, thousands of whom suffered martyrdom for the sake of the Truth. While the nations of the earth were engrossed in darkness and superstition of Roman Catholicism, these faithful witnesses held aloft the torch of the Word of God. These faithful witnesses were known as Waldenses. We have seen that the Baptists of Germany and Holland sprang from them. Much has been written relative to their origin, beliefs and practices.

As to their origin Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page

70, says, "It is asserted on the one hand that they originated with Waldo, and had no connection with former movements. This view is held absolutely, probably by very few." He says that very few now hold that the Waldenses sprang from Waldo. Who was Waldo? He was at first a Roman Catholic; but became converted and began to preach the gospel. He obtained a great following. He was driven from France, and finally joined the Waldenses.

Instead of the Waldenses receiving their name from Waldo, he received his name from them or from the valleys from which the Waldenses received their name. "Waldo was so called because he was a valley man, and was only a noted leader of a people who had long existed. This view is ardently supported by most Waldenses historians." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 71) Jones the Waldensian historian says, "It is proved, from their books that they existed as Waldenses before the times of Peter Waldo, who preached about the year 1160. Perrin, who wrote their history, had in his possession a New Testament in the Vallense (Waldensean) language written on parchment in a very ancient letter and a book - under date 1120 - twenty years before Waldo." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 257)

Dr. Allix says, "Wherefore that I may, once for all, clear this matter, I say, first, that it is absolutely false that these churches (Waldensean) were ever founded by Peter Waldo." This is the statement of a Waldensean historian. (Pierre Allix - *The Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont* page 192)

Waddington, Episcopalian historian, says, "There are some who believe the Vaudois (Waldenses) to have enjoyed the uninterrupted integrity of the faith even FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGES - At least it may be pronounced, with great certainty, that they had been long in existence before the visit of the Lyonese reformer." (George Waddington - *A History of the Church: From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation* page 353)

From the above testimony we see that the Waldenses did not derive their origin or name from Waldo. They derived their name from the valleys in which they lived. Eberhard de Bethune, A. D. 1160, says, "Some of them call themselves Vallenses because they live in the vale of sorrows or tears." Bernard, Abbot of a Monastery, about 1209, says they were called "Waldenses; that is, from a dark valley." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 71) Richard Cook's *Baptist History #14: the Story of the Baptists in All Ages and Countries* page 42 says, "In times of persecutions they (early Christians) sought refuge among the mountains, and dwelt in large numbers in the valleys of the Alps and Pyrenees, and,

hence, received the name Waldenses or valley dwellers.”

Back to their origin. William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 257, says, “Raneiro Sacchoni, an inquisitor, and one of their most implacable enemies who lived 80 years after Waldo, admits that the Waldenses flourished 500 years before that preacher (Waldo).” Christian’s *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 72, quotes Sacchoni. He says, “Among all sects, there is no one more pernicious to the church (Catholic) than the Leonists (Waldenses) because it is the most ancient - others date it to the time of the Apostles ... It is the most widespread. There is no country where it does not exist.”

Theodora Beza, Reformer of the 16th century, says, “As for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the VERY SEED OF THE PRIMITIVE AND PURER CHRISTIAN CHURCH since they are those that have been upheld, as is abundantly manifest, by the wonderful providence of God, so that neither those endless storms and tempests by which the whole Christian world has been shaken for so many succeeding ages - nor those horrible persecutions which have been expressly raised against them, were able so far to prevail as to make them bend, or yield a voluntary subjection to the Roman tyranny and idolatry (that is Roman Catholicism).” This Reformer traced the Waldenses back to the Apostles.

Jonathan Edwards, President of Princeton University, writes of the Waldenses, “Some of the popish writers themselves own that that people (Waldenses) never submitted to the church of Rome. It is supposed that this people first betook themselves to the desert, secret place among the mountains to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutions, which were before Constantine the Great.” He further says that “God was pleased to maintain an uninterrupted succession of witnesses, through the whole time, in Germany, France, Britain, as historians demonstrate.” (Christian’s *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 74)

Dr. Edwards, President of Princeton University, simply says that during the persecutions of the early Christians by the Roman Emperors, the Christians fled from the scenes of persecution and hid themselves in the secret places of the mountains. Those hiding in the valleys of the Piedmont became known as Waldenses.

