

**BOOK I**

**COME HITHER, I WILL SHOW THEE THE BRIDE, THE  
LAMB'S WIFE**

***A BOOK ABOUT THE TRIUMPHANT CHURCH  
IN HER GLORIFIED REALM ABOVE***

By

Stanley C. Phillips

An Examination of the Origin and Development of The Church  
as the Bride of Christ and Her Eternal Union In the Bridegroom

***Published by:***

**The Predestinarian Publisher**

1159 County Road 420  
Quitman, Mississippi 39355

*a.d. 2008*

**PUBLISHER:**

**The Predestinarian Publisher**

**1159 County Road 420  
Quitman, MS 39355**





Appendix J: Eternal Vital Union, Thomas P. Dudley, 1847 . . . . .	183
Appendix K: Eternal Vital Union, William Smoot, 1890 . . . . .	189
Appendix L: Regeneration and the New Birth, Thomas P. Dudley, 1868 . . . . .	197
<b>BOOK II</b>	
Introduction . . . . .	213
Chapter One: Definition of Terms: . . . . .	219
Chapter Two: Historical Origins of “Baptized churches of Christ” . . . . .	225
Chapter Three: Origins of Baptists . . . . .	231
Chapter Four: The Great Awakening . . . . .	236
Chapter Five: Commencement of the Modern Great Apostasy. . . . .	242
Chapter Six: Practical Aspects of the churches of Jesus Christ . . . . .	261
Chapter Seven: Doing All Things in Decency and in Order . . . . .	272
Chapter Eight: The Government of the Church . . . . .	279
Chapter Nine: How So Rapid An Apostasy? . . . . .	289
Addendum To The Baptized Churches of Christ . . . . .	303
Appendix A A: The London Confession of Faith, 1644 . . . . .	332
Appendix B B: Elder Reuban Ross Preached the First Arminian Sermon in West, 1820 . . . . .	357
Appendix C C: Dr. J. M. Pendleton’s Description of Baptists’ Preaching in Ross time. . . . .	365
Appendix D D: David Benedict’s Fifty Years Among Baptists, 1805-1855 . . . . .	370
Appendix E E: The Rising Opposition to Modern Missionary Movement . . . . .	373
Appendix F F: Miami Baptist Association in Ohio, 1814 . . . . .	375
Appendix G G: The Flint River Association in Tennessee and Alabama, 1814 . . . . .	376
Appendix H H: Alexander Campbell’s Circular Letter for the Redstone Association . . . . .	378
Appendix I I: Public ADDRESS by Daniel Parker, 1820 . . . . .	379
Appendix J J: Kehukee Baptist Declaration, 1826 . . . . .	401
Appendix K K: The Black Rock ADDRESS, 1832 . . . . .	411
Appendix L L: PROSPECTUS of the Signs of The Times, 1832 . . . . .	434
Appendix M M: Mississippi’s Bethany Association’s Reason and Appeals, 1844 . . . . .	435
Appendix N N: White River Regular Baptist Association Circular Letter, 1844 . . . . .	438
Conclusion . . . . .	443

## INTRODUCTION

The Church that is the “Lamb’s Wife” (Revelation 21: 9) is the “body of Christ,” and Christ is the Head of His progeny, and they are “*members in particular*” of His body (I Cor. 6:15; I Cor. 12:22; & Eph. 4:30). This Church is manifested upon the earth, both in collected visible assemblies, and, as called out individuals, during its development. Some of God’s children are added to the visible local churches and if preserved faithful to Christ, are preservers of the doctrine and order of His constitute kingdom on earth. Others, not added to the visible church, are equally in that Church,

the Bride, the Lamb's wife, and have full and free access to the Gospel of the grace of God in the churches' congregations, in areas where such exist and via private devotions as enabled by the Spirit of God. However, in considering her in her eternal union with Christ as His Bride, we will view her in the aggregate of **all the elect** of God (by some called the "Church Triumphant"), and the individual development of each of her members. For such that desire to examine the subject of the **local visible** and functioning churches of Christ on earth (by some writers referred to as the "militant church"), consistent with this presentation, and with that established by Christ in the beginning of the New Testament, we recommend **Volume II, "The Baptized Churches of Christ"** by this same author.

In order to examine the origin and development of the body and Bride of Christ, we wish first to notice a large collection of Scriptures that are needful to present this subject. Every Bible *reader* will recognize the passages we cite, and every Bible *believer* will realize that the Holy Spirit has presented them with a real and important design. Following this discussion, then, one may expect to see many of these passages unfolding to present a gestalt view of the spiritual Church of the living God. To begin this collection of passages, let us note some that are extremely important, drawn from the creative design of our Lord God in the beginning of the genesis of the race of man.

Others before us have discovered a "principle of first mentioning" in the Bible. To wit, wherever a

subject is first mentioned by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures, the way it is introduced is often applicable in other places where the same is used. So it is with reference to a theme found in the first chapter of Genesis. More than any other principle emphasized, the notation that all species developed “*after its own **kind,***” and have “***seed** within itself*” is outstanding (Genesis 1:11, 21, 24, 25, 29). Universally, in both the plant and animal kingdoms, life is produced by a **pre-existing life** of “like kind,” or parentage. In both kingdoms, plant and animal, all life is generated by a **living** parentage. The same is true of Man, who was made in the likeness and image of God, and was as Paul taught, a “***figure** of Him that was to come.*” (Romans 5:14). Not only, then, is the modern theory of evolution proved heretical, but the relation of the first creature to all its offspring is faithfully demonstrated to be absolutely true of the record God has revealed in Genesis one. The Truth is empirically presented to every sane man’s eyes and mind. There never were any “missing links” between species and kinds. Nor have *believers* ever supposed there were. Each birth or development of an offspring originates in the antecedent generation. This is a **cardinal point to remember**. No being begins from nothing. It is always produced by a previous generation of life, which life they had from the creation of the first of its kind, and which lay dormant in “seed substance” after “its own kind,” having “seed in itself.” Please keep this Biblical principle in mind throughout the reading of this work. It is important to understand, that God so fixed a separation between the various “kind” in the

plant and animal kingdoms, that they cannot mix their seed and beget an offspring. [Chromosomes must have equal numbers to procreate, and each kind possess a different number of chromosomes.] Each “kind,” has a number of “species,” in its classification, and when species do cross-breed, the *hybrid* offspring cannot reproduce. [Only three times in recorded history have mules (hybrids between horses and asses) ever produced offspring.] It is noteworthy that varying “kinds” can be classified in higher or lower “orders” of creatures. There has never been a cross between lower orders of species and kinds with those of a higher order. For instance: A reptile is lower than a bovine (cows, bison, water buffaloes), of the *genus Bos*, and they cannot mix. An anthropoid (apes, monkeys, gorillas, chimpanzees) is higher than a bovine, and they cannot mix. A man is higher than an anthropoid, and hence they cannot mix. An angel is higher than a natural man, and angels and men cannot mix. The Spirit is higher than an angel; and they cannot mix. Certain, then, God, who is a Spirit, is higher still than man, who is “lower than the angels,” and thus cannot mix. This last level of classification is useful to understand the doctrine of the spiritual new birth. “*That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*” (John 3:3). We will have needs to refer back to this subject when we deal with the doctrine of spiritual reproduction, or ***regeneration***.

It is also very noteworthy that consistent to this principle are the following revelations. *First*, God reveals the “***generations of Adam,***” (plural- Genesis 5:1), and

the “**generation of Jesus Christ,**” (singular- Matthew 1:1). *Second*, the Holy Scriptures reveal both a “*first Adam,*” (1 Cor. 15:45,) and a second or “*last Adam,*” (1 Cor. 15:45). It is written that the first man Adam was “*made a living soul,*” while the last Adam was “*made a quickening Spirit*” (1 Cor. 15:45). The first man “*is of the earth, earthy:*” the “*second man is Lord from heaven.*” (1 Cor. 15:47). We would alert the reader to the fact that as the first man Adam was made of the earth, the record is given that “*As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy,*” that is, of “**like kind**” with their father Adam, and as he, has his seed of reproduction within himself. (1 Cor. 15: 48). Each of his generations is in Adam’s fallen nature, and hence each are “*born of corruptible seed.*” (I Peter 1:23). And of special note, such as are of the last Adam, who is Lord from heaven (Christ), “*such are they also that are heavenly.*” (of “**like kind**”) (1 Cor. 15:48). *Third*, the revelation includes a “*natural man,*” born of the first Adam (1 Cor. 15:44,) and a full discussion of him is found throughout the Sacred text; and a “*spiritual man,*” born of God, (1 Cor. 15:44) whose characteristics are also fully presented in the holy pages. The inspired record speaks plainly of one that is born of the first Adam as being “*born of the flesh,*” (John 3: 6), and of those born of the Spirit of God, it is recorded that “*that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*” (John 3:6). So we see the first principle being maintained even in one’s spiritual birth: *i.e.*, reproduced in “**like kind**, from a seed within Himself.” *Fourth*, We read of the natural man, his body and all of its component parts and passions, referred to as “*our*

*outward man,*” and “*flesh,*” or “*body,*” and we read together with that phrase, of an “*inward man,*” “*but though our **outward man** perish, yet the **inward man** is renewed day by day.*” (II Cor. 4:16). In fact, the apostle clearly contrast these two men by saying, “*That ye put **off** the former conversation the **old man,** which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be **renewed** in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the **new man,** which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.*” (Ephesians 4:22-24). Again, as “like begets like kind,” hence the flesh can only produce flesh; and the Spirit can only produce spirit; the animal can only produce another animal of the *same kind*; and a plant of its *own kind*. This totally destroys Charles Darwin’s fatal theory, and a Christian should expect it to overthrow atheism, deism, Arminianism, as well as Calvinism. It destroys the *philosophical* concepts of: generation or birth by water, the preached word, decisionism, performance of any set of “works,” and plans of salvation to produce *spiritual* life. It overthrows the doctrine that “the sinner man is born again,” which is impossibly, according the law of reproduction of “like kinds” (Genesis 1). It affirms the precept that life begets life, and this life is produced by living beings of like kind to that which was begotten. But we are not discussing those false theories. Our subject is much more sublime.

In order for the reproduction of the species, including man, the “seed is in itself.” The seed carries the *living germ* **of life** necessary to reproduction and identity with the specie in view. The entire specie

throughout all time was in the seed of the **first** of its kind created. It is too well established among us for any to deny that in the sin of Adam's fall, the entire race of his progeny was in seed substance in him at the time of his transgression, and so "*all have sinned and come short of the glory of God*" (Romans 3:23). Death reigns over them all. "*As in Adam **all** die; so **IN** Christ all shall be made alive*" (1 Cor. 15:22) - that is, in "seed substance" in Him. The result is that "*there is none righteous, no not one,*" of all that were seminally in Adam's loins that fateful day. (Romans 3: 10, 23). So too, the inspired record amply speaks of a "**seed**" of the last Adam, or Christ. Here, brethren and sisters, we beg of you to give *careful attention*. Notice the Scriptures supporting this statement: "*And in **thy seed** shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*" (Gen. 22:8). It appears to us in this text to refer to Abraham's offspring, yet the Apostle says, "*and to **Thy seed**, which **is Christ***" (Gal. 3:16), when he refers to this O.T. verse. "*A **seed** shall serve Him, and it shall be counted to Him a **generation.***" (Psalm 22:30). "*He shall see **His seed**, and He shall prolong His days,*" (Isaiah 53:10). "***Thy seed** shall inherit the Gentiles,*" (Isaiah 54:3).

