

# **THE BAPTIZED CHURCHES OF CHRIST**

**BY STANLEY PHILLIPS**

**2006**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Subject**  
**Page**

**INTRODUCTION** . . . . .  
**Definition Of Terms:** . . . . .  
**Historical Origins of “baptized Churches of Christ”** . . . . .  
**Origins of “Baptists”** . . . . .  
**The Great Awakening** . . . . .  
**Commencement of The Modern Great Apostasy** . . . . .  
**Practical Aspects of The Churches of Jesus Christ** . . . . .  
**Doing All Things in Decency and in Order** . . . . .  
**The Government of the Church** . . . . .  
**How So Rapid An Apostasy** . . . . .  
**Appendix A: London Confession of 1644** . . . . .  
**Appendix B: Elder Reuben Ross Preached First Arminian Sermon in Tenn**

**J. M. Pendleton’s Description of Baptists Preaching in Ross’ time**

**Appendix C: The Rising Opposition to the Modern Missionary Movement**  
**94**

**Miami Baptist Association in Ohio, 1814. . . . .**

**Flint River Baptist Association in Tennessee & Alabama, 1814**

**Alexander Campbell’s Circular Letter in Redstone Association.**

**Appendix D: Public ADDRESS by Daniel Parker, 1820 . . . . .**

**Appendix E: Kehukee Baptist Declaration, 1826, . . . . .**

**Appendix F: The Black Rock ADDRESS, 1832 . . . . .**

**PROSPECTUS of the Signs Of The Times, 1832 . . . . .**

**Appendix G: Miss.’ Bethany Association’s REASON AND APPEALS, 1844.**

**Appendix H: White River Regular Baptist Circular Letter, 1844 . . . . .**

## **NEW HOME CHURCH**

**Clarke County Mississippi beside  
Highway 18, fourteen miles east of  
Quitman, Mississippi**

New Home Church is an Old School Predestinarian Primitive Baptist Church (See *Definitions*, pages 9-11 ). The Church was formed November 27<sup>th</sup>, 1909 with the following members holding letters which were examined and found orderly and orthodox: H. I. E. Carroll, C. L. Satcher, William Williams, Nancy Carroll, and V. A. Avera. Preaching by Elders L. F. Easley and W. R. Broom. Prayer by Elders S. F. Moore. Elders L. F. Easley, Elder L. A. Satcher, S. Carroll, W. S. Broom, E. R. Robinson and S. F. Moore composed the Presbytery. Elder L. F. Easley, **Moderator** and E. R. Robinson, **Clerk**.

### **CHURCH COVENANT Of New Home Church**

1<sup>st</sup>. Having in a judgment of charity and discretion toward ourselves and one another, first given ourselves to the Lord, we agree to give our selves to one another by the Will of God in a visible Congregational State.

2<sup>nd</sup>. We mutually agree to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace (Ephesians 5:3).

3<sup>rd</sup>. We agree to love one another in obedience to the command of Christ (John 13:35).

4<sup>th</sup>. We agree to sympathize with each other in prosperity and adversity (Romans 12:15).

5<sup>th</sup>. We agree to communicate with each others necessities, as circumstances may point out (Galatians 6:10).

6<sup>th</sup>. We agree to watch over one another and bear each others infirmities and admonish one another in faithfulness and Christian tenderness (Hebrews 12:15; Romans 15: 10).

7<sup>th</sup>. We agree to confess our faults one to another and to pray for one another (James 5:16).

8<sup>th</sup>. We agree to assemble together regularly for religious Worship (Hebrews 10: 25).

9<sup>th</sup>. We agree to have no respect of persons in Church affairs as an act of partiality on account of difference in external conditions (Romans 12:16).

10<sup>th</sup>. We agree to strive together for the faith of the Gospel and to earnestly contend for it; not suffering any **human invention** or unwarranted practice to be imposed upon us (Philippians 1:21; Jude 3).

11<sup>th</sup>. We agree that we will endeavor to be ensamples to each other and of a holy walk and godly conversation in Christ (2<sup>nd</sup> Peter 3:2).

The New Home Church was a associated church in the Little Zion Association of Alabama and Mississippi. This association was constituted in 1886 with this introduction: “We the United Baptist

Churches of Christ. . .” Of the churches remaining in this associated fellowship at this writing (2006), there are three: Philadelphia Church on Union Road east of Richton, Mississippi, Pilgrim Church on New Augusta Road, south of Ellisville, Mississippi and New Home Church. Philadelphia is the oldest, having been established in 1884, while Pilgrim was created as a merger between Old Zorah Church and Pilgrim in 1909. This is the same year as the formation of New Home. The former Moderator of Pilgrim, Elder S.A. Bradshaw, who served Pilgrim for fifty years, and whose father also preached for fifty years, gave the date for Zorah Church as 1820. It, with Philadelphia and other churches of the Little Zion were reconstituted and reorganized in 1884 and 1886. They have always been Predestinarian churches of the Old School Baptists.

The following is a presentation of a brief historical account of the baptized churches of Christ, together with the peculiarities of our people, both in the Church and our Congregation, and the roles of each individual believers given to this Congregation and Church by our Heavenly Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

## **“ . . . the Baptized Churches Of Christ”**

### **INTRODUCTION**

After having published two or three articles on various aspects of the baptized churches of Christ, known as Old School Baptists of the predestinarian faith and primitive order, we design to present an in-depth discussion of this faith and send it forth in book form.

Our intent is to define our unique terms, present the historical development of church issues that produced these unique features of the Church, and then discuss various topics that need to be refreshed in this latter day. One may consider it a *primer* for those who are members of the church, the congregation, and the household of faith to study and consider seriously. Hopefully, it may be of means to establish believers in the “faith once delivered to the saints.” Finally, the **Appendices** will include historical documents as: The “***London Confession of 1644***,” with annotation; J.M. Pendleton on Elder Reuben Ross’s Arminian sermon, the first preached among Baptists west of the mountains in Tennessee, and Pendleton’s report of the doctrinal preaching of Baptists before the mission movement began; The **Flint River Baptist Association** of Tennessee and Alabama’s actions in **1814-1817** with regard to the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions; and the same of the **Miami Regular Baptist Association** of Ohio; David Benedict’s **recollection of the Baptists** between 1809 and 1849; “***A Public Address to the Baptist Society and Friends of Religion in General, On The Principles And Practices of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions***,” by Elder Daniel Parker, **1820**; Description of Daniel Parker by the Missionary historians; “***The Kehukee Declaration***” by The Kehukee Association of Baptist churches in North Carolina, **1820**; “**Articles Of Faith of The Georgia Baptist Association of 1792**” that was adopted as the first Articles of Faith of the Southern Baptist Convention in **1845**; and Delaware’s, ***Black Rock ADDRESS***, **1832**; Indiana’s **White River Regular**

**Baptist Association's CIRCULAR LETTER 1844** which presented a history of the Modern Missionary Movement; Mississippi's **Bethany Primitive Baptist Association's REASONS AND APPEALS, 1844**, for their separation from the Mission Movement; *and* other documents of special interest. We will compose the **appendices** in smaller type fonts, but encourage the reader to give extra attention to these. Some are of historical importance that is not readily available to the general public. For one example, we have included the Elder Daniel Parker's objection to the rise of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions of **1820**, and the general misinformation published by all Missionary Baptist "historians," that Parker was **an illiterate** man and the "founder of The Primitive Baptists". The printed *Address* demonstrates the New School Baptists' machiavellian dishonesty.

We have rather deliberately selected our book title above because we have not always been called "Baptists," nor "Old School," or "Primitive," or "Absolute Predestinarians." All these terms came into usage due to *particular conditions* whereby these terms were desirable to distinguish the church from antichristian developments. These developments we will briefly touch upon as we introduce these appellatives for the "baptized churches of Christ." Many of the constitutions of our churches record these introductions: "We, the baptized church of Jesus Christ," or, "We, the churches of Jesus Christ of the predestinarian faith and primitive order," *etc.*

It seems appropriate here, early on, to make the following observation. When we write: "*baptized churches of Christ,*"

(plural) we have reference to *independent bodies of baptized believers gathered together for divine worship wherever they may exist*. When we refer to the “baptized church of Christ,” (singular) we make reference to the *aggregate number of God’s redeemed elect throughout time and space; that were represented in Christ when He was baptized by John, and are in that great body of Christ that will inhabit immortal glory in Christ their Head in eternity to come; or, to any **individual church** in a congregation of believers*. We are not hereby stating that true churches of Christ must hold the same titles, and in fact they don’t. But by selecting this manner of speaking, we are conforming to the ancestral form the churches used in describing themselves before any of the modern “names” were given to modern denominations of the “Christian” faith.

When the first churches, later to be termed “Baptists,” separated from the Anglican, Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational “churches of Christ,” which entities either poured water upon or sprinkled infants, these and those that went to the Dutch Anabaptists in Leyden, Netherlands, distinguished themselves from those Reformers simply as “**baptized churches of Christ**” or, “*churches of Jesus Christ*” as the “Anabaptists” also did. (See “*Definitions*” below. & Mr. John Robinson’s defense for “separating” from the Church of England, 1610). The first letters between these churches, addressed each other as “The baptized church of Christ at such and such place,” *etc.* The oldest collection of associated *baptized churches of Christ* in the United States was the Philadelphia Association, 1707. The word “*Baptist*” is not



found in their annual Minutes until **1758**. Before then, we read only, “The elders and messengers of the **baptized congregations**,” in their annual Minutes. (See “*Definitions*” under “*ecclesia*” on page 5).

The writer is reminded of an interesting discovery while teaching American History at the high school level: When historians present the Temperance Movement, the students are led to believe that only drunks and bootleggers resisted the fair maids and effeminate men in pushing this benevolent cause! In no history book will a student find a defense for the Biblical position for the *moderate use* of the blessing of wine, nor any arguments for it. Yet Gilbert Beebe published his debate on that subject in the *SIGNS OF THE TIMES* during the rise of that fanatical movement [*Editorials, Signs of the Times, Vol. 2, pages 146-243*]. The same is true with the subjects of **this book**: All are led to believe that when Robert Raikes invented the Sunday School in **1780**, (eighteen hundred years after Christ) all Baptists leaped on board with alacrity. Most New School Baptists believe Christ instituted it in the early church. Or, when Andrew Fuller organized the *first Baptist Missionary Society* as a “rope-holding society” for William Carey, in **1782**, that no voices were raised against the innovation. New School or Missionary Baptists invariably write of *itinerate* ministers as “missionaries” in periods of history prior to the development of *missionism*. There is a very great difference between a *itinerate preacher* and a “*missionary*”! Baptists did not have any *missionaries* prior to Andrew Fuller. *Again*, when the *New Divinity* leaders under William Rogers (who was the **first** in the

American states to collect money for Mr. Fuller's enterprise to the "Hindoos" in East Indies, 1794), "D. D." Samuel Jones and William Staughton (who collected the **first donation** in a snuffbox for William Carey in Widow Wallis' home in London when he was appointed a "*missionary*" by Andrew Fuller), gained control of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1800 to guide it into the development of an *American Missionary Society* (Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions, 1813-1815), that no whimpering objections were uttered! The fact that Baptists churches had nothing to do with either the creation of, nor activities of, the *Baptist Missionary Society*," nor appointed William Carey as anything should alert the reader that something was amiss! Or, when the *New Divinity Theory* of Andrew Fuller, J.M. Pendleton, David Benedict, Martin and Reuben Ross, Isaac McCoy, and their co-conspirators was introduced denying that Christ had saved His people from their sins, but taught that He only "put all men into a **savable state** where the influence of the gospel could save them through preaching, printing, and persuasion," the followers of such thought that **none stood to oppose them!** Evangelicals would like for the reader to believe this, but it certainly is far from the facts of history! This book opposes all such as listed above, plus more as found needful. May the reader seriously consider the discussion to follow herein. The writer invites the reader to pause, and ask himself these questions after each topic covered: "Is this true? Is it important to me? What is the consequence(s) of it being neglected? Where do I stand? Or do I stand anywhere at all?" May God

bles writer and reader both to thoughtfully enter into this most important arena of theological exegesis.

## DEFINITIONS

***Baptized*** – As used in the New Testament, it is the full immersion, or dipping, of the body of a professed believer under water as a figure of his death, burial and resurrection in Christ Jesus. Almost all Eastern (Christian) Orthodox Catholics today baptize by immersion, but they also baptize *infants* in lieu of the Jewish rite of circumcision. Hence, they are *paedobaptists*.

***Paedobaptists***- Any denomination of the Catholic/Protestant “Church” that either immerse, sprinkle, or pour water on infants’ heads and call this a burial, or “baptism.”

***Baptists***- Those who immerse (supposed) believers only under water as a figure of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ and their interest in His salvation.

***Congregation***- As used in *this book*, a collection of loyal believers who identify themselves with, bond to, and support a local visible baptized church (ecclesia) of Christ of the predestinarian faith and primitive order.

***Synagogue***- In New Testament Israel, “an *assemblage of persons*, either the “meeting” or the “place” of the meeting: synagogue.

**Exposynagogue** – To be put out of a membership in the synagogue, hence, an expulsion from a meeting of people.

***Church*** – **ekklesia** : A Greek city council or ruling assembly for the general body politic of a Greek city-state. In English: an assembly of baptized believers joined together in one place for divine worship and the conduct of general business for a church and congregation of the Lord. It is the ruling assembly of the Kingdom of God on earth.

***General Baptists*** – A group of “Baptists” founded by John Smyth in London following the principles of James Jacobus Arminius (Arminians) that taught that Christ’s atonement was *in general*, rather than in particular, for all mankind; denied the total inherent depravity and inability of man in salvation, and conditioned election on foreseen faith in the believer.

***Particular Baptists*** – A group of Baptists in London founded by John Spilsbery, who taught that Christ’s death was *in particular* for those chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and that Christ secured their salvation specifically by His substitutionary life and death in His first advent; that divine election was unconditional and based upon God’s everlasting love to His people, and not upon any foreseen works or faith in

the believer; and that the final perseverance of the saints was infallibly secured.

***Great Awakening-*** A Holy Spirit initiated and sustained *revival* of true religion and sound experience in large measure in Europe, England and the American colonies commencing about 1720 and lasting through 1760's, whereby thousands were effectually called to life and grace, who planted large numbers of churches on the American frontier. The Particular Baptists were recipients of most of these converts, while over 250 Protestant Churches (Episcopal, Congregational, and Presbyterian) embraced believers' baptism by immersion, and became known as **Separate Baptists**, to distinguish them from the Particular Baptists, which now began to be called "The **Regular** Baptists." Large numbers of these two groups merged in 1787, and 1806, and were recognized by the Philadelphia Association, which published this note in its Minute of that year:

#### **THE PLAN OF UNION**

"After a long debate about the utility of adopting a Confession of faith, agreed to receive the Regular Baptists. But to prevent its usurping a tyrannical power over the conscience of any, we do not mean that every person is to be bound in the strict observance of every thing therein contained: yet that it holds forth the essential truths of the gospel, and that the doctrine of salvation by Christ, and free unmerited grace alone, ought to be believed by every Christian, and maintained by every minister of the gospel. **And that the terms, *Regular* and *Separate* shall be buried in oblivion; and that from henceforth, we shall be known by the name of the *UNITED BAPTIST CHURCH OF CHRIST IN Virginia.***

**Copy Test.**

**N. B. This union respects all the Baptists below the Alleghany, and does not effect those on the Western waters.”**

{Since both “Regular”, “Separate”, and “United” Baptists still exist in Virginia and below the Alleghany (sec) at this date (2006), it is obvious that all Baptists did not agree to merge into this union in 1787 ! - S.C.P.}

**“*New Light*” or *Separate Baptists*** – Those Protestant Churches that seceded from the Episcopal, Congregational, and Presbyterian denominations during the Great Awakening and conformed to the New Testament mode of baptism and church governance.

***Regular Baptists*** – The name of some of the Particular Baptists on the American frontier near churches of the New Light or Separate Baptist settlements. The *original* Baptists as distinguished from the Protestant, or “Separate Baptists.”

***New Divinity*** – The doctrine of Andrew Fuller in England who adopted from the Catholic theologian, Thomas Aquinas, in his “*Summa Theologiae*,” and introduced it into the Particular Baptists’ churches he served. The theory taught by this view is that “The death of Christ was *sufficient* for the salvation of **all mankind**, but *efficient* for the elect only. That the atonement of Christ put all mankind, at least where the gospel was preached, in a *savable state*, where the influence of the gospel could reach them effectually upon the condition of their acceptance of proffered “*grace*”. Those that adopted the ***New Divinity Theology***, became known as “*New School*” or “*Missionary*”

Baptists. Between 1813-1820, the secret adherents of the *New Divinity School* of Baptists, in particular William Staughton, (who took up the first collection for William Carey), J.T. Jones, Luther Rice, Henry Smalley, James Manning, *etc.*, formed the **Baptist Board of Foreign Missions**, which split in 1845 over the question of slavery into the American Baptist Convention and the Southern Baptist Convention. Other New School, or Missionary, groups were also formed which never entered into either national conventions, and some that first went into one or other of them withdrew and formed associations and conventions separate from the original bodies.

*New School* – Any group of “Baptist” that does not believe that Christ saved His people from their sins in His first advent, and therefore “evangelize” the “world” to convert or save lost souls; any Baptist that gives “offers of salvation” to sinners, and utilize extra-scriptural auxiliaries and practices alien to pre-Fuller Baptists and the New Testament.

*Original or Old School* – Those Baptists that did not adopt the *New Divinity Theology* of Andrew Fuller; who remained Predestinarian or Free Grace in doctrine, and did not modify their form of worship to accommodate the innovations of the New School to entertain worshippers. The appellation, “Old School,” was principally given to the northern and eastern wing of the original Particular or Regular Baptists.

***Primitive*** – The designation of Regular and Separate Baptists in the South of the Old School pattern of worship. The “Separate” group of Old School dominate the Southern “Primitives,” whereas the “Regular” or “Particular” group dominate the Northern churches. The appellation “Primitive” is mostly connected to the Southern wing of the Old School Baptists.

***Conditionalists or “Limited”*** Predestinarians – The designation of the greater number of Primitive Baptists and refers to their doctrinal modifications after the 1870’s. During the Progressive Era’s “downgrade” in doctrine among all Baptists groups, the Primitive Baptists amalgamated Arminian and Calvinistic doctrines into a hybrid to produce a form of “*Calminianism*.” They limit predestination to only “five things” which they claim do not affect the daily lives of members, and hence no predestination at all; tend toward universalism, or Socinianism; and embraces Arminianism in the daily salvation “in time”; which “salvation” they teach that God has nothing to do with in this time world, and hence no salvation at all in time.

***Predestinarian*** –**a**, Any one that embraces the concept of the absolute sovereign rule of God over all creatures, events, and things. **b**, In particular, anyone in the church and/or congregation of the Lord that adheres to the doctrine of the absolute predestination of God. **c**, A member of a Predestinarian Old School / Primitive Baptist Church or congregation.



## HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE BAPTIZED CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES

The churches of the New Testament did not have “names.” There is no mention of a subdivision of the church into “*denominations*” in the New Testament. The church was a *numerator* – that is, it was ***one*** body, taken in the sense of the whole community of believers. Today, there truthfully is no such thing as a “*denomination*” of the true church. However, there are many *denominations* of the Roman Catholic Church. In fact, the word *catholic* means *an umbrella*, or overall collection of many differing “*Orders.*” When Constantine The Great (303 a.d.) ordered all the pagan, Jewish, and Christian religions of the Roman empire to merge into his universal religious organization, thereafter called “The Church,” and appointed the bishop of Rome to the ancient office of *Pontifex Maximus*, and made him the head of the pagan *Pontifical College*, it was of necessity to create “Orders” or “denominations” within the now corrupted “Church” to hold as many together as possible. Needless to say, large numbers of Christians refused to go into the homogenized state religion of the Empire. Because of this rebellion, Constantine, in 330 a.d., decreed that all religions unite in his “Church” on penalty of

banishment from the Empire. We will say more about some of these groups below.

In the New Testament, Paul addressed a very disorderly and irregular church by this salutation: “*Unto the church (Greek: ecclesia) of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints,*” and included also in that salutation, “*with ALL that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*” (I Corinthians 1:2). We note two things here: 1) He addresses a group that he refers to as the *ekklesia*, or church; and 2) others that also call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours. We hope you’ll keep this in mind, for we will have occasion to build upon that statement later. But the point to make here is, his salutation is not addressed to a church “by name.” He is only recognizing a called out baptized assembly that belongs to God, rather than some other called out assembly for some other purpose, or in some one else’s name.

Again, His salutation in II Corinthians is the same. It is addressed to the “*church of God at Corinth*” and to the “*faithful in Christ Jesus.*” There is no indication that the “faithful in Christ Jesus” are the same individuals that are *in the church* at Corinth, or in some other “church” in Achaia. In his salutation in the Book of Romans, he addressed it in these words, “*To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints,*” (Romans 1:7). In this case, he does not specifically address the “church,” but embraces a much larger number: “to all that be in Rome, called to be saints.” We see him addressing multiple “churches”, or “ekklesia”, in his epistle to the Galatians: “*Unto*

*all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia*” (Galatians 1:2). We wish to add this particular comment here: He addresses multiple churches as individual assemblies, rather than a single “denominational entity”. His address to the Ephesians is to both the “*saints which are at Ephesus and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.*” Is this one group of people, or **two categories**? To the Philippians, he addressed “*all the saints in Jesus Christ which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons*” (Philippians 1:1). Did a single church in Philippi have multiple bishops? Not likely, but they could have, as they also could have had multiple deacons. But here he does not specifically address a “church.” The reader may check all the other salutations. But I add this: “*To the churches of Christ.*” Were there “Campbellites” then? Or was there one denomination called “the Church of God” also? It is clear from the New Testament and the history of all the eastern churches that they baptized *by immersion*. So were they all called “Baptists”? [Many present-day churches’ constitutions says, “We, the church of Jesus Christ of the Baptist faith and order.”] Finally, the point here is that in the apostolic age, churches did not have “names,” nor are names necessary in any age of time, other than as a help to identify themselves to others who may not know them intimately, and to distinguish them from others with whom they cannot be consistently identified.

“Why then all these *names* today?” one may ask. The answer is rather easy: would you like to go from one “church” to another, covering perhaps fifteen-hundred or more to find the one with which you could fellowship? It is a given that all

“Baptists” do not believe alike, but at least you have eliminated several hundreds of others by only searching among them! It is also a given, that all Old School or Primitive Baptists are not of the same faith and order, but look how great a number you have saved yourself from having had to visit! And the list could go on. We fully admit that the **appellatives are not necessary**, nor Biblical, but they are helpful for one attempting to find a people with whom he may fellowship. It is also granted that it is *not* a perfect way, and in the end, it is left sovereignly in the providence of God to “*add to the church daily such as should be saved*” (Acts 2:47).

Where, and when, did the first large division take place in the early church? Asked a believer in Indiana. It is in answering this question that we begin to trace the origin of the “baptized churches of Christ.”

From Nero, Domitian, Trajan (98 A.D.) to Emperor Decius, persecutions were severe against the baptized church of Christ. There was a lull of about forty years in the persecutions after Emperor Diocletian, which saw a large increase in the early church, with large numbers of nominal head-knowledge believers entering the church unconverted. It became a “popular” thing to do. The last great pagan persecution is referred to as the *Decian Persecution* that ended about 251 *a.d.* It produced many martyrs as well as many *apostates*. The church had become full of politics, innovations, and spiritual darkness of great depth. It was best described as doctrinally bankrupt, lax in discipline, and evolving into a rich and haughty *organized institution* alien to the simplicity of the baptized

church of Christ in the apostolic age. Church offices were now being filled by political appointments and new offices created to give more positions to fill. In the New Testament period, there were only apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastor-teachers and deacons. But in time, the corrupt members appeared to outnumber the experimental believers sufficient to gain the control of the large bishoprics, and felt intelligent enough to improve upon Christ and His apostles' organization. This brings us to the first great schism in the Church.

The baptized church at Rome had multiple elders, called, *presbyters*. Two of them were Cornelius and Novatius. During the Decian Persecution, Cornelius apostatized, denied the faith under oath and turned the church books over to the Roman authorities to be burned. After the persecutions, Cornelius, as so many other apostates, came back into the church without repentance, confession, acknowledgment, and/or baptism as if nothing had happened. Novatius and many others stood against such a corruption, and became known as the *Cathrari Party*, meaning "Puritans." The bishop of Rome stood with the corrupt party, and Cornelius was appointed a presbyter. Upon the death of the bishop, the two contending parties put forth Cornelius and Novatius for the office of the bishop, but neither party was strong enough to prevail. The church called upon bishops from other large metropolitan churches, which resulted in the election of Cornelius as bishop of Rome. Thereupon, Novatius and the Cathrari withdrew from the corrupt churches throughout the Roman Empire. Thereafter, the puritan party was referred to by historians as *Novatians* in Italy; *Donatists*

(after a bishop Donatius the Great) in North Africa; and *Montanists* in Asia or Eastern Roman Empire. Within fifty years, the corrupt party became Constantine's Roman Catholic Church.

In 303 A.D., Constantine the Great won control of the Roman Empire. He set out to administratively reorganize the Empire into five administrative districts: the new city, Constantinople became first in rank; Rome, second in rank; Antioch in Cilicia, next in rank; Alexandria in Egypt, next in rank, and finally, Jerusalem was set up when he reorganized the religions of the Empire. [These religious districts were the Patriarch of Constantinople (or Eastern Orthodox), the Patriarch of Alexandria (or Coptic Catholic Church) in North Africa; the Patriarch at Rome, (or Roman Catholic Church) in Italy and western Europe, The Patriarch of Antioch (or Marionite Catholic Church) in Asia Minor, and Jerusalem Catholic Church in Palestine.]

For centuries prior to Constantine, Rome freely allowed various religions to flourish in Rome. The Senate appointed a governing council over these pagan religions, and appointed a *Pontifex Maximus* as its head, or Pontiff. Upon the death of the Pontiff, the office rotated to each of the pagan religions of the Empire. Having now put the administrative government of the Empire in order, Constantine decreed that all religions, pagan, Jewish, and Christians merge into one *umbrella*, or Catholic Church. The corrupt Church of Rome had no problem with it, since Constantine gave the office of *Pontifex Maximus* to the bishop of Rome in perpetuity. [Note: Most people are unaware

that the “Pope” was an ancient title in Roman religion for over 500 years before Christ.] However, during his reign, Constantine actually made himself Head of The Church Of Rome, with the Pope his subordinate. The one great mark of the apostate Church was that it now became a *political-religious entity*, or a State religion. Throughout ALL history since, in every nation with a State supported and controlled religion, their chief characteristic has been the persecution of the saints, and the baptized churches of Christ. This writer takes this single mark as the criteria to identify Antichrist. Under this heading we conclude with this single point: All the offspring of the State Religion of the Roman Empire have likewise set up state religions and enforced their heresies upon others by sword, whip, stocks, and/or imprisonment, even in Colonial America. Separation of Church and State is a BAPTIST BORN PRINCIPLE. Elder John Leland, an Old School Baptist minister drafted the Bill of Rights for James Madison, who promised faithfully and publicly (at Frederickburg, Va.) he would offer it as an amendment to the Federal Constitution upon Congress’ first session. He did what he promised.

## **ORIGINS OF “BAPTISTS”**

At the outset, we wish to clarify our historical record below by pointing out that **we are not presenting a “church succession”** of modern churches from earlier churches in a *lineal* history. Such cannot be done, and those who attempt it are intellectually dishonest, or have too much faith in such that

are. Protestants can trace their origins from Constantine's religious enterprise at Rome, which in turn can "claim" that the church at Rome is its own origin; and those who have splintered off from Protestant churches can equally trace their history through the Protestants back to the Catholics and to the church at Rome. Many Missionary and Primitive Baptists can trace their history back through the Separate Baptists of the Great Awakening, their rise from among the Congregational (Puritans), Presbyterians, and Episcopalians through the Church of England (Anglican) and on through the Roman Catholics to Rome. Few would dare attempt to claim they trace their history back to Jerusalem! True churches exist for a time, become lax, then corrupt, then metamorphoses into something altogether different from their previous historical faith and structure. [For an example, compare 1600 A.D. Arminianism with today's so-called "Arminianism." The 1600 form is nearer to Calvinism by far than today's "freewillism," which is *Pelagianism*." Southern Baptists' original Articles of Faith are a beautiful statement of Calvinism! – See copy on pages 29-30. And so is the Westminster Confession of Faith!]

**The church is the Lord's, and thus a New Testament Church, if it is sustained by the presence of the Holy Spirit, with experimental members having been called to life and salvation by the Holy Spirit, and abides in the doctrine of Christ and the gospel order of the New Testament faith and practice. If, however, the Holy Spirit withdraws from it; if they "abide not in the doctrine of Christ, they are none of His;" if the membership is filled with lifeless and nominal**



**believers; and if they depart from the order of the gospel as recorded in the New Testament by the inspiration of God; then they have become “synagogues of Satan” (Revelation 2:9; and 3:9). Now to proceed:**

During the heated debates of The Netherlands Reformed Church at Dort over the doctrines of the Reformation, there arose a gifted heretic named James Jacobus Arminius who contended that Christ’s death was universal for all mankind; that men in nature had sufficient ability to close with Christ for salvation; that election was conditioned on foreseen faith in believers; and that believers could finally fall away and be lost eternally. A convert to *Arminianism*, John Smyth, gathered together an assembly of Congregational dissenters from the Anglican Church [Church of England] and baptized himself (called “*Se*-baptism) and the assembly, and constituted the first “baptized church of Christ” in England in 1609. John Spilsbery in 1633 gathered together an assembly of believers, baptized them, and constituted the first “baptized church of Christ” holding to the New Testament doctrine of free and sovereign grace. In the same year, Mr. Richard Blount went to The Netherlands and was rebaptized by a congregation of Anabaptists, and returned administering the ordinance to his congregation. It too, was “Particular Baptist.” John Smyth’s group became known as *General Baptists*, and John Spilsbery’s and Richard Blunts’ group became known as *Particular Baptists*. Because of the vast differences between the doctrines held by the two groups, the names were identifying of their

doctrinal positions. One was *Arminian*, and the other **Calvinistic**. However, they did not call themselves this. *Historians* called them such. Both of them referred to themselves as a “baptized church of Jesus Christ.” Both of these groups faced a seemingly impossible task. During the Dark Ages, baptism by immersion of believers in England had ceased. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth the baptismal fonts were removed from Anglican “Churches.” These dissenting ministers, churches, and congregations were faced with this problem: “Where do we go to find the ordinance that we find in the New Testament?” There were three things that they could do, and each of these was done. First, they could baptize themselves by immersion, and then baptize the church. This is known as “Se-baptism,” and was the steps taken by John Smyth, and later by many of the Separate Baptists in the English colonies of North America. Second, they could form a church, and *the church* could then authorize the scriptural mode of baptism by immersion. In this case, one male member baptized another, who in turn baptized the next, *etc.* This was the course Roger Williams took in Rhode Island. Third, they could send to some foreign country, and if they could find a church baptizing by immersion of believers (not infants), receive baptism at their hand and return and baptize the church. This was the course pursued by Richard Blount. All three parties planted churches and congregations in the English colonies in North America. Mr. John Smith’s General Baptists grew mostly in the Carolinas, whereas the Particular Baptists churches of John Spilsbury and Richard Blount were firmly

established in New England colonies. Both groups were made up of *independent* congregations **until 1707**. We are counting from 1643 to 1707, a period of sixty-four years, during which time *baptized churches of Christ* spread down the eastern seaboard. Most were collected in the Carolinas, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Connecticut. Prior to 1707 there were no *associations* in America, and prior to **1769**, there were no *corresponding associations* in the United States. In that year, the appellation “*Baptist*” was first added to the “*baptized churches of Jesus Christ*” in the Philadelphia Association.

A very significant historical development commenced in 1701-1707. A church in Pembrokehire, in South Wales, in Europe, sold their property, purchased a sailing vessel and sailed to Pennsylvania and settled near Pennepek. In 1703, they moved to the Welsh Tract of land deeded to them by William Penn. The Welsh, as most churches in Europe, *did not sing* in church worship. But just prior to this, singing of the Psalms had been introduced among the English Baptists by Benjamin Keach, William Kiffin, and later, John Gill. In 1707, the Welsh and English gained fellowship together by organizing **the first “association of baptized congregations.”** In time, it became known as the *Philadelphia Association*, and later, *The Philadelphia Baptist Association (1769)*. These churches referred to themselves in after-years doctrinally as “Six Principle Baptists.” Peculiarly to them, they laid hands on all candidates for baptism following their immersion in water; and they did the same upon constituting themselves into a

“Church”. They adopted the Confession of Faith of 1689 [See Appendix A ], and Keach’s Catechism. The greatest “negatives” we would report of them is (1) the unscriptural introduction of an **organized ecclesiastical institution** which rapidly introduced error into the church, enslaving them in corresponding orders; (2) gained control of ordained ministers, and often set the bounds of their endeavors; and (3) set themselves up to be taken over by the skillful maneuvers of a determined group of **New Divinity** “doctors” in 1800; and (4) thereby launched the Modern Missionary frenzy beginning in 1813-1820. Positive remarks are: (1) They maintained the doctrines of free grace throughout their history until the association was destroyed by the Modern Missionary Movement; (2) contributed greatly to the publication of sound literature, bearing the expense thereof; (3) and wrote an Exposition of the doctrines of the Old London Confession of Faith of 1689, and other sound writings, and published the same in their annual Minutes for widespread distribution throughout the colonies and the young nation.

### **The Great Awakening**

Another very significant event in the history of our churches was the **Great Awakening** (1720-1760). A gradual awareness that many souls scattered throughout the American frontier were experiencing a sense of their lost and horrid sinfulness, turning to Christ for their only hope of salvation, and constituting congregations desiring the administration of

baptism, spread from village to village, town to town, city to city, until the whole American frontier was seemingly ablaze in an Holy Spirit **revival**. It would be unscholarly if we did not point out that many of these “Separate” congregations baptized themselves, and some only baptized by immersion those who were added to them. They were not Anabaptists. They did not rebaptize others already baptized. In 1762, numbering only those churches in *associations*, messengers came from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Jersey, Virginia, Maryland, New York, and “New England.” The total reported membership had grown to 5,970. This was fifty-one years **before** the rise of the Modern Missionary Movement in the United States. Before the rise of the so-called “Missionary” endeavors, **itinerate preachers** had filled the frontier. By 1790, twelve years **before** the formation of the New School’s *Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions*, there were now over 748 churches in associations, plus unnumbered independents scattered over the frontier, and over 60,970 Baptists in “*associated* capacity.”