Edwards’s statement is confirmed by the testimony of Orchard, the historian. He says, “The orthodoxy of the Novatian party, with the influence of some of their ministers, is supposed to have procured some mitigation of the law. Constantine’s (Roman Emperor) oppressive measures prompted many to

leave the scene of sufferings and retire into more sequestered spots. Claudius Sassy, the popish Archbishop, traces the rise of the Waldensean heresy to a pastor named Leo, leaving Rome at this period for the valleys." He further states that "Eckbertus and Americus, two avowedly and bitter enemies of the Waldenses, do assert, that the New Puritans (Waldenses) do conform to the doctrines and manners of the Old Puritans (Novatianists)."

Mr. John Newton Brown, editor of *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, remarks, "It seems to be a serious mistake, into which some popular writers have fallen, who represent the Waldenses as originating in France, about the year 1170, and deriving their name from the celebrated Peter Waldo. The evidence is now ample, that so far from being a new sect at that period, they had existed under various names, as a distinct class of dissenters from the established churches of Greece and Rome in the earliest ages. It is an egregious error to suppose that when Christianity was taken into alliance with the state, by the Emperor Constantine, in the beginning of the fourth century, all orthodox churches were so ignorant of the genius of religion as to consent to the corruption of a worldly establishment. The Cathari, or Puritan Churches of the Novatians, also had at that very period (about 325 A. D.) been flourishing as a distinct communion for more than seventy years over the empire; maintaining the integrity of the true faith, together with the purity of discipline and power of godliness which had generally disappeared from the Catholic (general, not Roman Catholic, for it was unknown) churches. These Puritans being exposed to severe persecutions from age to age, were compelled to shelter themselves from the desolating storm in retirement; and when, at intervals, they reappear on the page of contemporary history, and their principles are propagated with new boldness and success, they are styled a new sect, and receive a new name, though in reality, they are the same people."

He further states that "Dr. Allix, in his *The Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont* on page 1148 gives this account, That, for three hundred years or more, the Bishop of Rome attempted to subjugate the church at Milan under his jurisdiction; and at last the interest of Rome grew too potent for the church at Milan, planted by one of the disciples; insomuch that the bishop (pastor) and people rather than own their jurisdiction, retired to the valleys of Lucerne and Agrogna, and thence were called Vallenses, Wallenses, or people of the valley."

This is unmistakable evidence, that the Waldenses were driven to the valleys during the days of persecution by the early Roman emperors; also

from persecutions of churches which attempted to usurp authority over those churches practicing New Testament doctrines. The whole church of Milan, planted by one of Christ's disciples, fled to the valleys to escape persecution, and the members were soon called Waldenses. Dr. Muston says, "The Vaudois (Waldenses) are, in our view, primitive Christians - to have been preserved in these valleys. It is not they who separated from Catholicism; but Catholicism which separated from them." (*The Israel of the Alp: A Complete History of the Waldenses of Piedmont and Their Colonies*, quoted by Ray's *Baptist Succession* page 183)

D'Anvers says, "In the preface to the French Bible, and the first that was ever printed, they (Waldenses) say that they have always had the full enjoyment of that heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures, ever since they were enriched with the same by the apostles themselves, having in fair manuscripts, preserved the entire Bible in their native tongue, from generation to generation." The Waldenses claimed to have apostolic origin and to have preserved the Bible through the ages.

We have given above the testimony of Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and other historians, who state that the Waldenses did not begin with Peter Waldo in the 12th century, but hundreds of years before, even from the time of the Apostles. They state that during periods of persecution by Roman emperors or from general churches, many Christians fled to secret places of the mountains and were later called Waldenses, "valley dwellers." We gave the testimony of Mosheim and other historians who were not Baptists, stating that Baptists spring from the Waldenses, and, since the Waldenses were the primitive Christians, we have traced Baptist history back to Christ, the Founder of the First Baptist Church at Jerusalem.

The teachings of the ancient Waldenses were scriptural. Many have attempted to prove that they were Pedobaptists, i.e. baptized infants. The modern Waldenses do practice affusion (pouring) but the ancient did not. There were sects branded as Waldenses who were not. It was the practice of the Catholics to class all who opposed their doctrines under one general name.