It is the **life** that is in the **seed** that produces an offspring to perpetuate that specie. As surely as this is so of man in nature, so it must be of the *spiritual seed* that produces the *spiritual children* of God. A corrupt seed must produce a corrupt offspring; and an incorrupt seed must produce like kind: an incorrupt offspring. And so we read of God's children, "*Being born again, not of **corruptible** seed,*" of which we certainly

are in our first birth from the first man, Adam; “*but of **incorruptible**, by the Word of God that liveth and abideth for ever.*” (1 Peter 1:23). The very fact that spiritual life must proceed from a *pre-existent spiritual life* of like kind, forever disputes all the theories of regeneration or the new birth by any kind of human instrumentality. The preaching of the Gospel, or any other incantation, cannot produce spiritual life in a dead sinner. God’s children – all of them – are “*born of God.*” They are born, “*not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor the will of man, but of God.*” John 1:12-13.

We do not expect any to deny that whomever begat us into this world can only have been our father. If our father begat us by the implantation of his corrupt seed derived from Adam, then we surely must be “his children,” and also corrupt by birth. Will any dispute this conclusion? Then we insist that the same is true of the *incorruptible seed* as well. For any of us to be children of God, we imperatively must be “begotten **of God.**” This truth leaves out the Arminian theory of “gospel regeneration,” or of “preacher-made Christians.” John clearly taught: “*Whosoever is **born of God** doth **not** commit sin; for His Seed remaineth in him: and he **cannot** sin, because he is born of God.*” (I John 3:9). And “*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ **is born** of God: and every one that loveth Him that **begat** loveth him also that is **begotten of Him.***” (I John 5:1).

The implanted seed must be **alive** in order to produce an offspring. When God fashioned man, He then “*breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and*

*man became a living soul.*” Ever afterwards, man has transmitted that natural life from one generation to the next, wave after wave down to this present day. So too, the incorruptible seed is also a living seed, and conveys life to all God’s offspring. “*And this is the record, that God hath given to us **eternal life**, and **this life is in the Son.***” (I John 5:11). Notice where the actual life is found: Therefore the apostle can justly claim, as he did, “*He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son, hath not life.*” (I John 5: 12). In Adam’s family, the **living** sperm must impregnate a **living ovary**, or the attempted procreation will fail. [Note: Life does NOT begin at conception! life began at Creation!]

When that *eternal life* is transmitted by the **incorruptible seed**, the Word of God that **liveth** and abideth forever, the object that is born is a *child of God*; just as surely as a man is an offspring born of Adam and possessing natural life from him. A point ought to be made here. Whoever, or whatever, is born of God **cannot** commit sin. Hence, we cannot say that a man’s soul is born again, because the soul of a man can contract blame, as Paul prayed, that God would keep them, “*both body, soul and spirit, **blameless** unto the day of Jesus Christ.*” We read again, “*We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is **begotten of God** keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.*” (I John 5:18). Jesus did not say, “Except a man’s soul be born again,” or “Except a man’s spirit be born again,” or yet, “Except a man’s body be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” So not a “*part*” of that which is born of the *corruptible*

seed from Adam's life is the object of a renovation. The natural man is not born over again into a spiritual man, otherwise such a man would be sinless, and this is contrary to the witness and confession of every child of God! We have proven that life begets life of "like kind," and lower species and higher species cannot cross pollinate their seeds. "Being born again," does not mean "being born all over again." It simply means the man must experience a second birth, and this second birth is altogether different and distinct from his natural birth. His natural birth put him into the *human family* with all its cursed woes! And, he will ever be in that family, unchanged, biologically and physiologically the very same until the last heart-beat of that Adamic frame. But the second birth, produced by "*the incorruptible Seed, the word of God that liveth and abideth forever,*" gave him **eternal life**, and that life is in God's Eternal Son, and that experience raises him up in *God's family* in seed substance, and affixes that eternal life to a member of Adam's corrupted family. That spiritual family – every member of it – is counted for "*a generation*" (singular) Matt. 1:1), and is the completed body and bride of Christ of whom Christ is the Head and Husband, and they are "*members in particular*" set in that body in their rightful and ordained place and time.

If it is claimed, as it has been by some, that such a view as this means that God has not done anything for the body, we reply, "Are you completely unskilled in the Word! Every sin committed was done ***in the body!*** Every pain and groan of the suffering Savior was also

done because of the sins committed **in our bodies!** The whole scheme of salvation is to deliver those children of God who reside in the corrupt natural and earthy bodies of Adam's race. In fact, our Lord, seeing that His children are partakers of this flesh and blood, "*took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them,*" (Heb. 2:14) – His children, His offspring, His seed, His generation, from that corrupt family, and translate them from that "*kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son.*"

Brethren and sisters, the entire church and family of God were chosen in Christ **before** the foundation of the world. (Eph. 1:1-6) The life they must have to reside in His glorious presence was "*hid in Christ in God*" even that early, (Colossians 3:3) in seed substance, waiting until the time of their procreation and development, first into the family of man, and then in His spiritual family by the second birth. All of the sufferings of Christ, and all His obedience was for His children's fleshly tabernacle, in the putting away the results of their sinful fall in Adam and consequent works of wickedness in that evil family. In that gracious work, He put away sin, and its natural penalty, and only because they made up His bride, did He have relationship to them to legally incur their debt, and pay the full obligation of the transgressed law for each of them. We see this emphasized in Jude 1, "*. . . to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and **preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.***" Again, "*Lord, Thou hast been **our dwelling place** in all generations. Before the*

mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.” (Psalm 90: 1,2). They were all chosen **in Him, preserved in Him**, and had their dwelling place **in seed-substance in Him**, and so intimate was this relationship, that the Psalmists could say, “In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them: in His love and in His pity He redeemed them; because He **bare** them, and carried them all the days of old.” (Isaiah 63:9). [The Hebrew word for “bare” is “natal.” The text did not use the word “bear,” but “bare.” – that is, in “seed substance **in** Christ”.] And yet again, David speaking in personification of Christ, (David’s son, or “Son of David”) says, “My substance was not hid from Thee,” (“preserved in Christ Jesus”) “when I was made in secret,” (“before the world began”), “and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth” (in Adam’s earthy corrupted frame). “Thine eyes did see My substance, yet being unperfect;” (before actual development) “and in Thy book all My members were written, [Book of Life of the Lamb] which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. How precious also are Thy thoughts unto Me, O God! How great is the sum of them!” (Psalm 139: 15-17).

It too, is assumed by some that because there are two separate and distinct men in this tabernacle of flesh, that there need not be a bodily resurrection of the dead. [This has been referred to as a “hollow man doctrine”]. However, the record is too clear to deny, that the man of the earth, earthy, the sinner man, is the **object of redemption**, and also the **object** of divine

**adoption.** Being the object of divine adoption necessitates divine quickening to resurrection life. The Bride will be whole and complete in the day of her wedding. She will possess her real identity, and be herself, and not another, or a bodiless phantom – a puff of vapor. What she has waited in hope for will sweetly be her bliss in ages untold.

The Church in the aggregate is the Bride of Christ. While here below, she is waiting for the Bridegroom and must keep herself chaste. Church discipline helps, fellowship with one another strengthens the ties of matrimony, and finding one's place and work within the visible church helps to develop and maintain that heavenly and spiritual bond.

It is needful for every member and believer to assemble together to worship God and to encourage one another in the most holy faith, as Providence provides opportunity. When our Little Zion meets, it is all of our privilege to take such a rare opportunity, and make the most we can out of it. We can hunt, fish, work, play, watch ball games, or whatever else Adam's offspring find more entertaining just about any time we please; but the appetite of the spiritual family of the last Adam is in the spiritual realm, and here it should not be neglected, and if so, it is to our own disadvantage and grief. Our conversations are in heavenly places, and God keeps a book of remembrance of such assemblies. *"Then they that feared the Lord spake **often** one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard it, and a **book of remembrance** was written before Him for them*

*that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His name”*  
(Malachi 3:16).

With all the above Scriptural topics presented together, what reason or comprehensive view can we derive from this collection? That they are meaningful, none should deny; that they are given by inspiration for some ordained consequence should be admitted by all. Where, then, should we begin to draw our picture of the Bride, the “Lamb’s wife”? Considering that Paul teaches that Adam was a ***figure*** of Christ, and that Genesis presents the Adamic creation, we suppose that is where we should begin. But why not pass over Adam and his posterity until last, and go directly to his Creator’s Bride and her origin? Is it not written that “*the last shall be first and the first last*”?

## **Chapter One**

### ***The Beauty of The Bride, the Lamb’s Wife***

*“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of Thy kingdom is a right scepter. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows. All Thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made Thee glad. King’s daughters were among Thy honorable women: upon Thy right hand did stand the Queen in gold of Ophir. . . so shall the King greatly desire*

*thy beauty: for He is thy Lord; and worship thou Him.”*  
(Psalm 45:6-11).

The text shows that the beauty of the Bride as seen in her purity, honor, and position at His right hand; as well as her devotion to Him as she worships her Beloved. Positioned at His right hand gives her preeminence over all others of His creation. His scepter – a figure of His sovereignty – is ever near her, and she is enabled in that near position to forever bask in this most adorable attribute of Her Husband and Lord. The most superlative attribute the members of the body of Christ enjoy is His Sovereignty. As Jonathan Edwards once wrote: “Sovereignty I love to ascribe to my God, but formerly it was not so.” Every quickened and experienced child of God meditates daily upon his great King and His sovereign rule over all things. To him, God is GOD! For His subjects, His word is to them the finality of their rule and behavior. What He says is true, “*Let God be true, and every man a liar.*” (Romans 3: 4).

She is referred to as the “King’s daughter,” because all her members are born of Him. “*The King’s daughter is all glorious within: her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the King in raiment of needlework: the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto Thee.* (verses 13-14). The Bride is all glorious **within** due to the sanctification of the Spirit as well as the “*washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,*” and her clothing is of wrought gold. Gold symbolizes “glory,” and she possesses the same glory as Her Lord, and it is “wrought,” by Him in His suffering to

purify her by putting away her sins, and purging her from all unrighteousness. But when she is brought before her Husband, she is adorned “in raiment of needlework,” as seen in her being “His workmanship” and being ordained unto good works. She is not seen in her old nature, but in her new redeemed nature, having been now conformed into the image of her Lord. But with whom does He liken her?