It is off our subject a bit, but a quote from the 1803 Minute of the Philadelphia Association is of interest. The Clerk signing this was none other than the **New Divinity** usurper of the Association, William Staughton. Notice this:

“In treating further on this subject (Work of The Holy Spirit) we shall show, 1<sup>st</sup>, That the children of the Lord only, are made partakers of the Holy Spirit in His operations on their hearts. And 2ndly, What is effected by the Holy Spirit in such. Many well-meaning persons have certainly handled this subject very injudiciously: and we are convinced, if they would but for a moment consider, they must see into what difficulties they are involved; and that if they have a system of doctrine

at all, they must systematically **become Arminians**, [Which they certainly did! –Ed.] as it is impossible to hold the precious doctrines of grace upon such ground. It is not uncommon for many, from whom we might have expected better things, after treating upon some of the sublime doctrines of the gospel, in applying their subject and addressing impenitent and unrenewed sinners, to tell them God’s most holy Spirit **has been striving** with them from their infancy up, and that hitherto His attempts have been **unsuccessful**. If such doctrine is according to godliness, brethren, you will discover that the sinner, and not the Spirit of God, is omnipotent; and that from henceforth, instead of saying confidently, that the “*dead shall hear His voice and live*,” (John 5:25), we must always add, “provided men will condescend to let the Holy Spirit work,” since then, and not till then, shall they be quickened or made alive. Such doctrine is evidently in direct opposition to the Scriptures of truth; for the sinner, prior to regeneration, is always represented as passive, and therefore **is declared to be dead**, (Eph. 2:1), and is said to “be born;” to “be begotten.” As the creature begotten, cannot be said to be active prior to his existence, or be the instrument of its own existence, these expressions fully show, that it does not depend upon the favorable reception the divine Spirit meets with, that the work of grace is effected in the soul.” (Minute, 1803, written by William White, signed by Samuel Jones Moderator; and William Staughton, Clerk. Interesting, no?

With the effects of the Great Awakening, over 250 churches in New England alone came out of Presbyterian, Congregational, and Episcopal institutions, conformed to the New Testament pattern and began baptizing by immersion of believers only, and becoming congregational in church form. Hence, they were “Baptists.” However, having not been baptized by “Baptists,” [although some were] they were called *Separate Baptists*. The Six Principle Baptists, and Particular

Baptists of the original *baptized churches of Christ* became known as **Regular Baptists** to distinguish the two groups from each other. The independent Particular Baptists most often kept their distinct name as before, whereas the “associated” churches, led by the Philadelphia Association in the North and Kehukee Association in the South began to call themselves Regular Baptists for a brief period. And as noted before, these two groups merged into the **United Baptist Churches of Christ** in Virginia and later (1806) in Kentucky.

We reemphasize the point here: the “names” are not Biblical, nor necessary, *per se*. They only *identify* parties under particular conditions, as the above clearly demonstrates. New conditions, as errors increase, will also have ramifications upon what churches are called *publicly*. But we must note, that if one drives up to most of the baptized churches of Christ of the predestinarian and old school faith and order, they will find no church “Sign” anywhere in sight! In fact, the local community may not ever know the church has a “name.” They will most likely be known by other euphuisms, as “They are “Hardshells;” or, “Hypers,” “A family church,” *etc.*

Churches in Virginia and the Carolinas were most often of the General Baptist (Freewill) persuasion. Desiring fellowship with other “baptized churches of Christ,” they invited the Philadelphia Association to send ministers among them. This resulted in the reconstitution of these General (freewill) Baptists, and the formation of associations in the Southern seaboard and Piedmont, and these reconstituted and *associated* churches adopted the London Confession of Faith of 1689. So

far, so good! But they also fell into the trap set by the Philadelphia to organize independent churches into a *National Baptist Church*. With their conversion, the **corresponding orders** were established. That is, the **associations**, united together by electing or appointing *delegates* (sometimes called “messengers”) to each association in a chain of correspondence with other associations, *etc.*, binding them together as one state or national organization. To get control of these independent churches, the associations portentously denied by their written Constitution that they “*would lord it over the churches, nor infringe upon their liberties,*” but did, however, in fact do that very thing. The instrument of their power grabbing was this phrase: “*but (the association) shall be an advisory council only.*” They left unsaid what would happen if a local church should feel it necessary to refuse their *advice!* By the time they found out, the associations had ardent enforcers already planted in each church, known as “*delegates*” or “*messengers.*” Later, with the rise of the Modern Missionary organization, some associations established an office called “the Director of Missions,” or “**Doms**” who enforced the rule of the collected associations, or corresponding order, within his association. This tyranny remains to this day in such churches that are not vigilant, and independent minded.

Throughout history, there have always been Anabaptists who were separate and apart from Rome, State religions and organized institutional religious entities. Millions throughout the ages have been put to death for their peaceful opposition and refusal to join into union with the corrupt parties, and have



been considered “counter-churches” to established religions. The first Crusade in 1208 was against the Albigenses and Waldenses, and by the cruel instrument of the *Inquisition*, thousands were slaughtered in Europe. If the reader is interested in this aspect of history, we recommend John Fox’s *Book of Martyrs* and especially the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, which may be found in college libraries. Just look in the footnotes of each century under “heretics,” and the Roman religious institution proudly boast of how many they killed in that century! Mosheim’s *History of the Church* does the same.

The Particular Baptists in America were clearly “Predestinarians.” At first, they were independent of each other, but communicated together frequently, and accepted each other in mutual faith and respect. They were decidedly of the “old school,” or “old order,” having no auxiliaries to the church, no instruments of entertainment except the preaching of the gospel and the feast of charity. Those observing a feast of charity most often washed feet following the Lord’s Supper. (See: **Ordinances of a Gospel Church**, page ) Singing was, in earliest times, none at all; then the singing of metered Psalms were introduced; and later “lined” singing prevailed until the Sacred Harp and Christian Harmony’s singing of musical notes, *a cupella*, gave rise to metered tunes whereby lyrics could be sung. No church with instrumental music, choirs, special vocalists, Sunday Schools, missions, *etc.*, is considered “Old School.” (As one of our hymns reads, “They never *were cloyed in hymning the Lamb*” # 206). The rationale is simple: it is difficult enough to keep the “flesh” out of our devotions as it is.

Stirring it up in “God’s” name is counterproductive to our better enjoyment of His blessed Spirit. It can be, in practice, “*taking the name of the Lord thy God in vain.*”

### **Commencement of The Great Apostasy: Secret Plan For CHRISTIAN UNION**

The introduction of Fullerism into the American churches was from the first strenuously opposed. Beginning in 1788, the *Minutes* of the Philadelphia Association records an onslaught of one heresy after another. It may not have anything to do with this, but in each year that heresies were dealt with, the Association also recorded a “*Plague,*” referred to in history as the “Hessian Fly.” In 1788, the following query was submitted: “Whether a member, who professes that Christ **died for all mankind, and that every individual of the human race will finally be saved,** ought to be excommunicated?” Answer: “Agreed, That every such person, upon conviction, and after proper steps have been taken, **ought to be excluded.**” In that same *Minute*, we read: “Met according to adjournment.-Whereas, the church at Jacob’s Town, after acknowledging the unspeakable mercies of God to our nation and churches, have taken notice of **the army of God –the Hessian Fly – as judgment;** and propose to the Association, the propriety of appointing days of fasting and prayer on this account.” Again, in 1789, we read: “As we had reason to fear, at the last Association, that Mr. Worth of Pittsgrove, was far gone in the doctrine of universal salvation, we are well certified, by

undoubted authority, that he is now fully in that belief. We, therefore, to show our abhorrence of that doctrine, and of his disingenuous conduct for a long time past, caution our churches to beware of him, and of Artist Seagreaves, of the same place also, who has espoused the same doctrine.” Again, the plague is noted.

Two issues confronted the Association in 1790. First, the *Circular Letter* rebuked the doctrine of universal salvation. Second, the doctrine of Andrew Fuller’s *New Divinity* was addressed. “In answer to a query from the church at Stamford, accompanied with a number of quotations from certain authors, **holding what is called the new system of divinity**: Whether we hold them as Scripture truths, and whether such persons as hold them, and endeavor to promote them, are to be held in fellowship in a gospel church? We reply, that we *apprehend danger, lest by these fine spun theories*, and the consequences which are drawn from them by some, the great doctrines of the imputation of Adam’s sin, Christ’s proper atonement, imputed righteousness, &c., should **be totally set aside, or, at least, the glory of them sullied**. We therefore advise, that great care should be taken to **guard against innovations** not calculated to edify the body of Christ. But that the individual churches must judge for themselves, when any of their members so far deviate from that system of doctrine held by the churches of this Association, as to require their exclusion.”

Again in the same Minute (1790), we read: “This Association lament they have occasion again to call attention of that part of Zion we represent, to **another awful instance of**

**departure from the faith once delivered unto the saints.** Mr. Nicholas Cox, late a brother in the ministry, having espoused, and artfully, as well as strenuously endeavored, to propagate the fatal notion of the **universal restoration of bad men and devils from hell.** As such, we caution our churches, those of our sister Associations, and Christian brethren of every denomination, to be aware of him.”

In **1792**, Andrew Fuller printed his pamphlet “*The Gospel Worthy Of All Acceptation,*” wherein he promoted the universal provision of the atonement of Christ. Also, in **1793**, the “prevailing *infectious disorder*, with which God, in His Providence has been pleased to visit” Philadelphia is reported. In that year they wrote: “The Association, taking into consideration the awful dispensation of Divine Providence in the epidemical disorder now raging in the city of Philadelphia, together with the great drought in our part of the country, and general declension in vital piety, recommend that Tuesday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of November ensuing, be observed as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer, throughout our churches; and should it please God to remove any part of those judgments previous to that day, that His mercy therein be remembered with public thanksgiving at the same time.”

The plague returns in 1797, 1798, 1799, and 1803, during which time **Sunday Schools** were invented, **mission activity** commenced, as weak challenge to Fullerism noted, and for the first time in American History a Baptist Association took up a **collection** “for the propagation of the Gospel among the Hindoos, in the East Indies,” and the money sent to “Brother

William Rogers.” Mr. Rogers was one of the conspirators to make the Philadelphia Association a **mission society** so that through its renown status the *New Divinity* school could infiltrate all her corresponding associations. The Association, without suspicion, elected William Rogers as its Moderator. **1797**, the Association rebuffed Fuller’s doctrine while at the same time embraced his mission society plan! They wrote in the *Circular Letter*, “From what we have said, various useful observations, by way of inference, might be made; but we shall only mention two: First, that according to the Gospel, **the atonement of Christ did not extend to every individual of the human race**; and, secondly, that the Gospel **contains no conditional offers of salvation.**”

**1796** finds “Brother Staughton” in the association. He is here referred to as “Brother,” indicating he was not an ordained minister, and later, he is “D.D.” and the leading light of the *New Divinity* school of theology, and moderator of the Philadelphia Association when it disintegrated into the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions. Who is this man? He was a new arrival from England, and when he joined the Philadelphia Association, he was not listed as a minister. Somewhere between Kittering, England, and Philadelphia, he apparently gained a “Doctor of Divinity” degree from some institution, which degree is only an “honorary” degree unearned by the recipient by academic pursuit. In **1797**, the plague still raging in Philadelphia, the Association committed funds to establish a **theological school** to train preachers! The **1799** *Minute* has this statement:” At the same time, we may confess

with deep humility and sorrow of heart, that God has in a great measure **suspended** the powerful operations of His Holy Spirit in our churches.” In the void of the recognized withdrawal of the Holy Spirit, the following year saw the following sad innovation: “Apprehensive that many advantages may result from a **general conference, composed of one or more members from each ASSOCIATION, to be held every one, two, or three years, as may seem most subservient to the general interest of our Lord’s kingdom; this Association respectfully invites the different Associations in the United States to favor them with their views on the subject.**”

[It is appropriate to insert in this place the following quotation from the Biography of **Luther Rice**, the former Congregational “missionary” to India. In his letter to his brother, Rice wrote:

“Being obliged to ride in the night, I got lost. The roads in this part of our country are none of them fenced, and are most through wood; I had to go that night in byroads but little traveled – missed the way, got out of roads, at length, into mere paths, and ultimately lost the path – found myself alone in a dreary wilderness, unable to discover the point of the compass . . . I stopped and besought the Lord to lead me out – rose from my supplication and attempted to advance. In less, perhaps, than 10 minutes, certainly in less than five, fell into the road which conducted me to the place that I calculated to reach that night, at which I arrived about one o’clock. Have now just come from attending Sandy Creek Association [Guilford County, N.C. –Ed.] and am now on the way to Charleston.”

The Biographer continued: “One day as Rice rode the stagecoach from Petersburg to Richmond, Virginia, on a road too broken and rutted to allow him to write in his diary or make notes for his next sermon, he sat wrapped in thought. As though, he declared later, “*it came from divine revelation,*” an idea struck him! Why not call a convention of Baptists to consider the formation of a nation-wide organization? The Congregationalists could do it this way, why not the Baptists? If representation of Baptist churches strung out along the seaboard and along the Western Frontier once met together, they would feel a unity they had not dared depend on.

“Luther Rice talked to the Baptists about this wherever they gathered to hear him. He wrote persuasive letters at the end of each day’s journey. By the slow mail of that day and by personal visits Rice enlisted **the help of men he knew would stand firm for such an organization.** They included such Baptist luminaries as Dr. Richard Furman of Charleston, South Carolina; the Rev. Lucius Bolles of Salem, Massachusetts; and Dr. William B. Johnston of Savannah, Georgia. **There was Dr. William Staughton of Philadelphia, who had come to America from England, one of the men who had attended the meeting in Widow Wallis’ home in London when William Carey was appointed missionary to India and who had passed a snuffbox for the collection.**

Furman and Johnson were especially helpful to Rice in calling the proposed conference. They spread the word among Baptist pastors and associational leaders from Richmond to Savannah, pleading for support for the project, Many others

promised Rice that they would write letters urging Baptist leaders in all areas to be represented at the meeting and otherwise to use their influence to enlist a good group of those **favorable** to the idea of **Baptist missions**.

At Furman's suggestion, the **Philadelphia Baptist Association, oldest such organization in the country and most centrally located, issued the call for the conference. Dr. Henry Holcombe, pastor of the Philadelphia First Baptist Church, offered his Meeting House as the place for the gathering. The date was set for May 18, 1814.**

[Note: Holcombe is not listed as a member of the 1<sup>st</sup>. Church of Philadelphia in the Minutes of 1807, therefore we assume he is a new-comer to the Baptists from somewhere outside of that Association. As one historian noted: "The movement of many Separate from positions of leadership in the Congregational churches to position of leadership in the Baptist churches provided a stimulus which, although unmeasurable, had a very profound effect on the vigor and temper of the denomination." These "new leaders" from the Congregationalist churches included such famous "Baptists" as John Leland, Isaac Backus, James Manning, Hezekiah Smith, John Davis, Samuel Stillman, Shubael Stearns, Daniel Marshall, and David Benedict. The early plan was to guide the Baptist denomination into financially supporting the Congregational Missionaries (Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice) and other benevolent societies, and David Benedict collected moneys to help fund the Congregationalists' "American Education Society." This, the New Divinity ministers believed would lead eventually to



Christian unity. Lyman Beecher wrote in the 1826 *Christian Watchmen*,” of the Modern Missionary Movement, “An experiment is now making in the Christian world upon a more **extensive plan** than was ever before adopted of **uniting different denominations of Christians in objects for the general interest of the Church.**” – *Christian Watchman*,” July 13, 1822, p. 123. Alexander Campbell, a Baptist elder in the Redstone Baptist Association, kept the “Christian Restoration Movement” alive, and during this same period (1820’s and 30’s) carried off large numbers of Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Methodists which became known as “Campbellites, or “Christian,” “Disciples of Christ,” or “Church of Christ” (after 1906) This part of the plan was scraped after the harsh and arrogant President of Andover Seminary, Mr. Dwight, mistreated Benedict and two youthful Baptist students who attempted to enroll, because, as he said, “Dr. Baldwin and the Baptists in Boston opposed our Plan and refused to cooperate with us.”]

**Thus the American Missionary Baptists have their origins.** Who, then, were the Baptists that **existed antecedently to May 18, 1814?** Those that **did not enter** into the proposed organization, and those who at first supported it and **withdrew later** and returned to the fold, became known as the OLD SCHOOL and/or PRIMITIVE BAPTISTS. They were Predestinarian, or Calvinistic, and believed the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the inspired Word of God, and “**the only rule of faith and practice.**” This belief, burned into their soul by their experience of grace and faith in God held

them bound steadfastly in the apostles doctrine and the fellowship of their faith and practice. They are, (at least *some of* them) and ever have been, the New Testament Church.

Concluding this instrument of the Great Apostasy, 1800 saw the birth of the **Baptist Triennial Convention** being drafted and coming out of the Great Plague in Philadelphia. From a plague of infectious fever in nature, it mutated into an infectious plague in the innovations of the “baptized churches of Christ.” Between 1800 and 1813, the Philadelphia Association collected the names and addresses of all Associations in America. In 1814, they sent letters to all Associations soliciting their acceptation, receiving moneys for “missionaries,” and in 1815-1820 began to send “MISSIONARIES” INTO THE BOUNDS OF EACH ASSOCIATION TO DIVERT THEM INTO INSTRUMENTS OF THE CONVENTION. It must be supposed that the Baptist Associations in America were the first “*heathen*” that the Board had in their highest concern! Reader: notice the dates, and ask yourself this question: “Is it to be believed that all Churches of Christ in America willingly and eagerly jumped on board? What of those who **never participated** in the corresponding chain of associations with the Philadelphia, and those who saw the peril facing their liberties, faith, doctrine, and practices? Who and what were this “silent minority”? What happened to the “old school” before the arrival of this *New Divinity* and related innovations? We will give you some interesting material for these answers in the **Appendices** at the end of this book.

With the organization of the Baptist Triennial Convention (triennial means it met every three years), the selection by the Association of Luther Rice's supposed divine revelation was put into effect. By having the actual Convention to meet every **three years**, the power was therefore put into the hands of the mission conspirators. This was deliberate. This gave the governing board, **The Baptist Board Of Foreign Missions** a free hand to do pretty much as it wished with very little oversight by the Convention in the off years. It allowed this select few to falsely claim they had the *authority* of all Baptist churches in the United States of America. (The Convention met in 1814, three years later was 1817, and the next three years was 1820. Therefore, by the **third** meeting of the Convention, those not desiring to be snared by the Convention were peeling off right and left, and joining in with the Independents and nonaffiliated Churches, most of whom were sound predestinarian or Calvinistic bodies.) What the Board did in the meantime was absolutely demonic! The mission society became the greatest plague Baptists had (or have) relative to the preservation of the truth of God's free grace ever faced since the persecutions in the Dark Ages. The membership of the New Divinity School was made up of General Baptists, Particular Baptists, Seventh Day Baptists, Separate Baptists, Regular Baptists, Six Principle Baptists, various and sundry *societies* that purchased membership in it, and as members now of this union, became known as the "Modern Missionary Movement," or "Benevolent Movement so-called". These churches embraced the *New Divinity*, the *Social Gospel*, and the

*Socialism* of the English Fullerite Baptists [William Carey is credited by his biographer as establishing the first communist society in India! See *William Carey*, by Basil Miller, Bethany Publishers, Minneapolis, 1980, page 66, 70, 74, 76]; or just “Missionary Baptists.” Hence the necessity of new appellatives, just as the masses began moving westward across the new frontiers of the new nation. Those who did not embrace the **New Divinity** became known in the North as “Old School Baptists,” a name associated closely with those holding to the absolute predestination of God, and/or “Primitive Baptists” in the South and west. The name, “Regular,” still is used by both parties in the Midwest.

The New School, or Missionary Baptists include many various groups, as: *Landmark Baptists, Regular Baptists, Progressive Baptists, General Association of Regular Baptists (GARB), American Baptist Association (ABA), Missionary Baptist Association (MBA), Southern Baptists, American Baptists Convention, Eastern District Primitive Baptists, Bible Baptists, General Baptists, Freewill Baptists, Freewill Fellowship Baptists, United Baptists, Bethel Baptists, Independent Baptists*, and some new twentieth century groups, such as: *Sovereign Grace Baptists, Reformed Baptists, New Testament Baptists, Progressive Primitives, and Continental Baptists*.

The Old School groups include: *Predestinarian Old School Baptists*, both those in corresponding orders, and independents, *Primitive Baptists*, also those in corresponding orders and independents, *so-called Old Line Primitives* or “Conditional or

*Calminian Primitives,” Regular Predestinarian (two-seed) Primitive Baptists, Regular Primitive Baptists Universal Church,, Christian Baptists, Old Regular Baptists, Old United Baptists, Duck River Baptists, and perhaps others the author has missed. Two things all Baptists have in common: (1) that immersion is the only mode of baptism, and (2) they are the only ones with the proper administrator of that ordinance to the exclusion of all the others !*

By the time of the Great Baptist Separation (1820-1840), the New Divinity professors had in full operation one of the greatest and smoothest means of deceitful plans ever conceived in the human brain. First, they with feign words, swayed the masses by stirring up the human sympathies toward the reprobate world. They organized cells, called “mission societies,” **outside of the authority and control** of local churches. For fifty cents one could buy membership in these societies, and by a donation of one hundred dollars, membership on the governing board. No one needed to be a “Baptist,” and many were not. These “societies” were formed in various ways. Some were **outside** of the Church structure altogether. The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions set up other societies directly. It was the “Board” that “authorized” local churches to “form themselves into a *missionary society*.” Two things are noteworthy here: first, we get the name “Missionary” attached to the word “Baptist,” and this designation **identified them** as being separate and apart from their earlier connections to the Baptists’ associations and correspondences. Second, the very act of *reorganizing* themselves as something *different*

from the “baptized churches of Christ” necessitated a breach in fellowship between the New Divinity institutions and the Lord’s churches. This occurred right at that point in Baptist history when the churches were in a state of reform and attempting to disassociate themselves and their members from worldly organizations (Masons, Oddfellows, Know-Nothing Party, Socialist societies, Temperance societies, *etc.*) It put too much of a burden upon the Old Divinity school for them to rush head-long into this frenzy of innovations, the end of which no one could foretell, and directed by men openly associated with the Arminianism of the *New Divinity* theology.

Both groups, Old School and New School, had already embraced the concept of a single National “Baptist Church,” and both already had developed chains of correspondences between sister associations which were not scriptural. Neither had, as yet, a *national governing body*. It was this *body* the New Divinity cells saw in the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions, and the “missionaries” looked to the Board as such.

The Triennial Convention was composed of “two or three delegates from each mission *society*,” whereas the various associations were composed of “two or three messengers from each constitute *church*.” Hence, a reorganized Baptist Church as a “mission society” had two or three delegates to the **STATE Baptist Convention**, and with a donation of sufficient funds could also be a member of the Board. The State Convention could also send “delegates” to the Triennial Baptist Convention. In this way, the Board could arrogate to themselves the **authority** to speak *for* “Baptists,” without any

authorization or control by actual “Baptists.” [For the modern reader, you can see the same thing now occurring in the United Nations, that now has set up NGO’s (non-government organizations) and given them seats on the various agencies of the United Nations, thereby cutting out the authority and control of national governments of member nations. This is the same principle, and the result will likely be the same.] It is interesting to this writer that this aspect of the Modern Missionary Movement was what Gilbert Beebe, Samuel Trott, John Leland, Daniel Parker and the early Old School party opposed. The “Black Rock ADDRESS” did not strongly object to the *doctrinal* trend that was just then being introduced by the *New Divinity* School’s Missionary societies in their zeal to save the world of reprobates. They did, however, endorse the Prospectus of the **Signs of the Times** as being in agreement with their sentiments. (See Appendix F, The Black Rock Address, page 129, and Elder Reuben Ross’ Introduction of Arminianism, in **1817** at Port Royal, Tennessee, page 82). The doctrines of predestination, election, total depravity and inability of man, and particular redemption of the elect only remained the foundation of the Missionary Baptists until the “*downgrade*” period of the 1880’s. But the leaven was already at work and the yeast was rising rapidly. In fact, Elder Patrick Hues Mell, president of the Southern Baptist Convention for 17 years (1863-1871 and again from 1880 to 1887) preached his last sermon on Divine Election, Dec. 12, 1887. He wrote a book defending the doctrines of Predestination and Final Perseverance against the Arminianism of Russell Reneau in

1851. (See Mell's *Predestination*, reprinted by Sprinkle Publications, P. O. Box 1094, Harrison, Virginia, 22803. At this printing, it may be had for \$10.00 from Sprinkle Publications.) The Southern Baptist Convention adopted the Georgia Baptist Association's Articles of Faith of 1792. Elder Mell was the clerk of that Association from 1845-1854, and its Moderator from 1855 to 1870, and again from 1874-1886. There can be no question or contradiction that Southern Baptists in their formative years were Predestinarians through the first forty years of their existence. In one decade, they fell from that system of grace upon which they were founded. We will in this place insert the following proof, rather than place it in the appendices.

Following the Great Awakening, two Separate Baptists ministers traveled from Connecticut down the eastern coast. Shubael Stearns stopped in what is now Guilford County, N.C., and planted the Sandy Creek Separate Baptist Church. This Church today is a Conditional Primitive Baptist Church. Daniel Marshall traveled on down into Georgia somewhat following George Whitfield's earlier itinerary. He planted the first Separate Baptists Churches in Georgia, which in turn organized the Georgia Baptist Association. In **1792**, this association adopted the following Articles of Faith. This is the same Abstract later adopted in Mississippi (1805), and still later by the Southern Baptist Convention in **1845**. The writer believes it to be one of the best Abstracts written in America. As we set it up, we will place in **bold characters** those that prove them to be Predestinarian and in **bold italicized and underlined**



characters those portions that the Southern Baptists no longer believed at the time they adopted it at their founding of the Convention.

1. We believe in one only true and living God; and that there are a trinity of persons in the Godhead – the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in essence, equal in power and glory.
2. We believe the scriptures of the Old and New Testament were given by inspiration of God, are of Divine authority, and **the only rule of faith and practice.**
3. We believe in the fall of Adam; in the **imputation of his sins to his posterity**; in the **total depravity of human nature**; and in man's **inability to restore himself** to the favor of God.
4. We believe in the **everlasting love of God to His people**; and in the **eternal unconditional election** of a **definite number** of the human family to grace and glory.
5. We believe that sinners are only justified in the sight of God, by the **imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ**, which is unto all and upon all them that **believe.**
6. We believe all those who **were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world are, in time, effectually called, regenerated, converted, and sanctified**; and are **kept, by the power of God,** through faith, unto salvation.
7. We believe there is one **mediator between God and man,** the man Jesus Christ, who, by the satisfaction which He made to law and justice, “in becoming an offering for

sin,” hath, by His most precious blood, **redeemed** the **elect** from under the curse of the law, that they might be holy and without blame before Him in love.

8. We believe good works are the fruits of faith, and follow **after justification**, are evidences of a gracious state, and that it is the duty of all believers to perform them from a principle of love.
9. We believe in the resurrection of the dead, and a general judgment, and that the happiness of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked will be eternal.

[See Appendix B, page 88 for J.M. Pendleton’s description of the preaching of Baptists in his youth.]

Any fair-minded Baptist believer today found in one of the various Missionary Conventions cannot help but know that his lone voice is never heard. Only the leaders, the “wise and prudent,” have a say in the affairs of the Mission system. Today, committees of all kinds are created to give a “face” of legitimacy to the actions of the Convention, but those actions are already determined, and the committees rubber-stamp them. Let one “*buck*” that system and he is out of there forthwith!

While much is herein said relative to the Mission System, because by its development the original Baptists could no longer tolerate the apostasy, much of the same can be said of the “chains of corresponding associations” in those that are **not** in mission societies. Old School and Primitive Baptists have some of the same machinations wherever they have “esteemed elders” that are “wise and prudent” (sneaky and power-hungry). The ability of these leaders to hold their ministers in subjection

through fear is because every one of them knows what could be done to them and/or their church if they ceased to be submissive. The greatest outcome of this fear is the readiness to tone down the doctrines and preach generic sermons. One would expect that in time the truth would be lost to most following such a course. That, to this writer, is a serious thought.

The government of the “baptized churches of Christ” must be directed by Christ, through His eternal Spirit, is almost self-evident. Where the corresponding orders usurp authority over Christ’s body, decline and disorder follow. Wherever their power is diminished, independent churches seem to be unable to keep their own house in order. Carelessness in a commitment to the Scripture as the “**only rule of faith and practice**” is disastrous to the steadfastness to the New Testament pattern given by Christ and His apostles. Only God can bring about a true *reform*. No enlightened believer can doubt that a reform is badly needed. Much less T.V. watching, and much more study in the Scriptures could go a long way in aiding such a revival.

## **PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE** *“churches of Jesus Christ”*

***“Let all things be done decently and in order”*** (I Cor. 14:40).

The first thing we wish to note under this heading is that we refer to that group of the “*baptized Churches of Christ*” of the

Predestinarian faith and Old School orders that are independent of the corresponding associations. They have a freedom to speak their minds as the Spirit gives them utterance, a freedom to go anywhere the Spirit leads them without the fear or favor of man, and a freeness to live according the order of the gospel as close as they are given to understand it.

When our Lord first began His ministry, we find Him often in the *synagogues* teaching “as was His custom” (Matthew 12:9; and 13: 54). He was often found in the temple as well. There are two words that the Holy Spirit left to the Lord Jesus to introduce to His people. One was the word “*born again,*” or “*born from above.*” God’s people throughout all ages had the experience of a new birth, but it went unnamed until our Lord introduced it to Nicodemus. The other was the word “*ekklesia*” in the Greek language, which the King James translators rendered “Church.” “*Upon this rock I will build my **Church** (ekklesia, or ecclesia)*” (Matthew 16:18). Why might the Lord **change** the Hebrew word for an **assemblage** and **place** of divine worship from the customary usage of the Jews, *synagogue*, to the Greek word for “**assemblage**” (*ekklesia*) only? We wish particularly for the reader to note this answer, for it has great bearing upon our topic. The answer to this question will involve a definition of the Church unknown by modern religious enterprises, primarily because it destroys the power of priestcraft over the Lord’s Church and congregations. Because it is so unique, it is difficult to explain to others. It is better understood seen and felt than told.

The Lord used the Greek word rather than the Hebrew word. We offer a possible explanation that the Hebrew word did not adequately express the concept He would convey than the Hebrew word “synagogue.” The Hebrew word means *both* the **assemblage** of people as well as the **place** of that assemblage. The Greek word does not express the **place** of the assemblage, but the **assemblage only**. Not only is this so, it is even more restrictive than that. Immediately one ought to see what is wrong with the modern concept of the “church.” How often do they call the place or building in which people meet to worship, the “Church.” In no wise is the Greek “ekklesia” a Church **building**! If speaking of the place of worship, one should use the word “synagogue” or, as our forefathers, the “Meeting House.” We said the word “ekklesia” was even more restrictive than an assemblage of people. Why? because the ancient ekklesia of a Greek city-state was their **ruling body**! All Greeks were not citizens. All Greeks in a city-state were not citizens. All citizens were not members of the “ekklesia,” or “church.” The “ekklesia,” or “church” were people chosen or appointed from among that limited number of “citizens” to govern the body-politic. By now one may begin to grasp the concept we are presenting. Of the *congregation* God brings together regularly to worship Him in a given place and time, He “*adds to the church daily such as should be saved.*” They are found in the *congregation* first, and some of that congregation is added to the *church* to preserve the doctrine, faith, order, and commandments given to the church. This “church” has no divine commandment or authority to modify, invent new

practices, doctrines, or policies. It already has all the statutes of God's kingdom in its Code (the New Testament as canonized) by which it is to govern God's kingdom on earth.

To summarize: God's people are collected together by the Holy Spirit through grace and providence into one place, in a *congregation*, to worship Him and keep up the gospel of free grace until He shall come again. Out of this congregation, the Lord selects *some* to add to the **Church** by baptism. The *Church* is an assembly of *baptized believers* who are gathered together to maintain the true worship of God in a given locality. Therefore, there is an interstitial relationship between the congregation and its church in such a manner that one cannot exit without the other. The congregation has its ruling assembly (the Church), and the ruling assembly has its constitute body-politic (the congregation). If one ceases to exist, there is no further utility for the other's continued existence.

The *ekklesia* (Church) and its *congregation* were set up by Christ while here on earth during His first advent. The two combined, is the Kingdom Of God prophesied by Daniel that the Messiah would set up and its dominion would "never end." It was to be given to the "Saints of the Most High God," and these Saints are such by effectual calling. All such that meet together by God's grace and providence in one place, being born of the Spirit of God, are the "household" servants of the "King of Zion." Each Church and congregation stands alone as a "City" of God, and each such Church and Congregation following the same understanding of the doctrines, rules, and order are to keep up a lively communion one with the other, yet

respecting the internal affairs of each one separately. [See London Confession, Articles XXXV through XLVI, pages 56 – 59].

Everyone in the congregation is not a “leader.” All are not qualified to serve on the ekklesia (Church). God alone can qualify them, and God alone can *legitimately* add them to the Church. Hence, true Churches do not give “altar calls,” “appeals in solicitation for members,” “invitations for membership,” or “offers of salvation nor for membership” on the “ekklesia” or Church. **MEMBERSHIP IS NOT AN HONORARY POSITION. It has its own function, and every member is bound to know the limitation and duties that are required to preserve the gospel of Christ and feed and serve its God-assigned congregation. The congregation also has its roles to support its Church in every way Scriptural and provide for the general welfare of all members of the Church, the congregation, and believers within their community. By God’s appointment, He has assigned their habitation, to the end that all things work together to the glory of God and the benefit of the whole body of Christ.**

There are multiple ways to classify the New Testament Church. It is rightly called a “*theocracy*”, because it is set up by Christ, governed by Christ via the New Testament scriptures, and by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and it is perpetuated by the Spirit adding to it members thereof from the Congregation. Nothing is left to the carnal wisdom of the flesh. The *congregation* does not select its members, but God in His

divine providence and graces delivers whomsoever He pleases to find comfort in that specific congregation. The members of the congregation do not elect, select, nor appoint the members of the church. God Himself impresses upon the minds and hearts of some in the congregation to follow Him in obedience and baptism, and impresses the Church to receive such that He has qualified for baptism, and reject those that are not. Rejection from membership *in the Church* is in no wise to be interpreted as rejection *from His congregation*. The Church's members conduct all the Church's affairs by unanimous consent. In this way, the Church receives all its members, and can reject baptized individuals they perceive are not qualified for membership. The fact that it is somewhat self-perpetuating makes it an "*oligarchy*." The voting by unanimous consent is a "*democratic*" rule. They can also exclude members that walk contrary to the principles of righteous conduct as set forth in the scriptures. In all this, the Church is always *to do things decently and in order* according to the Golden Rule to "*do unto others as you would have them do unto you*." The Church is never to do anything before its time, *i.e.*, "*Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart: and then shall every man have praise of God*" (1 Corinthians 4:5). Attempting to enter into judgment of matters the Church is not faced with stirs up more strife than it placates.