Jones, the Waldensean historian, in discussing their doctrines says, "This description (is) applicable to one general class of Christians, scattered throughout southern France, valleys of the Piedmont, and country of the Milanese; though probably distinguished in different places by different names of Puritans, or Catharists - Albigenses, or Waldenses, the last of which ultimately became their more general name. No doubt there

were shades of difference - on points of minor importance - as today (among Baptists); and it is very certain that Catholic writers sometimes class under one general name Waldenses or Albigenses, persons whose religious practices were very opposite to the Waldenses. The practice of confounding heretics of all kinds in one common herd," says Mr. Robinson, "hath been an ancient custom with ecclesiastical historians, and it hath obscured much history."

These statements simply mean that Waldenses were called by different names in different countries, but in general they held the same views; also, that the Catholics usually classed all of those who opposed them under the general name Waldenses, and, says Robinson, "this has obscured much history." Many who were not Waldenses were called Waldenses by the Catholics.

We have proved above that the Waldenses were Baptists. We shall now confirm such proof by comparing their fundamental doctrines with those of the Baptists. Exact quotations from their confessions will be given. With the Baptists they believed.

1.) In the absolute authority of Scriptures.

"We believe only what they (Scriptures) teach, without any regard to the authority of man - nothing else ought to be received by us except what God hath commanded." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 294) Baptists, today, alone believe in the absolute authority of the Scriptures like the Ancient Waldenses. All other denominations follow some teaching of man.

2.) Like Baptists they taught that none but the regenerated should be members of a church. "We believe that there is one holy church - of elect and faithful." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 278) "He (the pope) teaches to baptize children into the faith and attributes to this the work of regeneration; thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration with the eternal rite of baptism." The Noble Lessons, a Waldensean document of the 12th century says, "Baptize those who believe in the name of Jesus Christ." Before a person was baptized by them, the preacher would show "the necessity of faith, in order to a worthy participation of Baptism." (Robert Robinson - *Ecclesiastical Researches*, page 473) They demanded regeneration before baptism and admission into a church. This Baptists alone demand.

3.) They baptized believers only. Their enemies and enemies of the Baptists have labored hard to prove that they baptized infants. We

saw above that they demanded regeneration before baptism, and their condemnation of the pope for baptizing infants. Enervinus of Cologne writes to St. Bernard a letter in which he says of the Waldenses: "They do not believe in infant baptism." (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 79) Petrus Ciuniacensis, A. D. 1146, wrote against them, and brought this charge: "That infants are not to be baptized or saved by faith of another." Alanus, an enemy of Waldenses says that the Waldenses taught that "baptism avails nothing before years of discretion are reached. Infants are not profited by it, because they do not believe. Hence the candidate is usually asked whether he believes in God the Father omnipotent. Baptism profits an unbeliever as little as it does an infant. Why, should those be baptized who cannot be instructed?" (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 80) These are clear statements of Baptists views on subjects of baptism.

4.) Immersion alone to them was baptism. "They observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 289) The Scriptures teach that immersion is baptism. History confirms the Scriptures. Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, pages 81-82 proves that the Waldenses immersed. He says, "It is equally clear that the form of baptism was immersion. This was, at that time, the practice of the whole Christian world. The great Roman Catholic writers affirm that immersion was the proper form of baptism." Christian next produces the testimony, of Peter of Lombard (A. D. 1164), Thomas Aquinas, and other great Roman Catholic doctors, who state that immersion was the form. Mezeray, the French historian, says, "In baptism of the 12th century, they plunged the candidate into the sacred font." In the 12th century the pope immersed some children. Like Baptists, immersion to them alone was baptism.

5.) Baptism to them was symbolical only, and the door into the church, and, since they alone could administer scriptural baptism, like Baptists, they believed that only their churches were the true churches of Christ. All others were men-founded. "We believe that in the ordinance of baptism the water is the visible and external sign which represents to us God's invisible operation within us. By this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God's people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 278) David of Augsburg, 1256-72, says, "They say a man is then truly, for the first time baptized, when he is brought into this heresy (that is when he joins a Waldensean Church). (Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 81)

Like Baptists they believed that their churches were the only scriptural ones; that they alone could administer baptism. There can be no doubt in any unbiased mind but that Waldenses were Baptists.