*“Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army of banners? . . .Return, return, O Shulamite; return, return, that we may look upon thee. What will ye see in the Shulamite? As it were the company of two armies.”* (Song of Solomon 6: 10, 13). We see her as victorious in her warfare, - flesh against spirit, and spirit against the flesh, mortifying the deeds of her body; we see her as a company of two armies, one of the earth, earthy; and the other of the Spirit, and spiritual. And through all her travel in grace, she was ever in war, the flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh. But as the Bride, the Lamb’s wife, we see her that has overcome, and by His power and grace triumphed gloriously over the dominion of sin and the law and self. Her rest has now begun. It is her joy now to be married to her Redeemer God and King of glory: *“Set me as a seal upon Thine heart, as a seal upon Thine arm: for love is strong as death; jealousy is cruel as the grave:”* *“I am my Beloved’s, and His desire is toward me”* she can readily say. (Song 7:10).

Here are some interesting notes from the pages of Holy Writ: We find Christ reporting, that “*The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old . . . When He prepared the heavens, I was there: when He set a compass upon the face of the depth. . . . then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him; rejoicing in the habitable part of His earth; and My delights **were with the sons of men***” (Proverb 8: 22, 27, 30-31). In this passage, reference seems to be in a sense that is timeless. Before creation, He rejoiced before the Father, and had His delights with the “sons of men.” How may we understand such a concept? We may compare it with mothers and fathers anticipating their yet unborn children, making plans for them, knitting clothing, collecting provisions, setting aside educational funds, etc. In other words, in “seed substance,” before they are brought forth. Surely God could do this much better, seeing His foreknowledge is infinite and His determinate counsel perfect, and His predestination absolute. Why would anyone think He could not “**see all His seed**, prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand”? (Isaiah 53: 11).

Look at her again in His eternal view: “*My **substance** was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see **My substance**, yet being unperfect: and in Thy book all **My members** were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them. How precious also are Thy*

*thoughts unto Me, O God! How great is the sum of them!”* (Psalm 139: 15-17). Many of us see this as a personification of Christ and His body, the church and Bride, before any of them were formed, even “from the foundation of the world.” The Son’s Bride and offspring were chosen IN HIM before the foundation of the world. The beauty of the Bride, the Lamb’s wife, is her **eternal oneness** with Him. Strangely, then, can we not discover an eternal union of Christ with His Bride from before the foundation of the world, or ever time existed? Is not the life of Christ that eternal life that He gives to each of His children? Is that life not hid in Christ in God even this early? We believe so. May we trace some of the above to the **figure** the Holy Spirit has given in Adam the first.

## ***Chapter Two***

### **Eve and the Lamb’s Wife were in their Husbands from “the beginning.”**

*“Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of*

*Adam's transgression, **who is a figure of Him that was to come.**" (Romans 5:14).*

Look at the "**figure of Him that was to come,**" i.e., the first Adam. Upon his creation, his bride and all the seed of the race of man were seminally **in his loins**, yet undeveloped. The first brought forth from him was his wife, Eve. She was not a "seed" in him, but was "*flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone.*" The twain was "one flesh." Upon her formation, the "seed substance" of the whole race of man was genetically, or seminally, in Adam; and in this regard when he transgressed and death was passed upon him, it naturally passed upon all that he was. This included all his posterity yet to be developed. Sin was imputed to all his offspring and sin actually possessed each that was in him. They were there in him, yet undeveloped, and hence "*had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the **figure of Him that was to come***" (Romans 5:14). Yet they all suffered the same penalty in nature: they all died!

Now, you and I were not sitting there in the orchard when Eve knocked the fruit out of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But we were "in seed substance" there that fateful day!

"Come hither, and I will show you the Bride, the Lamb's wife." And where shall I turn to show you her "in seed substance" in Christ? Why, in our favorite New Testament passage! "*According as He hath chosen us **IN HIM** before the foundation of the world, that we should*

*be holy and without blame before Him in love.”* (Ephesians 1:4). Did you read the preceding verses? *“Who hath blessed us with **all spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ**”* (Eph. 1:3). Now just how could He do that! Unless they were “in Him” “in heavenly places” when they were so blessed? Where did you get the color of your eyes, your complexion, your temperament, etc.? You received them from your father’s “seed” which had been transmitted through the generations from Adam. Much of your natural composition and disposition are genetically determined, and your DNA passes from one generation to the next with but slight changes over generations. That day that your mother, Eve, sunk her teeth into that fruit, all of your inherited characteristics, blessings and traits were stored in Adam’s seed within his loins. So what of the “Bride, the Lamb’s wife”? Was she not also blessed with all spiritual blessings that she would ever have “in Christ” “before the foundation of the world”? We suggest that the text says as much. Another text comes to mind: *“For we are His workmanship, **created IN Christ Jesus** unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them”* (Ephesians 2:10). What does that text imply? First, that the saints were “created in Christ Jesus” with a specific design in purpose: “unto good works.” May we assume that since these works were “before ordained,” then they must fall out in time at both the right moments, and by the specified individuals. If it can be taught that Cyrus the Great would destroy Babylon over a hundred and fifty years before he was born, and the Lord both surnamed

him, and revealed much of his life and success, when he was yet in the loins of his great-grand-father; why may we not understand the sense in which this text describes the members of the body of Christ, His Bride, the Lamb's wife, before they were actually developed? It certainly does not confound this writer! Right here, let me interject a notation very much needed after this book is printed: There will be those who will speak of this writer believing there are eternal spirits in heaven waiting for a body yet to be born; or that we speak of God's children in a metaphysical way as fully developed, *etc.* We do **not** believe, teach, write, or advocate that any of Christ' offspring have been **developed** prior to their new birth experience of grace in time. When the reader hears this, please refer them again to this page, page 24, and gently tell them the author called them a "willful liar."

The Bride, the Lamb's wife, is the "body of Christ." That body, as the body of Adam's offspring, is made up of millions of cells, joined together providing the various functions of the body for its consistency and usefulness for whatever purpose God has for it. Each member, or cell, has its specific purpose, "*but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also **is Christ.***" (I Cor. 12:12). "*But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him.*" (verse 18). "*Now ye are the **body of Christ**, and members in particular.*" (verse 27). It seems, therefore, that Adam is

a true “*figure of Him that was to come,*” in more than one way.

Adam’s wife was a part of him, and composed of all the same elements of which he was composed. So, too, Christ’s Bride, the Lamb’s wife,” existed “in Him” from eternity in seed substance even as Adam’s fleshly offspring were in him in seed substance; and so were all God’s creation “*whose seed is in itself,*” (Genesis 1:11). “*And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a **living** soul; the last Adam was made a **quicken**ing spirit*” (I Cor. 15:45). Follow that figure a ways: When God breathed into Adam’s nostril the breath of life, Adam became a “living” soul. Natural life resided in him, and in his seed. In the procreation of each of Adam’s generations thereafter (Genesis 5:1), that “life” is conveyed by means of that seed; even so, the *figure* is upheld in the spiritual realm as well. Christ is **Life**, and that **eternal life is in** God’s Son. Everyone that has the Son has eternal life, and anyone without the Son has not (spiritual) life. As the life of our natural flesh was in Adam from the beginning; so too, that eternal life that the elect are given in regeneration was in Christ from everlasting. Therefore we cannot dismiss the obvious conclusion, that the Church and each member of His spiritual body have life which was hid in Christ in God from before the foundation of the world. The life the saints possess is in perpetual union with Christ from eternity; and that life will, somewhere in time, be communicated to them by the Spirit of God by way of an “*incorruptible seed.*” This event is known in the Scriptures as “being born again,” or, “born from above.”

The eternal life they receive in the new birth has been stored in Christ's "incorruptible seed" until the appointed time for their second birth. Jude wrote, "*Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, the brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and **preserved in Christ Jesus**, and called*" (Jude 1). Preserving is one method to keep fresh or unspoiled over a long period of time; in this case, from eternity to the spiritual birth experience, and to eternity from whence the preserved saint came.

Here is a good place to make a very important observation. In the beginning, when Eva was extracted from Adam, in the presence of Christ the Word of God, Adam said to Christ, "*This is now **bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man***" (Genesis 2:23). According to Christ in Matthew 19, Christ said to Man, "*Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall **cleave to his wife: and they shall be one flesh.***" (Gen. 2:23). In Matthew 19, the Lord adds, "*What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*" (Matt. 19: 6). Remember, we are presenting Adam as a "**figure** of Him who was to come" – Christ, the Word of God (Romans 5:4). As a *figure*, the lesson is profound! God is declaring one of the many ways in which Adam was made in His own image and likeness. The Bride, the Lamb's wife was already in Him, before He created Adam and his race. He could have made any number of wives in like fashion as He had made Adam's, but if He did, the lesson would have broken the whole design from being a "*figure.*" However,

in the manner in which He did make them, the “twain became one flesh,” even as Christ and the Church are twain. Joined together as one flesh – she is His body, and He is her Head. To put the “twain asunder is to deny the oneness of Christ and His body, the Church. This is one specific cause that the Church below must be careful in not receiving unrepentant believers into the local visible church. The heavenly pattern is to be preserved as a figure as given by Christ in His creation of the race of man; the bodies of some of which serve as tabernacles of the children of God in their earthly development. Paul referred to Moses purifying the tabernacle by blood, and then referred to the mediation of Christ saying, “*It was therefore necessary that **the pattern of things in the heavens** should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which **are figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.**”* (Hebrews 9:23-25). It is certain that the view of Christ as the Head of the Church and the Church the body of Christ, as a *figure* and a pattern, the whole creation, first, of Adam and his race, and the generation and birth of his offspring, and the later regeneration and rebirth of the seed of Christ in some of Adam’s specie, the Church and Christ is the more ancient of the two families. Each of the two families is very different one to the other.

## CHAPTER THREE

### CHARACTERISTICS OF EACH OF THE TWO FAMILIES

#### 1. The children of the spiritual family: Fruits of the Spirit.

The children of the natural family descended from Adam, being born of his seed, are: “born of *corruptible* seed,” whereas the children of God have a much better initiation into this life. “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of **incorruptible**, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.*” (I Peter 1:23). Being born of God’s seed, this birth produces a man that cannot sin. “*Whosoever is born of God doth **not commit sin**; for His Seed remaineth **in** him: and he cannot sin, because **he is born of God.***” (I John 3:9). Believing this one specific text as John wrote it as true is absolutely necessary to understand the doctrine being presented. Some, deny this truth, by saying it only means that the child of God is not “longer *bent toward sinning.*” That is not what John said, or meant. Surely the Greeks had a word for “bent” in their vocabulary, and John surely could have used such a word if that was what he meant. However, not only did he declare that one born of God cannot sin, he even gave the reason for him saying it. “*For His seed remaineth in him,*” and if this is not enough, he gave a second reason, “*because he is born of God.*” You must

accept what he said, whether you are able to get around its seeming contradiction in your experience, or his declaration in the first chapter, “*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*” (I John 1:8). For the moment, take my word for it, this is no contradiction or antinomy. You will be able to grasp this *seeming* paradoxical position later. The reproduction of the *corruptible seed* is of no kin or likeness of the one born of the *incorruptible seed*. One is totally natural, of the earth, and corrupt in all his parts. That one can only commit sin! The one that is born of God is in no part corruptible, but is holy and without blame in all his parts. The natural man is born of Adam; the spiritual man is born of God. The natural man is generated by Adam’s seed; and the spiritual man is **regenerated** and born **again** by the Spirit of God. This spiritual man, dwelling in this “*earthen vessel*” is the one that cannot sin, because he is the one born of incorruptible seed, which seed is Christ. (Galatians 3:16).