Another aspect of the "baptized Church of Christ" is the relationship between ordained ministers and the Church and



congregation. In America, a Church perceives that one of its members has a call to the ministry, and is qualified for the office according to the instructions found for bishops in Timothy and Titus. The Church asked qualified ordained ministers of the gospel to examine the man and if found suitable, to ordain him by the laying on of the hands of a *presbytery*. (A “presbytery” is an official council of ordained ministers). The presbytery examines the brother, and if nothing is contrary to the *written qualifications* given by the Holy Ghost, ordains him. He is **thereby fully authorized to go wherever God in His Providence directs him, and preach the gospel, and administer all ordinances of that gospel. He is ALWAYS subject to his Church for his doctrine and conduct. They can, if he is found heterodox in doctrine, or unchristian-like in deportment “seat” him (refuse to allow him to preach until satisfaction is made), make void his credentials, or if unrepentant, exclude him. If excluded, he is no longer a minister of the gospel, and all pretended functions of the gospel that he performs is null and void for every other gospel Church. As a minister of God to the Church, He is accountable to His God as to whom, where, and what Biblical activities he is directed to perform.** He is not a free-lance, fly-by-night preacher. He can go forth and serve as many other churches as he feels called to. If he presents a problem, any such church has recourse to approach his membership church for redress, and His church is required to judge the issue(s) between him and the church offended. But in all cases, both he and the churches must follow the Scriptural

order found in Matthew 18 given by our Lord and Head of the Church. No *individual* may rebuke an elder, and any elder needing rebuke is to be rebuked *in public*. “*Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him as a father, and the younger men as brethren*” (I Timothy 1:1). And, “*Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin rebuke before **all**, that others also may fear*” (I Timothy 5:17). It seems needless to add, but expedient, that elders have a charge to “**rebuke with all longsuffering and gentleness,**” and in their fulfilling this charge, no *member* of the Church has gospel right to become offended for having to suffer such rebuke. “*These things speak, and exhort, **and rebuke with all authority***” (Titus 2:15.) Such an aggrieved individual is out of gospel order. The Church may hear his case, but if he is indeed guilty of an offense that needed rebuking, the Church is to deal with him, and not with the elder.

To be very specific: He can go forth and preach the gospel wherever God opens a door of utterance. If such labor produces a believer desiring to be baptized, and ***he*** determines that individual is qualified for membership in an orderly gospel Church, he has full authority to baptize the believer, whether there is a church near him or not. He is not compelled to drag the individual back to his church in order to receive permission to baptize him. He already has that authority by virtue of his ordination. If sufficient numbers of such baptized believers are collected together, and desire to maintain the worship of God in their community, he is fully authorized to pronounce them to be “a Church.” If, as a Church, they desire fellowship with other

churches of like faith, they may ask for a presbytery from such churches, if such think it needful, to examine them in their faith and practice, and make recommendation to the churches at large. However, this is **NOT necessary** to be a church, and some fellowships require no more. This falls under the term “customary,” and not found in the New Testament. It can, however, be a case of doing things “*decently and in order.*”

We have labored to show the relationship between “members” of the ekklesia, or **Church**, and members of its **congregation**. They do go together interstitially. However, we do not wish to be unclear in one major point: The New Testament charge, given to the apostles, and carried on by ministers of the gospel throughout all ages, is to “***Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.***” (Matthew 28:19-20). No one can deny that one of these “all things” is to baptize these believers. That, however, requires the *permission* of the “believer.” They are not to be coerced, tricked, and otherwise gouged into doing what is commanded of them. They are not to be discouraged from following the Lord’s commandment either. One cannot read the New Testament and fail to see, time after time, that an immediate response to the gospel was a desire to be baptized by the believer. “*Then they that gladly received his word were baptized*” (Acts 2:41). “*But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the*

*name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.*” (Acts 8:12). “*And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?*” (Acts 8:36). Relative to Paul being led blind to Ananias, “*And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.*” (Acts 9:18). “*Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*” (Acts 10:47). “*And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.*” (Acts 16:15). Or the jailer, “*And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and his, straightway.*” (Acts 16:33). “*And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.*” (Acts 18:8). And we could go on and on. This is sufficient to the point. Believers are command to be baptized. While baptism is not the “door of the Church,” it is necessary in the transition from the congregation into the Church. We are aware that many a poor believer has difficulty determining in themselves what their own status is: “am I His or am I not?” Nevertheless, if they do “gladly receive” the word of the Gospel, they ought to give earnest heed to whether they are in obedience, or disobedience, to the command of our precious Lord.

Again, I must also stress that the *congregation* is a vital part of the Church's life and faith. Believers in the congregation are as much an encouragement to the Church as the members of the Church. The Church suffers the loss of members of the congregation as much as that of a member of the Church, and absenteeism in the congregation is as hurtful to the Church as in its own membership. It is true, the Church may have rules for the attendance of its members, but they have no say over the same in the congregation. It has been this writer's experience that the members in both, are faithful in letting each other know if there is an occasion when one is to be absent. Oftentimes, members in a congregation see things needful or beneficial, and suggest to members of the church what they have in mind. The Church can act upon these suggestions or forebear. The communication between them is one of mutual relationship and fellowship. We have seen no less love and affection among them both. It is true of both, that "*by this shall all men know you are My disciples, if you have love one for the other.*"

### **THE ORDINANCES OF A GOSPEL CHURCH**

An *ordinance* is a divine *arrangement* or *institution* (Greek: *diatage*) This writer is one of a very few people that believe one should follow what the Holy Spirit has instituted in His Church. That means that he believes there are ***four*** ordinances, rather than just two as held to by modern Baptists. They agree that **baptism** and the **Lord's Supper** are ordinances. Some of them say that for it to be an *ordinance* that it must show forth the death, burial and resurrection of the Lord. They say this, but

the Bible does not, nor will I. The additional two are: **washing the saints' feet** and the **feast of charity**. Since there is so little presented to the public on the feast of charity, or the *agape feast*, we shall cover it first in order. Consider, however, that baptism should be the first respectively of the four.

**The Feast of Charity.** One real sad result of the negligence on this ordinance is the lack of sacred respect it is given. Such disrespect is as ancient as the ordinance itself, for such drew down upon the Corinthian Church Paul's harshest rebuke (I Corinthians 11: 20 and 11:33). But merely because it is so easily abused does not in the least deny its ordination by God to His church. It was as naturally observed by baptized believers as being baptized was by believers in the New Testament Church age. It is presented as an "*immediate response*" to their believing and being baptized. Notice this immediacy: "*Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers*" (Acts 2:41-42) In verse 46-47, we read: "*And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart,*" praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." Don't you know those blissful days were halcyon days indeed for young believers! No wonder these feast were known as *agape*, or love feasts, or "feasts of charity." How their hearts must have burned with love toward God and love toward His

redeemed people! But my point is this: It appears rather undeniable that this feasting together of God's people was *immediate upon their believing and being baptized.*

## **DOING ALL THINGS IN DECENCY AND IN ORDER**

The phrase "*decency and in order*" is rather vague. There is no specificity given to explain just how to do that. While Paul was with the Churches, they could ask him. But after the apostles were gone, they were "so to speak as a "man," on their own. Paul wrote to one Church on this topic saying, "*Wherefore, my beloved, as ye **have always obeyed**, not in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, **work out your own salvation with fear and trembling**, for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of **His good pleasure***" (Philippians 2:12-13). Thus, trusting in God, there is a great leeway given for Churches to work out problems in doing all "things in decency and in order." Sometimes those coming to the Church from other denominations of institutionalized religions see no utility in many of the customs the Church has maintained in common among themselves. All of these customs, in general, were developed to care for business in a way that promoted "decency and order." Disrupting these can often promote disorder, and may even set

loose the carnality of men to do things in violation of this injunction. Therefore both members of the Church and congregation (which is being taught, or “discipled”) could profit by understanding why some of these customs developed, and what their purposes are.

How shall holy men and women conduct themselves in decency? They are believers. They love decency, and would be embarrassed if found indecent. For a starter, should all men pray or preach simultaneously as in some religious bodies around us? Or one by one so that the body might be edified, and people hard of hearing may understand, and visitors not think the Church and congregation had gone mad? Some “baptized Churches of Jesus Christ” have a rule that they each speak by turn, and only after recognition by the moderator. Some limit the number of times one might speak on a given subject lest one overbearing or fervent individual push his agenda over the common agreement of the body. That is, *in decency and in order*. Most have a rule or practice that when one is speaking he is to address the moderator (who is representing the Church as a whole) rather than an individual. Why? Lest his remarks be construed personally and offend another. In this rule, they not only behave **decently** but also in an **orderly** manner.

Most Churches keep up a history and a list of those that are baptized among them. This is not provided for in the New Testament, other than by inference from the Book Of Acts of the Apostles, which can be considered a *history*. First, IT IS NOT MANDATORY to have a written history. It is left up to



the Church if they wish to or not, and some do not. Throughout history, perhaps more have not than have. But for those that do, they select someone to guide the conference. He is the **moderator**. The term indicates that this is not a religious, or Church, function. There are no “moderators” or “clerks” found in the New Testament, although brethren associated with the apostles often wrote the epistles as they dictated them to the Churches. The one recording the deliberation of the Church is most often called “the **clerk**.” Sometimes, however, some refer to him as the “Recording Secretary.”

Now, we grant that these things are *extra-biblical*, but they are *customs* developed to make sure “*all things are done in decency and in order.*” Hence, the New Testament provides for them indirectly. Each Church is **at liberty** to do “*all things*” in their own way so long as the means and end is to make sure they are done in “*decency and in order.*” So there are some things Churches do out of custom that are not provided for by direct commandment in the New Testament. May I compile a list for you? Here is one such list:

Is there any evidence of a “membership” Church in the New Testament? We can’t seem to find one, but it is the custom of most Churches to have one. However, one that the writer serves does not.

Is there any evidence of a Church voting to allow a minister to baptize a believer? Again, we can’t find one, but it is a widespread practice.

Is there any evidence that the early Church wrote letters of recommendation of believers to other Churches? We think so.

*“Do we begin again to command ourselves? Or from you?”* (II Corinthians 3:1). It seems rather certain that the practice was in the early Church, yet Paul did not need such. Hence, some Churches today, including some in Mississippi do not give such. These things are a matter of custom, but they are in the parameters of doing things in decency and in order.

Do the Churches in the New Testament record their history? Paul had scribes that did so, but did the Churches? Most probably did not, but some Churches did, for the King James translators translated the letter of the Church of Smyrna and that of the Church of Ephesus.

Do we have an example of a Church having a song service prior to their worship service? No. In fact, singing was first developed by the Roman, or Western Catholics; and later on by the Lutherans. However, Eastern Catholics to this day do not sing in their worship service. Singing in Baptists Churches date from the late eighteenth century. Singing, then, is a matter of custom.

Do we find an example of Churches in the apostolic age having their own meeting-houses? Again, we can't find such an example. However, at first, Baptists rented houses to meet in, and later bought or built their own. This too, is a matter of custom. Is there any evidence the New Testament Churches had cemeteries? No, and for over a thousand years the Catholic authorities would not allow such for “dissidents”, nor would they allow them to be buried in theirs! That is the reason for so many “family cemeteries” in Frontier America.

In having “conferences,” or “business meetings,” we do have **one** example in the Jerusalem council that met to consider the rules under which Gentile believers were bound. But to have conferences, how are these to be conducted? Answer: “*in decency and in order.*” Each Church is free to conduct their business as they please, but it has been considered well to stay pretty close to the practice of sister Churches of their fellowship. We present one such form used among *some* of our Churches.

“After divine service by elder \_\_\_\_\_, by motion and second the Church went into conference.

First, called for the peace of the Church. . .” Why this? To guard against doing something when the church is not in a peaceful state. To do so is highly dangerous, if it is assumed the Holy Spirit has removed His manifest presence from the Church at that time and place. Once the Church answers in peace, they continue: “the Church answered in peace.”

Second, the moderator called for brethren and sisters of like faith and order to be seated with us.” “Seated with us”? What is this? It is based upon our ***definition of the Church.*** A Church is a “called out assembly of baptized believers gathered together in one place to worship God.” There might very well be, and often are, baptized believers from other localities present. ALL baptized believers gathered together in one place make up “The Church.” By this phrase, the Church is recognizing the addition of these visiting baptized members of the body of Christ as one with themselves. This is based upon the concept of a unity, or union, of gospel churches in God’s Kingdom. One may ask,

“Can they then vote in the conference.” The answer is, “Yes, upon leave of the Church previous to their being seated.” Some Churches ask for “reference left over from previous conference” *before* seating visiting baptized believers upon the basis that these visitors would not know of the business then under consideration. Churches that do this, allow the visitors to give “advice and counsel”, with the understanding they are free to take their advice or reject it.

“Thirdly, the moderator calls for general business.” This is self-explanatory. “Fourthly, the moderator extended the privilege of the church for membership in our way of receiving them.” This is an extending of the privilege of the Church, or ekklesia” to members of the congregation. “In our way of receiving them,” translate into “by baptism,” or if baptized, by a personal relating of the hope of eternal salvation, and the Lord’s gracious dealings with them. [It is well to note here: In one Church Ledger in Mississippi, a sister from another Primitive Baptist church asked to join the Church. After relating her experience of grace, the Church received her. The next meeting day, another sister from the same Primitive Baptist Church also asked for membership. Upon relating her experience of grace, the records of the Church reads: “Not being satisfied with her relation, the Church rejected her”. This is the **right of every individual Church, regardless of one’s standing in another Church.**] In some Churches, this is done on a quarterly basis to prevent sudden emotional outburst leading to a carnal decision to “join the Church.” In these baptized Churches of Christ, no one attempts to get individuals

to join the Church. That is left solely up to the individual and his God and “at His appointed time.” Other Churches extend this privilege at each monthly conference, but this without any appeals or so-called “gospel offers” accompanying the privilege extended. Since this is a natural history of the Church, and **not a part of divine worship**, the Church reviews the events of the day, and instructs the clerk after any corrections, to place them, as corrected, in the Church’s ledger. Then the conference is adjourned “in peace and in order.”

### **The government, or constitution, of the baptized Churches of Christ:**

We might insert here a biblical principle. The government of the Church is “**congregational**.” That is, the “*Church*” determines what will or will not be done, and this is done by “unanimous consent,” and must have the Scriptures for the basis of their deliberation. These Churches **do not** go by “majority rule,” or *Robert’s Parliamentary Rules of Order*, as worldly societies do. The elder, or as this office is called in its business session, the Moderator, does not rule the Church. In fact, in most of their written decorum, the Moderator is not allowed to address the subject under discussion unless he is called upon by the Church to give his advice. Still, the Church is not under any obligation to “take his advice.” Some Churches even require that the Moderator vacate the office, appoint another Moderator *pro tempore*, before he can participate in the discussion, and only then if his membership is in that given

Church. Remember, we are discussing “**customs**” developed to do all things in “*decency and in order.*”

The Church is not considered a “democracy,” but a “theocracy,” and the view is that every member’s conscience is a veto. If a member votes in the negative, the Church “tables” the item under discussion, and the individual that “tabled it” is expected to bring it forward if he ever agrees with the rest of the Church. Otherwise, it stays “tabled.” Very little business is so pressing that it can’t wait, rather than divide the sentiments of the Church and Congregation. The **government** of Christ’s Church is referred to as their “**Order.**”

The word “order” has multiple meanings, and therefore needs to be better identified. When the Catholic Church, which is an “umbrella” of various “orders,” combined together under one episcopal head – a pope or patriarch, or even a king – the word describes a separate but integral organization in that religious institution. The word “order” very often has reference to a group of churches and/or associations under the rule of a minister, or a presbytery of ministers (elders, deacons, delegates), as in “our order or affiliation of churches.” Many Old School and Primitive Baptists use the word in this sense. As used in **this book**, by **this** author, the word “order” refers to “***The Rule of The Gospel, or government of the church(es),*** - hence: “gospel order.”

**Gospel Order:** Christ is the Head of His body, the Church. As such, He is called “King in Zion.” A **king** must have a **kingdom**, and Christ’s kingdom includes: His church, the congregation of born-again believers, and such as live too

distant to assemble together with others. **Citizens** of a kingdom are known as “**subjects**,” and are in *subjection* to their king. In such a kingdom, the King is the chief executor of His kingdom. As such, Christ **rules by His Spirit** over His vast domain. Because Christ is an Absolute Monarch, His kingdom does **not** have a legislative branch. The legislative power is embodied in the Scriptures under the authority of Christ and His apostles. The expressed rule of the whole “Baptist” order of churches is: “*We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is the inspired word of God and the **only rule of faith and practice**. It is very shamefully noted that those in gospel disorder do not take this rule seriously. **Disorder** refers to any deviation from the rules established in the Scriptures for the churches and believers to obey. Such can be equally applied to an individual as to a Church. For instance, it is the rule of the gospel given by Paul, that he received from Christ, that a “wife not depart from her husband.” That is a **gospel rule** the believer and Church is under. Yet, if she does depart, “*let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband*” (I Corinthians 7:11.) No other alternative is provided. For a husband, “Let not the husband put away his wife.” Again, no other provision is given. With all kinds of reasoning available by the carnal mind, the Church and the believer is under the clear instruction of the gospel government of the King of Zion. He has spoken; it is recorded; it is understandable as written. The proper place for a *believer* in such a case is to remain in the *congregation* in subjection to *the order of the gospel*. *Certainly they should not disturb the Church over their own state*, which is contrary to the gospel*

order given by Christ and the apostle. The Church has *no authority* to re-write the Scriptures. Another example is useful also: First, “*Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?*” (I Cor. 6:1). If a member of the Church does so, *he* is in **disorder**. If the Church allows it, *the Church* is in **disorder**. So, what is one to do? Follow the governing rule of the King of Zion: “*If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are the least esteemed in the Church.*” (verse 4). [And what shall we write pertaining to the awful rebellious practice of associations taking churches to courts to have the courts determine *who is the Church*, or to steal the Church’s property? What is written above is written! It is one of the worst **disorders** known in the gospel kingdom!] This is what “gospel order” means; doing things according to the instructions given by the King of Saints without subterfuge, deceit, cunningness, guile, or carnal reasoning. The Scripture is the Law Code of the Kingdom of God on earth. It is to be taken seriously, and followed carefully. This, within itself, requires the *members of the church* to be quite studious of even small details of the written word of God. Again, membership in a gospel church is not an honorary position. It carries grave duties that, if not followed, allow the Church to leave the principles of Christ her King, and eventually depart totally from the “*faith once delivered to the saints.*” There are multitudes of examples of this occurrence ever around us. Every member can cite an example of it by casual observation. If the “*least esteemed*” in the Church are to be given judgment of things



pertaining to “*the smallest matters*” (I Cor. 6:2); that of “*things that pertain to this life,*” then it is obvious that even the very least esteemed member must be an *informed member* in the rules of gospel order.

In this Kingdom, there is very little “business” that needs attending. Christ is the Head of the Church; the Spirit works in the members both to will and to do of His own good pleasure; the executive branch is thereby covered; the rules of the gospel are set in a fixed fiat; and judgment is prescribed according to the rules given therein. The Church has **no authority to go outside of the government of Christ for helps, inventions, and novelties. God has provided all things needful for His people to know and to do.**

A somewhat uniqueness of the baptized churches of Christ is their views relative to a money-based religious enterprise. They are against it. They have no collection plates to pass among the congregation; do not preach “tithing,” and conscriptions, nor allow auxiliary societies to make merchandise of the Church and congregation. Andrew Fuller’s sorry practice of going to William Huntington’s Chapel, and others, to collect money for missions from Huntington’s listeners as they exited the Chapel would not fair very well among them! Each Church and congregation is expected to, by **voluntary gifts**, to support their ministry. If one does not, the business is the Lord’s, not the minister or the Church. And the Lord can take care of His own. As the ministers travel, the New Testament practice prevails: the congregation and Church *to whom* he ministers, through private gifts, carries him onward to

other places of his service. As Paul wrote to one church: “*But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come to you: for I trust to see you [the Roman church] in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company*” (Romans 15:24). The New Testament is clear that the laborer is worthy of his heir, and the oxen his master’s crib. But to make the Church and congregation a house of merchandise, or worse, a “den of thieves,” they are unwilling to do.

Having said all this, there are some minor areas that require a Church to do things in order to fulfill these *given fundamentals*. We will continue these under the topic of “**customs,**” or things “**customary.**”

Some “**customs**” developed out of the frontier experience of believers. As the settlers moved westward, they had a craze for writing “charters.” Wagon-train charters, town charters, township charters, business charters, church charters, etc. were written everywhere a wagon train settled. Almost all “baptized Churches of Christ” followed about the same pattern. They first wrote a “constitution.” Then, due to the diversity of people called “Baptists” they felt it necessary to express their peculiar beliefs in an abstract of principles, or Articles of Faith. They most often had a set of rules to guide their business deliberations. These are stated as “Rules of Decorum.” “Decorum” is another way of saying: “doing our business in decency and in order.” None of these are Biblical. None are

necessary, *per se*, but they are still in existence whether written or unwritten.

For instance: Great Britain is a “constitutional monarchy,” even though it has no “*written*” constitution as the United States. Its constitution is by “precedents” in English Common Law. So too, whether it is written or not, the customary way reaching a commonality for unity is a “constitution.” Any time a preacher says, “I believe this Bible is true,” he just stated his article of faith on that topic. If a member says that: “We believe sinners are saved by the sacrifice of Christ,” that member has stated an article of his faith. So while Articles of Faith are unnecessary to be *written* down, they are, in fact, indispensable for a Church to have a **peaceful union of diverse members**. So too, for such Churches as the one this writer is in, the business is conducted without a set of Rules of Decorum written down. (They were burned in a fire many years ago.) However, the peaceful way in which the Church has accepted the conduct of business is an **unwritten** “decorum.”

Rejecting something merely because it is “*customary*,” or because it is “*written down*” is a poor (and perhaps ignorant), and can be, a dangerous reason. Why should a Church and congregation *reinvent* the “wheel” every time they meet together, and do things totally different each time they meet, when through years of orderly conduct the Church has peacefully, decently, and orderly, resolved how *they* are pleased to conduct themselves, and what *they* are satisfied with as the “doctrine of Christ.” All that is required is that they do

not step outside of the commandments of God, or contrary to the examples given in the government of Christ's Church.

To answer a question put to us as to whence we came, and how we developed, we are baptized Churches of Christ holding to the "old school" of divinity that *existed prior* to Andrew Fuller's New Divinity (1782) and the development of the New School, or Missionary Baptist movement that commenced in **1813** in America. We still hold to the doctrines our forefathers stated in the London Confession of Faith of 1647 [See Appendix A, page65] and 1689, which are predestinarian, or free grace, or "Calvinistic." Hence, we are rightly called "Predestinarians" when considered by our **doctrinal** basis. Since our Churches predate the Missionary Baptists, we are rightly called "*Primitive.*" Insofar as we baptized believers by immersion, we are also rightly called "*Baptists.*" In that we rebaptize individuals that were immersed, sprinkled, or poured (affusion) by religious or other societies that do not have the gospel of the grace of God, and hence do not have gospel ordinances, we are truly *Anabaptists*. We are "strict" in discipline, and believe in godly living of all our Church's members, insisting that each believer is *accountable* to God for his personal conduct (we did not say "*responsible*"), we are therefore, Cathrari, or "Puritan." Being of the persuasion that Christ died only for a particular people, we remain "*Particular Baptists.*" And, finally, insofar as we **predate** John Calvin, and believe in baptism by immersion and that all God's elect were saved by Christ, **when He died** for our sins, were baptized by immersion **with** Christ, and justified by the faith **of Christ**

which Calvin did not believe or practice, we are truthfully called “*Hypercalvinists*.”

Those of whom I have written above believed in the absolute sovereignty of God over all things, creatures, events, history and nations. One significant part of that faith is that God elected His people in Christ before He ever created anything. This is clearly taught in the Bible. (Ephesians 1:4). This being true, the actual number of the elect, therefore, is **absolutely set or fixed** and “cannot be increased or diminished.” So, each time one of them dies and goes to the “*General Assembly, the Church of the Firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect*” (Hebrews 12:23) in heaven, there is **one less on earth** to suffer the daily afflictions all are subject to in this life. Also, daily, the number of Predestinarians here on earth is **diminishing**, as the number in glory is **increasing**. Some day they **all** shall be in glory together. In the meanwhile, the *baptized Church of Christ* becomes smaller and smaller as you see it today. We are encouraged to believe that “*our salvation is nearer than when we first believed.*” Christ promised, saying, “*Fear not **little flock**, it is the Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom,*” to encourage that small number in Israel when He ascended into glory, and we here in this latter day as we find our numbers decreasing. He also promised, and we yet find it so, that “*where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.*” (Matthew 18:20). By experience, our dear friends, we find Him faithful to His word. It is **not** a cause for embarrassment to us to see the true church

in decline. It is a matter of faith and rejoicing in the faithfulness of Christ, in fulfilling His revealed and bright design in the salvation of all His elect.

Our next topic, then, will discuss the great and final apostasy of the latter day, as prophesied by Christ and the Apostles, and which has come upon us, beginning about 1800 in the Western Civilization.

## **HOW SO RAPID AN APOSTASY?**

Observing the rapidity in which the greater portion fell from the doctrines of grace and New Testament order, one must ask: “How did this come to pass so quickly?” Were they not established in the faith of God’s elect? Did they not actually believe what they had so recently written in the Articles of their Faith for all men to read and understand? Did they understand the meaning of their own hand-written declaration that “The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament is the written word of God and the **only rule of faith and practice**”? Why did they use the word “only,” unless they really meant to restrict their activities to the word of God? Their preachers almost unanimously declared the absolute sovereignty of God; the total depravity and inability of man; the unconditional election unto grace; the effectual calling to salvation by the Spirit; the substitutionary life and death of Christ for the penalty of the elects’ sins and the consequent imputation of His righteousness for their own; and the finished and accomplished salvation by Christ on the cross. Did they not often rejoice with tears

streaming down their cheeks at such glorious God-honoring doctrine? Eye-witnesses – even their enemies - have left on record that they had observed this scene often. Their enemies scoffed at their tenderness toward such *harsh doctrine!* How then shall one grasp so quickly a change in the Baptist denomination? This author has a three-fold hypothesis: (1) the time had then arrived for the fulfillment of the prophesy of the latter day apostasy. (2) They were more willing to choose their delusion than to preserve the truth they had held to so dearly. And, (3) they had gained too much confidence in the flesh – both theirs and others – that they dared to go bravely into the unknown zeal and frenzy of that age, even where angels feared to tread. We ask no one to take our analysis as the gospel truth. We will not “draw swords,” nor shed blood” with any disputant. We only offer our own private view, and hereby make it public.

First, the time had arrived, according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, to usher in the prophesied “latter days.” “. . . *There shall be false teachers*” [Recall the seminaries of learning so often read herein?] *who privily shall bring in damnable heresies* [Are not views derogatory of God’s sovereignty and free grace damnable?], *even denying the Lord that bought them*, [we will comment on this below] *and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many* [very much as a horde for numbers] *shall follow their pernicious ways* [and this they surely did]; *by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of*” [and this is for certain the result]. *And through covetousness shall they with feign words make merchandise*

*of you* [this is the most notable trait of all their so-called “good works”]: *whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not*” (II Peter 2:2-3). Read the rest of the chapter, but notice this verse in particular: “*Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness*” (verse 15) Couple this phrase with that to the angel of the church in Pergamos “*But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that **hold the doctrine of Balaam**, who taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to **commit fornication***” (Revelation 2:14, Numbers 24:14 & 25:1; 31:16) How does this fit the rise of the Modern Missionary Movement? Simply, Balaam accepted “wages” to prophecy, and the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions developed one of the world’s most highly organized systems of collecting money to hire preachers of unrighteousness! A hired ministry is a Balaam-like ministry, condemned by the New Testament.

Included in these New Testament warnings is one like to this, *i.e.*, “*Woe unto them! For they have gone in the way of Cain, and **ran greedily after the error of Balaam** for reward, and perished **in the gainsaying of Core (Korah)***”(Jude 11). Have you wondered what Core (Korah) was condemned for? It was for saying that all the children had a right to prophecy, and raised a rebellion against Moses. The earth opened up and swallowed he and his band into hell. What does this have to do with this subject? Simple! The Board did not see it necessary for a God called, qualified and sent ministry. They hired



students to “train” for the ministry in seminaries of learning, primarily because God was not calling, qualifying, and sending them out as fast and as many and to the places as the Board thought necessary. They became Corites (Korahites)! (See Numbers 16: 1-49).

We said we would comment on that phrase “*denying the Lord that bought them.*” My first remark is this, the word “Lord” in this text is not the word used for the Lord Jesus Christ, but *despotes*. Second, as it applies to this subject, how can one comprehend such elders as these: J.M. Pendleton, who preached the truth, and went blind to them, and even turned away from them? Of Reuben Ross, who for ten years preached the absolute predestination of all things, unconditional election for the elect only, and then quickly, in one sermon, overthrew all he had formerly preached? Or of Elder David Benedict, who for **fifty years** preached the truth, and then went directly, knowingly, and even admittedly against them? Of Jesse Mercer, who founded the University of his name in Macon, Georgia to **teach preachers the truth of free and sovereign grace**, and then apostatized the truth? Or of Elder James Manning, a long advocate of the truth, who took the charge of an Arminian congregation, and died in their favor? Or Elder Isaac McCoy, a free grace preacher, who sold his soul to work the wickedness of the Board and became an enemy of God’s suffering poor? Or even, alas! Andrew Fuller, a PARTICULAR Baptist minister, who introduced the Roman Catholic doctrine that the “atonement of Christ was *sufficient* for the sins of the whole world, where the gospel was preached, but *efficient* for

the elect only? Must we again rake Charles Haddon Spurgeon over the ashes for his participation in the calamity that brought the Baptists to the level of Freewillers? NO! We will spare him. He did repent, make acknowledgment, and returned to the Church before he died. That alone, is a good testimony in his favor.

Secondly, “They were willing to choose their delusion.” They testify repeatedly of their **embarrassment** of the Baptists. They wanted to be accepted with the dignity lavished upon the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, who had an “educated” and “enlightened” ministry. They were ashamed of their lowly, humble, and unassuming virtues. They, as Israel before them, said: “Give us a king, that me may be as other nations.” They, nor Israel, knew of what they were asking! They got more than they bargained for. They set out to win the world for Christ, and filled their ministries with them! They lost the gospel altogether! *“Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul **delighted in their abominations. I also will choose their delusions, and bring their fears upon them. . . .**”* (Isaiah 66:3-4). Again, *“And for this cause **God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness**”* (II Thess. 2:11-12). How serious is believing in and standing for the truth! How dangerous to play games with it!

Here is a quote from a letter of the Missionary Adoniram Judson’s wife, when she wrote back home and told her friends that she had been baptized a “BAPTIST!” “Can you, dear

*Nancy, still love me, still desire to hear from me, when I tell you I have become a Baptist?"* (Letter dated September, 1812. *Massachusetts Baptist Missionary Magazine*, n.s.111, 294). The *American Baptist Magazine* reported "Objections against joining a Baptist church presented obstacles. There are obstacles in the way of **a person of taste and refinement joining a Baptist Church.**" The writer expressed the objection, saying, "To go down into a river to be **publicly baptized** is considered by many a **mean and degrading thing** . . . It is but just to observe that the Baptists as a body **do not lay stress upon going down into a river.** In Europe they almost universally have **baptisteries** in the meeting houses . . . But this is a **mere circumstance.**" [When Speaker of the House, The Honorable Sam Rabin, was baptized by the Primitive Baptists at Killeen, Texas, Walter Cronkite reporting it on national T.V., smirked, "The Honorable Mr. Sam does not look so *honorable* dripping wet!"]

As one writer expressed his attitude: "The *defensive bravado* (of the Baptists) *is also evident in the favorite Baptist hymn* of the period sung by those who *marched to the river* to be immersed while crowds of curious Congregationalists stared at *the bizarre spectacle*. Its first verse began,

"I am not ashamed to own my Lord,  
Or to defend His cause,  
Maintain the honor of His word,  
The glory of His cross."

My point here is this: There were enough of these kinds of "Baptists" cloaked in among our people, that they were glad to

forsake their humble origins, doctrines, and joys, in the delusional dream of raising the so-called “dignity” of the Baptists to a higher social status. And while gaining “First Baptist Status,” they are not yet accepted on the par by the masses with the other clerics of “better class churches.” In return, they lost all that they formerly had, including the divine Presence in their worship. Even a hint of their written doctrinal Articles is suspect to every member of that class of “Baptists.” Under the pretense of raising money, developing methods and organizations, to preach **the gospel** to the heathen, they instead, became the heathen (doctrinally), and altogether lost **the gospel!**

Thirdly, “They had gained too much confidence in the flesh . . . both theirs and others.” For Baptists on the Frontiers of America, John Gill was the accepted “authority” on all doctrinal points. He was the humble frontier preacher’s “Theologian.” We mean no ill to John Gill in what we here write, but point out how serious it is for men to have “confidence in the flesh.” We believe that one of his views set the Baptists up for the fall! Not intentionally, but John Gill’s view that the reign of the antichrist was near at hand, set them off on a wild and mad frenzy of emotionalism and sentimentalism that catapulted the Mission system upon the world stage. Writing in 1766, Gill said:

Now this seemed to be a probably era to begin the reign of antichrist; and as this was in the year four hundred and seventy-six, if one thousand two hundred and sixty years are added thereunto, the **fall of antichrist must have happened in the**

**year one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six; (1736)** this some learned men were very confident of, especially Lloyd, bishop of Worcester, a great calculator of times, affirmed, that all the devils in hell could not support the pope of Rome, longer than one thousand seven hundred and thirty-six. But we have lived to see him mistaken; more than thirty years have since passed, yet the popish antichrist is still in his seat; though his **civil power** has been weakening, and is still weakening; so that it might be hoped, he will, ere long, come to his end.” . . . “Now if to the above date (a.d. 606) are added one thousand two hundred and sixty years, the end of antichrist’s reign will fall in the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six (1866): according to this computation, antichrist has almost an hundred years more to reign.” . . . “But now supposing these dates could be settled with any precision, as they cannot, until more light is thrown on them, which perhaps may be, when nearer their accomplishment; yet the time of the second coming, and personal appearance of Christ, **and of the millennium, or thousand years reign upon it**, cannot be known hereby; because the spiritual reign of Christ, will only take place upon the above events. . .” (John Gill, *Body of Divinity*, Book VII, page 450, Maon Jones, Printer, Ill.)