6.) They were what Baptists are called today, “close communionists.” Baptism and supper were the only church ordinances, and symbolical only. In referring to baptism and the supper they say, “We acknowledge no sacraments but baptism and the Lord’s supper.” They are “signs of holy things or visible emblems of invisible blessings.” (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 276) Like Baptists they believed that these ordinances were church ordinances, and only members of a church could participate in the supper. Since the supper follows baptism, and they say that a man is baptized only when baptized by them, then, only members of their churches could eat the supper. This is exactly the Baptist position - none but Baptists can scripturally eat the supper.

7.) They believed that “Christ died for the salvation of all who believe, and rose again for their justification.” (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 276) They simply mean that one is “**justified by faith**” apart from works. This Baptists believe - salvation by grace through faith, apart from works.

8.) They, like Baptists, believed in the equality of believers. “That none in the church ought to be greater than their brethren, according to **Matthew 20:25.**” (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 269) They did not have a graded ministry, such as presiding elders and ruling bishops. Their congregations, like Baptists, were democratic, equal in rank and privilege.

9.) They believed in individual responsibility to God, or religious liberty. Baptists in all ages have believed this, and have shed their blood to obtain it for all people. They believed that the state had no right to say what form of belief or worship they should adhere to.

10.) They believed in the absolute Lordship of Jesus Christ. “Of this church, the Lord Jesus is the head - it is governed by His Word.” No human being to boss their churches. This is true of Baptists and New Testament Churches.

11.) The final Baptist mark borne by them was that of persecution. Christ’s true churches have always been known by their persecution. “**I have given them thy Word - they have kept thy Word - the**

world hath hated them.” This Scripture was true of the Waldensean Baptists long ago, and of genuine Baptists today. Real Baptists are hated by all other denominations. Their loyalty to Christ and His Word are mistaken for bigotry by their enemies.

In the fundamental doctrines of the New Testament the Waldenses were Baptists. As we saw above, there were shades of differences in the opinions of the Waldenses in different parts of the world, but fundamentally they were one. The writer has never met a Baptist with whom he fully agreed on all points, but, in the fundamental doctrines all genuine Baptists agree. None but those who are ignorant, or, who refuse to accept the truth, will deny that the ancient Waldenses were Baptists. Great historians and scholars of various denominations affirm that the ancient Waldenses and the genuine present day Baptists are the same people in doctrine and practice. What a glorious heritage present day Baptists have! May the Lord help us to faithfully hold aloft the torch of divine truth, so faithfully elevated by the Waldensean Baptists in the long ago.

We shall close the chapter on the Waldenses, by repeating the statement made by two learned men appointed by the King of Holland, to write a history of the Dutch Reformed Church. These men, Doctors Ypeif and Dermout, included a chapter devoted to the Baptists. Of the Baptists they say, “We have now seen that the Baptists who were formerly called Anabaptists, and, in later times, Mennonites, WERE THE ORIGINAL WALDENSES; and have long in the history of the church received the honor OF THAT ORIGIN.” The ancient Waldenses were Baptists.

PART TWO

CHAPTER SIX - THE NOVATIANISTS

We saw in the chapter on the Waldenses that they have a succession back to Christ, but that before they were known as Waldenses they were called Novatianists or Novatians in some instances. This leads us to inquire, “Who were the Novatianists?”

The Novatianists received their name from Novatian, who is alleged to have received what is called “clinic baptism” - i.e., while he was upon bed supposed to be sick unto death, water was poured upon him from head to foot, imitating immersion as much as possible. But he did not die, and after he recovered, his enemies claim that he was not immersed, but was satisfied with his pouring. Remember, that this is the testimony of his enemies and not his friends. The true account of him and generally of God’s true churches through the ages, was wholly or

partially destroyed by the enemies of truth. The enemies of the Novatianists and of the Baptists, contend that since Novatian was not immersed Baptist succession back to Christ, through the Novatianists, has been broken.