The origins of each are totally different, and their characters and traits are equally totally different. They are opposing armies in the same tabernacle of the flesh.

When considering the members of the Bride, the Lamb’s wife, before her development by being added to Adam’s family, we find that in eternity past, they were then “*Blessed with **all spiritual blessings IN heavenly places IN Christ. . . before the foundation of the world.***” (Ephesians 1: 3-4). We could liken this to the genetic heritage the children of Adam’s family

inherit from their progenitors. Some are blessed with high intelligence, successful financial family motivation, while others are not well motivated, are mentally challenged, prone to alcoholism, drug intolerant, mean-spirited, *etc.* These qualities are inherited in seed substance from their father Adam from creation. Some are blessed with spiritual characteristics in seed substance in Christ from eternity. Those that are spiritually blessed receive those blessings through the incorruptible seed in regeneration and are manifested by the second birth. For these *spiritual* blessings, the Scriptures refer to them as “**fruit of the Spirit.**” When the *natural* characteristics are mentioned, they are called “**works of the flesh.**” Nothing can direct the mind to the operations of each better than this difference. Anything “spiritual” must, imperatively, be a production of the Spirit of God; and anything that is of natural production can only be the “works of the flesh.” Grace is the moving cause and effect of the spiritual man, and in the absence of free grace, all one possesses is the production of Adam’s natural seed. This is the cardinal reason for such an abundance of *natural religion*. As Paul proved, “*For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is **life and peace.** Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is **not subject** to the law of God, neither **indeed can be.** So then they that are in the flesh **cannot please God.** But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God **dwell in you.** Now if any man*

*have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His” (Romans 8: 5-9).*

The personality traits of the children of God are on a higher plane than that of Adam’s offspring. In Galatians 5: 19, the Lord gives us a description of the **fruits** of the Spirit. In Galatians 5:17, He gives us a list of the **works** of the flesh. Notice again that the list of the outward, or Adamic man, is called “works,” while that of the spiritual man is called the “fruits” of the Spirit. One is natural, and the other strictly by grace. This within itself is descriptive of two diverse progenitors.

The first **fruit** of the Spirit listed in Galatians 5:19, is *love*. He that loveth is born of God. By “love,” we do not mean altruism, or humanism, no more than sentimentalism, all of which are of the flesh and learned by the human mind. *“Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God: He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. . . . If we love one another, God **dwelleth IN US**, and His love is perfected in us”* (I John 4:7-12). Love that is of God sets Him first and foremost in one’s adoration. He that is begotten of God loveth Him that begat, as well as others begotten of God. They love God, His people, His church, His congregation, His appearances, His commandments, His doctrines and instructions. To defend a sinner against God, an unrepentant in preference to God, is an oxymoron – there can be no such thing.

A second **fruit** of the spiritual inward man is *joy*. Joy is a pleasant feeling. There are many that condemn men for “feeling” their religion, but such a person manifest clearly he is void of that characteristic trait which is common to all God’s regenerated people. It is a good mark set upon His offspring that they can rejoice *feelingly* in the Gospel of the sovereign grace of God, enjoy hearing His word, doing His commandments, and find a deep heart-attraction to others who manifest a love of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

A third **fruit** of the Spirit is *peace*. One thing every experimental living child of God knows full well is that “we must *through much tribulation enter the kingdom of God*” (Acts 14:22). Nothing is more disturbing to a living child of God than the passage through the “strait and narrow way” that leads to life eternal; and this travel is sore enough that peace becomes of high value when pardon is obtained, and peace is applied by the Spirit of God. Paul “gloried in” the members of the Thessalonians’ church for their “*patience and faith in all their persecutions and tribulations that they endured,*” which he said was a “*manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that they may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which they suffered.*” (I Thess. 1: 4-5). God’s dear children have a warfare wherein the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, so that they cannot do what they will. It is so trying at times, and one will argue against himself that he cannot be one of God’s elect. Doubts and fears plague their minds, undermine their faith, and keep them troubled over their spiritual standing in sore trials

of their faith. For some, long seasons of grief over sin, and their shortcomings and backslidings cause them to hesitate asking for a place in a local church, or even following their Lord in baptism. Many live and die outside a local church's membership who are esteemed by all the saints to be born of the same heavenly Father as themselves; Their spirit witnesses with that one's spirit that he is born of God. Great is that "*peace that passeth all understanding,*" when after they have suffered and finally prevailed, they are given a deep soul-satisfaction to rest their case in the hands of their loving Father. This fruit, they know by experience must be granted to them; for in themselves, they could never have triumphed.

The experiences of the children of God are so often complex and disturbing that these teach them patience and longsuffering. The fourth **fruit** of the Spirit listed in our text is "*longsuffering.*" It is the production of the Spirit, a fruit, that in every way consistent to the holy and sacred nature of their heavenly Father. The adage, "Like father; like son," can be applied here. "*And the Lord passed by before him (Moses), and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, **longsuffering,** and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty. . . .*" (Exodus 34:7). It is the longsuffering of God "*that leadeth thee to repentance*" (II Peter 3:9) and this being so, how much is needful of His children to forgive one another, bear with one another, and through this fruit endure through all tribulation to

attain unto salvation. “Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot, and blameless. And account that the **longsuffering** of our Lord is salvation. .” (II Peter 3:15).

Again, let us consider that these eternal blessings that belong to the elect and chosen children of God existed as hidden in Christ in God before any of them were developed, for these blessings were theirs before the “foundation of the world.” Another way we may observe to clarify this point is to consider how the tabernacle in the wilderness was designed. God commanded: “And let them make Me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to **all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of ALL the instruments thereof**, even so shall ye make it” (Exodus 25:8-9). Paul said of this, “as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shown thee in the mount” (Hebrews 8:5). We are insisting that, the creation was after a pre-existing pattern, as when He said, “let us make man in our own image.” Likewise, the dwelling place of God among men – the tabernacle – was also according to a pattern that pre-existed the building and development of it (Exodus 25: 8-9) and all of it was in existence before God showed it to Moses on the mount. Again, the same is seen in the construction of the Temple by Solomon. As the word reads: “And the **pattern of ALL that he had BY THE SPIRIT**, of the courts of the house of the Lord, and of all the chambers

round about, of the treasures of the house of God, and of the treasures of the dedicated things. . . . All this, saith David, the Lord made me to understand in writing by His hand upon me, even **all the works of this pattern**” (I Chron. 28:12, 19). That this temple was patterned according to a pre-existing design, and was a figure of Christ and His Bride, the Lamb’s wife is seen in the purpose of it as recorded: “And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made **ready before it was brought thither: so that there was neither hammer or axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building**” (I Kings 6:7). Can not an informed reader catch the comparison with the spiritual church, the body of Christ with this pattern? There was no sound of “works” in the preparation of the materials – only pure silence and free grace brought it forth, and all the materials, whether stone, metals, wood, or talented artisans were fashioned before they were actually brought forth and placed in their respective places in the temple of God. So it is with the Bride, the Lamb’s wife. Every member of her was chosen, recorded, given eternal life in Christ [As it is written, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on Me **HATH everlasting life.**” “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, **HATH** everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but **IS PASSED** from death unto life” (John 5:24)] and ordained unto the work that each will perform “before the foundation of the world.” Again, polygamy in the visible church breaks this pattern, and because it is inconsistent with the pattern

of heavenly things, (Christ is monogamous) the visible church must wait until a believer is cleared of this inconsistency and their confession of repentance and agreeableness with this holy pre-existent pattern is in evidence. Thus, the entire church – the body, the seed of Christ, His Bride, the Lamb’s wife, was pre-existent in seed-substance, and serve as a type of Christ and the eternal vital union of He and His Bride. When the members of His Bride are developed, being born of God, their characteristic traits are inherited from Him, and are part and partial of their existence as a “new creature in Christ.”

Returning to those inherited traits, or “**fruits**” of the Spirit, the fifth one mentioned by Paul is “*gentleness*.” This fruit is somewhat different from “meekness” and “humility,” – both which are mentioned. It means “usefulness,” excellence, and/or kindness. It is a self-sacrificing virtue that is commendable as a “Christian” trait far above the common selfishness of the “outward man.” Paul placed beside it the sixth **fruit**, that of *goodness*, possibly because of their agreeableness to each other. Again, “like father like son,” this characteristic is so much like unto the Father, in His goodness. It is the “*goodness of God that leadeth thee to repentance*,” and in Him this goodness is discriminating: “*Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfill all the good pleasure of **His goodness**, and the work of faith with power.*” (II Thess. 1:11). Again, joining several of these spiritual virtues together, Paul wrote: “*Now the God of hope fill you with*

all **joy** and **peace** in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost. And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also **are full of goodness**, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another.” (Romans 15:13-14). “Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.” (Galatians 6:2). Again, “As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” (Gal. 6:10).

Now, we remind the reader that these are *fruits* of the spirit born of God. The goodness that God has blessed His children with is as a crown of gold upon their heads, and greatly to be desired and shared one with the other in the church and congregations when gathered together in His name.

Another **fruit** given to God’s born children is *faith*. It is paired in another text, where the apostle speaks of the three highest gifts: “*faith, hope, and charity.*” Faith should not be confounded with a “belief about something,” or a moral suasion as Arminians and many Calvinists think. Faith is a gift of God, a fruit of the Spirit, given by measure to one as needed, and is directly opposed to a “know-so-salvation.” We are not called to walk by sight, but “by faith.” When faith is spoken of as the “substance of things hoped for,” that faith is Christ the object of our hope in the resurrection and change of our bodies at our eternal adoption as children. In times of trials and difficulties in our walk, faith is the strength given one to bear up under the trial, and be enabled to say, “Lord, Thy will be done.”

Faith can be measured as “little faith,” “great faith,” “the assurance of faith,” and to most readers’ surprise, it may be Christ’ faith within us, which is the faith by which a believer is justified before God.

A beautiful, and in this day, a very rare **fruit** is that of *meekness*. Within this context, it can be equated with true humility. It seems to be increased to the same degree as one’s disesteem for his own righteousness and ability. In fact, it seems to be opposed to one’s self-confidence and in agreement to the admonition to God’s children not to have “*confidence in the flesh.*” A man may be highly skilled in some manner of art or trade, and in the realm of religion, know so much about his weakness, ignorance, unworthiness that this gift is given to keep him in his rightful place at the feet of Jesus. “*Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the **spirit of meekness**; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.*” (Gal. 6:1).