In his Commentaries, he often mentioned the “Spiritual Reign of Christ” separate and apart from His “Personal Reign.” He gave as the sign of its accomplishment as being when the pope of Rome would loose his “civil power” over the nations of Europe & the Americas. This took place with the Treaty ending our “War of **1812.**” **Notice that year!** No wonder Missionary

Baptists published a paper titled, “*The Baptist LUMINARY.*” Or Alexander Campbell’s *The Millennial Harbinger* ! The circular letters of the Baptists during these two next decades is awash with the millennial theme: Christ is on His way, and we can convert the whole world to Christianity forthwith! Baptists, filled with pride, anticipated a rapid rise in their status among men, and desired it so much as to abandon their doctrines, principles, and practices – the very things that made them “*Baptists*”!

One other illustration of this point, and we will pass on: Samuel Jones, preached the “Century Sermon” in 1807, of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. In it, he had these choice statements ready at hand for us.

*“Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitation: spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left.”*

“These are the words of the elegant and sublime Isaiah, who, on account of the clearness of the discoveries made to him of the gospel day, obtained the name of the **evangelical prophet**. Indeed in some places his predictions have the air of history, rather than a prophecy.

The passage before us refers to the implantation of the gospel among the Gentiles. It began to be accomplished in the days of the Apostles, and has been fulfilling in all age of the Christian church to this day, and will **continue so to be to the commencement of the millennium**. “Their sound,” says the Apostle, “went into all the earth, and their word unto the end of

the world.” (Romans 10:18). . . . “What shall we say of **the missionary spirit**, that has for **some years**, and more especially **of late**, prevailed in many places, and among different societies, with a view to spread the knowledge of the gospel and the way of salvation among the heathen in various parts, as well as **among Christians** in places destitute of the **means.**” (Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, 1707-1807, page 453-454.) The above sermon was preached only seven years prior to the take-over of that Association, and many others, by the New Divinity followers of Andrew Fuller’s friend and disciple, William Staughton

We conclude, that a large number of Baptists, most coming from the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Episcopal churches, being embarrassed by the humbleness of their low estate, was ready, able, and willing to discard “*the faith once delivered the saints,*” and drank in the delusion God sent upon them. We are more than **two-hundred years** since the beginning of the New Divinity School and the first Baptist missionary society, **AND THEIR MILLENIUM HAS NOT COME! Instead, we see the fulfillment of “Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come, EXCEPT THERE COME A FALLING AWAY FIRST, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.*”** In every age of the Christian dispensation, there have been more sound free grace believers, even in times of severe persecution, than we can find today. If this text, is appropriate at the time of the rise of antichrist, how much more in this latter day? In our day, we can witness some who in words can identify with the doctrines

of grace, yet for the same reason as the early Missionaries, attend Arminian services so that they may please their spouses, their children, their friends, or parents. Others may come to the knowledge of free and sovereign grace, and yet stay in Arminian groups in the vain hope of leading them out of their error. They seem not to give any thought after they “lead them out,” where they would “lead them to” since they have stayed “where they are”! Few can bring themselves to return to the pre-Fullerite Baptists and walk in the ways of their spiritual forefathers. This would cut too deeply into the flesh, and none of us are eager to lay it aside for the sake of purity in the doctrine, faith, and practice of the apostles.

Our forefathers in the faith of God’s elect believed, and recorded, that they believed the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament was the word of God. Many will yet say the same. However, they also stated that these Scriptures “**are the only rule of faith and practice.**” That is still where every “baptized church of Christ” must stand. This uniqueness is a sanctifying element to the Church, for it “separates” a Church and congregation from all other religious institutions; even more than its doctrinal foundation. There is a great number of “Calvinists” and “Hypercalvinists” that have left the modern religious institutions, call themselves “New Testament Baptists,” “Reformed Baptists,” *etc.*, but can in no wise truthfully declare that they believe the New Testament is “the only rule of faith **and practice.**” No doubt, many do in fact, and seriously, consider the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the inspired word of God and the only rule of faith. Many of them



are extremely close to the full understanding of the doctrinal basis of the true Church. It was this belief that strengthened their resolve to follow the Lord in the truth of His word, and oftentimes under severe censure by their dearest friends and/or family members. This writer has been there! But, for inexplicable reason, they just cannot bring themselves to cut loose from the false institutions and their carnal trappings under which they were reared. There can be no true “Reformed” anything, that is not actually “**re formed,**” and reformed on the inspired word of God for their faith, practice, and order. The New Testament practices, stripped of all the novelties of the Modern Missionary Movement, or “so-called benevolent societies,” are the most difficult aspects of the surrender to the absolute sovereignty of God over all things. There is always that lingering notion “*We will not have this man to **reign** (govern) over us.*”

This same carelessness, or embarrassment in being “different,” or appearing “backward,” without style, humble, or common, is the plague of all the churches of Christ in all ages. This unwillingness to “*take up thy cross and follow Me*” is the greatest impetus in the churches’ apostasy; and it is the greatest impediment to a true and full reform necessary for a “baptized Church of Christ” to return to the “*faith once delivered to the saints.*” Maybe we ought to stop singing that precious hymn our forefathers’ relished so dearly:

“I’m not ashamed to own my Lord,  
“Or to defend His cause,  
“Maintain the **honor of His word,**

“The glory of His cross” - until such time that we can bear the full weight of that cross, and return to the ancient faith, as articulated in the inspired Word of God.

There is a very simple premise upon which a true reform can be had: If Jesus said to **do it**, then, **do it!** If the New Testament said **to do it**, then **do it!** If Jesus said: “Don’t do it,” then **don’t do it**. If the New Testament says “Don’t do it.” Then again, **don’t do it**. When a Church with its congregation can walk by this rule, that Church and congregation will, if God is present in them, be a “baptized Church of Christ.” It will be predestinarian in faith, primitive in its order, New Testament in its practice, and a beauty to behold to every living child of God. Then will the called of God love to assemble together; they will delight in the word and fellowship one with another. Truly, peace like a river will flow out of Mount Zion, and then in a much more observable manner, Christ will be “King of the saints,” and they shall be subjects of the great King in His kingdom on earth. It was “*prepared for them from the foundation of the world*” (Matthew 5:3; 25:34).

## APPENDICES

We offer these historical documents, with some annotation, for your examination. We apologize for the smaller print, but some of these documents are too important to be edited, or abbreviated. However, regardless of the font size, we encourage

your examination of them, and hope you find them useful for your greater understanding of the history of the Lord's Church.

## APPENDIX A

### The London Confession of Faith of 1644

#### ANNOTATION:

We invite the reader to give attention to these dates: John Spilsbery established the first Church and congregation of “baptized Churches of Christ” holding to **particular redemption** in London in the year **1633**. Eleven years later there were seven of these Churches, and in that year, **1644**, they felt it advisable to write a Confession of their faith. Why? For all manner of slander and libelous charges were being circulated against the small band of believers. They were accused of eating their babies and drinking their blood, of damning little babies to “hell not a span long,” charging that they were “free-will” advocates, that they did not believe in original sin, that they were anti-government or seditious, that they were baptizing both men and women naked in mixed company, and anything else to make them appear exceedingly vile, odious and reprobate in character.

**No matter what we may think of creeds today, we must consider their circumstance and give room to their best**

**judgment as to how they ought to counter such wild and discrediting charges.**

In the Confession below, you will find the writers thereof both doctrinally sound, predestinarian, and well versed in the scripture of Truth. One may find both personal edification and profit in studying what these early Christians believed and propagated. May this be the reader's blessing.

**LONDON BAPTIST CONFESSION OF FAITH  
A.D. 1644**

**The  
Confession Of Faith  
Of Those Churches which are  
Commonly (though falsely)  
Called Anabaptist;**

Presented to the view of all that feare God, to examine by the touchstone of the Word of Truth: As likewise for the taking off those aspersions which are frequently both in Pulpit and Print, (although unjustly) cast upon them.

*“We can not but speake the things which wee have seene and heard.”*  
Acts 4:20.

*“To the Law and to the testimony, if they speake not according to this Rule, it is because there is no light in them.”* Isaiah 8:20.

*“But wee had the sentence of death in ourselves, that wee should not trust in ourselves, but in the living God which raiseth the dead; who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver, in whom wee trust that He will yet deliver.”* 2 Corinthians 1: 9,10.

## LONDON

Printed by *Matthew Simmons* in *Aldersgate-street*.

1644

### TO All That Desire

The lifting up of the Name of the Lord Jesus in sincerity, the poor despised Churches of God in *London* send greeting, with prayers for their farther increase in the knowledge of JESUS CHRIST.

We question not but that it will seem strange to many men, that such as we are frequently termed to be, lying under that calumny and black brand of Heretics, and sowers of division as we do, should presume to appear so publicly as now we have done: But yet notwithstanding we may well say, to give answer to such, what David said to his brother, when the Lord's battle was a fighting, 1 Samuel 29:30. "Is there not a cause?"

Surely, if ever people had cause to speak for the vindication of the Truth of Christ in their hands, we have, that being indeed the main wheel at this time that sets us a work; for had anything by men been transacted against our persons only, we could quietly have sitten (sic) still, and committed our Cause to Him who is a righteous Judge, who will in the Great Day judge the secrets of all men's hearts by Jesus Christ: But being it is not only us, but the Truth professed by us, we cannot, we dare not but speak; it is no strange thing to any observing man, what sad

charges are laid, not only by the world, that know not God, but also by those that think themselves much wronged, if they be not looked upon as the chief Worthies of the Church of God, and Watchmen of the City: but it hath fared with us from them, as from the poor Spouse seeking her Beloved, (Song of Solomon 5:6,7). They finding us out of that common roadway themselves walk, have smote us and taken away our veil, that so we may by them be recommended odious in the eyes of all that behold us, and in the hearts of all that think upon us, which they have done both in Pulpit and Print, charging us with holding Free-will, Falling away from grace, denying Original sin, disclaiming of Magistracy, denying to assist them either in persons or purse in any of their lawful Commands, doing acts unseemly in the dispensing the Ordinance of Baptism, not to be named amongst Christians: All which Charges we disclaim as notoriously untrue, though by reason of these calumnies cast upon us, many that fear God are discouraged and forestalled in harboring a good thought, either of us or what we profess; and many that know not God encouraged, if they can find the place of our meeting, to get together in Clusters to stone us, as looking upon us as a people holding such things, as that we are not worthy to live: We have therefore for the **clearing of the Truth we profess**, that it may be at liberty, though we be in bonds, briefly published a Confession of our Faith, as desiring all that fear God, seriously to consider whether (if they compare what we here say and confess in the presence of the Lord Jesus and His saints) men have not with their tongues in Pulpit, and pens in Print, both spoken and written things that are contrary to Truth; but we know our God **in His own time will clear our Cause**, and lift up His Son to make Him the Chief Cornerstone, though He has been (or now should be) rejected of Master Builders. And because it may be conceived, that what is here published, may be but the judgment of some one Particular Congregation, more refined than the rest; We do therefore here subscribe it, some of each body in the name, and by the appointment of **seven Congregations**, who though we be distinct in respect of our particular

bodies, for convenience sake, being as many as can well meet together in one place, yet are all in Communion, holding Jesus Christ to be our Head and Lord; under whose government we desire alone to walk, in following the Lamb wheresoever He goeth; and we believe the Lord will daily cause Truth more to appear in the hearts of His saints, and make them ashamed of their folly in the land of their Nativity, that so they may with one shoulder, more study to lift up the Name of the Lord Jesus, and stand for His appointments and laws; which is the desires and prayers of the condemned Churches of Christ in London for all saints.

Subscribed in the names of seven Churches in London.

*William Kiffin  
Spilsbery*

*George Tipping  
Thomas Skippard  
Thomas Munday*

*John Mabbatt*

*John Webb*

*Paul Hobson*

*Thomas Goare*

*Edward Heath*

*Thomas Patience*

*John*

*Samuel Richardson*

*Thomas Gunne*

*Thomas Killcop*

*Joseph Phelpes*

### **Article I**

That God as He is in Himself, cannot be comprehended of any but Himself, 1. dwelling in that inaccessible light, that no eye can attain unto, whom never man saw, nor can see; that there is but 2. one God, one Christ, one Spirit, one Faith, one Baptism; 3. one Rule of holiness and obedience for all Saints, at all times, in all places to be observed.

## Article II.

That God is 4 of Himself, that is, neither from another, nor of another, nor by another, nor of another: 5 but is a Spirit, who as His being is of Himself, so He gives being, moving, and preservation to all other things, being in Himself eternal, most holy, every way infinite in 7 greatness, wisdom, power, justice, goodness, truth, *etc.* In this Godhead, there is the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; being every one of them one and the same God; and therefore not divided, but distinguished one from another by their several properties; the 8 Father being from Himself, the 9 Son of the Father from everlasting, the holy 10 Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.

## Article III.

That God hath 11 **decreed in Himself from everlasting touching ALL THINGS**, effectually to work and dispose them 12 according to the counsel of His own will, to the glory of His Name; in which decree appeareth His wisdom, constancy, truth, and faithfulness; 13 Wisdom to that whereby He contrives all things; 14 Constance is that whereby the decree of God remains always immutable; 15 Truth is that whereby He declares that alone which He hath decreed, and though His saying may seem to sound sometimes another thing, yet the sense of them doth always agree with the decree; 16 Faithfulness is that whereby He effects that He hath decreed, as He hath decreed. And touching His creature man, 17 God had in Christ before the foundation of the world, according to the good pleasure of His will, foreordained some men to eternal life through Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of His grace, 18 leaving the rest in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His justice.



#### **Article IV.**

<sup>19</sup> In the beginning God made all things very good, created man after His own <sup>10</sup> Image and likeness, filling him with all perfection of all natural excellency and uprightness, free from all sin. <sup>21</sup> But long he abode not in this honor, but by the <sup>22</sup> subtlety of the Serpent, which Satan used as his instrument, himself with his Angels having sinned before, and not <sup>23</sup> kept their first estate, but left their own habitation; first <sup>24</sup> Eve, then Adam being seduced did wittingly and willingly fall into disobedience and transgression of the Commandment of their great Creator, for the which death came upon all, and reigned over all, so that all since the Fall are conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity, and so by nature children of wrath, and servants of sin, subjects of <sup>25</sup> death, and all other calamities due to sin in this world and forever, being considered in the state of nature, without relation to Christ.

#### **Article V.**

All mankind being thus fallen, and become altogether dead in sins and trespasses, and subject to the eternal wrath of the great God by transgression; yet the elect, which God hath <sup>26</sup> loved with an everlasting love, are <sup>27</sup> redeemed, quickened, and saved, not by themselves, neither by their own works, lest any man should boast himself, but wholly and only by God of <sup>28</sup> His free grace and mercy through Jesus Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption, that as it is written, “he that rejoiceth, let him rejoice in the Lord.”

#### **Article VI.**

<sup>29</sup> This therefore is life eternal, to know the only true God, and whom He hath sent Jesus Christ. <sup>30</sup> And on the contrary, the Lord will render

vengeance in flaming fire to them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

#### **Article VII.**

The Rule of this Knowledge, Faith, and Obedience, concerning the worship and service of God, and all other Christian duties, is **not man's inventions**, opinions, devices, laws, constitutions, or traditions unwritten whatsoever, but only the Word of God contained in the Canonical Scriptures. <sup>31</sup>

#### **Article VIII.**

In this written Word of God hath plainly revealed whatsoever He hath thought needful for us to know, believe, and acknowledge, touching the Nature and Office of Christ, in whom all the promises are Yea and Amen to the praise of God. <sup>32</sup>

#### **Article IX.**

Touching the Lord Jesus, of whom <sup>33</sup> Moses and the Prophets wrote, and whom the Apostles preached, is the <sup>34</sup> Son of God the Father, the brightness of His glory, the engraved form of His being, God with Him and with His Holy Spirit, by whom He made the world, by whom He upholds and governs all the works He hath made, who also <sup>35</sup> when the fullness of time was come, was made man of a <sup>36</sup> woman, of the tribe of Judah, of the seed of Abraham and David, to wit, of Mary that blessed Virgin, by the Holy Spirit coming upon her, and the power of the most

High overshadowing her, and was also in <sup>37</sup> all things like unto us, sin only excepted.

### **Article X.**

Touching His office, <sup>38</sup> Jesus Christ only is made the Mediator of the new Covenant, even the everlasting Covenant of Grace between God and Man, to <sup>39</sup> be perfectly and fully the Prophet, Priest, and King of the Church of God for evermore.

### **Article XI.**

Unto this Office He was foreordained from everlasting, by the <sup>40</sup> authority of the Father and in respect of His Manhood, from the womb called and separated, and <sup>41</sup> anointed also most fully and abundantly with all gifts necessary, God having without measure poured the Spirit upon Him.

### **Articles XII.**

In this call the Scripture holds forth two special things considerable; *first*, the Call to the Office; *secondly*, the Office itself. First, that <sup>42</sup> none takes this honor but He that is called of God, as was Aaron, so also, it being an action especially of God the Father, whereby a special Covenant being made, He ordained His Son to this Office: which Covenant is, that <sup>43</sup> Christ should be made a Sacrifice for sin, that He shall see His seed, and prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand; which Calling therefore contains in itself <sup>44</sup> choosing, <sup>45</sup> foreordaining, <sup>46</sup> sending. Choosing respects the end, foreordaining the means, sending the execution itself, <sup>47</sup> all of mere grace, without any condition foreseen either in men, or in Christ Himself.

### **Article XIII.**

So that this Office to be Mediator, that is, to be Prophet, Priest, and King of the Church of God, is so proper to Christ, as neither in the whole, nor in any part thereof, it can be transferred from Him to any other. 48

### **Article XIV.**

This Office itself to which Christ was called, is threefold: of 49 a Prophet, of 50 Priest, and of 51 a King: this number and order of Offices is showed; *first*, by men's necessities grievously laboring 52 under ignorance, by reason whereof they stand in infinite necessity of the Prophetical office of Christ to relieve them. *Secondly*, 53 alienation from God, wherein they stand in need of the Priestly Office to reconcile them: *Thirdly*, our 54 utter disability to return to Him, by which they stand in need of the power of Christ in His Kingly Office to assist and govern them.

### **Article XV.**

Touching the Prophecy of Christ, it is that whereby He hath 55 perfectly revealed the whole will of God out of the bosom of the Father, that is needful for His servants to know, believe, and obey; and therefore is called not only a Prophet and 56 a Doctor, and the 57 Apostle of our profession, and the 58 Angel of the Covenant; but also the very 59 wisdom of God, and 60 the treasures of wisdom and understanding.

### **Article XVI.**

That He might be such a Prophet as thereby to be every way complete, it was necessary that He should be <sup>61</sup> God, and withal also that He should be man; for unless He had been God, He could never have perfectly understood the will of God, <sup>62</sup> neither had He been able to reveal it throughout the ages; and unless He had been man, He could not fitly have unfolded it in His <sup>63</sup> own Person to man.

### **Article XVII.**

Touching His Priesthood, Christ <sup>64</sup> being consecrated, hath appeared once to put away sin by the offering and sacrifice of Himself, and to this end hath fully performed and suffered **all those things by which God, through the blood of that His Cross** in an acceptable sacrifice, might reconcile His elect only; <sup>65</sup> and having broken down the partition wall, and therewith **finished** and removed all those rites, shadows, and ceremonies, is now entered within the veil, into the Holy of Holiest, that is, to the very Heavens, and presence of God, where He forever liveth and setteth at the right hand of Majesty, appearing before the face of His Father to make intercession for such as come to the Throne of Grace by that new and living way; and not that only, but <sup>66</sup> makes His people a spiritual house, an holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God through Him; neither doth the Father accept, or Christ offer to the Father any other worship or worshippers.

### **Article XVIII.**

This Priesthood was not legal, or temporary, but according to the order <sup>67</sup> of Melchizedek, <sup>68</sup> not by a carnal commandment, but by the power of an endless life, <sup>69</sup> not by an order that is weak and lame, but stable and

perfect, not for a 70 time, but forever, admitting no successor, but perpetual and proper to Christ, and of Him that ever liveth. Christ Himself was the Priest, Sacrifice and Altar: He was 71 Priest, according to both natures, He was a sacrifice most properly according to His human nature: 72 whence in the Scripture it is wont to be attributed to His body, to His blood; yet the chief force whereby this sacrifice was made effectual, did depend upon His 73 divine nature, namely, that the Son of God did offer Himself for us” He was the 74 altar properly according to His divine nature, it belonging to the Altar to sanctify that which is offered upon it, and so it ought to be of greater dignity than the Sacrifice itself.

### **Article XIX.**

Touching His Kingdom, 75 Christ being risen from the dead, ascended into heaven, sat on the right hand of God the Father, having all power in heaven and earth, given unto Him, He doth spiritually govern His Church, exercising His powers 76 over all Angels and Men, good and bad, to the preservation and salvation of the elect, to the overruling and destruction of His enemies, which are Reprobates, 77 communicating and applying the benefits, virtue, and fruit of His Prophecy and Priesthood to His elect, namely, to the subduing and taking away of their sins, to their justification and adoption of sons, regeneration, sanctification, preservation and strengthening in all their conflicts against Satan, the World, the Flesh, and the temptations of them, continually dwelling in, governing and keeping their hearts in faith and filial fear by His Spirit, which having given Him, He never takes away from them, but by Him still begets and nourisheth in them faith, repentance, love, joy, hope, and all heavenly light in the soul unto immortality, notwithstanding through our own unbelief, and the temptations of Satan, the *sensible sight* of this light and love be clouded and overwhelmed for the time. 79 And on the contrary, ruling in the world over His enemies, Satan, and all the vessels

of wrath, limiting, using, restraining them by His mighty power, as seems good in His divine wisdom and justice to the execution of His determinate counsel, delivering them up to a reprobate mind, to be kept through their own deserts, in darkness and sensuality unto judgment.

#### **Article XX.**

This Kingdom shall be then fully perfected when He shall the second time come in glory to reign amongst His Saints, and to be admired of all them which do believe, when He shall put down all rule and authority under His feet, that the glory of the Father may be full and perfectly manifested in His Son, and the glory of the Father and the Son in all His members. <sup>80</sup>

#### **Article XXI.**

That Christ Jesus by His death did bring forth salvation and reconciliation only for the <sup>81</sup> elect, which were those which <sup>82</sup> God the Father gave Him; and that the Gospel which is to be preached to all men as the ground of faith, is, that <sup>83</sup> Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the ever blessed God, filled with the perfection of all heavenly and spiritual excellencies, and that salvation is only and alone to be had through the believing in His name.

#### **Article XXII.**

That Faith is the <sup>84</sup> gift of God wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Spirit of God, whereby they come to see, know, and believe the truth of <sup>85</sup> the Scriptures, and not only so, but the excellency of them above all other writings and things of the world, as they hold forth the glory of God in His attributes, the excellency of Christ in His nature and offices,

and the power of the fullness of the Spirit in His workings and operations; and thereupon are enabled to cast the weight of their souls upon this truth thus believed.

#### **Article XXIII.**

Those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit, can never finally nor totally fall away; and though many storms and floods do arise and beat against them, yet they shall never be able to take them off that foundation and Rock which by faith they are fastened upon, but shall be kept by the power of God to salvation, where they shall enjoy their purchased possession, they being formerly engraven upon the palms of God's hands. 86

#### **Article XXIV.**

That faith *is ordinarily* 87 begot by the preaching of the Gospel, or word of Christ, without respect to 88 any power or capacity in the creature, but it is wholly 89 passive, they being dead in sins and trespasses, doth believe, and is converted by no less power, 90 than that which raised Christ from the dead.

#### **Article XXV.**

That the tenders of the Gospel to the conversion of sinners, 91 is absolutely free, no way requiring, as absolutely necessary, any qualifications, preparations, terrors of the Law, or preceding Ministry of the Law, but only and alone the naked soul, as 92 a sinner and ungodly to



receive Christ, as crucified, dead, and buried, and risen again, being made <sup>93</sup> a Prince and a Saviour for such sinners.

### **Article XXVI.**

That the same power that converts to faith in Christ, the same power carries on the <sup>94</sup> soul still through all duties, temptations, conflicts, sufferings, and continually whatever a Christian is, he is by <sup>95</sup> grace, and by a constant renewed <sup>96</sup> operation from God, without which he **cannot perform any duty to God**, or undergo any temptations from Satan, the world, or men.

### **Article XXVII.**

That God the Father, and Son, and Spirit, is one with <sup>97</sup> all believers in their <sup>98</sup> fullness, in <sup>99</sup> relations, <sup>100</sup> as Head and members, <sup>101</sup> as house and inhabitants, as <sup>102</sup> Husband and wife, one with Him, as <sup>103</sup> Light and Love, and one with Him in His inheritance, and in all His <sup>104</sup> glory; and that all believers by virtue of this union and oneness with God, are the adopted sons of God, and heirs with Christ, co-heirs and joint heirs with Him of the inheritance of all the promises of this life, and that which is to come.

### **XXVIII.**

That those which have union with Christ, are justified from all their sins, past, <sup>105</sup> present, and to come, by the blood of Christ; which justification we conceive to be a gracious and free <sup>106</sup> acquittance of a guilty, sinful creature, from all sins by God, through the satisfaction that Christ hath made by His death; and this applied in the manifestation of it through faith.

### **Article XXIX.**

That all believers are a holy and 107 sanctified people, and that sanctification is a spiritual grace of the 108 new Covenant, and effect of the 109 love of God, manifested to the soul, whereby the believer is in 110 truth and reality separated, both in soul and body, from all sin and dead works, through the 111 blood of the everlasting Covenant, whereby he also presseth after a heavenly and evangelical perfection, in obedience to all the Commands, 112 which Christ as Head and King in His new Covenant has prescribed to him.

### **Article XXX.**

All believers through the knowledge of 113 that Justification of life given by the Father, and brought forth by the blood of Christ, have this as their great privilege of that the new 114 Covenant, peace with God, and reconciliation, whereby they that were afar off, were brought nigh by 115 that blood, and have (as the Scripture speaks) peace 116 passing all understanding, yea, joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by 117 whom we have received the atonement.

### **Article XXXI.**

That all believers in the time of this life, are in a continual warfare, combat, and opposition against sin, self, the world, and the Devil, and liable to all manner of afflictions, tribulations, and persecutions, and so shall continue until Christ comes in His Kingdom, being predestinated and appointed thereunto; and whatsoever the Saints, any of them do possess or enjoy of God in this life, is only by faith. 118

### **Article XXXII.**

That the only strength by which the Saints are enabled to encounter with all opposition, and to overcome all afflictions, temptations, persecutions, and trials, is only by Jesus Christ, who is the Captain of their salvation, being made perfect through sufferings, who hath engaged His strength to assist them in all their afflictions, and to uphold them under all their temptations, and to preserve them by His power to His everlasting Kingdom. <sup>119</sup>

### **Article XXXIII.**

That Christ hath here on earth a spiritual Kingdom, which is the Church, which He hath purchased and redeemed to Himself, as a peculiar inheritance: which Church, as it is visible to us, is a company of visible <sup>120</sup> Saints, <sup>121</sup> called and separated from the world, by the word and <sup>122</sup> Spirit of God, to the visible profession of the faith of the Gospel, being baptized into that faith, and joined to the Lord, and each other, by mutual agreement, in the practical enjoyment of the <sup>123</sup> Ordinances, commanded by Christ their Head and King.

### **Article XXXIV.**

To this Church He hath <sup>124</sup> made His promises, and given the signs of His Covenant, presence, love, blessing, and protection: here are the fountains and springs of His heavenly grace continually flowing forth; <sup>125</sup> thither ought all men to come, of all estates, that acknowledge Him to be their Prophet, Priest, and King, to be enrolled amongst His household servants, to be under His heavenly conduct and government, to lead their

lives in His walled sheepfold, and watered garden, to have communion here with the Saints, that they may be made to be partakers of their inheritance in the Kingdom of God.

**Article XXXV.**

And all His servants are called thither, to present their bodies and souls, and to bring their gifts God hath given them; so being come, they are here by Himself bestowed in their several orders, peculiar place, due use, being fitly compact and knit together, according to the effectual working of every part, to the edification of itself in love. <sup>126</sup>

**Article XXXVI.**

That being thus joined, every Church has <sup>127</sup> power given them from Christ for their better well-being, to choose to themselves meet persons into the office of <sup>128</sup> Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, being qualified according to the Word, as those which Christ has appointed in His Testament, for the feeding, governing, serving, and building up of His Church, and that none other have power to **impose them, either these or others.**

**Article XXXVII.**

That the Ministers aforesaid, lawfully called by the Church, where they are to administer, ought to continue in their calling, according to God's Ordinance, and carefully to feed the flock of Christ committed to them, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. 129

### **Article XXXVIII,**

That the due maintenance of the Officers aforesaid, should be the free and voluntary communication of the Church, that according to Christ's Ordinance, they that preach the Gospel, should live on the Gospel and not by constraint to be compelled from the people by a forced law. 130

### **Article XXXIX.**

That Baptism is an Ordinance of the new Testament, given by Christ, to be dispensed only upon persons professing faith, or that are Disciples, or taught, who upon a profession of faith, ought to be baptized, and after to partake of the Lord's Supper. 131

### **Article XL.**

The way and manner of the 132 dispensing of this Ordinance the Scripture hold out to be dipping or plunging the whole body under water: it being a sign, must answer the thing signified, which are these: *first*, the 133 washing the whole soul in the blood of Christ: *secondly*, that interest the Saints have in the 134 death, burial, and resurrection; *thirdly*, together with a 135 confirmation of our faith, that as certainly as the body is buried under water, and risen again, so certainly shall the **bodies** of the Saints be raised by the power of Christ in the day of the resurrection, to reign with Christ. The word *baptizo*, signifying to dip

under water, yet so as with convenient garments both upon the administrator and subject, with all modesty.

#### **Article XLI.**

The persons designed by Christ, to dispense this Ordinance, the Scriptures hold forth to be a *preaching Disciple*, it being no where tied to a particular Church, Officer, or person extraordinarily sent, the Commission enjoining the administration, being given to them under no other consideration, but as *considered Disciples*. 136

#### **Article XLII.**

Christ has likewise given power to His whole Church to receive in and cast out, by way of Excommunication, any member; and this power is given to every particular Congregation, and not one particular person, either member or Officer, but the whole Church. 137

#### **Article XLIII.**

And every particular member of each Church, how excellent, great, or learned soever, ought to be subject to this censure and judgment of Christ; and the Church ought with great care and tenderness, with due advice to proceed against her members. 138

#### **Article XLIV.**

And as Christ for the 139 keeping of this Church in holy and orderly Communion, placeth some special men over the Church, who by their Office are to govern, oversee, visit, watch; so likewise for the better

keeping thereof in all places, by the members, He hath given <sup>140</sup> authority, and laid duty upon all, to watch over one another.

#### **Article XLV.**

That also such to whom God hath given gifts, being tried in the Church, may and ought by the appointment of the Congregation, to prophesy, according to the proportion of faith, and so teach publicly the Word of God, for the edification, exhortation, and comfort of the Church. <sup>141</sup>

#### **Article XLVI.**

Thus being rightly gathered, established, and still proceeding in Christian communion, and obedience of the Gospel of Christ, none ought to separate for faults and corruptions, which may, and as long as the Church consists of men subject to failings, will fall out and arise amongst them, even in true constituted Churches, until they have in due order sought redress thereof. <sup>142</sup>

#### **Article XLVII.**

And although the **particular Congregations** be distinct and several Bodies, every one a compact and knit City in itself: yet are they all to walk by one and the same Rule, and by all means convenient to have the counsel and help one of another in all needful affairs of **the Church**, as members of one body in the common faith under Christ their only Head. <sup>143</sup>

[We omit Articles XLVIII through LII because they cover political institutions of the times in which these Churches were first established. We also are leaving out the Scriptural proofs note in the body of the

Confession. If, however, the Reader desires them, he may write the publisher and it will be sent to him.]

## APPENDIX: B

**ANNOTATION:** Reuben Ross preached the first Arminian, or Freewill sermon among Baptists near Port Royal, Tennessee in **1817**. The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions had been set up on **1813-1815**. During the same time, his brother, Martin Ross, introduced the **call for missions** in the Kehukee Baptist Association in North Carolina, from whence Reuban had come. The two events so closely joined together possibly is an explanation for the speed in which the Kehukee Churches reacted against the *New Divinity* innovations, in their Kehukee Declaration (See Appendix E, Page 124)

The following excerpts on Reuben Ross, was written by the great Missionary Baptists' light, J. M. Pendleton, to Ross's granddaughter. The second selection below is Pendleton's description of the preachers in Ross's fellowship, which is yet an adequate description of the doctrines and preaching today among Predestinarian Old School Baptists Churches. We have for special emphasis placed some points in **bold heading** that the reader might be aware that these things were then believed, and are yet believed by the true Church and believers in Christ in this day.

First Excerpt: "Elder Ross Explains His Views." (Chapter XXVIII.)

We will now pass on to the year 1817, which may be regarded as an epoch in the life of your grandfather, since during this year he gave utterance to those views which culminated in his separation from his



hyper-calvinistic brethren, and the organization of the Bethel Baptist Association.

At the commencement of his ministerial labors, as was to have been expected, he adopted the rigid views of his family and of the church to which they belonged, - in which faith **so many great and good men** have lived and died. It would, perhaps, not be extravagant to say that many of the **brightest intellects from the earliest ages of the church** down to his own time **had contended for** these views as for “the faith once delivered to the saints.”

They believed in **particular and unconditional election and reprobation, that Christ died for the elect only, and that not one of His elect would ever be lost, or one of the non-elect ever be saved.** That the Almighty, who knows the end from the beginning, looking down, as it were, upon the generations of men yet unborn, without the least regard to character or conduct had elected or selected one here and another there to be saved and had passed all others by as vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.

These views, as he thought, represent the heavenly Father as a parent who had lavished all His care and tenderness on a part of His children only. These He had provided with food, raiment, instruction, and all things necessary to their comfort and happiness. The rest He had left to struggle on as best they might for a time against hunger, cold, and neglect, and finally to perish, not because they were less deserving than their brethren, but simply because it was His will and pleasure to pass them by. [The writer must point out, that Pendleton either misrepresents these elders, or himself does not comprehend the total depravity and willful sinfulness of the reprobates, nor the kindness given them often above His elect in natural prosperity and material comforts. The latter is most likely the case.]