Did Novatian receive only baptism through affusion (pouring)? In those days immersion was the practice. Novatian, after his recovery, became a staunch defender of the truth. He stood for New Testament teaching and practice. His followers were Scriptural in beliefs and practices. So say the historians. Says Jones, the historian, "The doctrinal sentiments of the Novatianists appear to have been very Scriptural, and the discipline of their churches rigid in the extreme. They were the first class of Christians who obtained the name Puritans." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 153)

Mr. Waddington, Episcopalian, says of the Novatianists, whom he called 'Sectaries', "And those rigid principles which had characterized and sanctified the church in the first century were abandoned to the profession of schismatic sectaries in the third (George Waddington - *A History of the Church: From the Earliest Ages to the Reformation* page 70). This learned writer acknowledges that the Novatians, called Sectaries, preserved the teachings and practices of the New Testament Churches. Novatian was a strong advocate of New Testament doctrines and practices. Common sense and logic would teach us that he who stood so faithfully for the truth, would not be satisfied with pouring. It is evident that he was immersed upon his recovery.

But if he was not immersed after his recovery, his baptism did not affect the succession of the Novatian any more than the lack of baptism on the part of a few "Baptist" ministers who have received "alien immersion," for Novatian had no more to do with the organization of the Novatian churches throughout the empire than the force of example. He was not the founder of the Novatians.

Let us see why the true churches of Christ were called Novatians in the third century. Mr. Robinson, a historian, who was not a Baptist, says of Novatian, "He was an elder in the church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrines as the church did ... his morals irreproachable. He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church."

Mr. Robinson goes on stating that during the periods of persecutions of the early Christians by the emperors of the Roman Empire, many professing Christians, in order to escape persecution, would deny the faith. After the

persecutions ended, they would rush back to the churches for reinstatement. Many of the churches received these traitors back into their fellowship. Soon the churches were filled with such Christ-denying professing Christians. The majority of churches were as full of unsaved people as the churches of today. Their members were worldly minded; church discipline was no longer enforced.

Among the preachers who opposed receiving those back who had denied Christ during the persecutions, and, who stood for strict church discipline, was Novatian. As Robinson said, of him above; "He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church." He and Cornelius were before the Church of Rome for election as pastor. Cornelius was in favor of receiving those who denied Christ during persecutions back into the churches. He was also opposed to strict church discipline. He was elected over Novatian. That part of the Church of Rome that stood for the New Testament teachings and practices, withdrew from the church and elected Novatian as their pastor.

This church at Rome was founded by someone during the days of the Apostle Paul. It was still Scriptural in doctrine, but the majority in it did not believe in strict discipline. The minority did believe in strict discipline. They withdrew and elected Novatian as pastor. When this happened, throughout the Roman Empire, the churches believing in strict discipline withdrew from those which did not. Jones, the historian, says, "They tax Novatian with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the empire; and yet, he had no influence over any than what his good example gave him. People everywhere saw the same cause of complaint and groaned for relief; and when one man made a stand for virtue, the crisis had arrived; people saw the propriety of the cure, and applied the same means to their own relief. They blame this man (Novatian) and all these churches for severity of their discipline - yet this severe discipline was the only coercion of the primitive churches." (William Jones - *The History of the Christian Church* page 152)

Jones, page 154, further states, "All the ecclesiastical historians complain loudly of the schism made in the Christian Church by the Novatians, whose differences respected matters of discipline only." Christian's *A History of the Baptists* Volume 1, page 43 says, "Their (Novatians) contention was not so much one of doctrine as of discipline." Of Novatian, Mr. Robinson says: "Holding the same doctrine as the Church." (Church at Rome - not Roman Catholic, for it was then unknown).

This division was made because of differences of views on church discipline

and not on doctrinal points. Novatian was of the same faith as the church of Rome, but protested against lax discipline. “A majority declared in favor of Cornelius. The minority would not yield. They withdrew, formed a separate church, and invited Novatian to become their pastor. Others imitated their example in various parts of the empire, and Novatian churches sprang up in great abundance.” (John Cramp - *Baptist History* page 56) When Novatian and his church took a stand against corrupt practices in the churches, many others throughout the Roman Empire followed their example. These churches contending for strict discipline as well as for the pure scriptural teachings, were called Novatianists, not that Novatian was their founder, but their leader.