The last, or ninth, **fruit** of the Spirit evidenced in God’s born again offspring is “*temperance: against such there is no law.*” While the phrase “against such there is no law” is presented after “temperance,” we believe it, being the summation of these fruits enumerated, it is to be applied to the whole body of these characteristics that make up the personality traits of a living child of God. Paul uses the sports arena to emphasize this trait: He refers to it saying of one seeking “*for the mastery is temperate in all things.*” (I Cor. 9:25). Officials in the Church are admonished to be “*temperate in all things,*”

(Titus 2:2). It is very unbecoming for a believer to be intemperate in anything: alcohol, drugs, anger, lusts, politics, backbiting, reveling, riot, etc., and anything “*wherein there is excess.*” (I Peter 4:3; Eph. 5:18.)

As a whole, these are identifying characteristics of God’s children. They are peculiarly provided to such that will suffer tribulation, persecution, ridicule, for their faithfulness and steadfastness in the Christian Gospel and order. They strengthen the believer, to turn the cheek when called upon; to refuse to revile when evil entreated; to bear the cross of Christ in patience and submissiveness; and to mortify the deeds of the body of this flesh in times of temptation and inward sins and rising corruptions. They are given, as gifts, because they are very much needful in the path the believer is called to tread. As a conclusion of this section, we finish the quotation from Paul: “*And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.*” (Galatians 5:22-26.

## **2. The Children of the Natural man: The Works of the flesh.**

The natural children are born of Adam’s corrupt seed, and are of the “generations of Adam.” (Genesis 5:1). Jesus said to Nicodemus, “Ye must be born

again,” teaching that while the first birth, of water, gave to us our first existence in this kingdom of darkness below, He added: “*that which is born of the flesh is flesh.*” It is natural, carnal, corrupt, earthly, sinful to the max, devilish, sensual, and ALL of its works are sinful and wicked. Even socially “good” works “*without faith, is sin.*” He can be described no better than being referred to as “the sinner man,” this “body of clay.”

What we write here ought not to be any great surprise, because everyone of us are very familiar with ourselves and what we are and do. As Paul introduced this enumerated list of characteristics of the Adamic man, or natural, fleshly man – our body, he wrote: “*Now the **works** of the flesh are manifest, which are these;*” (Galatians 5:19), and he commences his list:

The first **work** of the flesh he calls attention to is, with the next, the strongest on the list: *adultery*. The procreating force of nature is the strongest and most enduring drive of the lusts of the flesh. In nature, it is designed for procreation purposes, and to bind husbands and wives together until natural love has developed and matured. But it is a source of the most vile corruptions in the specie of man. As to its origin, it is based upon the same “lust of the flesh,” as the next *work* of the flesh: “*fornication.*” Fornication covers all manner of sensual uncleanness, whereas adultery is more specific. Fornication includes adultery, but adultery is not the same as fornication. In one passage in the New Testament **both words** are used, which clearly denotes a differentiation. After Christ had told

the Pharisees that putting away one's wife was not permitted, that "the twain is one flesh," and ordered that "*whatsoever God has joined together let no man put asunder;*" the Jews, to trip Him up on a legal matter said, "*Why then did Moses give a writing of divorcement,*" quoting from Deuteronomy 24:1. Christ is now answering their legal question relative to the law of Moses, and He said of Moses' law, "*Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for **fornication**, and shall marry another, committeth **adultery**: and whoso marrieth her which is **put away** doth commit **adultery.***" (Matthew 19:9). Clearly, then, the two words have different meaning in the NT. And, Christ gave the meaning of *adultery* in this text; whereas Moses gave the definition of *fornication* (the exception here) in Deuteronomy 24:1. (the unclean thing, or filthy "words of nakedness," marginal reading).

One of the purposes given for marriage is, "*Nevertheless, **to avoid fornication**, let every man have his **own** wife, and let every woman have her **own** husband. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.*" (I Cor. 7:2-3). It is sufficient to quote Paul again here: "*Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.*" Certainly, there is no Biblical, or moral justification for one advocating the commission of either fornication or adultery. This is a mark of reprobate minds, (Romans 1:24) and hardness of heart: "*All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given.*" (Matthew 19: 11). It is evident that

most modern religionists today cannot receive this saying. No matter what reasonableness is pleaded for the unbridled lust of the body, it is manifestly clear that these are “**works of the flesh**” which are to be “*mortified by the spirit.*” (Romans 8:13).

Tied to these two works is another in the same category. It is “*uncleanness.*” This Greek word includes all manner of *impurities*, whether moral or physical. For the Jews under a dietary law code, it would embrace the eating of unclean animals. Under Christianity, it would include the eating of foods blessed by the antichristian establishments, or “things offered to idols” in the “shambles.” It embraces all filthiness of the flesh, and extends to the former works of fornication and adultery.

This work of the flesh is often the result of the reprobation of one of Adam’s family whereby they are given up to further judgments. As Paul expressed it: “*Wherefore God also **gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts**, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves (homosexuality): who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the **creature** (flesh) more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.*” (Romans 1:24-25). Stronger words for this generation cannot be found, for the whole pursuit of carnal pleasures characterize it.

This age, even among the most conservative religions, accept uncleanness as a matter of course. Paul upbraided the Corinthians in these words, “*For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall **not find you** such as I*

would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not: lest there be debates, envying, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults: and lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented **of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness** which they have committed.” (II Cor. 12: 20-21). What a sad future this servant expected for a church in gross disorder among which he had labored so diligently to set in Gospel order. He seemed to expect the worst for them. They were a Gentile church, and of these peoples he knew that culturally they were Epicurean in their mores. He exhorted Christians to walk a different way from their contemporaries, and is very clear in the way he viewed the Gentile culture. “*This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk **not as other Gentiles walk**, in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: who being **past feeling** have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to **work all uncleanness** with greediness. But ye have **not so learned of Christ**; if so be that ye have heard Him, **and have been taught by Him**, as the Truth is in Jesus:” (Ephesians 4:17-21). Therefore he continues with the admonition, “*That ye put off concerning the former conversation the **old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts**; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye **put on the new****

**man**, which after God is created in righteousness and **true** (in contrast to feign) holiness.” (verse 22).

Hence, uncleanness in morals or physical abuse is contrary to the very fundamental principles of the Christian faith, and a church ought not say “Godspeed” to such by neglecting the censure of such deportment. Paul stated that this way: “*But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not **be once named among you**, as becometh saints.*” (Ephesians 5:3). True Christianity has its own culture, “not of this world,” and hence believers and churches are in error to inculcate the culture of this world into that of the Gospel church. The result of such an amalgamation is the creation of an antichristian religious order.

The serious need for Christians to withdraw from the world and its amorality is encouraged by the fact that “*When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory*” (Col. 3:4); Therefore we are to: “*mortify your members which are upon the earth; fornication, **uncleanness**, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry: for such things’ sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: in the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived with them.*” (Col. 2:4-7).

Again, Paul attacks the works of the flesh in Colossians, “*But now ye also put off **all these**’ anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the **old man with his deeds; and put on the***

**new man**, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.” (Col. 2:8-10). [Incidentally, while not yet on the subject of eternal vital union and regeneration, we note that this text refers to “the image of Him who **created HIM**.” The last “him” is the “new man,” and hence is a created being. He is not the “old man” born over again into a “new man” as many suppose.]

While so many today use the sweet and blessed doctrine of predestination as a cloak for their uncleanness, nevertheless, “God hath not called **us** unto **uncleanness**, but unto holiness. He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto **us** His holy Spirit.” (I Thess. 4:7-8). Now He may very well have ordained **them** to uncleanness, but not so the children of His family. He has taught all of His, saying, “For this is the will of God, even your **sanctification**, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of **you** should know how to possess his vessel (this body, or tabernacle) in sanctification and honor; not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not God.” (I Thess. 4: 3-5).

There is another Greek word that is translated “uncleanness” in 2 Peter 2:10, which means “contamination.” It reads, “But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of **uncleanness** (contamination), and despise government (dominion). Presumptuous are they, **self-willed**, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.” Similar to fornication is uncleanness. In the following passages it is connected to fornication: Eph. 5:3; Col. 3:5. It extends the concept of fornication to any impurities, such as filthy language, vulgarity, lustful fantasy, hearts and

imaginings of fornication, adultery, vulgarities, indecencies, seductions, perversions. It embraces the next work, *lasciviousness*, which is lust and lewdness, and which is a preoccupation with sex and sexual desires and speech.

We usually consider *idolatry* as the worship of images, sculptures of the so-called “saints,” and “holy icons,” and man-made carvings considered as gods. It includes the violate of the first commandment in all its various forms, from idols, to crosses of Talmuz, holy trees, Easter eggs, or anything that is set above God as an object of adoration. Even the “mass for Christ,” or, Christmas, is covered under this condemnation. However, the New Testament puts *covetousness* as idolatry, too. (Col. 3:5). That includes a selfishness, stinginess, and lack of liberality.

*Witchcraft*, including palm-reading, horoscope, astrology, sorcery, voodooism, charlatanism, mysticism, *etc.* This writer sees no reason to leave out Arminianism and other superstitions from this classification. We do that because their priests develops and utilizes fictitious half-scriptures as magical incantations to produce what they call the “born again Christian” for deception is getting followers, and their wealth.

It is probably well accepted that *hatred* is included in these wicked works of the “Old Man.” Few would agree to throw in prejudices into the mix, but many biases are festered by hatred. Sometimes it is difficult to define one’s feelings whether they are the result of hatred, or displeasure with conditions, people, or

actions. I know that I dislike Arminianism, but I know very many Arminians that I harbor no ill feelings toward. I would not feel I have violated God's law if I hated a false doctrine that dethrones Him from His sovereignty; yet when reminded that I should love my enemies, there is a line over which I fear I may cross. Nevertheless, we imagine that all will agree that whether we can help it or not, hatred is in the works of the flesh, and therefore a "wicked deed" of the old man.

*Variance* is a work, or deed, of the old man of the flesh. Variance can be compared with "two-facedness," unstable in opinions and positions, contradictory, saying one thing and meaning the opposite, wishy-washy, quarrelling, wrangling, and being contentious, full of debate and strife. There can be no doubt that these are the old man's wicked deeds, and are opposed to the very principles found in the fruits of the new man. This evil has been the plague of churches throughout the history of the Christian faith.

*Emulations* appear to be rather common to our specie as well. "Keeping up with the Jones," attempting to excel above others for show. In the Greek, it refers to one becoming "heated," or "zealous," "jealousy," and/or malice, envying, and indignation. It somewhat covers a multitude of sins.

Of course, *wrath* is easily recognized as being of the flesh. The old man is full of it! The Greek: *Breathing hard*, as being fierce. *Strife* is self-explanatory, and very much associated with wrath, at least in putting wrath into action.