Early in his ministry his mind became perplexed and troubled on this subject. He could not understand how this could be when the sacred writings declare that His tender mercies are over all His works; that “He

is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that **FEARS HIM and works righteousness** is accepted of Him.” But such was his reverence for the wisdom, knowledge, and piety of those who had **gone before him and held these views**, that he would not permit his thoughts to dwell upon them when he could avoid doing so.

When he came to the West he found his brethren **here of THE SAME BELIEF**, and tenacious of it to the last degree. They watched over it with the utmost solicitude, and **over every member of their communion in regard to it**, and especially **over their preachers**. If one of them was suspected of being unsound in the faith or Arminian in his tendencies, they **turned away from him, and his usefulness among them was at an end**.

Could this doctrine be true? He often thought. Does the Bible teach that our happiness after death depends on unconditional election? That if elected, we shall be saved simply because we are elected: and if lost, it will be because we are not elected. [Pendleton’s footnote: “*The advocates of election would be slow to admit that this is a correct view of the doctrine. They certainly do not believe that election saves independently of a compliance with the requirements of the gospel, but that election leads to such compliance, and that God in choosing ends chooses means to accomplish them. On the other hand, it is not scriptural to represent sinners as lost and punished, because they are not elected; but they are lost and punished for their sins, and for no other reason.*”] He doubts this and is determined to bring all the faculties of his mind to the investigation of this subject, one of the most important in his estimation in the whole range of Christian theology.

On one side of this great argument stands John Calvin, of Geneva, with his hard, cold, merciless, but powerful logic. On the other, James Arminius, of Holland, no less able, with his warm, generous, and merciful interpretation of the sacred writings.

Mighty men, so to speak, have fought under these leaders respectively, and for a long time victory seemed to be perched on the

banners of the former; but, in these “latter days,” the signs are, that the views of Arminius will triumph in the end. [Pendleton is quoting from Ross’s biography, and adds this footnote here: “*The biographer here expresses his opinion, which he had a perfect right to do; but from this opinion many, no doubt, will dissent. J. M. P.* ]

In calling to mind the disadvantages under which your grandfather labored, one can but regret the strait he was in; and nothing shows more clearly what manner of man he was than the patience and courage manifested by him. . . . Gill’s “Body of Divinity” was a book held in high estimation by Baptists at that time. He greatly desired to get it, hoping it might throw much light on the subject of his studies, and he knew it could be had for six dollars. But six dollars were something to him in those days. I remember to have heard him and your grandmother often speak of purchasing this book. Sometimes they almost made up their minds to buy it, and then again declined doing so.

The book, though, was at last bought, and for days we saw but little of him, so much was he absorbed in its perusal. Some time after this he purchased another book, “The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation,” by Andrew Fuller, of England, - a work which greatly interested him. [Pendleton’s footnote here: “*Andrew Fuller, in his day, found the state of things among the Baptists in England quite similar to that referred to on the theater of Elder Ross’s labors. (They were predestinarians too! Editor). It was to them a troublesome question whether the gospel should be preached to sinners at all. Dr. Gill hesitated about the matter, as we learn from Dr. Cramp’s “History of Baptists.” (Dr. Cramp apparently was no more familiar with Gill’s writing than Pendleton shows himself to be!) Fuller differed from Gill, and believed in an “objective fullness” in the provisions of the atonement of Christ, sufficient for the salvation of all men. He therefore insisted that the gospel is worthy of all acceptance, and is to be preached to men, not as elect or non-elect, but as sinners under the wrath of God and in need of salvation. Eternity*

*alone will reveal all the good accomplished, by God's blessing, on Fuller's Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation." J.M.P. ]*

He would often speak of the **delicacy of his position during these years**. He was all the time engaged in preaching, and it was of **the utmost importance to express himself so that it might not transpire prematurely** to what his investigations were tending. For **ecclesiastical history shows that as much wisdom and sound discretion is necessary in religious movements as in those of governments and armies, and that, for want of these, many great and good men have failed in effecting much needed reformation.**

Fortunately for him, the Baptists in this country at that time were divided in sentiment in regard to preaching to sinners or calling them to repentance; one class **knew** that if they were reprobates, it would all be of no avail. Others **thought** it would do no harm to scatter the seed broadcast, since none but the elect germs would, after all, vegetate and bear fruit. He availed himself of this state of things to the full extent, and urged all alike to repent and believe the gospel.

As he proceeded in his investigations, **he saw that the Bible, from beginning to end, was instinct with the doctrine that all our blessings, both spiritual and temporal, are more or less CONDITIONAL. . . .**

When asked if there were not texts which seemed to teach differently? He would reply that many good men thought there were such; but that **unconditional and conditional salvation could not both be true**, since this would involve a contradiction in terms; and hence the conclusion that they were misunderstood, and that, were this not the case, all parts of the sacred writings would be found to harmonize on this subject.

By **supplying a word or phrase, now and then**, which is done in every language, to bring out the meaning, there would be found, as he thought, but few texts not in accord with the drift and scope of the Bible

in its teaching in regard to salvation as being conditional or unconditional.

Having thus satisfied himself that **man's salvation is conditional and depends on his character and conduct** and not according to election and predestination, and that the **atonement is general**, he determined henceforth to preach in accordance with these views, and a fitting opportunity soon after presented itself to address the people in regard to them.

In the month of July 1817, he was requested to preach the funeral sermon of Miss Eliza Norfleet, who had died some time previously near Port Royal, Tenn. From what I have heard of this young lady she was greatly esteemed and beloved in the community in which she had lived, on account of her gentle and amiable character, - one of those bright flowers so often seen to bud, bloom, and fade away in the morning of life. The place where the funeral sermon was preached was a short distance only from Port Royal, on the road leading thence to Nashville, distant only a few miles from the spot where ten years before he had first been heard as a preacher in Tennessee; and now as then in a grove of shady trees and in a community where he was highly esteemed both as a man and as a preacher. The wish was general to pay marked respect to the memory of the departed, and to hear a favorite preacher on the occasion. I have seen lately several old gentlemen of the highest respectability who were then present and from whom I learned many interesting particulars.

Your grandfather, on that occasion, preached a sermon remarkable, both on account of the deep impression it left on the minds of the people who heard it and on account of the important consequences that followed. In the conclusion of his discourse **he gave utterance to those views which characterized his preaching thereafter until the close of his ministerial labors**; they were as follows:

That the human race in consequence of disobedience, are in a state of alienation and rebellion against their Creator and they must become

reconciled to him before they can obtain his favor and forgiveness, -that Christ by his suffering and death has made an atonement **sufficient for the sins of the whole world, - that salvation to all who will accept the terms,** is as free as the light of heaven or the air we breathe,- that he has given his word to teach them the way **and plan of salvation and the terms on which they will be forgiven and received into favor,-** that these terms are repentance, faith, love, obedience – in a word to become followers of Christ; - that in addition to the word the Holy Spirit is given to **influence men directly** to believe in Christ, to love and serve God, and lead pious and godly lives; yet that he never operates **with such power on the human soul as to destroy its free agency, but leaves to man the fearful responsibility of deciding for himself whether he will serve God or no.**

That is, if we yield to the influences of the Holy Spirit and become followers of Christ, we shall be pardoned and saved. If not, we shall be lost. If we are lost, it will be our own fault. If saved, it will be on account of the goodness and mercy of God and not for any merit in us. That **the election spoken of in the Bible is not unconditional, but always has reference to conduct or character. That the Almighty before the foundation of the world elected those to be saved, that he knew from the beginning would love and serve him.**

These views, it is said, were received with great joy by the people, and a suppressed expression of approbation was heard to pass through the multitude.

When his discourse was ended he descended from the stand, passed silently through the crowd, mounted his horse and rode home, about twenty miles distant. He does not wish just now to meet face to face his kind old brethren; those who ten years before had received him with open arms when he first came a stranger among them; who had given him so many proofs of sincere friendship, and came to hear him as one of the ornaments of the church. He prefers at present to pursue his

solitary ride and indulge his feelings of regret that so often in this life duty and friendship cannot go hand in hand together.

But while he is wending his way homeward let us return to the grave he had just left. Here a little apart from the dispersing crowd might have been seen a group of men, many of whose heads were grey with age, in earnest conversation trying to decide what was best to be done under the circumstances. It was finally settled that Elder Fort should go down to see your grandfather; expostulate with him in regard to his strange discourse; and try, if possible, to induce him to reconsider what he had said in his sermon, and save his church from the great reproach he had brought upon it by falling into the grievous heresy of Arminianism. . . .”

“It is proper here to add that although a difference of opinion in regard to election and predestination, or rather to the grounds of election and predestination, was the chief cause of the wide spread dissatisfaction among the churches at this time, yet this was not the only cause of alienation and estrangement. There was a wide difference also among them on the subjects of an educated ministry and Foreign and Domestic Missions. The Old School Baptists, as we came to term them, were violently opposed to everything new of this sort, and in favor, so to speak, of letting all these things take care of themselves. The others felt a deep interest in sending the gospel into foreign lands, to those sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, to the heathen nearer home, and also to giving the ministry the advantages of learning and general culture.” [ Life and Times of Elder Reuben Ross, by J. M. Pendleton, Philadelphia, 1882, pages 278-291.]

**ANNOTATION:** This seems a good place to insert the next excerpt showing what manner of elders huddled together that day when Elder Ross introduced his heresy of Arminianism among them at the funeral. Here is J. M. Pendleton’s description of them. Keep in mind, that Pendleton is an adversary to the doctrines the Baptists then believed.

**PENDLETON'S DISCRIPTION OF THE  
BAPTISTS MINISTERIAL FRIENDS  
OF ELDER REUBEN ROSS**

There were, besides your grandfather, four preachers of notoriety in the Association (Red River) whom I remember well, and whom I have heard preach many times. Of these personal appearance and the character of their preaching, I have a distinct recollection. These were elder Lewis Moore, Jesse Brooks, Isaac Todevine, and Sugg Fort. I will attempt to describe them, that you may have some idea of the men with whom your grandfather was for many years associated in the ministry.

**They were staunch Predestinarians, and gloried in the doctrine they preached.** All were of excellent character, and some of them of fine talents. In point of ability it was generally admitted that Elder Lewis Moore stood foremost. He was not above medium height, heavily built, with a short neck, large head, full face, and was rather careless in his dress. Out of the pulpit he had little to say, but in it he was certainly no common man. Before coming to this country in 1728, he was pastor of the Reedy Creek Baptist Church in Warren County, N.C. When I first knew him he was pastor of the Muddy River Church and of several others in this country. This church was, I think, situated somewhere north of Russellville, Logan County, Kentucky. In his style of speaking he was nervous, vehement, and sometimes startling. He seemed to carry in his memory every text in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation that bore on election, predestination, and kindred subjects; and could apply them with great force and effect. His irony, too, was exceedingly sharp and cutting.

It was customary in those times for the preachers while arguing their points to call on a brother, or a sister even, to say if what they affirmed was not true. They would do so many times during a sermon after becoming heated by the argument, and the brother appealed to would sanction with great energy. After piling text upon text, and argument



upon argument, and making his position seemingly impregnable, he would say:

“Tell me now, Brother Todevine, it not this doctrine true?”

“Yes, Brother Moore, it is true, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

“Sister Owens, is this doctrine true?”

“Yes, brother, and bless the Lord for it.”

“And yet,” he would continue, “there are men in the world, and not a few of them either, who deny the truth of this glorious doctrine of election that has made glad the hearts of God’s people for thousands of years. They say, forsooth, it is partial and unjust, and does not give every one an equal chance to be saved. Now just reflect. We are all miserable sinners, “conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity;” (Psalm 51: 5 “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.”) and if we had our just deserts would every one be sent to hell, and that speedily; but God in His infinite goodness and mercy has condescended to elect and save some of us. And instead of adoring His Holy Name because **all** are not lost, they are raising a great clamor because all are not saved! A has money and chooses to give B a part of it. The money is his own, and he can use it as he pleases. But it is no sooner known that he has bestowed a portion of it on B than every vagabond in the country denounces him as partial and unjust, because he does not give everyone some, too. Who is injured by this? I would like to know. Some are benefited, but does that defraud any one else? One man makes a feast, and invites his friends to come and partake with him. Those who have not been invited, nor would come if so, raise a howl as if victuals had been taken out of their own mouths. Alas! For the folly and presumption of human beings! It is really past finding out.”

“But let me tell you, my friends, what is really the matter. I am sorry to say it, but according to them, the truth is the Almighty don’t properly understand His business. That is clear from the mistakes He is constantly making. Would it not be a blessed thing if He could have some of our

wise men to assist Him? Some that have studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew in the colleges and high schools, to help Him better govern the world? Or might it not be better still as the poet has said to

“Snatch from His hand the balances and the rod;  
Rejudge His Justice; be the god of God.”

Then would follow one of his perorations, or conclusions, which I used to think very fine.

“But, my dearly beloved brethren and sisters, let not your hearts be troubled at these things. Your bread shall be given you, and your water shall be sure. Your house is built on a Rock. Let the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing. Greater is He that is in you than they that are against you. Let us contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. The conflict will soon be over, and we shall be where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest. In these bright mansions not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, crowns and diadems and palms of victory await you, which shall be placed on your brow by the Great King Himself.”

It was delightful to see how happy the brotherhood seemed to feel on occasions like this. Every countenance was radiant with these inspiring hopes, but no hands would clap or shouts be heard. These preachers would stop instantly in the midst of one of their loftiest flights should any one give way to his emotions.

Elder Moore believed that long before the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy at the glories of the new creation, the Almighty looked down upon the ages yet unborn, as it were, in review before Him in His determinate counsel and selected one here and another there to enjoy eternal life and left the rest to the blackness of darkness forever; and so He preached. . . .

Elder Brooks, like other Calvinistic preachers of the say, had but little to say to sinners, as those were called who had never made any

profession of religion or connected themselves with any church. Indeed, they were tough subjects, and they seemed very much disposed to let them alone. If they were not of the elect, all the preaching in the world would do them no good, so far as salvation was concerned, since they believed Christ had died and saved the elect only. Why then preach to them at all? On the other hand, if they were of the elect, nothing could prevent their being called. They would be sure, sooner or later, to come into the fold. Many of these Old Order of Baptists still doubt the propriety of making sinners the subjects of gospel addresses.

[Editor: Perhaps this next paragraph indicates why J.M. Pendleton went Arminian with the New Divinity. He certainly had a very blind spot.]

I have heard the subject of hereditary depravity discussed many times. The argument was about this:- That we are all parts of our father Adam; and when Adam, who was the whole, sinned, we the parts in him sinned also in him; and as he deserved punishment, so do we, as being Adam drawn out at length, as they expressed it. I used, when a boy, to try hard to comprehend this mystery, **but never succeeded**. We know that one can receive a taint morally and physically by hereditary transmission, as in pulmonary consumption, and bad tempers and dispositions both in men and brutes. But how one can be really guilty for this inherited defect is not so easy to conceive. Sinners were advised to shun outbreaking sins if possible such as horse-racing, card-playing, cock-fighting, profanity, drunkenness, and fiddling and dancing especially.

**Election, predestination, the nature and extent of the atonement, the final perseverance of the saints, effectual calling, and the glorious and happy state of the elect after death were the themes on which Elder Brooks and the others loved to dwell.**

I have taken unusual pains to recall my early impressions of these old pioneer preachers, who may be considered **representative** ministers among the Baptists of those days.

But there was one dread thought that often brought these old Christians low even unto the dust. “Am I, after all, one of the elect? May I not, after all, be mistaken? And if so, then all hope is gone!” The storm-tossed mariner, when his boat goes down, may find a plank or broken spar, and on it may reach the friendly shore; but for him who is not of the elect there is no plank or spar or friendly shore; he must sink in the deep, dark waters. There is ground for believing that by this dread apprehension the reason of many has been dethroned.

I have heard many, whose minds were filled with doubts and fears on this subject, converse with your grandfather in regard to it. While troubled with these gloom apprehensions, they might often be heard singing the plaintive hymn:

“’Tis a point I long to know,  
Oft it causes anxious thought;  
Do I love the Lord or no  
Am I His or am I not?”

Before passing on to our next chapter we will add, that there was one theme of which these old Christians never grew weary, and which filled their hearts with unspeakable love and gratitude. That the Almighty should have loved them with an everlasting love, chosen them to be lively stones in His holy temple, made them the special objects of His regard, vessels of honor, while others, as good by nature as they, perhaps better by practice, were vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, seemed at times to fill their hearts with love and gratitude beyond expression.

(J. M. Pendleton, *ibid.*, pages 124-132.)

It seems well to insert here David Benedicts remarks on the origins of the mission and benevolent movements among Baptist. David Benedict is the first “Historian” produced by the Missionary, and was, in fact, one

of their main initiators of those movements. Pastor of the Baptist Church in Pawtucket, R.I., he instituted, along with Samuel Slater and Quakers, the **first Sunday school in America, in 1820**. He was the **first to introduce instrumental music** in Baptist worship in this country, and he was the **first** to organized choirs and special singers in Baptist churches. In 1813, he published his “History,” of the Baptists, and desiring to upgrade the status of Baptists, he included benevolent organization of other denominations, making it *appear* they were “Baptist”. He promoted the union of **all Protestants** into one single centralized organization. In time, however, personal mistreatment by the Congregationalists turned him away from so broad a union. Thereafter he worked toward the union of all the various kinds of Baptists into one centralized benevolent organization. His 1848 edition of *The History of The Baptists* was so blatantly false, that even New School Baptists criticized him. He promised to correct it, and his “correction” is his Autobiographical history, titled, *Fifty Years Among Baptists, 1809 to 1859*. Here is what he wrote what Baptists **were** when he first came among them from the Congregationalists Church:

**“Sunday Schools and Bible classes, and ALL the other institutions of modern times, for objects of Christian benevolence and moral reform, which are in much successful operation with us, and other communities in the land, were wholly UNKNOWN IN MY EARLY DAY. . . . The idea of a religious newspaper was then nowhere entertained, nor did anyone think of going to the secular press with articles of a religious cast. . . .”**

“When I look back, I can hardly realize the **changes** which have taken place in our denomination, in my day, in the **means of intelligence and benevolence**. It seems almost incredible that a society which **so lately was slow to engage in any new enterprise**, and was so jealous of any **collegiate training for its ministers**, should at this **early period** have as many colleges and kindred institutions spread over the land; that such a **flood of periodicals** of kinds should **so soon** be added. . . that so

much should have been done by this people in the **home and foreign mission departments, in the Bible cause, in the publication of Baptist literature, in Sunday Schools and Bible classes, and in labors of various kinds; and ALL SINCE I FIRST BEGAN** to collect the scanty and scattered materials for their history. . . . **Fifty years ago, NOT AN AGENT FOR COLLECTING FUNDS FOR ANY OBJECT OF BENEVOLENCE OR LITERATURE WAS TO BE SEEN IN THE WHOLE BAPTIST FIELD. . . .”**

Note: This being so, and historical documents prove him correct, what can be said about those so-called “Missionary Baptist historians” that proclaim loud and far that the Missionary Baptists can trace their history back to the church in Jerusalem in a.d. 33 ? If they can, they must trace them through those Baptists who were opposed vehemently against them!

Here is what David Benedict says about the rise of missions. Remember that he is in favor of them, and the year of this publication is 1859:

“About **forty years ago** [this would be 1819] the dormant energies of our denomination in this country **began to be aroused in favor of some systematic efforts in favor of SENDING THE GOSPEL TO THE HEATHEN.** The cause of this **movement** may be traced to the conversion of Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice to the sentiments of the Baptists, while **on their way** to India as missionaries, **under the patronage of the pedo-baptists** [Congregationalists] . . . . Mr. Rice soon returned to America **to solicit pecuniary aid for assisting in establishing a BAPTIST MISSION IN THE EAST,** which the attention of the American Baptists was now **directed in a SUDDEN AND UNEXPECTED MANNER.”**

(David Benedict, *Fifty Years Among Baptists*, 1859, pp. 20,21, 53, and 84.)

We need say very little about the **whole collection of institutions** that identify New School or Missionary Baptists as “Baptists,” compose

a completely **new denomination** and totally separate from the original Baptists in America. Every sovereign grace, or Calvinistic believer, full well can tell that this group of “Baptists” no longer is capable of preaching the gospel here at home or abroad. They’ve lost it altogether! It is rather interesting, that most of these Baptists say “God cannot save a sinner without the preaching of the gospel!” What does this say of their contemporary members that have never had occasion to hear it?

## APPENDIX C

### THE FIRST RISING OPPOSITION TO THE BOARD OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC MISSIONS

#### ANNOTATION:

We will here present a common sample of the letters the Baptist Board of Foreign And Domestic Missions sent out to all the Baptists’ associations in America, beginning in 1814. We must use Minutes of early associations that existed in 1814. For this reason, we have selected the historical note by Henry C. Vedder, the historian for the American Baptist Convention, which proves the Missionary Baptist was a ***new movement*** in 1814; Minutes of the Miami Baptist Association in Ohio, and the Flint River Association in Alabama/Tennessee.

For the reader uninformed as to the use of “Minutes,” this bit of information is useful: Each association kept (and keeps) a history of its annual meeting. It then prints this report in Minutes of the Association, which in turn are then sent to the associations with which it corresponds for their information on its state and standing. **Bold letters** are supplied by the editor for emphasis.

## VEDDER'S HISTORY

“The need was at once felt of some **one central organization** that would **unite** the forces in the missionary cause, and after mutual counsel among **the officers of several existing bodies**, a meeting was called for the organization of a **national society**. This meeting was held at Philadelphia in May 1814, and resulted in the formation of the “General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions. . . . There was, however, **considerable OPPOSITION, not by any means confined to any one section, to this NEW missionary movement**. Many Baptist churches held to a **form of Calvinistic doctrine that was paralyzing to all evangelical effort**. Their doctrine of **the Divine Decrees was practically fatalism**: when God was ready to convert the heathen, He would do so without human intervention . . . . Consequently, from this time onward the Baptists of the United States **became divided** into two parties, missionary Baptists and anti-missionary Baptists. {or, itinerate preaching Baptists – Ed] The latter were at first equal, **if not superior in numbers to the former**; in some districts the anti-mission Baptists were **largely in the majority**.” (Henry C. Veddar, A Short History of The Baptists, page 332.) Note: Vedder was the historian for the American Baptist Convention in 1907, a Missionary historian.

### MIAMI BAPTIST ASSOCIATION, 1814 MINUTE

“The Association received the constitution of the “Baptist Missionary Society.” Ordered that their articles be printed with their Minutes this year, and do solicit the churches to take the matter into serious consideration and raise money to be sent to the General Assembly at Philadelphia for the purpose of **qualifying and sending preachers out to heathen lands to preach the Gospel to them**. Said constitution contains a Preamble and fourteen Articles drawn up **for** the direction of



the said society. It provides for a “Triennial Convention,” consisting of *other religious bodies* of the Baptist denomination now existing in the United States, and which shall **contribute regularly** to the General Missionary fund **a sum amounting to at least \$100.00 per annum**. It provides also, for a Board of twenty-one Commissioners, to be called the **Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for The United States.**” (Miami Baptist Association Minute, 1814.)

Five years later, the Miami’s action proves conclusively that they were *not antimissionary*. If there became a problem, it was not that they did not believe in preaching the gospel to sinners, but rather they deplored the sinister and deceitfulness of the Institute pretending to speak for the Baptists. The Minutes of the Miami Association of 1819 has this note:

“In answer to the Sugar Creek Church, The Association advises the churches *to become a board AUXILIARY TO the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions of Philadelphia*. A dun was presented by the Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions for money to aid in educating young men for the ministry **REJECTED.**” (Dobb’s Condensed History of the Miami Old School Baptist Association of Ohio, Page 10.)

However, by 1835, this and other associations were cognizant that Andrew Fuller’s Arminianism was at the core of the Modern Missionary Movement. We here print the article dealing with missions from the 1835 Minute.

**RESOLVED**, That we lay it over (admission of Mt. Zion Church) until tomorrow at 10 O’clock, and before deciding with regard to the admission of said church the Association shall proceed to investigate the subject and declare her sentiments with regards to the *benevolent institutions of the day, so-called*. On Saturday took up the benevolent

institutions, which was introduced by the following Preamble and Resolution:

**WHEREAS**, There is a great excitement and division of sentiment in the Baptist denomination relative to the **benevolent institutions of the day, so-called**, such as Sunday Schools, Bible, Missionary, Tract, and Temperance Societies, therefore, **RESOLVED**, That this association regard those said societies and institutions as having no authority, foundation, or support **in Sacred Scriptures**, but we regard them as having their origin in and belonging to the world, and as such we have no fellowship for them as being of a **religious character**, but do not hereby declare non-fellowship **with those brethren and churches** who now advocate them. Votes for Resolution: yeas 40, nays 21; Carried.” (Dodd, *ibid.*, page 10.)

### **FLINT RIVER BAPTIST ASSOCIATION, 1814**

The Flint River Association is the oldest association in Alabama, and had its origins in 1813 in the Elk River Association, Lincoln County, Tennessee. The resolution proposing its constitution was on the 24<sup>th</sup> of September, 1814. This was the same years that saw the completion of the take-over of the Philadelphia Baptist Association (1707) by William Staughton and the New Divinity ministers lately arrived from Andrew Fuller in England. The first mention of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions was read before that body on October 4, 1817, which entry reads:

“Called on our corresponding secretary, who made the following report, that he had received the third annual report from the Board of Foreign Missionaries, being directed to give one to each church which forms this Association, with which order the Secretary complied.”

“On motion for a collection for the use of the Board of Foreign Missions \$7 and 25 ct were collected from among the messengers of the Association.”

The following year, the Minutes record two items touching on the Board of Foreign Mission. It is worth the reader's notice. The first prove the Flint River's honesty, and the second their wisdom!

Their honesty:

"The corresponding Secretary made the following report: that there remains in his hands seven dollars twenty-five cents for the use of the Board of Foreign Missions. It is therefore resolved that brother Hopewood pay the same in his hands to brother Burns for the use for it was designed."

Their wisdom:

"On motion it was agreed that this Association **drop the correspondence with Foreign Missions.**"

We wish to note here, that the Flint River dropped the correspondence with the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions in **1818**, which was two years before Daniel Parker's Address of **1820**. This action is seen in Baptists' associations all over the frontier, as evidence by the Minutes of associations from 1814 to 1820. Hence, by 1822 to 1832, large numbers of Baptist churches and associations escaped the snares of this religious anti-Christian financial enterprise. The next time the reader reads or hears that Daniel Parker founded the Primitive Baptists, he can immediately recognize that Missionary Baptists' historians are as loose with the truth as are their preachers.

### **ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD AND TOTAL DEPRAVITY OF MAN, 1817**

This is not a proper place to insert this Article, but finding one better suited more difficult, we insert this only to preserve it for posterity, and give it a wider circulation than otherwise. As we have already well proven, records of these colonial and frontier Baptists show a strong

predestinarian foundation. Alexander Campbell, a Separate Baptist from the Congregational Church, joined Brush Run Baptist Church, (a church that joined the Red Stone Baptist Association in 1813), and was baptized by Elder Matthias Luce. He is best known in religious history as the founder of the Campbellian Restoration Movement, or “Campbellites,” in the 1820’s and 30’s. But in **1817**, he was a Predestinarian Baptist of the old divinity school. In that year, he was appointed by the Red Stone Association to write their “*Circular Letter*” to the churches and corresponding associations. Here is what Elder Alexander Campbell wrote”

“There is a combination of errors in the minds of those who present the objections (to God’s sovereignty). They not only disbelieve that **God is sovereign**, but they discredit the testimony of God concerning the natural state of all men. The objection proceeds upon the supposition that men do something to obtain salvation, which the purpose or ordination of God prevents them from doing. But the word of God teaches us that man can do nothing to save himself; that he has so destroyed himself, or that his ruin is so complete, that every faculty of his soul is so depraved, that until he is born from above, all he can do is abominable in the sight of God. “*They that are in the flesh cannot please God.*”

“The natural man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them. “*The carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.*” So that instead of this doctrine being averse to the salvation of any, it is only in consequence of its being true that any could be saved. So that “*except the Lord of Host had a remnant, according to the election of grace, we had all been as Sodom and perished as the men of Gomorrah*”; so then, if there be no election, there is no salvation. . . . The language of this doctrine is, that there is no difference amongst men but what grace makes.” [Red Stone Baptist Association, “Circular Letter,” 1817.]

## APPENDIX D

### PUBLIC ADDRESS TO THE BAPTIST SOCIETY by Daniel Parker, 1820

**ANNOTATION:** Almost ALL Missionary Baptists Historians (if they can be so classed), state that (1) Daniel Parker founded the Primitive or Old School Baptists, and (2) that Daniel Parker was an illiterate preacher. Both statements are typically as far from the truth as the doctrine they preach. First, we have already proven that there was a wide-spread and numerous collection of Baptist churches that totally rejected the New Divinity doctrine of Andrew Fuller and his Missionary societies, and hence, in no wise could Daniel Parker, in 1820, be the founder of those Old School and Primitive Baptists that long pre-existed his ministry.

Second, this ADDRESS, within itself, demonstrates clarity of mind, consistency of organization, and as equally grammatical construction as others educated on the American frontier. When scanning this document through Word's Spell-Check, it is amazing how few errors are found. While we point this out for the reader's special attention, nevertheless, that is not the purpose of this insertion. The *message*, however presented by Elder Parker, is the purpose for this presentation.

Again, it is set to 14 font size print, which is readable, and is a somewhat lengthy ADDRESS. Every Baptist interested in the preservation of the Gospel of Free Grace throughout these long decades of doctrinal decline and apostasy from the truth of Christ, ought to know the solid truthfulness of our Lord, "*the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" It seems, almost at times that it has; yet God is faithful, He cannot lie, nor can He deny Himself. The Truth still stands unbending, unyielding, and is still the joy of Zion's daughters:

## THE PUBLIC ADDRESS

By Daniel Parker, 1820

Circumstances have occurred in the course of a year or two past, which have caused some letters to pass between myself and some of my brethren, on **the mission system**, which letters have created an anxiety in the minds of some of my acquaintances, and they have requested me to bring my views on that subject before the public. And as I feel my mind seriously impressed to detect error and defend the cause of Truth, I feel willing to answer my part, and shew my opinion.

It is evident that great talents have been engaged, and much time and money spent to vindicate the **mission plan**, and yet, but little said or done against it. It makes me shudder when I think I am (the first one that I have knowledge of) among the thousands of zealous religions of America, that have ventured to draw the sword against the error, or to shoot at it and spare no arrows; and more particular, when I know that I lack that qualification that is pleasing to the spirit of the world, for I have no formal education but to read, and have no knowledge of the English grammar, only as my Bible has taught me; but all the apology I shall make for my grammatical errors is, that God has chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise. . . . therefore, I will venture:

About eighteen years ago, when I was in the state of Georgia, I believe the Lord called me to preach the Gospel (1802). Since that time, I have traveled through a great many of the States of America, and spent much of my time in the state of Tennessee; but I am now a citizen of the state of Illinois, Clarke County. Through this course of my life, I have found it my duty, to defend the cause of my Master, and contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. In doing this I have been under the necessity to expose error, and when I find it among my Baptist brethren, which I believe is the living Church of Jesus Christ, my feelings are worse hurt, and I am apt to strike the harder. I have observed four things that cannot be denied.

1. The errors that have flowed from the misled zeal, and from under the cloak of religion, are almost innumerable.
2. These errors have nearly all originated amongst the wise and learned.
3. They are more generally supported by arguments drawn from the wisdom of the world, than from the authority of the Bible.
4. That when the Scriptures are introduced as evidence, they are sure to be drawn in more to answer the plan of man's invention, than give the true meaning of God's word; and so the error is better supported by the cunning craft of ingenious argument than the force of evidence. By this means the dear children of God are thrown into a state of confusion, and friends of religion or enquiring characters stand amazed in wonder and the enemies of religion take latitude to deny revelation and persecute the saints.

I make these remarks to lead our minds to the subject in hand, which is "**the principle and practice of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions.**" N attending to this subject I shall aim to give my views in as short a manner as I can, so as to give the reader a plain understanding of what I mean to oppose, and what I am willing to support, without making use of any unfair argument, stubbornness or bigotry. In doing this, I hope you will admit me to speak my mind freely without offering any violence to your feelings, as I know I am an accountable creature to God for all I do. As such, consider what I say, and may the Lord give the understanding in all things. As I am writing to a people that I hope are well acquainted with their Bible, it relieves me of the trouble of referring to chapter and verse in my quotations, except in some particular cases.

In order to be well understood, I shall undertake the subject in the following manner.

1. To remove the prejudices that have arose against us who oppose the mission system.

2. To show what we stand opposed to, and what we are willing to do.
3. To understand what the Baptist Board intends to do, from the face of their Constitution, and prove it by their doctrine and practice.
4. Examine the principle evidences they introduce for its support.
5. Try the principle and practice of the Board in sending out preachers by the principle and practice of Christ and His apostles.
6. Point out some of the particular evils that I view in the mission plan.
7. And lastly, take a small view of the whole.

It is not my wish to cause any further distress among my brethren than now exists, but hope this short epistle may be a means in the hands of God to show them the great evil they are supporting; for the confidence I have in the religion of my brethren induces me to believe that if they could lay aside the vices of their mind, and examine their zeal, they would find it was not according to the knowledge given in God's word. They would then come fairly to the Truth, and we could say, we are of one heart, one soul and one mind; how pleasant this would be. Now as the subject is of great magnitude on which the peace of Zion greatly depends, I hope my reader will not pass too hasty a judgment, but will read, consider, and compare with God's Word, then ask his heart whether these things be true or not. I now proceed to take up the subject.

**In endeavoring to remove the prejudices** from the minds of the people, I shall have to answer the charges exhibited against those who **oppose the mission system**. I am informed we are charged with the following accusations:

1. That we are **opposed to the spread of the Gospel, among the heathen**. To this I answer, we are pleased with the spread and growth of *Emanuel's* kingdom throughout the world. But we wish it under His direction and government, and crown Him with the glory, which we believe is **not** the case in the mission plan.