Of these Novatianists Cramp says, “Novatian Churches were what are now known as Baptist Churches, adhering to the Apostolic and primitive practice.” (John Cramp – *Baptist History* page 49) John Newton Brown, editor of the *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, page 877, says that the Novatians have “just claims to be regarded as the pure, uncorrupted and Apostolic Church of Christ.” As to these early Baptist Churches Mr. Robinson, a non-Baptist says: “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.” (Robert Robinson – *Ecclesiastical Researches* page 56) To this statement David Ray (*The Baptist Succession* page 198), remarks, “It was the custom of the old English writers to use the word ‘baptized’ where we use the word ‘baptist’ so we have the historic statement that these early churches were Baptist Churches.”

Thus before Novatian there existed separate, independent congregations or churches, believing and practicing the same doctrines that the Novatians taught. The majority of churches down to Novatian preserved and practiced New Testament doctrines. So says Ray the historian as well as Robinson and others. Ray says, “It is a fact conceded by all historians, that the primitive churches, with few exceptions, down to Novatian, preserved church ordinances as they were delivered by inspiration. The corruption had respect mainly to the lax discipline which prevailed, especially in the city churches. In other words, all parties acknowledge that the main body of the churches, prior to the middle of the third century, were true churches of Christ, and that they had their origin from Christ and His apostles. It is shown on good authority that the Novatians had their origin from these primitive churches, therefore their succession reaches back through the primitive churches to Christ and Apostles.”

The division among the churches during the days of Novatian did not occur

because of doctrinal differences, for the churches as a whole then were New Testament churches in doctrine, but because of discipline. The churches then, like present day churches, did not enforce discipline. Some in the churches would not stand for strict discipline; others contended for strict discipline. They separated themselves from the worldly churches, and were called Novatians or Novatianists, not that Novatian was their founder but their leader. We have seen that they were the original New Testament churches. They were what are now called Baptists.

From the shores of America we have followed the footprints of the Baptist Denomination back, through England, Holland, Germany, to the valleys 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 parts 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 modeled after the original church founded by Christ Himself at Jerusalem.

Baptists have been witnessing for Christ since He Founded His Church at Jerusalem! This is in fulfilment of His promise in **Matthew 16:18**, **“Upon this Rock I will build My church; (not Luther’s, Calvin’s, Wesley’s or Campbell’s) and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”** This promise has been and is still being fulfilled by the Baptists. Baptists alone have a history extending back to Christ; they alone teach New Testament doctrines. Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Campbellites, Holiness, and all others have human founders, and most of them are very young compared to Baptists. If the above named are Christ’s true churches, then for hundreds of years, Christ’s churches did not exist on earth, and He failed to keep His promise.

What have we proved in the foregoing pages? That Jesus founded His Church, which was a Missionary Baptist Church, not in name but in doctrine and practice. He promised that churches like the one He founded would continue through the ages. During the first two or three centuries, the churches as whole were Scriptural in doctrine. In the third century there was a division of the churches, not because of doctrinal differences but with reference to discipline. Those who believed in strict discipline as taught in the New Testament, withdrew from those who did not believe and enforce discipline. The churches contending for strict discipline were called Novatians, not because he founded these churches, for they were founded by disciples of Christ, but

because he was their leader.

Because of persecution of the Roman emperors and worldly churches, these Novatians fled to different countries for protection. In the countries to which they fled, they were called by various names. Those in France were called Albigenses. One million of them were slain by the Roman Catholics within twenty years. The Novatians who fled to the Piedmont valleys at the foot of the Alps, were soon called Waldenses, i.e., valley dwellers. The Waldenses enjoyed liberty in the fastnesses of the Alps for a while. Later the Roman Catholics sent their doctors to win them to Catholicism, but soon discovered that the Waldenses knew more Scripture than they did. Having failed to win the Waldenses through teaching, the Roman Catholics applied the sword. Thousands were slain for the cause of Christ.