*Seditions*, or rebellion. The children of God are commanded not to be engaged in rioting, or revolting against authority. “*The powers that be are ordained of God,*” and they are for the preservation of good social order. It should be considered as well, in one’s obedience to church discipline. To rebel against the church is to rebel against highest authority on earth, and care should always be given the greatest examination. It is admitted that a church can be wrong, but so can one hold wrong or ignorant opinions and positions. Especially is that so in the age in which thick darkness covers the whole land relative to revealed religion. It refers in this text to disunion and dissention, and ought to be avoided at all cost for the peace and unity of the brotherhood.

The next is a serious one indeed: *Heresies*. This word in the Greek is “choices,” “disunion,” or “party.” Taken together, it is a divergence from the church, or the truth, and a dividing into parties over such choices. “*There must need be heresies among you, that the approved be made manifest*” (I Cor. 11:19) said Paul, when discussing *divisions* in the church of God at Corinth. *Envy, murders, drunkenness, reveling*” are recognized as of the carnal flesh. But what of this “*reveling*”? In I Peter 4: 3 we read: “*For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, **revellings, banqueting,** and abominable idolatries.*” Reveling is partying. Here in our local church, we had a member that returned from WWI. The community threw a party for returning vets,

and he attended. He was brought before the church in violation of these two texts! Reveling stirs up the carnal flesh, and gives rise to other wicked works of the old man and his deeds.

Now, consider the above with Paul's concluding remarks: "*I have also told you in times past, that they that do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.*" (Gal. 5:21).

How shall we approach that conclusion? These things listed are the "works of the flesh." They are part and partial of the "deeds of the old man." We read: "*Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have **put off the old man with his deeds;** and have **put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.***" (Col. 3:9) These are all the result of our natural birth, and we all, without exception have walked in them, and all are even now, plagued by them. So how shall it be said that such shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Let us put it in its natural context.

Paul also taught after pointing out the above list, said of such, "shall not inherit the kingdom of God," and again, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." We conclude that the "*old man and his deeds*" have no inherent right to the kingdom of God. That the fleshly, Adamic man has no promise, no covenant, or rights, to enter heaven's portals can be thus concluded. Without something else, this natural man is doomed. However, in Roman's, Paul shows that the old man that possesses the new man, or the elect, is given a *spirit of adoption*; and will receive the sonship of this adoption

in the resurrection of the same body, but changed, or glorified. This “vile body” – yes, still vile; “*shall be changed like unto the glorious body of Christ.*” This corrupted mortal will die, and corrupt; but will be regenerated, follow Christ in a resurrection, and be united body, soul and spirit glorified, and united with the body of the church, the Bride, the *Lamb’s* wife, and enter into the nuptials of our great Head, Husband, Shepherd, and Bridegroom.

The “old man and his deeds” will have been destroyed and changed and glorified; and this old man will be united in one with that spiritual new man, created in true righteousness in Christ Jesus our Lord, that was “born of God” “from above.”

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE WARFARE OF TWO ARMIES WITHIN

*“This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust **of the flesh.** For the **flesh** lusteth against the **Spirit**, and the **Spirit** against the **flesh**: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye **cannot do the things that ye would.** But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.”* – Galatians 5:16-18). Before proceeding, please note that the translators capitalized the “S” in the word “spirit,” thus recognizing Him as deity of whom they spoke.

Perhaps the most influential reason one embraces the “two men doctrine of regeneration,” is the truth of the Christian warfare. Every born of God child experiences this strange and unusual dichotomy, and it is usual a surprise to him. Once the struggle that commences with the new birth experience consummates in a felt-pardon and resultant peace, the child of God is upheld sweetly in what is called “his first love.” It seems to him that he can never get into such bad sorts again as previously, and God nurtures him peacefully for a time. He is sure his troubles are over. And then, with a startling fear, all his comforts seem to fade away, and he is just as sure as before, that he cannot possibly be a child of Jehovah! “Why am I thus,” he thinks, “If I’ve been born of God?” And often times this new struggle seems endless, and hopeless. The experimental child has found the truth of the Christian’s warfare! In the preceding chapter, we compared the *works* of the flesh with the *fruits* of the Spirit, and with but little argument, one will notice that the two are diametrically opposite one to the other. It is perfectly logical that with such a contradictory set of principles within one that is born from above, something must give! It is not a mere antinomy as Calvinists and Arminians sometimes argue. Indeed, they are both true, but they are not truly contradictory, for each set is found in “two different men” inhabiting the same “*vessel of honor afore prepared unto glory;*” (Romans 9:23) or the “*earthen vessel*” (II Cor. 4:7) of this tabernacle that houses the *treasure of spiritual life* and grace.

This struggle between the flesh of the “old man,” or “fleshly man,” of Adam’s generations, and the “new man,” or “spiritual man,” of Christ’s generation is difficult to explain, or comprehend, in the absence of all the theories on “regeneration” that make the whole, or some part, of the “old man” to be the subject of the new birth. If that which is “born of the flesh” is also the same as is “born of the Spirit,” then the old is replaced by the new, and there is no explanation possible for this experimental conflict. If the “soul is born again,” as many believe, this belief system can lead directly to the denial of the resurrection of the body (or “hollow man doctrine”.) Yet, in spite of that error, the entire system of Truth is that Christ bore the penalty for sins committed in and by the body; and this body consists of flesh and blood as well as spirit and soul of natural man.

The conflict arises from the very *natures* of the two men inhabiting this body of clay. “*That which is born of the flesh **is** flesh,*” and as shown in the last chapter, has its own characteristics which the Bible refers to as the “*works of the flesh.*” These works are inherent within the nature of the fleshly offspring of the specie of the Adam-man. They come about *naturally*. They are universal in the family members of Adam. They are never unexpected by members of society. All possess the same, and these are manifested in varying degrees by all mankind. The *nature*, or characteristics of the new man, which is born of the “*incorruptible seed, the word of God that liveth and abideth forever,*” and as shown in the last chapter, are referred to as the “*fruits*”

*of the Spirit.*” The clash of these two distinct characteristics within one individual results in that Christian warfare. Under no other system of theology is this experience rationally explained, except that of the “two men doctrine of regeneration.”

As pointed out earlier, one text taken exactly as written is the particular key to unlocking the mystery of the experimental warfare. Let us read that text carefully: “*Little children, let no man deceive you: he that **doeth righteousness is righteous**, even as He is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the **works of the devil**. Whosoever [The word “whosoever” shows clearly this is a person] “is **born of God**” [this phrase refers to a birth of which God is the begetter – not a preacher, or a freewill choice] “**doth not commit sin;**” [that is as plain as it can be stated by anyone! John knows what he is writing! The question is, Do you believe him? He even gives his rationale for that statement, saying,] “*for His seed remaineth **in him:**” [It cannot mean “his seed,” referring to the man himself, for his seed is *corruptible* and therefore unable to prevent him from sinning. The reference is to Christ’s seed, and that Christ’s seed remaineth in that man, so that He is prevented from sinning.] “**and he cannot sin,**” [A second time stated, making two witnesses to this truth that the man born of God cannot sin, and another rationale to support his additional statement is added:] “because he is *born of God.*” That truth, so clearly stated, is a foundation block to the truth of the**

“two men doctrine of regeneration,” and absolutely necessary for one to understand (1) the doctrine of eternal vital union of Christ with His church; (2) the Christian’s warfare raging in his body; (3) the truth of Holy Spirit regeneration without the instrumentality of corrupt man; (4) the election of grace ***in Christ***, *rather than in Adam*, **before the foundation of the world**; and (5) the spiritual blessings being given to the elect before they had their actual development on earth in time. In the absence of this Truth, (that one born of God cannot sin) these significant doctrines are threatened, and the child of God denied the precious and sweet and comforting blessings of these holy doctrines. This truth, then dear reader, is imperative to one being established in the most holy faith. What more can one say to convince you that John did (1) tell the truth, (2) knew exactly what he was saying, (3) and meant exactly what he said? Another witness John would have us to believe is stated in I John 5:18: “*We know that whosoever is born of God **sinneth not**; but he that is **begotten of God** keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.*” How often, and in how many ways, must John use for you to enjoy the truth he presents?

Yes, we know exactly what you could be thinking at this point: “But I do sin! I know that I do!” John knew that too! For he wrote previously, “*My little children, these things write I unto you, that **ye sin not**. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (I John 2:1) and, “*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and**

*the truth is not in us. . . . If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us.*" (I John 1:8 & 10). Reader, this is the same John writing these sentences only minutes apart! He could not have so shortly forgotten what he had just written, now could he? Is he a mad man? Or is he not presenting **two different and distinct men with two different and distinct natures?** This is the key! The old man of the flesh, the one that makes up your fleshly, sinful, carnal, natural, Adamic body, would be a liar if he said that he had no sin, or said he had never sinned! He ***is*** sin! But, remember, he is born in Adam's generations. He is born of a "*corruptible seed,*" and hence is both corrupted and corrupting in all his ways. However, John speaks in the third chapter, of one that is not born of corruptible seed. He speaks of one that is "born of God," born of "*incorruptible seed,*" a spiritual birth, from the Spirit of God Himself. He is, John said, "born of God." There is no escaping this truth except it is hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto His babes. As you ought to be able to see, there is no real contradiction between these passages of Scripture, ***IF*** there are "two men" being presented; but if there is not, these passages are unintelligible to natural men – God does not present what Calvinists call "antinomies" to His children. What He says is always the Truth.

We will have occasion to go over this truth again often in this book, and will gladly do so in order to enable the reader to develop these concepts from the Scriptures and apply them to his own experience for his own comforts. But we will bring these two points of

doctrine together quickly here to help the reader catch a full view of them before going further into the topic.

This can be done easily with a presentation of Peter's agreement with John. In I Peter 1:22, "*Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth **through the Spirit** unto unfeign love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: being born again **not of corruptible seed***" – [We need to note that the natural birth is of the corruptible seed mentioned here and handed down through Adam's generations, from your daddy, and as John said in John 1:12-13, "*which were born, not of blood, nor the will of the **flesh**, nor the will of man, but of God.*] "*but of incorruptible*" seed, [The same seed that "remaineth in you and because it does, you cannot sin.] "*by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. . . . But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.*"

So, according to Peter and John, the instrument in the regeneration of spiritual life in the second birth is the spiritual Word of God, which is Christ, by means of His seed. To prove this, we go to Paul and his contribution to this view: "*Now to Abraham and **his seed** were the promises made. He saith not, And to **seeds**, as of many; but as of one, And to Thy seed, **which is Christ.***" (Galatians 3:16).

One of the real reasons this concept is so difficult to understand, is not because it is in itself so difficult, but we are reared in an antichristian culture, where all denominations have an agenda to get members, and to

do this, they teach that regeneration of life is the work of men: the preachers, soul-winners, and decision-makers. Almost **none** any longer believe that God Himself begets His own children to life. Even among Primitive Baptists, a vast majority belong that the Adam man is the one born all over again! But here, we must insist that if God is our Father, then He must “father us.” And these texts so teach that precious Truth.