2. We are charged with **opposing the translation of the Scriptures, and the education of the heathen.** To this I answer the charge is incorrect, for we oppose neither; but will help with heart and hand if it could be taken in a proper manner, and take the evils from it.
3. We are charged with **holding a tyrannical principle, inasmuch as we are not reconciled to our brethren in their giving their money to the mission system,** and the argument is that they have a right to do what they please with their own, and we would bind them down that they should not have liberty to bestow their money to the relief of any of their fellow mortals, whatever. To this I answer, as to the bestowing your money to relieve the needy in a point of moral duty, we believe is performing good works, and we truly wish such good works were more common among the Baptists. But as to a professor being at liberty to do what he pleases with his own in all cases without being accountable to the Church, is a very absurd idea. I ask would you be willing that your brethren should gamble on his own money, or even lend it to a gambler for that purpose; or give it to the priest to forgive his sins, or to the worship of idols, or in many other cases too tedious to mention? I think the spirit of religion saith not willing. Just so if the mission system be an evil, and God has never required it at your hands to give the blessings He has bestowed on you to support an unscriptural plan that is repugnant to His Gospel government, then we are no tyrants; but have a right to deal with you as violators of the government of Christ.
4. It is said by some that the **Wabash Association had no right to interfere with the mission system in the way she did;** or did not understand what she was doing. To this I answer, the Wabash Association well understood what she was doing, and had an undoubted right to make head against the penetration of heterodox principles or disorderly practices among her. And if the mission principle and practice is not agreeable to the “law and the

testimony”, then it is to be deemed heterodox in principle and disorderly in practice. These charges, with many other similar ones are very improperly stated in order to weaken the confidence of the people in our objections against the mission system, and by this means practice fraud on the minds of the public, by unfair arguments, grounded on false charges. But I hope when the public are informed of the (Board’s) intrigue, their prejudices will be broken that were against us and they will come fairly to the Truth and give due weight to our arguments.

I now proceed to the second thing proposed, which is to **shew what part of the mission object we oppose, and what part we are willing to support.**

We stand opposed to the **mission plan in every point and part where it interferes or is connected with the ministry**, either in depending on the Church to give them a call, or seminaries of learning to qualify them to preach, or an established fund for the preacher to look back upon a support, and when the Board assumes authority to appoint the fields of their labor, we believe they sin in attempting a work that **alone belongs to the Divine Being.** Consequently we are not reconciled to the unfruitful works of darkness but feel it our duty to reprove them; and as to the extravagant plan of translating the Bible and civilizing of the Indians, we could bear with it, if it was not under the sacred name of religion, but we believe as paper, types, and the labor of men, all cost money, and belong to the things of nature, that it should be conducted under the direction of moral government, and not at the expense of religion; and as to educating the heathen, we think it very improper for to establish missionary families securing the rights of flocks and herds, farms and incomes, all under the color of religion. It seems like making the sacred character of religion no greater than the merchandize of this world, and putting it in a long line of trade and traffic, when the colonization of the heathen ought to be conducted under the direction of our *civil government*, or a society formed for that express purpose, not

under the character of any society of religion whatever. But we rejoice at all good that is done in translating the Bible, or educating the heathen, and are willing to give our aid in counsel, or money, provided it can be done and not dishonor the cause of religion. So you may see we are not opposers of the translating of the Bible, nor educating the heathen, but we think there could be a better way fallen on and not mingle matters of religion with the things of the world. But the object of missionary societies in respect to the ministry we are opposed to **in every point**, and our reasons will be more fully understood before we are done; so I shall go on to the third thing proposed, (Note, when I use the word “we,” I include myself with the common objections of those who stand opposed to the mission plan,) which is to understand **what the Baptist Board intends to do from the face of their Constitution and prove it by their doctrine and practice.**

The reason I take up this point is that the principles of the Board are denied by numbers who are engaged in the practice, and it is often smoothed over and the true meaning not admitted; by these means the ignorant are drawn in to support those errors which they otherwise would not do. The points often denied are that the Board does not claim the government of the ministry or hiring preachers and sending them out. These points I shall attempt to prove by **their** own principles and practices, which I think will not be denied by any candid mind, if they understand words; if they will but reflect one minute on the exalted title they are pleased to be known by which is the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions for the United States of America. I ask what are we to understand by the word “Missionary”? Is it not designed to convey to our understanding a mission given, and alone belongs to the ministry, when spoken of relative to religion?

(Editor’s note: The Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions ***did*** –in spite of denials- educate, train, hire, locate, and recruit ministers to be placed in established churches secretly, in associations to gain control of, and devise geographical plans for the placement of these recruits in

advance of the rapid populating frontiers. For proof, read their missionary's autobiography –Ezra Fisher, a copy of which is in the Indiana Historical Archives, Indianapolis, Ind.)

Then by the title they bear, we understand a society formed for the purpose of sending the ministry to foreign parts. There is one thing now I wish to notice in the title they bear, where they claim their authority of the foreign ministry for the United States of America. This evidently proves they claim the government of the ministry and consequently arrests the government and authority Christ gave His Church; for the first article of the Constitution cites them to the general missionary convention for the Baptist denomination in the United States of America, for foreign missions. Here they have claimed the Baptist name and authority, which the **Baptist union or government has never authorized them to do**, and in the 13<sup>th</sup> article claim the authority of domestic missions in **our own country**; but if we will notice the 4<sup>th</sup> article, we will find they do not only claim the power, but deem it their **duty to employ missionaries**, by which I understand *preachers*, and take measures if necessary, for the further improvement of their qualifications, and fix on the field of their labors; also on the compensation to be allowed them for their services. What are we to understand the Convention means in this article, or shall we say they did not understand the meaning of these words? No, they are men that understand the grammatical sense of these words. Well, shall we think they intended to impose them on us, thinking we would not know what they meant? I would fain hope not; but then why not the meaning of these words be freely acknowledged, for when they say to “employ missionaries,” do we not understand to “hire preachers”? Yes, we are obliged to understand that, especially when they have to agree on the “compensation” for their services, for if I get only one meal a day for my services, it is so far a part of the pay for my labor. Then I must be an hireling although I work for so little. Well, who has hired or employed me? The Board. Where will I get my pay? From the Board I look to for

it, for they have employed me, and appointed the field of my labor. I am under their government and direction. Well, what has the Board got to pay a man for preaching? Are they better off than the “wise virgins”? Have they got any “oil to spare”? I trow not. Then it must be money or something of this world’s goods to pay me for preaching. I ask who has the right to appoint the fields of the labors of the preacher? certainly the authority that has employed him. Well then, the Board acts consistent with their principle, for they have employed preachers and sent them out, and pay them for their labours, and to the Rev. Luther Rice, as high as eight dollars a week, besides his traveling expenses, so I hope the mission friends will no longer deny this truth, but defend the cause of their principle, or forsake its evil.

The principles of the Board are further understood by the 14<sup>th</sup> Article of their Constitution: In this article, as well as some others, it goes to prove they believe **education** essential to the gospel ministry, and their practice in the urgent resolutions entered into in their paper, the *Latter Day Luminary*, No. 5, pages 234-235, goes to prove the fact, for in those resolutions they have resolved to **divide America in three sections, and two men in each district appointed to receive contributions, and to attend to the business under the control of the Board.** Here we find the Baptist Board has urged us to **form auxiliary societies.** What is this great exertion for? It is stated to give pious young men education to *qualify them to preach.* This pointedly proves their principle is not only to **educate** preachers, but also to **hold the government** of the ministry **in their own hands.** Many other facts might be referred to, but this is sufficient to the point in hand. But there is one thing more observable in the mission principle that I think ought not to escape the notice of the Baptists; and that is, they prove to us by their writings that it is the business of the churches to impress on the minds of their “pious young men to preach the gospel,” or call them to the work; although they *say* in one place, it is the Holy Ghost that makes us able ministers of the new testament. But in this their Constitution they only claim gifts and grace

to introduce them to the seminaries of learning. I ask, may not man possess all these and yet never be called of God to preach the gospel? And further, in urging the necessity of supplying the world with preachers, it appears their eye is on the churches to call them to the work of the ministry, which may be observed in the following remarks made by them in the *Latter Day Luminary*, No. 6, page 281. This remark is, "If Christian teachers are to be sent forth, it is obvious that the Christian churches must send them." In the same number, page 284, they say, they take it for granted, that in all Christendom, there are not less than thirty thousand suitable young men, that might be called to this work. On page 285, they say it is granted that there are suitable men enough, if they were disposed to go, and the churches were able to send them to the work. On page 290, they say to the churches it belongs to move forward it is for them to implore the guidance and blessings of the Lord, it is for them to seek out and call forth the messengers of salvation, &c. Also, on the first page cited, they tell us, it is the duty of Christians to send forth preachers of the gospel, in such numbers as to furnish the means of instruction of the whole world. Many other similar passages might be referred to, but it is unnecessary, for these remarks evidently go to prove, to call or send forth preachers, they deem it the work and business of the church. I ask my Baptist brethren to realize this principle, and ask their Bible and their hearts, if they dare believe that God has ever called on the Christian world to look out, call, qualify and send out preachers of the gospel? Or has He reserved that work to Himself, and will fulfill it in His own time and way?

I now pass on to the fourth point in hand, which is to take notice of or **examine the most common evidences introduced to support the mission plan.** In this there are three points to be observed:

1. The Scripture they introduce to justify them in qualifying, sending out, and supporting the missionaries.

2. The evidence that justify them in their plan for collecting money in the manner they do, and keeping an established fund for that purpose.
3. The right of the titles and names of the officers in the mission system.

But the first point named is the most important matter to be considered; for if I am right when I say the mission system has **neither precept nor example to justify its principle and practice**, and those Scriptures introduced **cannot support it**, then the error must be great in the mission plan and ought to be rejected, for on this hangs the whole point. It is *“to the law and testimony, for if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them.”* For we have a right to **reject men or angels that bring any other gospel than that which is already brought**. But to the reverse, if I am wrong and the mission plan is right, then I am in an awful error, and should be withstood. So we agree the Bible **is the standard**, and to it we will go.

I shall in order to be short and well understood, plainly give my own views on the Scriptures, as I bring them in, as well as to show what the friends of the mission system aim to prove by them. I shall begin with Jonah’s being sent to Nineveh: This part of the Scripture is introduced by the friends of the mission system to justify them in sending preachers to the heathen. This is the first account of a Hebrew teacher being sent to the Gentiles; this text is intended to justify the **missionary society** in sending out preachers. We will now examine and see if it will answer the purpose. We find this was a special act of God in sending Jonah to Nineveh, and that not by or through a *missionary society* and stands a very pointed evidence in my favor, and against themselves unless the mission society will say they are acting as God, in sending out preachers, and I hope this they will not say. Notice Jonah was not sent to a **seminary of learning** to prepare him to preach to the Gentiles, but was under the tuition and special order of his God, and was in no case under

the order or direction of any body of men whatever; neither did he look back to a **society formed to raise money for his support**. So we find this text will not answer the missionary purpose but contracts guilt on their own heads; and whenever quoted by them, instead of justifying their system, only proves they **assume the authority of God**. And the same may be said by every text they draft to answer their purpose; and instead of being angry as Jonah, (as some say we are in a gospel sense) we are hurt with our dear brethren for attempting a work that alone belongs to the great God; that it, **to employ preachers, qualify them and send them out, and fix on the field of their labours**. I now go on to the mission evidence.

The Covenant of grace that God made known to Abraham, when He told him in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed: this text is brought to justify the mission plan in sending the gospel to all nations in order to secure that blessing to them. Here I wish to observe we can join our prayers with our brethren at a throne of grace, that the kingdom of Christ may come, and His will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and the whole world be filled with the glory of God, and the kingdom of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ; but we cannot join them **in prescribing a plan for the Sovereign of the universe**, and begging Him to work that way; for as to the heathen nations having the gospel preached to them, we have no doubt that it will be done, for God has said so; but as to the mission plan to accomplish the object, God's Word knows nothing of such a plan – for in the last quoted text as to the Covenant of grace, Abraham had no knowledge that a **seminary of learning or a missionary society formed** (independent of the Church) was essential to accomplish the work; but it is evidence that after our Lord had risen from the dead, and God was about to break down the middle wall of partition between the Jews and the Gentiles, and make of twain, one new man to the praise of His glory, and lay the foundation of the gospel faith throughout the world, and build His Church on the Rock, that the gates of hell should not prevail



against it; He gave His disciples their commission to preach the gospel throughout the world.

Here my brethren attached to the mission plan lay their main stress on this command Christ gave His preachers, and claim it as fully authorizing them to pursue the mission system now prescribed. Stop here, O my brethren and pause. Was this a missionary society that gave this command, or is it the command of our King and King of Zion, or was there a missionary society independent of the Church to send them and fix on the field of their labours, and support them, or a seminary of learning lay between those disciples and the place their Lord was about to send them? If there were any of those things, where are the texts? They will do you some good; if you cannot find them, then the others stand pointed against you, for we are under the same dispensation or commission to this day, for the commission or command that Christ gave His disciples in preaching the gospel, plainly manifests His authority, power and wisdom in accomplishing the work of salvation throughout the world, agreeable to His own counsel, and admits of no alteration. So I still say whenever the advocates of the mission system force in these Scriptures to justify themselves in that work, just so far they introduce evidence to prove themselves acting in the place of God; to look out, employ, qualify and send out preachers of the gospel, and fix on the field of their labours, and compensate them for their services.

The next passage to be noticed is about to the same amount, and the same reply might be made to it, which is in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter of Acts, where the Holy Ghost saith, "Separate me Paul and Barnabas, to the work whereunto ***I have called them.***" This text will do the mission friends no good unless they will say they are acting as God, or in the place of the Holy Ghost in sending out preachers. But this text shows two things: first, just what Christ told His disciples the Holy Ghost would do when He was come, that He should guide them into all truth and bring all things to their remembrance that He had said unto them. Secondly, show the order of God in His Church, and the union that exists

between Christ and His Church. First, His calling His preachers to the work, and then the Church (not a missionary society), sending them out in gospel order to preach and administer the ordinances of the gospel that “*all things might be done decently and in order*”, which only goes to show the propriety of ordaining preachers to the work; for it is called the Spirit sending them. When the Church or disciples had fasted and prayed, *they* sent them away, and they went **as they were directed by the Holy Ghost**, and not by a mission society. Now this text can have no allusion to the present plan of the mission society, as we have no account of a seminary of learning for them to go through, nor an established fund to look back at for a support. No, they depended on the Lord for their support, knowing the laborer was worthy of his hire, and no doubt they believed like some of us, that where ever God sent His gospel, He would send His Spirit with His ministers, or before them, and He would produce a willingness in the hearts of the people to support the gospel, as He did when He sent Peter to Cornelius and Paul to the Gentiles; and if so, there is no need of sending money after them, for even the Church at Philippi, that administered to Paul’s relief, was of the Gentiles, which text is often brought to justify the mission conduct in their plan of supporting the ministry; but I hope it will be remembered that I do not look at the Board of Missions holding the power or authority of a Church as such; no point of Scripture that goes to show the act, power or authority of the Church is not admitted as evidences; consequently this text will not answer their purpose as it was a Church act, or an act of some of the brethren in the time of some particular need, and was not governed by any previous contract made between them. I might go on to answer a number of other texts on this point, but they are all to the same amount and to be answered in like manner. So I shall proceed to the second point in this head, which is to **notice their authority in collecting of money**, which is the 22<sup>nd</sup> chapter of II Kings, and the 24<sup>th</sup> and 34<sup>th</sup> chapters of II Chronicles, where we have the account of the

collection of money for the purpose of rebuilding the temple or repairing the house of God.

I must say there are no greater evidences to prove the falsehood of any system, than to find its advocates put to the pitiful shift to force in evidence that has no allusion whatsoever to the point. Just so the friends of the mission plan force in these Scriptures through necessity; for if you say these workmen engaged in repairing the temple, stand as figures of the gospel ministers, I presume you dare not say the money that was given these workmen, stand as a figure of the money you give your preachers you send; for if you do, you will then acknowledge you look at the money as the real cause of men's salvation; but you must say the money they received stands as a figure of the preachers' reward, which is evidently the answer of a good conscience towards God and man, as they preach the gospel not for filthy lucre's sake, but with a ready mind, and seeing souls flocking to God, which is better than gold, and you must say the money they received for their labor was not designed to qualify them to do the work, but to reward them for their services; but if you say the money you collect is not to qualify the preachers you send, but reward them for their labors, then you will confess that money is the object in view. But we find that agreeable to the mission plan, that some of the money you collect, is designed to qualify the preachers as well as reward them for their labors; so turn it which way you will, it will not fit your case, and the collection of money on the mission plan must fall when rightly tried by these Scriptures, as those collections of money were for the express purpose of repairing the temple and could not tolerate us further than public collections for building meeting houses.

I come now to the third point, that is to **say something about officers or titles of commission**; but as this is a matter of small amount, I shall say but little about it; but the same chapters referred to above, are brought in this case. But as the collection of money falls when tried by these Scriptures, so all the titles or names of commissions will fall with it, but the Book of Daniel is referred to, to justify the title "President,"

which I conceive doth not only belong to national affairs but under the tyranny of a heathen king, and when professors of religion give way to the spirit of nature and are pleased with the names of honor from the world, it is time to say, “take care,” for Israel following after the heathen idolatry was the cause of her captivity; so I leave the public now to judge, whether the principle and practice of the mission system, is proven and justified by these evidences or not, and pass on to the next point in hand, which is the Fifth.

Agreeable to my arrangement, which is to try the principle and practice of the Board in sending out preachers, by the principle and practice of Christ and His apostles. On this point I shall be short and plain still, I shall find it necessary to take notice of some of their reasonings on the matter, and answer them. My object here, is to show that the principle and practice of the mission system is according to the spirit of this world, and not according to the spirit of the gospel, and the best method to try this, is to come plainly to the word of God as the sure “rule of both faith and practice.” The mission advocates say their principle is good, because it is to send the gospel to the heathen, and by that means have heirs of glory begotten. Just so I might say, my neighbor or friend is very wealthy and wants an heir very badly, and I viewing his wealth, and how happy his heir would be, with his anxiety to divide his happiness with his heir: would it not be a good principle to wish he had an heir? Yes, but a most horrid act for me to attempt to become the father! Just so we all agree the object is good, and we can truly say, O that the heathen were all saints; but for us to step in the place of God to send means to accomplish the birth of these heirs must be horrid and wicked. Just so if the mission system is not compatible with the word of God and they are attempting a work that God has reserved to Himself, and claims all the glory. Then they should be boldly withstood, notwithstanding their wisdom and zeal, for I have thought that their zeal is something like old Sarah’s was when the Lord had promised the birth of an heir, she became so restless and was so anxious, that she could not

wait for the Lord to bring it about agreeable to His own purpose, but must give her handmaid to her husband. But still, notwithstanding all it was an Ishmaelite, and was not the heir as God designed, and there has been a constant war ever since, between the children of the bondwoman, and of the free. It seems the mission friends, as God has promised the birth of the heathen, they have become so anxious they cannot wait for God to bring it about, but turn in at it themselves, give their handmaid, that is their money and wisdom, bestow it on preachers of their own appointing, and what will be the consequence God only knows, but I fear an awful war, between the families, both parents and children. And I wish you to notice the awful consequence of the great regard that Uzzah had for the Ark of the Lord, when the cart was jostling, which caused him to put forth his hand as though it was to be supported by the arm of flesh; although the object seems good, yet the principle was so bad, it cost him his life. So it seems the mission friends are putting forth the arm of flesh to support the Ark of the Covenant, and I have but little doubt as striking to our heart as it may be, but it still without a recantation cost them their life in the Baptist union.

Remember the strange fire that the sacrifice was offered with, although on the altar of the Lord, yet it cost Nadab and Abihu their lives. I might make many remarks here, but I must come close to the point in hand, the difference between the plan of Christ and His apostles in the spread of the gospel, and the plan proposed by the mission system, both in the qualification of the ministry, and the preachers being sent out to preach, and their support.

The mission society seems in their constitution to claim the right to qualify pious young men, who have gifts and graces, by conferring with flesh and blood, that is, to give them the wisdom of this world by sending them to a seminary of learning, for I have not as yet known a school set up in this world to teach people the gift of God's grace, except it is the gift of God's Spirit in His Church, and that agreeable to His word, and that teaches us a different plan. Notice the mission society

does not require a **call to the work**; only gifts and graces and what sort these are we must guess at. But Christ when He was about to send out preachers, **called them**, whether they had learning or not (most did not), and gives us no account that a seminary of learning was essential to the ministry. And old Paul tells us when it pleased God to call him, he conferred not with flesh and blood and that he never even sought it of man; neither did he obtain, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ; and the Bible tells us, if any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God. And Paul brings us to view our calling by telling us we see our calling, brethren, that not many wise, that not many noble, after the flesh, are called. Let me observe here, I have thought the mission system is about to give old Paul the dodge here, for it seems that if they are not wise and noble when they are called, they intend to make them wise and noble before they send them out. But God takes the wise in their own craftiness, and Christ rejoiced that it was the pleasure of the Father to hide these things from the wise and prudent and reveal them unto babes.

I could quote many similar texts, and quote chapter and verse; but it would be more tedious and you can search them at your leisure, and I hope my readers will still remember that when he (Paul) came to preach to his brethren, that he did not come with the words of man's wisdom, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Again, the wisdom of this world was foolishness with God, and if he sought to please man, he was not the servant of God; and he that is a friend to the world, is an enemy of God. So we see the apostles had not only no idea that the wisdom of this world qualified them to preach but seem to stand opposed to such measures as well as some of us, and no wonder while they held their exalted vies of the grace of God, which taught them to look to the Great Giver for wisdom, and not to this world. And again when we apply to the world for wisdom, consider the contempt we throw on the wisdom that comes from above; observe whenever we apply to any source for help, it proves that we look at that as a superior source.

I consider the Board cast this contempt on the school of Heaven, whenever they propose seminaries of learning to qualify preachers; and in respect to sending out preachers, the Scriptures hold out to our view that it is God who calls, qualifies and prepares a preacher for the work He designs him to do, and the Church is the instrumental means, in the hands of God, to send him out in gospel order, that the union with Christ and His Church may appear extraordinarily as it is internally performed by His Spirit, which internal union cannot appear nor be perceived by the act of the Board of Foreign Missions; and as to the support of the minister, the Board teaches their students to look back (remember Lot's wife) for a support which was not the case with the apostles, for they were taught to forget the things that are behind, and not act like those men that stoop down to the water, but catch as they pass on and lap like Gideon's men. That is, they take no thought to themselves what they shall eat or drink, or wherewith they shall be clothed; but they trust the God of grace, knowing that they who preach the gospel shall live of it, and that the laborer is worthy of his hire – and their heavenly Father knoweth what they need, and where they go their support is their due, that is, if they give themselves wholly to the work.

Here let me observe the preachers have no right to look back where they **came from**, for there is no account that the gospel ministers are supported from behind – for Paul calls it “**robbery**,” and confesses himself guilty of robbing other churches and taking wages from them to do service to the Corinthians Church, and **asks forgiveness for that wrong**. We must say that wherever a preacher labors, **is the place for him to claim his support**, and he has no Scriptural authority to look anywhere else – for the plan of supporting preachers by contribution, is without the authority of the Bible, for the contribution the Scriptures speak of, and taking it from one place to another, was for “the relief of the poor saints” and ***not for the preachers***. For the preachers are supported as a **debt we owe the gospel**, and that where they preach, and not to be sent after them, and we cannot pay a debt we owe by a liberal

gift – so the poor are relieved by an act of charity, and the preachers **supported as their just due.**

As I have gone this far, it is necessary for me to say more, lest my readers may think I aim to make a trade of the gospel. No, this is what I mean: when I travel and preach, I think I have a right to claim my support, and that I am not in debt to the people for the *reasonable supplies* to enable me to go on in the ministry; and when I am at home it is my duty to labor for the support of myself and family – and whenever my family is in need of assistance, and I cannot relieve them by reason of my engagements in the ministry, then it is the duty of the Church to assist them. But my family cannot eat money, and whenever the offer of a little corn, wheat, or a piece of meat becomes offensive let them alone till they get hungry enough to eat a piece of ash pone [bread cooked in hot coals or ashes]. So I think it is necessary for the preacher to know it is better to give than receive, and be looking forward to the mark for the prize, and remember that God is able to cause the Ravens to feed His people. And now the plain fact is, when we try the principle and practice of the Mission system for the spread of the gospel by the word of God, they are different, for the mission plan is to look to the world for qualification and support, while the Scriptural plan is to look to God for both, for the mission society claims the government of the ministers, to look them out, qualify them by learning, send them out and appoint the field of their labors and compensate them for their services; while the Scriptural plan is that God holds the internal government of the ministry by the internal impressions made by His Spirit, and has given the authority of the government of the ministry to His Church, to conduct the executive part of the ministry, in the external parts of the gospel to be performed agreeable to the government in His word; and God claims the right of looking out preachers and qualifying them by teaching of His Spirit, and that agreeable to His word, and of sending them out under the direction of His Spirit and government as above stated. He directs them into the field of their labor by His Spirit, whether to Jews or Gentiles,



and compensates them with “well done thou good and faithful servant” – and the promises of the life that now is, and that which is to come.

When all other evidences fail to establish the mission principles, then its advocates will introduce **the zeal that attends the mission spirit for justification**. But, my dear brethren, if great and warm zeal is to justify the principle, then surely the worshippers of Juggernaut will claim the preference, while the Mahometans [Moslems –Ed] may lay in their plea, and the persecutors of the Church of Christ have much to hope, and King Saul’s zeal must be better than his command, for instead of his killing all the Amalekites, as God told him, he save some alive to sacrifice to the Lord. But Samuel told him to hearken was better than sacrifice, and to obey than the fat of rams – so let us fear lest our zeal leads us to do that which God hath not required at our hands, and it returns with curses on our heads like Israel when they wished to be like the rest of the nations of the earth, and prayed for a king, and God granted their prayers – gave them a king – pointed him out to them and instructed him what to do – and at the same time designed him to be a curse to his people. So I wish the mission friends to know that all their zeal, their prayers, their answers to their prayers, and their foregoing all the conflicts of life, even if they give themselves a sacrifice to the mission system, it will never justify the principle nor practice unless they have a “Thus saith the word of the Lord” for it. For, we are commanded not to be wise above that which is written. We have to acknowledge, that the gospel has been conducted, directed and supported for nearly eighteen hundred years **without such a plan** as the Board has prescribed. I ask, is not the earth the Lord’s now the same as it ever was? Yes, and let the churches do their duty and the thing can be done in a gospel like manner.

I keep thinking of a little anecdote that I once heard, A very homely lady undertook to dress herself before the glass, and make herself look handsome; but let her turn herself or her dress as she would, the glass was true and would show her ugly features until she was very much enraged, and to vent her spite struck a fatal blow at the innocent glass

and broke it in pieces and scattered it over the whole house, which made the matter still worse, for then go where she would in the house, there was some piece of glass which would still show her ugly features. This I have thought most beautifully brings to my view the situation of the saints after the day of Pentecost, when they were embodied together, and as a glass all the devil could do in his dissimulations and coming as near the gospel light and beauty, by his dressing error as finely as he possibly could. Yet the saints, as the glass through which the gospel light did shine disclosed the ugly features of the error. The devil got mad, struck the fatal blow through the Pagan persecution, scattered the disciples of Christ through a great many parts of the then known world, and the same may be said by every persecution ever since; but blessed be God there is in a great many parts of the world, and even in what we may call the wilderness and frontiers of America parts of that true glass which will show Satan's ugly features, let him come in whatever shape he pleases, and even if it is among the Baptists, the true Church of Christ. And I should as soon think that somehow like this, the gospel will get to all nations, as any other way, as God generally breaks the devil's head with his own weapons.

But I must return to the subject – you will say, perhaps, what will become of the preachers Baptists have sent out? I ask, what made you send them? For if God had sent them, no doubt but He would provide for their support where He sent them, as He has done for His other preachers He has sent. You will say then, what will become of our translators whom we have sent? I answer, support them as long as necessary for that work, but not as preachers but as translators or printers; and remember that the Kingdom of God is like a grain of mustard seed, that if God has planted it there, it is the Lord's work to make it grow; and instead of our being opposed to giving the heathen the Bible, we are willing to help you do this; take everything else from it, that is, if further translation is necessary, if it can be taken in a proper manner, as we have agreed that can be done by the things of this world, as types, paper and the labor of

men all cost money. But as to preaching of the gospel, we believe it is directed by the special workings of God's Spirit, and that work we leave for God's direction, and we cannot join you in that, for we think you sin when you touch it in the way you do.

The mission advocates seem to ground all their arguments on the propriety of sending the gospel to the heathen, but if this was all, we could bear with it better, but when we look at the Plan proposed in the mission system, we find the heathen are not the only object, for we find they are aiming to **establish missionary families** not only among the heathen, but on **our own frontiers where preachers are perhaps as plentiful as among ourselves**, there setting up schools and raising family funds and stocks, flocks and herds, of various kinds, all belonging to the mission system. [Parker here refers to communal living as used by William Cary in India. -Ed] And we see them aiming to get thirty thousand preachers circulating throughout the world, here as well as elsewhere, all to look to the seminary of learning for a qualification, and to the mission fund for a support, and depending on them to appoint them their field of labor.

Dear Brethren, can you blame us for not believing the mission system now pursued, to be the way or medium through which the Lord is about to fill the world with His gospel or preachers, when you are not able to show such a Plan or society, throughout the lids of the Bible? And I ask, can we believe that God ever designed so great a work to be performed in that way, and has given us no account in His Word, so that His children might understand His will and agree with the work?

There is one thing more I wish to notice before I close this point. I have noticed in some correspondent letters from the Board, and some remarks in what they call "The Latter Day Luminary" with some plain hints in the "circular address" by Isaac McCoy, that all we who do not fall in with the mission system, or stand opposed to it, are **deemed impious, or not on the Lord's side, or opposers to the commission**

**Christ gave His disciples to preach the gospel, and unfriendly to the heathens having the Bible.**

[Editors note: This is ever the false charge the whole brood of Missionaries and Arminians charge against the Old School Baptist. They still today –2006- say thy do not “believe in preaching the gospel to sinners,” or, “they do not believe in preaching the gospel,” or “they do not believe in education,” *etc.*, all of which is based upon the Old School Baptists not believing in the evil institution of the mission system nor in theological mixing of the religion of Jesus with the philosophies of man. It simply is a “rush,” smoke and mirror deceit.]

And what seems strange and inconsistent is the mission system advocates often tell us it is a *free thing and with no compulsion*, and we are *at liberty without any censure or charge from them to act our pleasure* and they claim the same right to act in favor of the Plan. Strange indeed that we should be such base characters and still hold our seat in full fellowship, and stranger still to hear them say that they are not hurt with us when we refuse to support the mission system! And still even more strange, if possible, to think we are so foolish as to rest contented under charges of such great magnitude! It must be owing to this one thing, the mission friends know they have no **Scriptural grounds to raise or support a charge against us**, as we believe and practice as we always have upon constitutional ground. And we have not left them but they have left us. As such we cannot say that our beloved brethren, leaving off the good old way and falling into error, do not hurt us. So I conclude that when we bring the principle and practice of the mission system to the word of God, the sure standard, it will not measure nor weigh with it. As such, we are bound to give it against the mission system, and bring in a verdict in favor of the Bible plan, for making and sending out preachers of the gospel.

I shall let these remarks suffice on this point, and pass on to the 6<sup>th</sup> head under consideration, which is to show the most **particular**

## **objections I have to the principles and practice of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions.**

My object on this point is to show the **moral evil** that I see in the mission system, and where it causes our brethren to sin, which is the reason we can have no fellowship with them in the mission spirit, and lays us under the heart-rending necessity of denying fellowship with them, while engaged in it.

Now dear brethren, as the mission system is bringing such distress in Zion, although I know you lay the blame of this distress on those who oppose the innovations of the mission plan, yet I as well know the cause is in you, and the time is come when we are compelled to submit to, or join in with, that which we believe in our very hearts to be contrary to the “faith of God’s elect,” and heinously wicked in its nature, or exhibits our charges against the principles and deny fellowship with the practice, so I hope you will pay close attention to my objections or charges, and give every remark due weight and not let prejudice blind your minds nor hardness possess your hearts. And I hope you will not think these statements, because they are pointed and plain, comes from the harshness of spirit; but the sincerity of my heart as an accountable creature to God, and a lover of the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ. And I request one thing more, and that is, not let the arguments lose their weight for the want of being decorated with the flowery language of the learned.

I come now to my **first objection**; which is the principle and practice of the mission system in its present operation. It has neither precept nor example to justify it within the two lids of the Bible. Therefore we have a right to reject it. For through the precept of the Lord we get understanding; therefore we hate “every false way.” This objection I have fully treated on heretofore and I have just named it now to bring to your minds the weight it justly deserves, and I will now state my second objection, which I hope will be duly attended to.

I conceive the Baptist Board in their principle and practice, have rebelled against the King of Zion, violated the government of the gospel Church and forfeited their right to the union and brought distress on the Church of Christ.

1<sup>st</sup>. They have rebelled against the King of Zion, inasmuch as they have assumed an authority that Christ has reserved alone to Himself.

2<sup>nd</sup>. They have violated the right or government of the Church of Christ in forming themselves into a body and acting without divine authority of the union.

3<sup>rd</sup>. They have forfeited their right to the Union by departing from the gospel plan and the common, constant and constitutional faith and practice of the Baptist Church, and thereby brought distress on the Church of Christ.

In order to be short, I shall notice all these points under one view. It is a soul reviving faith that is peculiar to the Baptists, and I believe denied by none that profess the Baptist faith (as such it saves me the trouble of being so very particular in my evidence to prove my doctrine) that Christ did set up and establish His Church in this world upon that Rock that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. And the Spirit told Daniel that God should set up a kingdom which should never be overthrown and Paul calls it the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth; and Christ has evidently manifested His Kingly power and authority, and has given His law, the gospel government, to be observed and practiced by His Church, and sent His Holy Spirit to guide them into **all truth**, and bringing all things to their remembrance that He has said unto them; and has **never authorized** any man nor set of men (although they may have the wisdom of the wise or the tongue of an Angel) to alter His law or change the method of His government, that He gave His Church, nor arrest the authority He has given into their hands; no not from the Apostolic age of the world even until now. But by a proper and close attention, and a just execution of government, the blessed union of the Church, the body of Christ, is preserved and they are united together,

and separated from the world even while they are in it. By this means the glory of God is manifested throughout His Church.