In the above chapters we produced testimony proving that the Baptists sprang from the Waldenses; that is, the Waldenses were Baptists. These Waldensean Baptists were scattered into different parts of the world and were called by other names in many instances. They were known as Waldenses at first in Germany. Later they were known as Anabaptists and Mennonites. From Germany and Holland many went to England and joined the Baptists of England. From England and Wales the Baptists came to America.

In concluding this chapter we once more produce evidence proving that Baptists do not have a human founder like all other denominations, but that they were founded by Christ Himself and have been in existence since Christ's earthly ministry, although known under different names; but distinguished by their doctrines which are Scriptural.

Cardinal Hosius (Catholic) president of Council of Trent, 1545, says, "Were it not that the Baptists have been grievously tormented and cut off with the knife during the past twelve hundred years, they would swarm in greater numbers than all reformers." This Catholic writer admits that Baptists had been in existence since 345 A. D. The Methodists are only two hundred years old; the Presbyterians are only 400 years old; the Campbellites one hundred years old, and all of the Holiness branches of very recent date.

Sir Isaac Newton says, "The Baptists are the only body of Christians which have not symbolized with Rome."

Mosheim (Lutheran), says, "Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay secreted in almost all the countries of Europe persons who adhered

tenaciously to the principles of the Modern Dutch Baptists.”

Edinburgh Encyclopedia, “It must have already occurred to our readers that the Baptists are the same sect of Christians that were formerly described under the appellation (name) of Anabaptists. Indeed, this seems to have been their leading principle from the time of Tertullian to the present time.” Tertullian was born fifty years after the death of the Apostle John.

Professor Wm. Cecil Duncan, professor of Latin and Greek, University of Louisiana says, “Baptists do not, as do most Protestant denominations, date their origin from the Reformation of 1520. By means of that great religious movement, indeed they were brought forth from comparative obscurity, into prominent notice, and through it a new and powerful impulse was given to their principles and practices in all of those countries which had renounced allegiance to the pope of Rome. They did not, however originate with the Reformation, for long before Luther lived, yea, long before the Roman Catholic Church herself was known, Baptists and Baptist churches existed and flourished in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa.”

Mosheim, Lutheran, “The origin of the sect ... called Anabaptists ... are not altogether wrong when they boast of a descent from these Waldenses - usually styled witnesses for the truth before Luther.” He says the Baptists and Waldenses were the same people. Theodore Beza, a reformer, who was not a Baptist, tells who the Waldenses were. He says, “As for the Waldenses, I may be permitted to call them the very seed of the primitive and purer Christian Church.” He says the Waldenses were the New Testament people, thus linking Baptists of today with New Testament Churches.

Barclay, Quaker, says, “The rise of the Anabaptists (Baptists) took place long prior to the foundation of the Church of England, and there are also reasons for believing that on the continent of Europe small hidden societies, who hold many of the opinions of the Anabaptists, have existed from the times of the Apostles.”

Alexander Campbell, founder of the Campbellite denomination, says, ‘Hence it is that the Baptist denomination, in all ages and in all countries, has been, as a body, the constant asserters of rights of man.’”

The King of Holland appointed two learned men, Drs. Ypeif and Dermout, to write a history of the Dutch Reformed Church. In their history they devoted one chapter to the Baptists. They say, “We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists and in later times, Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and 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 the ages.”

The above testimony is from authorities who are not Baptists, but readily concede that Baptists alone have existed since the days of Christ. And yet, denominations, young compared to the Baptists, contend that they are composed of the true churches of Christ! All of the present denominations except Catholics and Baptists have come into existence since the Reformation of Luther 1520. Who were the Faithful witnesses of Christ before the Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Campbellites, Holiness and many others were known? Baptists were the faithful witnesses as we have proved. The above named denominations are men-founded and do not have Scriptural grounds for their existence.

Let the writer repeat an above statement. There are truly regenerated persons in all denominations. Church membership has nothing to do with salvation but with rewards. We are saved because of what Christ has done for us, and not because of anything we can do. But obedience is essential to rewards. It is the test of love. **“Why call ye Me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” (Luke 6:46)**. Regenerated persons who join these men-founded denominations will have their works burned, but themselves be saved. Read **1 Corinthians 3:12-15**. May we seek to walk humbly in the footsteps of our blessed Saviour as all faithful Baptists have done through the nineteen centuries.