No matter how many very plain Scriptures we quote, that well establishes this doctrine for one able to see it; there is yet a charge, “It is not taught in *my* Bible!” Or, “This makes the elect as old as God is;” Or, again, “This is ‘metaphysical!’” But when the opponent gives his opinions, arguments of the natural mind, he says, “I’m just simply stating what the Bible teaches.”

Reading over this “simple” explanation, I discover it is not as simply presented as I would wish. Here goes, again! The natural man is born into Adam’s natural family by a corrupt seed. The spiritual man is born into God’s spiritual family by an incorruptible seed, and this seed is Christ. Recall: Life is produced by a pre-existing life form of its own kind? God produces His own family, or generation! He does not relegate the procreation of His own children to another man, or call upon other men to be the midwives in bringing His children forth. Hence, we have two men, two generations, two seeds, two families; one natural and the other spiritual. The natural man sins all the time; and until death, will always do so. The spiritual man cannot sin, and never

can; because Christ dwells in him. Is that easier? I hope so.

Again, let us try another approach in building this concept for better understanding. What is the result of these “two men” abiding in one body? The Christian warfare is the result. As Paul wrote, and hopefully you can now understand, “*For I know that in me (that is in my flesh,) [do you now understand him there?] dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.*” (Romans 7:18). “*For the good that I would I do not:*” [Do you grasp that?] “*but the evil which I would not, that I do.*” [Are you still with the two men doctrine here?] “*Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it,*” [Now, if it is not Paul doing it, who then is doing it?] “*but sin that **dwelleth in me.** I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.*” [Where is that evil present with him, if not in the fleshly man?] “*For I delight in the law of God **after the inward man:***” [How about that! Two men in one Paul! The other man where sin dwelleth is the “old man, or fleshly man,” and we will note him in a moment.] “*But I see another law **in my members,** warring against the law of **my mind,** and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in **my members.***” . . . “*So then with the **mind I myself** serve the law of God; but with the **flesh** the law of sin.*” (Romans 7:17-25.) Here is the two men doctrine explaining the warfare. “Myself” serving with delight the law of God, is the spiritually born Paul, and “my flesh,” is the natural man Paul, born of the flesh and serving the law of sin and death.

Reader, are you with us yet? Can you see that your *natural man* is what is born of the flesh, and full of sin? “Yes,” you may answer. “But I’m not so clear as to whether there is any spiritual characteristics in me also. If I but could know that, how happy it would be my lot!” Go back to the “*fruits*” of the Spirit. Do you find your heart knit with God’s people? “*By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if you love one another.*” Good evidence indeed! And, “*We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren.*” (I John 3:14). All Calvinists, even those “dead in trespasses and sin, believe in election; but only God’s born children love that doctrine and find comfort in it. Do you believe and also love the doctrine of God our Savior? “*Whosoever transgresseth, and **abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.***” (2 John 1:9.) Behold how many have today abandoned the doctrine outright! They are as a flood rushing to disaster. The fact of experience, that you may often be filled with doubts and fears; of heart-sins and backslidings; coldness and luke-warmness, etc., is no evidence against you. It is the common experience of all the saints, and is referred to by the apostle as a “trial” of ones faith: “*Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: that the **trial of your faith**, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried by fire, might be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though*

*now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.” (I Peter 1:6-8).*

God has ordained that one must enter the kingdom through much tribulation, so tribulation is no mark against your hope, but rather an encouraging evidence of the same. In Paul’s journey, confirming the souls of the disciples, *“and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God,”* (Acts 14:22) we find tribulation a *mark of God’s family*. They must enter into the kingdom of God through a “strait and narrow way,” and straits are passageways blocked by dangerous obstacles to mariners.

The warfare, then, is one of *your best evidences* of membership in God’s holy family. The soul without it, is gravely deceived as to his standing before his Maker, and is only a vain, deluded hypocrite. But the source of this warfare is clearly the “two men” conflict between the natural and the spiritual children of these two distinct and altogether opposite natures attempting to dominate the *“earthen vessel,”* the *“vessel afore prepared unto glory.”* That warfare will triumph in the adoption of the outward man at the resurrection and redemption of the body. Precious soul, the warfare often makes you so weary, so ashamed, so depressed, that if you could but get rid of that body, how great a peace you think surely you would then have. Listen to something Paul wrote: *“No man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherishes it, even as the Lord the church”* (Ephesians 5:29). Does it seem possible to

both love and hate the same object? Surely one can; it is a common experience among mankind. In spite of your grief, and the ever-present temptations of the flesh, you do, in fact, love that “old man.” All you really want out of him is to change! When he does, you will be so happy, and you will embrace him in love and warmth. And **he is “gonna be changed! Believe it!”** Some one told Elder Bradshaw of a sister in one of the churches in Mississippi, that she had a terribly abusive husband, and wondered, “Why do you think she stays with him?” He old sage answered: “Probably because she loves him.” Couples living in the same house frequently seem to be born opposites each other; and “the fur often flies.” Police know full well that one of the most dangerous situations are “domestic violence” calls. Let the peace officer attempt to make an arrest, and the spouse may kill him! In your most sober moments, don’t you really just wish that he would change to the better? And how much better cannot be imagine! Talk about behavior modification! That glorious day will show such a great one a soul cannot even suspect such a change. Believe me, precious soul, when you two stop fighting in that one tabernacle, you are going home to renew marriage vows!

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **CHRIST’S SEED AND GENERATION**

## **His Seed:**

In presenting this topic, we will of necessity have to repeat some points earlier made in the Introduction. The purpose of this chapter is to present the reality that Christ does have a seed, and that seed is counted to Him for a generation. While for most, we need not labor this point, nevertheless, adversaries to the “two men doctrine of regeneration” seem to deny outright that Christ has a seed, and/or that seed is eternally in Him. As one repeatedly says, this view makes God’s people as eternal as Christ! That, to him, is preposterous. But, without batting an eyelid, we answer, “Indeed it does. And, so what if it does?” Christ is the “same yesterday, today, and forever.” If we have ever been in Him; or if we ever shall be in Him; then we have always been in Him in some manner or other.

Last evening, Elder Bruce Atkisson, of Talladega, Alabama placed on our internet Forum the following brief article by John Gill. It is useful enough to use to make this point, without someone claiming that we made the doctrine up ourselves!

“1. There is an election-union in Christ from everlasting: *God hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world* (Eph. 1:4). This is an act and instance of everlasting love, by which the **persons** chosen are considered in Christ, and **one with Him**. Christ as an head His people as members with Him. Nothing is

more commonly said by those who are esteemed sound divines, than this: Now how Christ can be considered as an head, and the elect as members of Him in this **eternal act** of election without union to Him, is hard to conceive. *Arminius* and his followers, the Remonstrants, have frequently urged the text now mentioned in favor of election from faith foreseen, and their argument upon it is this: “None are chosen to salvation but in Christ; none are in Christ but believers, who are engrafted into Christ, and united to Him by faith, therefore none are chosen to salvation, but those who are believers in Christ, are engrafted into Him, and united with Him.”

For they had no other notion of being in Christ, but by faith; like some others, who yet would be thought to be far from being in their scheme. But then, among other replies, they have been told by *Anti-Remonstrants*, “*That it is certain that we are chosen and regarded in Christ before we were believers; which is fully proved from several places of Scripture, which plainly make it appear, that **the elect have some existence in Christ, even before they believe; for unless there had been some kind of union between***

***Christ and the members, Christ would not have been their head, nor could He have satisfied for them.***” (posted August 06, 2008)

We will labor to prove, beyond successful contradiction, that Christ has a seed, and this seed has ever been ***in Him***, from everlasting to everlasting. Consider, if you will, the following: most modern readers have a workable understanding of common knowledge in the scientific areas of biology, physiology, and genetics. They should, with little thought, comprehend the process of human and animal reproduction sufficient to know that the seed of life for each is seminally in the parentage of each generation; and conclude with us that the entire race of man was genetically, or seminally, ***in Adam*** the day he came forth from His Maker’s hands. That truth should not be foreign to our readers’ understanding. If the reader will recall Paul’s statement that, Adam “*is the **figure** of Him that was to come*” (Romans 5:14), he would conclude with us that Christ also had (1) a bride in Him, and (2) a seed in Him from eternity. Was Christ the ***figure*** of Adam; or was Adam the ***figure*** of Christ? Adam is the figure, and Christ is the substance of that figure. Therefore, if Adam (the figure) has a bride and his progeny was in him from his beginning; so too, Christ has His bride and progeny in Him from eternity.

There is no need for the foolish objection to this precious truth that this view has “fully developed men, women, boys and girls in heaven waiting for a body to

incarnate.” Biology, physiology, nor genetics teach that you and I were “fully developed boys and girls in the garden of Eden waiting for a body to inhabit!” As is the substance, so too, is the figure.

From the earliest days of creation, there was given a promise to Adam and Eve of her “seed” which “*shall bruise*” the Serpent’s head; whereas the Serpent’s “seed” should “*bruise His heel.*” (Genesis 3:15). What a strong stigma rested upon women throughout Adam’s generations that suffered a barren womb! That “seed” has been traced through the many generations of Adam. “*So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations*” (Matthew 1: 17). This may be referenced to the promise made by Psalmist in the Messianic psalm: “A **seed** shall serve Him; and it shall be accounted to the Lord for a **generation.**” (Psalm 22:30). Of that seed, the next verse reads, “*They shall come, and shall declare His righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that He hath done this.*” Who will deny that Christ is meant when Isaiah said, “*And I will bring forth **a seed** out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of My mountains; and Mine **elect shall inherit it,** and My servants shall dwell there*”? Again, of whom spoke Isaiah when he reported, “*For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and **Thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles,** and make the desolate cities to be inherited*”? (Isaiah 54:3 & 65:9)

The Scriptures refer to this seed as being in “substance” and gives an analogy of it in this manner: “*But yet in it shall be a tenth, (the remnant) and it shall return, and shall be eaten (severely oppressed): as a teil tree, and as an oak, **whose substance is in them, when they cast their leaves: so the holy seed shall be the substance thereof.***” (Isaiah 6:13). Objectors often reply that they have never heard of “a seed substance in the Bible;” and say that the church “made that term up.” But are they correct in this, or ignorant of Scriptures? Read this from the Holy Scripture: “*My **substance** was not hid from Thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see **My substance**, yet being unperfect; and in Thy book all My members (the Church triumphant) were written, which in continuance were fashioned, **when as yet there was none of them.***” (Psalm 139:13). Does that sound as if we made it up? But more important, is it the truth? We say so.