Now observe, when a body of men attempt to perform a work that a King has reserved to his own authority, it is evidently a rebellion against that King. Just so I view the mission society, in their attempts to seek out preachers, qualify them, send them out and appoint the field of their labors, they have most certainly rebelled against the authority of Christ, for we Baptists profess to believe, and we think upon Scriptural authority, that the internal work of the calling and sending out of preachers, is as evidently performed by the Spirit of God on the heart, as it is in calling the sinner from nature to grace. And now in the next place observe any society formed, undertaking a work, bearing title of the work of God performed in the name of the Church, and that society **not under the government of the Church** (whose title it bears) as to the objects of its pursuits, is evidently a **rejection of the authority of the Church, or indirectly a rebellion against it**. Just so the Board is styled the “General Missionary Convention of the Baptist denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions;” still they **are not under the government of the Baptist union**, and let them do good or bad it is under the *name of the Baptists*, and we have no way to help ourselves, but must bear it, and **cannot call them to account by any authority we have given them or they have given us**. I know it is argued by some that the Board is under the government of the Baptist union, but this argument is false, for the membership of the Triennial Convention is composed of members from “missionary societies” and other “religious bodies” of the “Baptist” denomination; that is, if they bring a hundred dollars with them; if not, they have no seat. These members **do not possess even delegated authority** from the Baptist union to transact the mission business, but derive their powers from the missionary societies which are formed of various persons, believing and supporting a multitude of doctrines. We have no doubt but that these men may be accountable to the churches where their membership is, for their moral

conduct; but as to the mission system, the churches have nothing to do with it.

The fact is, the mission society has formed a plan that requires a great deal of money to carry it into effect, and now calls on the churches for to help them get the money. But the counsel of the union is neither asked nor known in the mission plan; for I cannot think that wise men should be so ignorant as to think that asking the counsel of certain individuals, whom they thought would most favor their plan, was the proper method to get the voice of the union. And I now ask, when any person great or small gives themselves, as we hope, first to the Lord and then to us, by the will of God, **have they any right to act contrary to the common and constant faith and practice of that body of people, or that government which they have subjected themselves to?** You are obliged to answer, "They have no such right." Well, I ask what have the mission society done, when neither **Scripture nor history** gives any account that the Baptist Church has ever taken this method to fill the world with preachers? Then I ask, where has the mission society gotten their power? Not from the Baptists' authority, nor from the authority of God's word, for that knows of no such a plan, and it has given no such authority. It is then **a practice without any legal authority, and has only originated amongst themselves**, and claim a power that alone belongs to Christ and His church, and consequently their work is in ***disorder***. The preachers they send, the members they baptize and the churches they constitute **are all in a state of disorder**. And now if my statements is correct, which I am persuaded you cannot overthrow by the authority by the authority of the Scriptures, and the principle and practice of the Baptist Church, have we no cause of grief? Our beloved brethren have gone astray; they have sinned against the King of Zion; they have violated our government and thereby forfeited their right to the Baptist union, for they have left us; they have gone into these measures **without authority or consent**; while we believe and practice as the Baptists have generally done and walk in the good old apostolic path.



Our brethren have left us; we have not left them; therefore we claim the constitutional grounds and in such cases the minority can exclude the majority. I now leave the remarks on this objection for the candid mind to ponder on, and pass on to the next objection.

My third objection is, **the mission society applies, under the character of religion, to the enemies of Christ for help, and therefore cast contempt on His dignity.** In this I wish to notice in a brief way the method of the mission society, in collecting money for the support of the gospel. We remember when Christ was in the world with His disciples, He gave them a very particular caution, and told them they were in the world, but they were not of the world, therefore the world would hate them, but He let them know the world hated Him before it hated them. The whole scope of Scripture goes to prove that there is a pointed enmity in the world or carnal mind against Christ and consequently against His Church, because of their union or friendship with Him. And now the question is, has our blessed Lord become so weak, so poor, and so dependent, that He must apply to His enemies for help? O contemptible idea of Christ! We see the mission society opening the door and using every exertion to collect money from the world, and qualify men by the wisdom of the world for the purpose of accomplishing the work of salvation amongst the heathen, and causing the kingdom of Christ to more fully come. And again, not only mingling with the wicked of the world, but with other professions of religion which we believe are the daughters of the mother harlot, and consequently in their system of religion is in part of the anti-Christian spirit; and if so, in that part the enemy of Christ. What is the cause of wicked men giving their money for religious purposes? Is it because the spirit and plan of the mission system is more agreeable to the spirit and plan of nature? No doubt but there will be objections or denials to these charges. But I say these things are so, for the missionary societies formed auxiliary to the Board. Members of these societies obtain their seats and authority here by paying their money; and wicked men here have as great a right as any

other by paying their money, and when my money gives me a seat in a religious counsel, I then say *money* is the cause of my fellowship, and it looks as though I had forgotten that the “*love of money is the root of all evil.*”

I fear that some of my Baptist brethren have forgotten this caution. Some may say that I stand opposed to education from the remarks I have made; [Editor’s Note: Almost every Missionary Baptist historian –so-called, do in fact make this charge, as well as charge him of being “unlearned” as well] but I think education a great common blessing in its place. But when we worship the creature instead of the Creator, we sin, and abuse the blessings bestowed on us. So I oppose the principle of education being an essential **qualification to the ministry**. It is evident that education makes a man a more **accomplished deceiver**, and he is better able to practice fraud on the minds of the people, and it has ever been the case and ever will, unless governed by the powers of divine graces; for it is evident that education has made manifest more bad men than it ever has good ones. So I think we had better leave it to God’s work to call men of education when He would have such, than to undertake to make preachers by giving them education. It is true, where grace governs education, both meeting in one man, and that man is called by the effectual workings of God’s Spirit, to the work of the ministry, he is better qualified to express or communicate his ideas. But he still labors under serious difficulty. The pride of his heart calls on him to tickle the ear or please the fancy of the learned part of his congregation; and to do that leaves the less educated part without information.

But this is like the spirit of the world, and like the old proverb, “God help the rich, the poor can beg.” Let the learned part of the world be pleased and informed more and more, but the ignorant stay where they are. **So I say, if the “clergy” must have education to understand the grammatical sense of words, so the hearers ought to have the same understanding, lest a fraud should be practiced on them,** for through

the false zeal and the advantage of education, the whole of the delusions and false ways are imposed on the world of mankind, and have caused thousands of God's dear children to seal their testimony of Christ with their own blood, when persecution has prevailed under the prejudice of education. Then no wonder when we Baptists dread its appearance, under the name of "religion" and draw the sword against it.

So I conclude that adopting such plans is aiming to make addition to God's word, and argues that the King of Zion was *imperfect* and did not know the best plan for qualifying, supporting and sending out preacher. I conceive the mission plan cast this contempt on the dignity of Christ, while they rob God of His glory and make merchandise of the gospel.

Much more might be said on this point, but I shall pass on, hoping you will not count me your enemy because I have told you the truth.

My fourth objection is, **the mission spirit does not appear to my view like the Spirit of Christ**; it looks like that abomination spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, or where it ought not. This holy place spoken of, or where it ought not to be, is evidently the Church of Christ, and the abomination spoken of by Daniel is the anti-Christian spirit; its standing where it ought not, is when that spirit would stand in the Church or holy places. Alas! Alas! Has the time come when the spirit that moved in the Council at the rise of the Popish dominion, that gave education a seat *in religion*, and made **it essential** to the ministry, has it now got possession of the hearts of some of our dear Baptist brethren? Will it prevail? Oh, no! For I verily believe it is one of the floodgates of hell, and our blessed Lord has said it "shall not prevail against" His Church.

Oh! My dear brethren, this is the stay and comfort of my heart. The mission system now prescribed never will prevail against the Baptist Church or union; nor be supported by its act. How far it may split the union God only knows. I hope not far. For I have no doubt but there will be a **faithful few** that will "*contend earnestly for the faith once delivered*

to the saints,” as there was at the establishment of the abomination of the Popish empire.

No doubt some will laugh me to scorn and say I am like a timid horse in the lead, which starts at the shadow, when there is no danger, and frightens all the rest. [Editor: Is it not abundantly evident that Parker accurately picked up on the danger of the modern missionary movement?] I know there is no danger *now*, under our republican government, but how soon may this blessed liberty be snatched from us when so much abused? And how soon may the time come when they that kill us will verily think they are doing God’s service? And again I find the mission spirit is to go on to accomplish their object, whether they have the mind of Christ and His Church or not. And although they say “*when science would claim the preference, let it be rejected,*” I fear my brethren have not considered what manner of spirit they are of, for their conduct contradicts their words. My brethren, I have traveled through many parts, and I too often see that the mission spirit causes party feelings among the Baptists, and plans laid to weaken the hands of the opposers of the mission system and support their own designs, and the mission friends seem to rejoice in the *Latter Day Luminary*, while I feel as though the latter day darkness is approaching; for the world is at this time in as great a state of sin and rebellion against God, as perhaps it has ever been. Iniquity is abounding and the love of many waxing cold. My brethren can discern the face of the skies, but I fear they do not discern the signs of the times, for I fear that many are departing from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils and heaping to themselves teachers having itching ears, and the doctrine that is preached is the subject of the millennium. [Editor: The greatest moving cause of the Modern Missionary Movement was the belief of many that Christ was ready then to come and set up an earthly kingdom, commencing at the time the Pope of Rome lost his power over the political powers of western Europe; which event occurred in 1815. John Gill advocated this position in both his Commentaries and the Body Of

Divinity. Baptists were very familiar with Gill's notion. It was wrong, but it helped to catapult the frenzy of that Movement.] I do not believe but that subject is too tedious for me to enter on at this time, but drop a hint that I discover the mission spirit has drawn too many of our preachers too far into the Arminian principle or method of preaching, and they have laid down the weapons of war against the prevailing errors of false systems, and **unite truth and error together, and give false principles and practices more credit than the Bible authorizes them to do.** Brethren, try the spirits, for many false ones are gone out, and are crying "Lo! Here is Christ and Lo! There is Christ. But go ye not after them." Firt, I discover my brethren of the mission system will sacrifice the government of the union and the feelings of their Brethren to accomplish their object, and it is evident in my view they are better supported by misled zeal and ambition than by the authority of the Bible. There is one thing more I must notice:

It is a stubborn fact that through the States that hold slaves, where the mission spirit prevails very considerably, that there are numbers engaged in the mission plan who do not labor one day in a year, and yet possess great wealth and throw in liberally to the support of missions. Their slaves by intense labor have accumulated this wealth. Now I ask a candid public whether this is the religion of Christ? Let us take a glance at the situation of the Negro. Neither money nor time are given even to **teach** him to read the Bible. Go to his hut which he built in the night. It is not fit for a work horse to stand in; his lodging is a scaffold with some straw on it; his diet is at best the scraps which fall from his master's table; perhaps not so good. And as to his clothes, decency and modesty cannot look at him without blushing. All this he endures besides the abuse he meets with from a hard master. These things are so. Now hear his master exclaim, "Oh, the poor heathens! They are lying in a state of ignorance. Their direful situation so oppresses my mind that I cannot rest. Oh! I give my money freely to send them relief and I wonder that all the Christian world does not join in together so laudable an

undertaking!” And at this same time the poor Africans, who have earned this money for him, must groan under the despotic yoke of these would-be-thought philanthropists, while the products of their labor are lavishly squandered in support of missionaries, sent to **foreign countries** seeking opportunities of converting foreign Barbarians.

[Editor’s Note: Daniel Parker was born in Culpepper County, Virginia, April 6, 1781 – A slave State; He was reared in Dickson County, Tennessee, a slave State. He confronted Luther Rice face-to-face at the Concord Baptist Association; and moved to Illinois, A Free State eventually, December, 1817. Here he confronted Isaac McCoy at the Wabash Association. This Address was written in 1820.]

Now my dear brethren, is not the soul of a Negro as precious in America as in Africa? Does it not look like robbery of the darkest shade to hold these human miserables [sic] in bondage – deprive them of the liberty even of learning to read the Word of God, and meeting together to offer up their humble petitions to Him who was nailed to the cross to atone for the sins of mankind – to scourge them with the crimsoned lash – to filch from them even that which is necessary to sustain nature, and then take the avails of their temporal, and perhaps spiritual sufferings to purchase worldly popularity or support a mistaken zeal? I would as soon believe the Devil a saint, as to believe this is the true spirit of true religion. I could say many more things on this point, but I shall just submit I have said to the candid reader, and let him ask his heart whether these things are so or not. I now proceed to the last thing proposed.

Seventh, and lastly. In this I design to take a small view of the matter in hand. I have in the first place endeavored to remove the prejudices from the public mind that have arisen from improper charges exhibited against us, who oppose the mission system. I think I have said enough to remove prejudices from every candid mind, and to justify us as candid men, in our opposing the innovations of the mission system. In the second place, I have endeavored to bring to the public view the points of the mission system that we are not reconciled to, and what we are

willing to support if brought in a proper manner; and I hope our Baptist brethren will consider the great necessity of preserving the blessed union of the Church, by destroying the evil, and bring the good on principles it can live.

In the third place I have endeavored to bring to public view what we are to understand the Board intends to do from the face of their constitution, and prove it by their doctrine and practice. And I think it cannot be denied but the Board designs to take over the government of the ministry in their own hands, and support it by education and money; and this point I hope my brother preachers will examine, and try by their own experience, as well as by the word of God. Now my brother, consider how it was with you, when the Lord was about to set you to preach the gospel to a dying world; when you were in a great strait in your mind; you saw and felt yourself so inadequate for so great a work, that your spirit shrunk within you; and you were ready to cry out, "Lord it is too great a work for me, I shall dishonor the cause." I ask you, my brother, where did your mind center, that gave you relief, that enabled you to venture in the work? Was it that you concluded that you would spend a year or two at school, and by that means receive suitable qualifications, and then you would venture in the work? Or was it that you were brought to see there was help in God, the source of wisdom; and He alone it was that was able to supply your needs, and enable you to do the work He designed for you to do? On Him you ventured, and He has been your Helper.

In the fourth place, I have examined the Scripture evidence most generally introduced for the support of the mission system, and find they all fail to answer their purpose. But in this case there is no doubt, but there is and will be Scriptures introduced that I have not taken under view, but if rightly understood will come out about the same way with the other; and I hope the Baptists will examine the reality of those evidences more closely then they have done heretofore.

In the fifth place, I have endeavored to bring to light and shew the difference that exists between the principle and practice of the mission society, and that of Christ and His apostles, which appears plain that one is of man and the other of God. I hope this distinction will be more particularly examined into, and let us come out from amongst the unclean, and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

In the sixth place, I have laid before the public some of my most particular objections against the mission system, and I hope the objections will be duly weighed by all the friends Zion. No doubt but the weight of these objections will be tried to be destroyed by the art of criticism, but I feel willing to bear all the dispersions that the enemy may cast on me for the truth's sake. I hope my dear brethren who are on the Lord's side, will stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made you free; and be careful to walk in their duty and maintain good works.

I know in a little while more I must lie down in death, and know the reality of these things. Now my dear readers, here is the one thing that comforts my heart while tears are ready to flow from my eyes, that when my body is mingling with its mother dust, you may know that there was some in such an age of the world that still stood as witnesses against error, and in behalf of truth; and may the Lord grant it may comfort your feeble minds. Before I come to a close, I feel to give a small glimpse of my views on the matter.

When I look at the difference that appears amongst the Baptists now, and thirty or forty years ago, it really fills my heart with sorrow. They were about that time I think, the very description that Christ gave of His humble followers. They were meek and lowly in mind, and separate from the world both in appearance and conduct. O, how lovely they appeared then, how sweet their company was to the meek and lowly in heart. But alas! Now many, even preachers, when we see them at the court house, by their appearance and conduct, we scarcely can tell them from the lawyers; and common professors are hardly known from the



world. This makes me think of old Israel; it appears that when God had blessed them with peace and prosperity, they grew proud and forget God's goodness, and became neglectful of their duties, and began to follow after the heathen idolatry, which caused God to bring distress upon them, and He gave them up sometimes to the hands of their enemies, and sometimes judgments of various kinds to chastise them for their sins.

Observe, it was generally the leaders of Israel that were cut off because it was the leaders of God's people that had caused them to err. So when I look at the conduct of the Baptist Church for some times past, with the conduct of the mission system, this is my view, and solemn thought. The Church of Christ has upwards of forty years enjoyed peace and prosperity, and like Israel of old, they have not only grown carnally proud, but spiritually proud, and forgot the goodness of God, and neglected their duty; got above the meek and lowly way prescribed for them to walk in, and drink in the spirit of the world, and rather conform to the practice of the world than bear the reproaches and persecutions, that is the legacy of all the humble followers of our blessed Lord – and they begin even in their religious institutions to pattern after the rest of the nations of the earth; I mean the religion of the world. Just look at the simile between the rise of popery and the principles and practice of our beloved brethren in the mission system, and I have no doubt but Constantine appeared to possess as great zeal as our brethren now do, and what awful consequences attended that establishment. I can truly say, O, solemn thought, I feel like the time is not far distant when God will chastise His people for their pride and folly. And I fear the mission establishment is the way this distress will come – and as the leaders of God's people are the ones that have brought in this evil, they are the ones that will be cut off, (I mean in a gospel sense,) while the poor and despised and persecuted followers of their blessed Lord will have to mourn not only for their own afflicted state, but for their dear brethren, like Israel mourned for the tribe of Benjamin, their brethren when they

were forced to cut them off. But as God has always preserved, even through the worst of times, a little faithful few, although despised, yet witnesses for the truth of free grace, and have respect to all the precepts of their Lord, in self-denial order of the gospel, and I had far rather when I lie down in death, leave my name recorded among these despised few, as a witness for the truth, than have it recorded in the high circles of fame.

I wish the public to know it is not the value of our money we regard, but as honest men in the candor of our hearts, our respect is to the true order of our Lord. My mind is yet fruitful, but I must come to a close, by just observing I am fully apprized of the room there is for criticism. But I hope my reader, as an honest man, will lay aside all criticism with the bias of their mind, and come fairly to the truth, for I can say in truth, I have designed no part of this piece to hurt the feelings of any person whatever; but I think my sincere prayer to God, is that He, by His Spirit, and agreeable to His word may guide you and me into all truth; and if it be His will, that this may be a means in His hands to show my dear brethren the evil they have joined with. I hope my brethren will reconsider the matter, and come fairly to the truth, and remember we are told the love of money is the root of all evil, and to charge them that are rich in this world not to be high minded: And I hope you will take particular notice, and don't forget that when Christ found in the temple them that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and them that attended to the table of money changing, that He made a scourge of small chords, and drove them out, and overthrew the table, and charged them of making His Father's home a house of merchandise, or a den of thieves. And we have no account of money changing to be set up in His spiritual temple, and we think He will not, as He overthrew it Himself; and I hope you will not think hard if Christ should with His scourge of small cords, that He has still left in His temple, drive out all such characters, and overthrow the table. So I hope you will trade no more on sheep and

oxen, but consider what I say, and may the Lord give the understanding in all things.

Clark County, Illinois, 1820.

[Editor's concluding comment: Today, much of the arguments above are mute. The fact of modern religion, in almost all branches and institutions, is that the gospel then believed by Baptists and others, is no longer preached at all. It's gone! And thus, the whole discussion of how, where, when to preach the "**gospel**," and even to whom, is a dead issue. Missionaries do not preach the gospel to anyone, because today it is "**hid**," from the wise and prudent, and there are but few "babes" left. The system supposedly designed to spread the gospel destroyed it instead.]

## APPENDIX E

### **KEHUKEE BAPTIST DECLARATION, 1826**

#### **ANNOTATION:**

Elder Rueben Ross had preached the first Arminian sermon among Baptists near Port Royal, Tennessee in 1817 (See Page 70). He had come from the Kehukee Baptist Association in North Carolina and settled in Tennessee. Over in the East, his brother, Martin Ross, also in the Kehukee Association had been preaching up missions from the commencement of the New Divinity Missionary Movement in 1805. He naturally supported the establishment of the Board of Foreign Missions in Philadelphia from 1814 to this time period, 1827. The first communication from the Board to the Kehukee was read in their 1815 session.

Reuben's visit to North Carolina was fruitful with his brother, for he converted him to Arminianism. The Kehukee became one of the first Baptist associations able to see the Arminian direction of the mission movement. Their enlightenment came to fruition in 1826. At this session, a paper purporting to be a "***Declaration of The Reformed Baptist Churches of North Carolina***" was read before that body, and it was tabled on Saturday, and then called up and discussed on Monday. It was referred to the churches for consideration, and request was made to bring their attention back to the association the following annual meeting, in 1827. The Kehukee Baptists Association was the largest and oldest Association in the South, having been constituted in 1769, and was the first to arrange correspondence with the Philadelphia Baptist Association in Pennsylvania, the oldest in the country (1707). It was the Philadelphia that had been seized by William Staughton and the New Divinity gang and stirred it into the Modern Mission enterprise. It may have caught the Masonic Order by surprise, when the non-fellowship swept them out of the churches with the same brush stroke as the other societies; but Masons were foremost in the activities of the New Divinity school, and worked to advance the mission enterprise. The following is copied from the Minutes of 1827:

#### **THE KEHUKEE BAPTISTS DECLARATION**

"A paper purporting to be a Declaration of the Reformed Baptists in North Carolina, dated August 26, 1826, which was presented at the last Association, and referred to the churches to express in their letters to this Association their views with regard to it, came up for deliberation. Upon examination, it was found that most of the churches had given their opinions; and after an interchange of sentiments among the members of this body, it was agreed that we ***discard all Missionary societies, Bible societies and Theological seminaries, and the practices heretofore resorted to for their support,*** in begging money from the public; and if

any persons should be among us, as agents of any of said societies, we hereafter discountenance them in those practices; and if under a character of a *minister of the gospel*, we will not invite them into our pulpits; believing these societies and institutions to be the inventions of men, and not warranted from the word of God. We further do ***unanimously agree*** that should any of the members of our churches join the **fraternity of Masons**, or, being members, continue to visit the lodges and parades, we will not invite them to preach in our pulpits, believing them to be guilty of such practices; and we declare non-fellowship with them and such practices.” [1827 MINUTES: Kehukee Baptist Association.]

## APPENDIX F

### THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS, 1832

#### ANNOTATION:

The action of the Kehukee, the most well-known and largest of the Southern Associations of Baptists, had a profound and stunning effect on the mission advocates on the one hand, and the “Old Divinity” churches on the other. The “non-fellowship” declaration severed all mission societies, benevolent societies, socialists and anarchist societies, and secret societies connection to the Baptist Church. Unlike the Baptist Board of Foreign Mission, this action was done upon the authority of the local Baptists churches, acting officially in their own conferences, and then communicating their will to the Kehukee Association of which they were affiliated. The Association merely voiced the decision of the churches. In the government of the Baptists churches, when such a non-fellowship declaration is officially declared, its immediate effect is to draw a line against other associations and churches found in that error non-fellowshipped. Thus, the most serious line had been drawn separating the Baptist Church from the alien influence.

The most important event following this was in the Middle States to the north of the Kehukee and south of the Philadelphia Associations. These associations were caught rather empathically “in the middle.” They could no longer remain on the sidelines of the issues. As the middle Associations gave deliberation as to what course they must pursue in 1828, 1829, 1830, plans were being drafted on both sides of the issues as to how to deal with the splinter. The Board was too vigorous in their combat, and exposed their real hostility to the Baptist union. The Old School divinity churches and associations were drawn closer together, and their hands strengthened. In 1831, the Baltimore Baptist Association, formed originally with churches from the Philadelphia and the Welsh churches, called for a Convention of messengers from associations to meet together with them at the Black Rock Meet House, Baltimore, Maryland in **September, 1832. It is here that THE GREAT BAPTIST SEPARATION took place.** Messengers from Associations and churches all over North America convened. Some of these associations had acted beforehand to purge out the auxiliaries of the Board from among them. The Country Line Baptist Association (formed in 1805) had already acted prior to September, 1832; the Wabash in Illinois had much earlier taken her stand. Below, we present the **original unabridged** copy of the Black Rock **ADDRESS**. There are many copies printed that were abbreviated. This contains the full text of this historical document.

***THE BLACK ROCK ADDRESS***

***September, 1832***

(unabridged)

A meeting of Particular Baptists of the Old School convened agreeable to a previous appointment at the Black Rock meeting house, Baltimore, Maryland, on Friday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 1832.

The introductory sermon was preached by Samuel Trott, of Delaware, from Daniel 2:34,35. *“Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands,” &c.*

The meeting was then called to order by Elder John Healy, of Baltimore.

Prayer by Elder Thomas Barton of Pennsylvania.

Elder William Gilmore, of Virginia, was elected Moderator and Elder Gabriel Conklin, Clerk.

A brief statement of the object for which the meeting had been called was made by the Moderator, and there upon it was:

“Resolved, That a committee of seven brethren, *viz.* Trott, Healy, Poteet, Barton and Beebe, together with the Moderator and Clerk, be appointed to prepare as ADDRESS expressive of the views of this meeting, touching the object for which it was convened.

Brethren Scott, Cole, Ensor and Shaw, were appointed to make the necessary arrangements for preaching during this meeting.

Prayer by Brother Trott.

Adjourned to 9 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Saturday Morning, 9 o'clock

Met pursuant to adjournment.

Prayer by Brother Choat.

The committee appointed to prepare an ADDRESS, submitted the following, which was *unanimously adopted*.

### THE ADDRESS

To the Particular Baptist Churches of the “Old School”\* in the United States

[\*In reference to the epithet “Old School,” which we have used as a discriminating term, we beg leave to say that we were led to adopt it from its having been applied to us by others; and that in our use of it we

have reference to the school of Christ, in distinction from all other schools which have sprung up since the Apostles' days.]

Brethren: - It constitutes a new era in the history of Baptists, when those who would follow the Lord fully, in all things pertaining to religion, conformed to the pattern showed in the Mount, are by Baptists charged with *antinomianism*, inertness, stupidity, &c., for refusing to go beyond the word of God; but such is the case with us.

Brethren, we would not shun reproach, nor seek an exemption from persecution; but we would affectionately entreat those Baptists who revile us themselves, or who side with such that do, to pause and consider how far they have departed from the ancient principles of the Baptists, and how that in reproaching us they stigmatize the memory of those whom they have been used to honor as eminent and useful servants of Christ, and of those who have borne the brunt of the persecutions leveled against the Baptists in former ages. For it is a well known fact that it was in ages past a uniform and distinguishing trait on the character of the Baptists, that they required a "*Thus saith the Lord,*" that is, direct authority from the word of God for the order and practices, as well as the doctrine, they received in religion.

It is true that many things to which we object as departures from the order established by the great Head of the Church, through the ministry of His apostles, are by others considered to be connected with the very essence of religion, and absolutely necessary to the prosperity of Christ's kingdom. They attach great value to them, because human wisdom suggests their importance. We all the Head of the Church alone to judge for us; we therefore esteem those things to be of no use to the cause of Christ, which He has not Himself instituted.

We will notice severally the claims of the principal of these *modern inventions*, and state some of our objections to them for your candid consideration.

We commence with *Tract Societies*. These claim to be extensively useful. Tracts claim their thousands converted. They claim the



prerogative of carrying the news of salvation into holes and corners, where the gospel would otherwise never come; of going as on wings of the wind, carrying salvation in their train; and they claim each to contain gospel enough, should it go where the Bible has never come, to lead a soul to the knowledge of Christ. The nature and extent of these and like claims, made in favor of tracts by their advocates, constitute a good reason why we should reject them. These claims represent tracts as possessing in these respects a superiority over the Bible, and over the institution of the gospel ministry, which is charging the Great I Am with a deficiency of wisdom. Yea, they charge God with folly; for why has He given us the extensive revelation contained in the Bible, and given the Holy Spirit *to take the things of Christ and show them to us*, if a little tract of four pages can lead a soul to the knowledge of Christ? But let us consider the more *rational claims* presented by others in favor of tracts, as that they constitute a convenient way of disseminating religious instruction among the more indigent and thoughtless classes of society. Admitting the propriety of this claim, could it be kept separate from other pretensions, still can we submit to the *distribution of tracts* becoming an order of our churches or our associations, without countenancing the prevalent idea that tracts have become an *instituted means* approved of God for the conversion of sinners, and hence that the distribution of them is a religious act, and on a footing with supporting the gospel ministry?

If we were to admit that tracts may have occasionally been made instrumental by the Holy Spirit for imparting *instruction* or *comfort* to inquiring minds, it would by no means imply that tracts are an *instituted means of salvation*, to speak after the manner of the popular religionists, nor that they should be placed on a footing with the Bible and the preached gospel in respect to imparting knowledge of salvation.

Again, we readily admit the propriety of an individual's publishing and distributing, or of several individuals uniting to publish and distribute what they wish to circulate, whether in the form of tracts or

otherwise; but still we cannot admit the propriety of uniting with or upon the plans of the existing Tract Societies, even laying aside the idea of their being attempted to be palmed upon us as *religious institutions*. Because that upon the plan of these societies those who unite with them pay their money for publishing and distributing they know not what under the name of *religious truth*; and what is worse, they submit to have sent into their families weekly or monthly, and to circulate among their neighbors, anything and everything for religious reading which the agent or publishing committee may see fit to publish. They thus become accustomed to received everything as *good* which comes under the name of "religion," whether it be according to the Word of God or not; and are trained to the habit of letting others judge for them in matters of religion, and are therefore **fast preparing to become the dupes of priest-craft**. Can any conscientious follower of the Lamb submit to such plans? If others can, we cannot.

Sunday schools come next under consideration. These assume the same high stand as do Tract Societies. They claim high honor of converting their tens of thousands; of leading the tender mind of children to the knowledge of Jesus; of being as properly the instituted means of bringing children to the knowledge of salvation, as is the preaching of the gospel that of bring adults to the same knowledge, &c. Such arrogant pretensions we feel bound to oppose. First, because these as well as the pretensions of the Tract Societies are grounded upon the notion that conversion or regeneration is produced by impressions made upon the *natural mind* by means of religious sentiments instilled into it; and if the Holy Spirit is allowed to be at all concerned in the thing, it is in a way which implies His being somewhat blended with the instruction, or necessarily attendant upon it; all of which we know to be wrong.

Secondly, because such schools were never established by the Apostles; nor commanded by Christ. There were children in the days of the apostles. The apostles possessed as great a desire for the salvation of souls, as much love to the cause of Christ, and knew as well what God

would own for bringing persons to the knowledge of salvation, as any do at this day. We therefore must believe that if these schools were of God, we should find some account of them in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly, We have exemplified in the case of the Pharisees the evil consequences of instructing children in the letter of the scripture, under the notion that this instruction constitutes a saving acquaintance with the Word of God. We see in that instance it only made hypocrites of the Jews; and as the Scriptures declare that Christ's words are *spirit and life*, and that the *natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God* (Romans 8:7-8, 1 Corinthians 2:14), we cannot believe it will have any better effect on the children in our day.

The Scriptures enjoin upon *parents* to bring up *their* children in the "*nurture and admonition of the Lord*;" (Ephesians 6:4) but this, instead of countenancing, forbids the idea of parents intrusting the religious education of their children to giddy, unregenerate, young persons, who know no better than to build them up in the belief that they are believing the religion of Christ, and to confirm them in their natural notions of their own goodness.

But whilst we thus stand opposed to the plan and use of these Sunday Schools, and to the Sunday School Union, in every point, we wish it to be distinctly understood that we consider Sunday Schools for the purpose of teaching poor children to read, whereby they may be enabled to read the Scriptures for themselves, in neighborhoods where there is occasion for them, and when properly conducted, without that ostentation so commonly connected with them, to be useful and benevolent institutions, worthy of the patronage of all the friends of civil liberty.

---

<sup>1</sup> After two-hundred years of experience, it is safe to say the Sunday School movement totally failed in teaching youth anything of the Truth of the Christian faith. Rather, it initiated the principle of entertaining people with socials, parties, gyms, etc.

We pass to the consideration of the *Bible Society*.<sup>2</sup> We are aware, brethren, that this *institution* presents itself to the mind of the Christian as supported by the most plausible pretext. The idea of giving Bibles, without note or comment, to those who are unable to procure it themselves, is in itself, considered, and calculated to meet the approbation of all who know the importance of the sacred Scriptures. But under this auspicious guise, we see reared in the case of the American Bible Society, an institution as foreign from anything that the gospel of Christ calls for, as are the kingdoms of this world from the Kingdom of Christ. We see a combination formed, in which are united the man of the world, the vaunting professor, and the humble follower of Jesus; leading characters in politics, the dignitaries in church, and from them some of every grade, down to the poor servant girl, who can snatch from her hard-earned wages fifty cents a year for the privilege of being a member. We see united in this combination all parties in politics and all sects in religion; and the distinctive differences of the one and the sectarian barriers of the other, in part thrown aside to form the union. At the head of this vast body we see placed a few leading characters, who have in their hands the management of its enormous printing establishment and its immense funds, and the control of its powerful influences, extended by means of agents and auxiliaries to every part of the United States. We behold its anniversary meeting converted into a great *religious* parade, and forming a theatre for the orator who is ambitious of preferment, either in the pulpit, in the legislative hall, or at the bar, to display his eloquence and elicit the cheers of the grave assemblage. Now, brethren, to justify our opposition to the Bible Society it is not necessary for us to say that any of its members have manifested a disposition to employ its powers for the subversion of our liberties. It is enough for us to say,

---

<sup>2</sup>Whatever “good” may have then been said of Bible Societies in 1832, these societies today **fully corrupt** the Bible by using liberal translators who do not even pretend to believe it to be the inspired Word of God.

1<sup>st</sup>. That such a monstrous combination, concentrating so much power in the hands of a few individuals, could never be necessary for supplying the destitute with Bibles. Individual printing establishments would readily be extended so as to supply Bibles to any amount and in any language that might be called for, and at as cheap a rate as they have ever been sold by the Bible Society.

2<sup>nd</sup>. That the humble followers of Jesus could accomplish their benevolent wishes for supplying the needy with Bibles with more effect and more to their satisfaction by managing the purchase and distribution of them for themselves; and such will never seek popular applause by having their liberality trumpeted abroad through the medium of the Bible Society.

3<sup>rd</sup>. That the Bible Society, whether we consider it in its moneyed foundation for membership and directorship, or its hoarding up funds, in its blending together all distinctions between the Church and the world, is an institution never contemplated by the Lord as connected with His Kingdom; therefore not a command concerning it is given in the “*decree published,*” nor a sketch of it drawn in the pattern showed.

4<sup>th</sup>. That its vast combination of worldly power and influence lodged in the hands of a *few*, renders it a dangerous engine against the liberties, both civil and religious, of our country, should it come under the control of those disposed so to employ it. The above remarks apply with equal force to the other great *national institutions*, as the American Tract Society, and the Sunday School Union, &c. &c.

We will now call your attention to the subject of *Missions*. Previous to stating our objections to the mission *plans*, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that *we do regard as of the first importance the command given of Christ, primarily to His Apostles, and through them to His ministers in every age, to “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,” and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the Providence of God directs our*

*way, and opens a door of utterance for us.* We also believe it to be the duty of **individuals and churches to contribute to their abilities, for the support, not only of their own pastors, but also of those who “go preaching the gospel of Christ among the destitute.** But we at the same time contend, that we have no right *to depart* from the order that the Master Himself has seen fit to lay down, relative to the administration of the word. We therefore cannot fellowship the plans for spreading the gospel, generally adopted at this day, under the name of *Missions*; because we consider those plans throughout a subversion of the order marked out in the New Testament.

1<sup>st</sup>. In reference to the medium by which the gospel minister is to be sent forth to labor in the *field*: Agreeable to the prophecy going before, that “*out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem,*” (Micah 4:2) the Lord has manifestly established the order, that His ministers should be sent forth by the Churches. But the mission plan is to send them out by the Mission Society. The gospel society, or Church, is to be composed of baptized believers; the poor is placed on an equal footing with the rich, and money is of no consideration, with regard to membership, or Church privileges. Not so with the Mission Societies; they are so organized that the unregenerate, the enemies of the cross of Christ, have equal privileges as to membership, &c., with the people of God, and money is the principle consideration; a certain sum entitles to membership, a larger sum to life membership, a still larger to directorship. &c., so that their constitutions, contrary to the direction of James (James 2:1-4), are partial, saying to the *rich man, sit thou here,* and to the *poor, stand thou there.*

In Christ’s Kingdom, all His subjects are sons, and have equal rights, and an equal voice, as well in calling persons into the ministry, as in other things. But the Mission administration is lodged in the hands of a few, who are distinguished from the rest, by great swelling titles as Presidents, Vice Presidents, &c. Again, *each* gospel Church acts as the *independent* Kingdom of Christ in calling and sending forth its members

into the ministry. Very different from this is the Mission order. The Mission community being so arranged that from the little Mite Society, on to the Missionary association, to the State Conventions, and from them on to the Triennial Convention, and General Board, there is formed a general amalgamation, and a concentration of power in the hands of a dozen dignitaries, who with some exceptions have the control of all the funds designed for supporting ministers among the destitute, at home, and abroad, and the sovereign authority to designate who from among the hired ministers of Christ, shall be supported from these funds, and also to assign them the field of their labors. Yea, the authority to appoint females, and school-masters, and printers, and farmer, as such, to be solemnly set apart by prayer and the imposition of hands, as missionaries of the cross, and to be supported from these funds. Where as in ancient times the preachers of the gospel were called and sent forth by the Holy Ghost (Acts 13:1,4).

2<sup>nd</sup>. In reference to *Ministerial Support*. – The gospel order is to extend support to them who preach the gospel; but the mission plan is to hire persons to preach. The gospel order is not to *prefer one before another, and to do nothing by partiality* (See 1 Timothy 5:17,21). But the Mission Boards exclude all from a participation in the benefits of their funds who do not come under their direction and own their authority, however, regularly they have been set apart according to gospel order to the work of the ministry, and however zealously they may be laboring to preach the gospel among the destitute. And what is more, these Boards by their auxiliaries and agents to scour every hole and corner to scrape up money for their funds that the people think they have nothing left to give to their own preacher who may come among them alone upon the authority of Christ and by the fellowship of the Church.

Formerly not only did preachers generally feel themselves bound to devote a part of their time **to traveling and preaching among the destitute, but the people also among whom they came dispensing the**

**word of life, felt themselves bound to contribute something to meet their expenses.** These were the days when Christian affections flowed freely. Then the hearts of the preachers flowed out toward the people, and the affections of the people were manifested toward the preachers who visited them. There was then more preaching of the gospel among the people at large, according to the number of Baptists, than has ever been since the rage of missions commenced. How different are things now from what they were in those by-gone days. Now, generally speaking, persons who are novices in the gospel, however learned they may profess to be in the sciences, have taken the field in the place of those who, have been taught in the school of Christ, were capacitated to administer consolation to God's afflicted people. The missionary, instead of going into such neighborhoods as Christ's ministers used to visit, where they would be most likely have an opportunity of administering food to the poor of the flock, seeks the more populous villages and towns, where he can attract the most attention, and do the most to promote the cause of missions and other popular institutions. His leading motive, judging from his movements, is not the love to souls, but the love of fame; hence his anxiety to have something to publish of what he has done, and hence his anxiety to constitute "churches," even taking disaffected, disorderly, and as has been the case, *excluded persons*, to form a "church," in the absence of better material. And the people, instead of glowing with the affection for the preacher as such, feel burdened with the whole system of modern mendicancy, but have not resolution to shake off their oppression, because it is represented as *deistical* to withhold and so popular to give.

Brethren, we cheerfully acknowledge that there have been some honorable exceptions to the character we have here drawn of the modern missionary, and some societies have existed under the *name of "Mission Societies"* that were in some important points exceptions from the above drawn sketch; but on a general scale we believe we have given a correct view of the mission plans and operations, and of the effects which have



resulted from them, and our hearts really sicken at this state of things. How can we therefore forbear to express our disapprobation of the system that has produced it?

*Colleges and Theological Schools* next claim our attention.<sup>3</sup> In speaking of colleges, **we wish to be distinctly understood that it is NOT to colleges, or collegial education, as such, that we have any objection.** . . . But we object, in the first place, to *sectarian colleges*, as such. The idea of a Baptist College, and of a Presbyterian College, &c., necessarily implies that our distinct views of church government, of gospel doctrine and gospel ordinances, are connected with *human sciences*, a principle which we cannot admit, for we believe the Kingdom of Christ to be altogether a kingdom not of this world. In the second place, we object to the notion of attaching *professorships* of divinity to colleges, because this evidently implies that the **revelation** God has made of Himself is a **human science**, on a footing with mathematics, philosophy, law, &c., which is contrary to the general tenor of revelation, and indeed to the very idea itself of a *revelation*. We perhaps need not add that we have for the same reasons strong objections to colleges conferring the degree of “Doctor of Divinity,” and to preachers receiving it.

Thirdly, We decidedly object to persons, after professing to have been called of the Lord to preach His gospel, going to a college or academy to *fit themselves for that service*.

1<sup>st</sup>. Because we believe that Christ possesses perfect knowledge of His own purpose, and of the proper instruments by which to accomplish them. If He has occasion for a man of science, He having *power over all flesh*, (John 17:2) will so order it that the individual shall obtain the requisite learning before He calls him in His service, as was the case with Saul of Tarsus, and many others since; and thus avoid subjecting

---

<sup>3</sup> Almost universally among New School, or Missionary Baptists “historians,” their charge is that Old School Baptists do not “believe in education.” It is drawn from this objection to **ministerial** or **sectarian** education.

Himself to the imputation of weakness. For should Christ call a man to labor in the gospel field who was unqualified for the work assigned him, it would manifest Him to be deficient in knowledge relative to the proper instruments to employ, or defective in power to provoke him.

2<sup>nd</sup>. Because we believe that the Lord calls no man to preach the gospel till He has made him experimentally acquainted with that gospel, and endowed him with the proper measure of gifts suiting the field He designed for him to occupy; and the person giving himself up in obedience to the voice of Christ will find himself learning in Christ's own school.

But when a person professedly called of Christ to the gospel ministry concludes that, in order to be useful, he must first go and obtain an academical education, he must judge that human science is of more importance in the ministry than that knowledge and those gifts which Christ imparts to His servants. To act consistently then with his own principles he will place his chief dependence for usefulness on his scientific knowledge, and aim mostly to display this in his preaching. This person, therefore, will pursue a very different course in his preaching from that marked out by the great Apostle to the Gentiles, who "*determined to know nothing among*" the people "*save Jesus Christ and Him crucified*" (I Cor. 2:2).

As to *Theological Schools*, we shall at present content ourselves with saying that they are a reflection upon the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost, who is engaged according to the promise of the great Head of the Church to lead the disciples into all truth (John 16:13). Also, that in every age, from the school at Alexandria down to this day, they have been a **real pest to the Church of Christ**. Of this we could produce abundant proof, did the limits of our address admit their insertion.

We now pass to the last item which we think it necessary particularly to notice, *viz.*, four-days or *Protracted Meetings* [our modern-day so-called "Revivals"]. Before stating our objections to these, however, we would observe that we consider the example worthy to be imitated which

the Apostles set of embracing every opportunity consistently with prudence for preaching the gospel wherever they met with an assembly, whether in a Jewish synagogue on the seventh day or in a Christian assembly on the first day of the week; and the exhortation to “*be instant in season and out of season*” we would gladly accept. Therefore, whenever circumstances call a congregation together from day to day, as at an association or the like, we would embrace the opportunity of preaching the gospel to them from time to time, so often as they shall come together; but to the principles and plans of protracted meetings, distinguishingly so-called, we do decidedly object. The principle of these meetings we cannot fellowship. Regeneration, we believe, is exclusively the work of the Holy Ghost, performed by His divine power, at the provisions of the everlasting covenant; but these meetings are got up either for the purpose of inducing the Holy Spirit to regenerate multitudes who would otherwise not be “converted,” or to “convert” them themselves by the machinery of these meetings, or rather to bring them into their churches by means of exciting their animal feelings, without any regard to their being born again. Whichever of these may be considered the true ground upon which these meetings are founded, we are at a loss to know how any person who has known what it is to be born again can countenance them.

The plans of these meetings are equally as objectionable; for, in the first place, all doctrinal preaching, or in other words, all illustrations of God’s salvation, are excluded professedly from these meetings. Hence they would make believers of their converts without presenting any fixed truths to their minds to believe. Whereas God has “*chosen His people to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and **belief of the truth***” (II Thess. 2:13).

Secondly. The leaders of these meetings fix standards by which to decide of persons’ repentance and desire of salvation, which the Word of God nowhere warrants, such as *rising off their seats, coming to anxious seats, or going to a certain place, &c.* Whereas the New Testament has

given us a standard from which we have no right to depart, *viz.*, that of “***bringing forth fruits meet for repentance***” (Matthew 3:8).

Thirdly. They lead the people to depend on **mediators** other than the Lord Jesus Christ to obtain peace for themselves, by offering themselves as intercessors for them with God; whereas the Scriptures acknowledge but the **one God and one Mediator**.

Some may be ready to inquire whether protracted meetings, as such, may not with propriety be held, providing they be held **without excluding doctrinal preaching**, or introducing any of these new plans. However others may judge and act, we cannot approve of such meetings for the following reasons:

1<sup>st</sup>. Because by appointing and holding a protracted meeting, as such, although we may not carry it to the same excesses to which others do, yet as most people will make no distinction between it and those meetings where all the *borrowed machinery* from the Methodist camp-meetings is introduced, we shall generally be considered as countenancing those meetings.

2<sup>nd</sup>. Because the motives we could have for conforming to the custom of holding these *newly invented meetings* are such as we think cannot bear the test. For we must be induced thus to conform to the reigning custom either in order to shun the reproach generally attached to those who will not conform to what is popular, or to try the experiment whether our holding a four days’ meeting will not induce the Holy Spirit to produce a revival among us commensurate with the strange fire kindled by others; or else we must be led to this plan from having imbibed the notion that the Holy Ghost is somehow so the creature of human feelings that He is led to regenerate persons by our getting their animal feelings excited; and therefore that in the same proportion as we can by any measure get the feelings of the people aroused, there will be a revival of religion. This latter motive can scarcely be supposed to have place with any who would not go the whole length of every popular measure. But – (1) We do not believe it becoming a follower of Jesus to

seek an exemption from reproach by conforming to the schemes of men. (2) We believe the Holy Ghost to be too sacred a Being to be trifled with by trying experiments upon Him. And 3<sup>rd</sup>. We believe the Holy Ghost to be God. We would as soon expect that the Father would be induced to predestinate persons “*to the adoption of children*” (Ephesians 1:5) by their *feelings being excited*, and the Son be induced to redeem them, as that the Holy Ghost would be thus induced to *quicken them*. These *three* are *One*. The purpose of the Father, the redemption of the Son, and the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, must run in perfect accordance, and commensurate one with the other.

Brethren, we have thus laid before you some of our objections to the popular schemes in religion, and the reasons why we cannot fellowship them. Ponder these things well. Weigh them in the balances of the sanctuary; and then say if they are not such as justify us in standing aloof from those plans of men, and those would-be *religious societies*, which are bound together, not by the fellowship of the gospel, but by certain money payments. If you cannot for yourselves meet the reproach by separating yourselves from those things that the Word of God does not warrant, still allow us the privilege to “*obey God rather than man.*”

There is, brethren, one radical difference between us, and those who advocate these various institutions that we have noticed, to which we wish to call your attention. It is this: they declare the *gospel* to be a *system of means*; these *means* it appears they believe to be of human contrivance; and they act accordingly. But we believe the gospel dispensation to embrace a system of faith and obedience, and we would act according to our belief. We believe, for instance, that the seasons of declension, of darkness, of persecution, &c., to which the Church of Christ is at times subject are designed by the Wise Disposer of all events; not for calling forth the inventive geniuses of men to remove the difficulties, but for trying the faith of God’s people in His wisdom, power, and faithfulness to sustain His Church. On Him, therefore, would we repose our trust, and wait His hour of deliverance, rather than rely

upon an arm of flesh. Or, we are called to the ministry, although we may feel our own insufficiency for the work as sensibly as do others, yet we would go forward in the path of duty marked out, believing that God is able to accomplish His purposes by such instruments as He chose; that He *“hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty, and base things, &c., hath God chosen, that no flesh should glory in His presence”* (I Cor. 1:27-29). Though we may not enjoy the satisfaction of seeing multitudes flocking to Jesus under our ministry, yet instead of going in to Hagar to accomplish the promises of God, or of resorting to any of the contrivances of men to make up the deficiency, we would still be content to *“preach the word,”* and would be *“instant in season and out of season,”* knowing it *“has pleased God,”* not by the wisdom of men, but by *“the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe”* (I Cor. 1:21). And that His *“word will not return unto Him void, but it shall accomplish that which He please, and prosper in the thing whereunto He sent it”* (Isa. 55:11). Faith in God, instead of leading us to contrive ways to help Him accomplish His purposes, leads us to enquire what He hath *“required at our hands,”* and be satisfied with doing that as we find it pointed out in His word; for we know that His *“Counsel shall stand, and He will do all His pleasure”* (Isa. 46:10). Jesus says, *“ye believe in God, believe also in Me.”* Ye believe in the power of God to accomplish His purposes, however contrary things may appear to work to your expectations. So believe in My power to accomplish the great work of saving My people. In a word, as the dispensation of God by the hand of Moses, in bring Israel out of Egypt and leading them through the wilderness, was from first to last calculated to try Israel’s faith in God – so in the dispensation of God by His Son, in bringing His spiritual Israel to be a people to Himself.

There being, then, this radical difference between us and the patrons of these modern institutions, the question which has long since put forth, presents itself afresh for our consideration in all its force: *“Can two walk*

*together except they be agreed?"* We believe that many who love our Lord Jesus Christ, are engaged in promoting those institutions which they acknowledge to be of modern origin; and they are promoting them too as *religious* institutions; whereas if they would reflect a little on the origin and nature of the Christian religion, they must be, like us, convinced that this religion must remain unchangeably the same at this day, as we find it delivered in the New Testament. Hence that anything, however highly esteemed it may be among men, which is not found in the New Testament, has no just claim to be acknowledged as belonging to the religion or the religious institutions of Christ.

With all who love our Lord Jesus Christ, in truth, and walk according to apostolic tradition, or gospel order we would gladly meet in church relation and engage with them in the worship and service of God as He Himself has ordered. But if they will persist in **bringing those institutions for which they can show us no example in the New Testament, into the churches or associations,** and in making them the order thereof, we shall for conscience sake, be compelled to withdraw from the disorderly walk of such churches, associations, or individuals, that we may not suffer our names to pass as sanctioning those things for which we have no fellowship. And if persons who would **pass for preachers,** will come to us, bringing the messages of men, &c., a gospel which they have learned in the schools, instead of that gospel which Christ Himself commits unto His servants, and which is not learned of men, they must not be surprised that we cannot acknowledge them as "ministers of Christ."

Now, brethren, addressing ourselves to you who profess to be, in principle, **Particular Baptists of the "Old School,"** but who are practicing such things as you have learned from a New School, it is for you to say, not us, whether we can longer walk in union with you. We regret, and so do you, to see brethren professing the same faith, serving apart. But if you will compel us either to sanction the traditions and inventions of men, as of religious obligations, or to separate from you,

the sin lieth at your door. If you meet us in churches to attend **only to the order of Christ's house** as laid down by Himself; and in associations, upon the ancient principles of Baptist associations, *i.e.*, *as an associating of churches for keeping up a brotherly correspondence* one with another, that they may strengthen each other in the good ways of the Lord; instead of turning the associations *into a kind of legislative body*, formed for the purpose of contriving plans to help along the work of Christ, and for **imposing those contrivances** as burdens upon the churches, by *resolutions, &c.*, as is the manner of some, we can still go with you in peace and fellowship.

Thus, brethren, our appeal is before you. Treat it with contempt if you can despise the cause for which we contend, *i.e.*, **conformity to the Word of God**. But indulge us, we beseech you, so far at least, as at our request to sit down and carefully count the cost on both sides; and see whether this shunning reproach by conforming to men's notions will not in the end be a much more expensive course than to meet reproach at once, by honoring Jesus as your only King, "*choosing rather to suffer afflictions with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season*" (Hebrews 11:25). And *rebellion*, you know, is *as the sin of witchcraft*."

May the Lord lead you to judge and act upon this subject as you will wish you had done when you come to see the mass of human inventions in connection with the **Man of Sin**, driven away like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and that **Stone** which was cut out "*without hands*" alone filling the earth. We subscribe ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.

---

We acknowledge with pleasure the reception of an affectionate letter from the Muskingum Association (in Ohio), expressive of their warm attachment to the ancient order of the Baptist Church; and also an interesting epistle from our venerable brother John Leland, disclaiming any connection with the popular schemes of the day.



The following resolutions were unanimously adopted, *viz.*:

*Resolved*, That our next meeting be held with the church at Pleasant Valley, Washington Co., Md., on the Monday after the third Lord's day in May. 1833, at the close of the business of the Baltimore Association.

*Resolved*, That we cordially invite our ministering and other brethren from all parts of the United States, who accord with our views as expressed in our *Address*, to attend our next meeting. Also, that we recommend our *Address* to the consideration of such Baptist Churches as profess to adhere to the ancient faith and order of the Particular Baptists' requesting those of them who are disposed to unite with us in the stand which we have taken to give us an expression thereof by messenger or otherwise.

*Resolved*, That Brother Henry Moon be our messenger to the Muskingum Association, and that Brother Gilmore write them an affectionate letter on our behalf.

*Resolved*, That we consider the receiving persons into Baptist Churches upon any ground whatever short of an evidence of their having been born from above, to be a subversion of the ancient principles of the Baptists, of the apostolic example, and of the declaration of the Master that His Kingdom is not of this world. Therefore we will not administer baptism to any without receiving for ourselves an evidence of their having experienced the specific change; and we beseech the churches of our faith and order to guard against persons getting in among them through the excitement of their animal feelings, with as much caution as they would watch against receiving persons upon the ground of their receiving baptism as regeneration.

*Resolved*, That Brother Healy superintend the printing of our *Minutes*, and that he be authorized to print 500 copies.

*Resolved*, That brethren Samuel Trott, Newark, New Castle Co., Del., William Gilmore, Leesburgh, Loudoun Co., Va., Thomas Poteet, Golden, Baltimore Co., Md., Edward Choat, Golden, Baltimore Co. Md., Thomas Barton, Strakers Ville, Pa., Gilbert Beebe, New Vernon, Orange

Co., N.Y., Stephen W. Woolford, Washington City, D.C., Gabriel Conklin, Slate Hill, Orange Co., N.Y., be a Committee of Correspondence.

We beg leave to recommend to the patronage of our brethren a paper published by our brother, Gilbert Beebe, entitled, "*The Signs of The Times.*"

As some have misunderstood certain expressions in the latter part of his *Prospectus* relative to the popular institutions of the day, we would say that the views of the editor *are such as are expressed in the Address* published by us.

We desire at the close of our meeting to acknowledge the kind hand of God, which has been manifested in bringing us together, and permitting us to sit and consult together in harmony and fellowship, and for the affectionate manner in which we have been received by our brethren and friends in this vicinity.

After an affectionate address and prayer by the Moderator, the meeting was adjourned to the time and place above mentioned.

William Gilmore, *Moderator*  
Gabriel Conklin, *Clerk*

Preaching during the meeting as follows:, viz., Saturday, 29<sup>th</sup>, brother Edmond J. Rees, from Hebrews xiii. Chapter, and first clause of 9<sup>th</sup> verse: "*Be not carried about by divers and strange doctrines.*" Brother Barton, from Matt. Xvii.5: "*While He yet spake, a bright cloud overshadowed them,*" &c., Brother Conklin, from Isaiah xxxv.8: "*And an highway shall be there, and a way,*" &c.

Lord's Day – Brother Healy, from Zechariah vi.12,13: "*Behold the man whose name is The Branch,*" &c., Brother Beebe, from Matthew vi. 13: "*For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever, Amen.*" Brother Gilmore, from John xv.1,3: "*I am the true Vine,*" &c., Brother Trott, from Rev. iii.22: "*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.*"

Preaching every evening during the meeting in various places,

We, the undersigned, do hereunto set our names, as cordially uniting in all the proceedings of this meeting. Signed,

|                       |                        |                       |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Elder John Healy,     | Elder William Gilmore, | Elder Edward Choat    |
| Elder Samuel Trott,   | Elder Thomas Poteet,   | Elder Thomas Barton   |
| Elder Edward J. Rees, | Elder Gilbert Beebe,   | Elder Gabriel Conklin |
| Elder Henry Moon,     | Elder William Wilson,  | Elder James B. Bowden |
| Abraham Cole, Senator | Lewis R. Cole,         | Samuel Shawl          |
| Luke Enson,           | Shadrick Bond,         | John Ensor            |
| Richard English,      | Edward Norwood,        | Joseph Perigoy        |
| Joseph Mattem         |                        |                       |

Elders Wilson and Bowen were not present at the meeting, but having examined the Minutes and Address, have authorized the insertion of their names.

Elder John Leland, upon reading the Address requested his name affixed.

- THE COMMITTEE

### ***PROSPECTUS OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES***

[The following paragraph in the ADDRESS that says, “As some have misunderstood certain expressions in the latter part of his Prospectus relative to the popular institutions of the day, we would say that the views of the editor *are such as are expressed in the Address published by us,*” is a deliberate endorsement of the doctrines stated in the Prospectus of The Sign Of The Times. What then, did these ministers state that they believed on THE DOCTRINES? Here is a copy of those doctrines, found in the **PROSPECTUS** :

1. The Existence, Sovereignty, Immutability, Omnipotence and Eternal Perfections of the Great Jehovah – the Revelation which God has given Himself, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. “These Three are One.” I John v:8.

2. **The Absolute Predestination of All Things.**

3. Eternal, Unconditional Election.

4. The Total Depravity and just condemnation of fallen man.

5. That the Atonement and Redemption of Jesus Christ are for the Elect only.

6. The Sovereign, Irresistible, and in all cases, Effectual work of the Holy Spirit, in Regeneration and Quickening the Elect of God.

7. The Final Preservation and Eternal Happiness of all the sons of God, by grace.

8. **The Resurrection of the dead, and Eternal Judgment,**

9. That the Church of Christ is composed **exclusively of Baptized Believers** – that to her are given able ministers of the New Testament; that the Scriptures are the only **divinely authorized Rule of Faith and Practice** for the saints of God.

10. That there is no connection between the Church and State, and as touching the proposition for a marriage between them, the Hon. R. M. Johnson, in his Report on the Sabbath Question, has expressed our faith.

The “Signs of the Times” will be decidedly opposed to Bible, Tract and Missionary Societies, Theological Seminaries, Sabbath Schools, &c., &c., **making war with the Mother, Arminianism, and her entire brood of Institutions.**

## APPENDIX G

## MISSISSIPPI BAPTISTS' REASONS AND APPEALS 1844

[In 1844, some of the churches composing the Mount Pisgah Baptist Association in central Mississippi withdrew from that fellowship and formed the Bethany Association. Both these associations still exist today. Some of the churches in the Mount Pisgah have united into a Southern Baptist affiliated association, while the Mount Pisgah remains a “missionary” association outside of the Mississippi Baptist State Convention. The *Reasons and Appeals of 1844* is a fair example selected to show the stated reasons for these churches protest against the Modern Missionary Movement. The reader may note, that the next following Address of the White River Association in Indiana shows that in both North and South, on the frontiers, large numbers of churches *did not approve of the innovations sweeping the nation in that decade.*]

“When in view of passing events, conscience points out the necessity of breaking asunder the bonds of union which have hitherto bound together those who profess to be of the same sentiments, and to be governed by the same laws and rules, it becomes those who dissent or separate themselves from others to set forth their reasons for separation.

Therefore, we, who hitherto have been members of the Mt. Pisgah Baptist Association, hereby make known our reasons for separating ourselves from these brethren who still choose to remain in that body.

4. Because they hold and publish to the world that there are now more gospel ministers than there is money to send them out. (See MINUTES of the Baptist State Convention, May 4, 1839, page 7).

2. Because they hold and publish to the world that embarrassments in pecuniary matters have obstructed some of the holiest enterprises for the advancement of the Messiah’s Kingdom. (See Third Annual Report of the American and Foreign Bible Society.)

5. Because they are in practice of buying life membership in societies under the pretension of spreading the gospel, therefore placing the gospel side by side with common merchandise, and placing the poor brother on an unequal footing with the rich hypocrite. (See Constitution of the American Baptist Home Mission Society, Article 3.)
6. Because they employ men at high stipulated wages to go and preach and act *as agents in collecting money*, and laying claims of education before the churches. (See *Minutes* of the Baptist State Convention, 1843, Appendix, page 8.)
7. Because they hold and publish to the world that large sums of money can be spent with prudence, economy and profit in advancing Christ's Kingdom; if such sums cannot be obtained, such profitable efforts cannot be effected, thereby laying such stress upon money as to make the advancement of Christ's Kingdom entirely dependent on the amount of money that can be raised, thereby placing the salvation of God's church on human effort and contingency, which is in direct violation of God's salvation, as revealed in His written and infallible Word, which He has given for *the rule of our faith and practice*. (See Tenth Annual Report of Baptist Home Mission Society, April 26, 1842, page 18.)

These are some of the reasons that impel us to the course that we are now pursuing. We do not wish to be understood as saying that all the brethren from whom we are separating are in direct and immediate practice of all the unscriptural and newly invented schemes against which we complain, or that all of them directly favor or sustain the mammon-like schemes of the present day societies which were never participated in by the Baptists until within our recollection; but we hold such brethren to be in disorder for countenancing and continuing in fellowship with those who are practicing and endeavoring to carry on such worldly and unscriptural measures as we have herein set forth, for

we are unwilling to give up the long cherished doctrine and sentiments upon which the Baptists have relied ever since the Lord Jesus Christ established His Church on earth.

Finally, brethren, addressing ourselves to you who profess to be Particular Baptists of the Old School but who are suffering such things to be preached and practiced among you as are learned from men, and not from the Word of God: It is for you to say, not us, whether we can longer walk in union with you. We regret, and so must you, to see brethren professing the same faith severing themselves from each other; but brethren, if you compel us to sanction the traditions and inventions of men as religious obligations, or to separate ourselves from you, the sin lieth at your door. This, brethren, is our appeal to you. You may treat it with contempt if you despise the cause for which we contend in conformity with the Word of God.”

*Minutes* of the Bethany Association of the  
Old School faith and orthodox Order  
October, 1844

---

## APPENDIX H

### THE WHITE RIVER REGULAR BAPTIST ASSOCIATION OF INDIANA, 1844

#### *CIRCULAR LETTER*

Beloved Brethren,

Wishing you health and salvation, and if anything more loving and charming can be experienced from the bowels of the Christian religion, we give all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation. The great Shepherd has been very mindful of His sheep many years past; and although they have been persecuted and even to death in almost every age for 1800 years, yet He who controls the destiny of man and nations, has turned it all to the furtherance of the Gospel of Christ: and the establishment of that Kingdom which is never to end. The Baptists have been the sufferers in every age, whether they have been known by the name of Novatians, Paterines, Burgundians, Patrebrusians, Lollards, Waldenses, Albigens, or Baptists; yet they have stood firm under the banner of their King, uniformly maintaining the laws laid down in the Old and New Testaments as the only rule of their faith and practice; and anything else introduced is a **usurpation of authority**, and a direct insult to the King Himself. The carrying out of the principles as laid down in the text, has subjected the Church to persecution in every age, either by word, law or sword, and sometimes by all. But “*the foundation of God standeth sure having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His.*”

We have her acknowledged faith in the Articles placed above [in the White River Regular Baptist Association’s Articles of Faith- Ed.], and whatever is not found revealed in the Old and New Testaments, is not her faith nor her practice. This Article is found in all Baptist Confessions, yet there is none more egregiously violated or trampled under foot. It nevertheless is the standard of holiness, and no subject has the liberty of departing therefrom, without incurring the displeasure of the Lawgiver, and becoming offensive to His real subjects. But, we proceed to the analogy of the subject of missions.

The 17<sup>th</sup> century was an age of missionary promise. The 18<sup>th</sup> century began to fill that promise. The 19<sup>th</sup> is called the “age of missionary enterprise.” The **union of all Christians** for this object is to become universal, its presence has taken the rank of a **new power**. The Swiss in



1556 sent out a few missionaries, and in 1559 the king of Sweden sent out more. There were some few others, together with the Spaniards and Portuguese; all of which, however, were so far from the spirit of the New Testament, that we think it unnecessary to say anything positive about them,- (Great Com., Harris, by Baptist Advocate, Vol. 4: No. 10).

The first **moneyed missionary establishment** we can find, was established by Gregory, the Pope of Rome, in 1662, and called the "Congregation for Propagating the Faith." – (Enclp. Buck's Dic. Baptist Advocate.) It had, like our missionary systems among the Protestants, an incredible number of donors, rich and emulous to excel in the greatest gifts, and was expanded by Pope Urban VIII, and by this Congregation's money a vast number of missionaries were educated and sent to the remotest parts of the earth, among the most barbarous heathen, In India, China, and Japan, many thousands of these were won over by the artful Jesuits and Monks, to embrace the Roman Catholic faith. These missionaries soon began to tamper with civil governments [Note: American missionaries immediately received funds from the U.S. Congress to establish Columbia University, and Luther Rive was made its president.- Ed.] , as has been their **uniform practice**, and here the system will be consummated among Protestants sooner or later unless it is thwarted by some action of Divine Providence or of Grace.

The Catholics have their missionaries now in almost all the world, in North and South America, in Canada, and nearly all Indian tribes, South and West, many millions of dollars have been and still are expended for the propagation of their faith. Now considering the difference between Catholics, Protestants, and Baptists, in doctrine and practice, is it not strange that Protestants and Baptists (some of them) should be aping after Catholic fashions; but we are imitable beings, hence both have borrowed this system from their neighbors, and if there is any glory in it the Catholics are certainly entitled to it.

2<sup>nd</sup>. The Moravians in 1741, sent out their missionaries in Greenland, St. Croix, the Indians of North America, the slaves in the South, and

elsewhere, but they being small in number are only appropriate between \$50,000 and \$100,000 yearly to the prosecution of their system. – (Buck’s Dic. Enclp. Baptist Recorder, &c.)

3<sup>rd</sup>. The “English mission” establishment, The first mission we can find upon record was established in 1792, called the Baptist Missionary Society. Mr. Harris and other missionary writers say this was the *first*. The London Missionary Society was founded in 1795, on the principle of embracing all denominations. In 1796 the Edinburg Missionary Society was formed, and in 1801, arose the Church Missionary Society. In 1808, a society was organized to carry the gospel to the Jews. In 1816, there was a Seminary formed to make missionary preachers for Bazel. The same year the Evangelical Society was formed, &c., &c. A late missionary writer informs us that there are now between 3,000 and 4,000 societies originating from, and are either independent of, **or tributary to**, these as the original roots. [ See: Miami Baptist Association’s 1819 recommendation that her churches form themselves into *auxiliaries to* the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions, page 71 above.-Ed.]

4<sup>th</sup>, and lastly. American missions. Mr. Kirk, of England, says in reference to the connection between English and American missions, that Andrew Fuller and William Carey laid the foundation thereof in America. Mr. Harris says it was not until the inspiring accounts of Carey, Vanderkemp, and Buchanan became circulated that American piety became *divinel awakened* to its claims; with that awakening the names of Judson (An Arminian, Ed.) Rice (A Congregational Arminian), Mills and others, stand vitally connected. On thse *youthful students* the *missionary spirit* had eminently rested, and that while they were at school studying theology, they were accustomed to pour out their prayers behind a haystack which was near the college, and there behind this stack, they *called down a missionary spirit from heaven which proved the glory of our country*. (- Baptist Advocate, Vol. 2, No. 4).

Question: If these young students called down this missionary spirit from heaven **was it ever in the Church of Christ before?**

Among the **first** establishments in the United States, was the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which was **established in 1810 by the Congregational Church, This, in 1813, sent out** Judson, Rice, Nott, Newel, and Hall. After they left the American shore, Judson and Rice became baptised. They were never really “Baptists, certainly not in doctrine, faith, or practice. Rice soon returned to the United States, and **stirred up a spirit of missions among Baptists.** In twelve months he traveled, preached and took up collections to the amount of \$5,443, of which he spent himself \$1,963, (American Rep., page 125) But as there are many Baptists who know all about Mr. Rice and his operations, we need only refer them to the Boston Rec., and Taylor on “Missions.” (Selected from the 1844 *MINUTES*, “Circular Letter,” of The White River Regular Baptist Association of Indiana.)

NOTE: The 1844 *MINUTE* continues with the historical development of dozens of other “benevolent institutions” needed to advance the Mission System’s cause; such as Colleges, Sunday School, Temperance societies, and “Domestic” Missions” which was added to the “Foreign Missions,” to send preachers into the bounds of Baptists’ associations and churches to divert them to the control of the Baptist Board of Foreign and Domestic Missions. However, since all these innovations, or auxiliaries, were of later date, the above is sufficient to prove our contention that the Baptists that did not dive head-long into the *New Divinity movement* are, in fact, the original Baptists, whereas the New School associations, conventions, and churches are fraudulent or misnamed “Baptists.” They are “Baptists” without the doctrine of Christ, nor New Testament authority or ordinances. Neither do they preach the Gospel of Christ in the present age. They have fallen from grace, and closer in doctrine and practice to Methodism and Pentecostalism than to the former Baptists.

*Finis*