In Isaiah, a well known prophecy is given. It reads, “*Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He hath put Him to grief: when Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see **His seed**, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.*” (Isaiah 53:10). That Christ is, and has, a seed cannot be Biblically denied. And that seed shall be accounted to Him for a “*generation.*” Isaiah raised this question: “*Who shall declare **His generation?** For He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of My people was He stricken.*” (*ibid.*, vs. 8). At first glance, some seem to believe that the question is whether

Christ had any physical offspring, seeing He was cut off without issue. But the Scripture already answers that. His seed, rather than a physical issue, shall be accounted to Him for His generation.

God gave a promise to Abraham, saying, “*And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed,*” and, “*And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto **thy seed** will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the Lord, who appeared unto him.*” (Genesis 12:3 & 7). It seems reasonable to conclude that God promised the land where Abram was, that his descendents would inherit Palestine. But is this the truth these verses teach? Not according to Paul. Read his view on this passage: “*Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to **thy seed, which is Christ***” (Galatians 3:16). Peter refers to the same seed, saying, “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible (**seed**), by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever*” and says that “*this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.*” (I Peter 1:23,25).

Now, the question is put: Does the Scripture teach that Christ is a seed, and has a seed, in substance, ***in Him*** from eternity? This is the statement of the Biblical doctrine of ETERNAL VITAL UNION of Christ with His children, His spiritual offspring, His family, or His church. It is an eternal union, for the seed has been in Him from eternity. It is vital, or living, for it consists of

eternal life, and it is as much a union to Him as Adam's offspring are to him in his creation. The doctrine is hereby established and is Biblically indisputable to a true believer.

### **His Generation:**

One cannot really separate the concepts of a seed from its **generation**. They go together, for the seed is necessary to procreate a generation. We have separated them only because opponents deny their Biblical existence. We are proving that the Bible teaches the doctrine, and that this doctrine is prevalent and pervasive throughout the Bible. Only spiritual blindness can account for the inability of one to see and believe it.

A seed has seeds within it. As pointed out in the Introduction, Genesis 1 presents the universal truth that all life is produced from a *pre-existent life-form*, or parentage, whose seed is in it's self and that it can only produce "like kind." We have proved from Scripture that the seed is in its "substance," and hence can only produce the same "substance" as itself. We draw the conclusion, therefore, that Christ is the promised **Seed** and He has His children in seed-substance in Him, and that from eternity, or ever He has existed; and as Adam is the figure of "Him that was to come," the natural process of reproduction is similar to the spiritual. The natural serves as a lesson for the understanding of the spiritual.

In the 5<sup>th</sup> chapter of Genesis, it is written in verse 1: "*This is the book of the **generations** of Adam. In the*

*day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him.*” Thus, Genesis begins the record of Adam’s offspring. In Matthew 1, verse 1, we read: “*The book of the **generation** of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.*” Note particularly this difference: Genesis is a book of the many generations of Adam; whereas Matthew sets forth a single generation of Jesus Christ. This should show clearly that all of the children of God springs from one progenitor; whereas each generation of Adam produces the next generation. The latter is quite obviously the truth!

In Matthew, one at first might think the list of those given from Abraham to the birth of Christ is the genealogy of Christ in the same sense as if one traced a family tree. But, there are far more than fourteen generations between the two points of references. Ahab, the husband of Jezebel, and that lineage is missing! We do not anchor our defense on the following observation, but offer it as a secondary thought, that each of the ones received in that enumeration are elect individuals that bare in their bodies the “seed” that was to be born in Bethlehem of Judea. Otherwise, we have no reason why some are not included. We admit that some of those listed were evil and vile persons, but so are all elect in their fleshly nature. Manasses is listed, and he was granted repentance unto life, though one of the bloodiest tyrants in history. (II Kings 21, and II Chronicles 33:11-15). But, I will not insist upon this point. It is sufficient to merely show that the enumerated list shows the generation of Jesus Christ, which within itself proves that He had such!

It is no real wonder if some do not understand how Jesus could have a generation when He was cut off without an issue from His loins. The Ethiopian eunuch had a problem with it too. That was the very thing he was reading when Philip ran and joined his chariot. *“The place of Scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened He not His mouth: in His humiliation His judgment was taken away: and **who shall declare His generation?** For His life is taken from the earth. And the eunuch answered Philip, and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself, or of some other man?”* (Acts 8:32-35). Apparently the question, “Who shall declare His generation,” was that Philip would! Many of us still do. I would have loved to have heard that sermon on eternal vital union that day in that desert!

When we consider that Adam begat a son in his own likeness and image, he produced the first generation of man on earth. Seth likewise produced offspring, and these individuals were the second generation of men on the earth, *etc.* When God begets a child by means of the *“incorruptible seed, the Word of God which liveth and abideth forever,”* this spiritual reproduction is another, or “new birth,” by which one is born from above. This spiritual **generation, becomes a regeneration**. The word “*regeneration*” is used only twice in the Scriptures. Obviously, it means to generate again. As there is a birth of the flesh, which produces one’s following generation; so too, there is a spiritual birth of the Spirit of God which produces a

regeneration. The first birth brings forth a corrupt man in a corrupt or “*untoward generation;*” (Acts 2:40), the second birth brings forth an incorrupt man in an incorruptible generation; a generation that **cannot sin**. The first birth and consequent generation is (for God’s elect) followed by the second birth and consequent regeneration. I trust that is not so elementary as to seem childish. It is as simple as we can explain this blessed Truth.

There can be no argument by any living child of God against God’s word. And Peter wrote: “*But ye are a **chosen generation***” (some one’s elect progeny, or offspring), “*a royal priesthood*” (so this priesthood is of a line of kings’ offspring), “*a holy nation,*” (Hence a kingdom of holy subjects), “*a peculiar people;*” (distinctly different from other people), “*that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath **called you** out of darkness into the marvelous light: which in time past were not a people, but are now **the people of God:** which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.*” (I Peter 2: 9,10). These are distinct, or peculiar, from other people. All other people of the “so-called Christian” faith believe the natural man is born all over again, but this generation does not so believe. They are a peculiar specie!

This should be sufficient to prove conclusively to any individual subject to God’s word, that there is a “*seed that shall serve Him, and this seed shall be accounted to Him for a generation,*” in spite of the fact that according to nature, He died without issue. There

is no escaping the Truth that this seed is as eternal as its progenitor – the Lord Jesus Christ; hence we are on solid Biblical foundation to speak of the doctrine of *eternal vital union*, as well as the doctrine of *two men in one earthen vessel, afore prepared unto mercy*. The doctrine stands upon the clear revelation of God’s inspired word.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **THE SECOND AND SPIRITUAL BIRTH**

The cobwebs of Arminian and Calvinistic errors should be torn out of our minds, if we are to comprehend how God Himself begets His own offspring. I begat mine: one son, one daughter. If you have children, did you beget your blood offspring, or did someone else – perhaps an ego-bloated preacher? We believe we have laid a sufficient foundation already so that this topic should be readily seen. We probably do not need to go in-depth into the natural birth of the fleshly baby. I suspect the reader knows as much about that as the writer. But preachers can be amazingly ignorant as supposed “specialists in religion.” [They can read a newspaper report that a child is held by captors

for ransom, and know exactly what the word “ransom” means, and step into their pulpit and argue that Christ ransomed “the whole wide world! So no surprise they do not know what is meant by one being “*begotten of God.*” – the dummies!

Let us deal with those cobwebs of Arminianism and Calvinism; that is, the view that the work of man has a significant role in putting spiritual life into a formerly “dead-alien sinner.” Or as the early “Means and Measures Baptists” said, the “sinner man is the one who is born again.”

Is the “sinner man,” or our natural fleshly person born of the Spirit of God? If so, “*whosoever is born of God cannot sin, because his seed remaineth in him, and He cannot sin because he is born of God.*” (I John 2:9). Think! Have you ever in your life met someone whose flesh has been born of God? Can he walk on water? Or raise the dead? What is such a man like? Does his face shine so brightly that he needs a veil to cover his face as did Moses after visiting the Lord God on the holy mount? Or, does he appear as fleshly as anyone else? I dare say the last is true! As I told a church and congregation near Tuscaloosa, Alabama recently, “if the Adam man is born all over again a second time, I’m heading straight to hell. Do you know what? You all are going with me! – and everyone else I’ve ever met, too!”

A point that should be considered: If the doctrine or theory does not fit the reality of a man’s experience,

he ought to give it greater berth – be careful and studious.

Can a man's mere decision to acknowledge the possibility that Jesus might be the Son of God initiate the new birth process, whereby he is "saved," (meaning "born again"??) and heaven bound? How can one explain the new birth as a mental decision? Is the *spirit* nothing more than a *thought*? Can anyone introduce to me any man on earth that was persuaded to be born into his father's family? Is the spiritual birth no better than this? What kind of persuasion is necessary or possible, to infiltrate the soul of a natural man, and give that soul eternal life? Isn't that what preachers think they are doing? But, is it the soul, or spirit, or body, of a natural man that is born again? I say not! No part of the one first born of the flesh is the object of that second birth. It is a birth completely distinct and different from the natural birth.

The natural birth is of the flesh; the spiritual birth is of the Spirit. The natural birth is "of blood, of the will of the flesh, and the will of the parents (in some cases); the spiritual birth "is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh nor the will of man, but of God" (John 1:12-13). The natural man, and all his parts, draws all his sustenance from the earth; the spiritual man draws all of his from heaven. The natural man is of the earth, and to the earth he shall return; the spiritual man is from heaven, and to heaven he shall return. There is no similarity between the two men. They live on totally two different planes. The preacher persuading one to "be

saved,” is ignorant of the fact that all God’s elect are already saved and safe, and the poor deluded soul that is given to believe that preacher is in danger of eternal fire. He is not thereby saved, for nothing that preacher can do can give him anything that the preacher does not have! These are the filthy rags of man-made righteousness, the cobweb theories that blind men to the truth of how God regenerates His own offspring “right by Himself.”

Now, we can proceed to the second birth experience of one in Adam’s family born into this world, “dead in trespasses and sins.”

First, men think that one has to do one thing at a time. God does not! He chose His people IN Christ – we emphasize the word “in” on purpose, for right here, almost everyone fails to grasp that concept. He did not look into the future and choose His people in Adam. He did not look into the future and choose His people because He foresaw they would do whatever it is that a man may think he ought to do to “get saved.” Rather, they were in “seed-substance” “in” Christ from eternity, and simultaneously, He chose the Adam-man in the seed that would be planted in them in time in their experience. Just as they were “preserved in Christ Jesus,” (Jude 1), they were also watched over in nature after their first birth. *“God is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.”* (II Peter 3:9). Again, *“Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own*

*purpose and grace, which **was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.***” (II Timothy 1:9). Let us separately look at that text:

Paul placed “saved us” in the past tense and first in order. He separates the “saved” from the experimental “calling,” and has this calling following the saving. We know by experience that the divine call is associated with the new or spiritual birth. Therefore, the saving in view is antecedent to the regeneration of God’s children. There are two approaches to that salvation: (1) It certainly may refer to the eternal and living union of them to Him before the world began; and (2) it may refer to His previous suffering and death in making the atonement for them; or, (3) it could be both. But it is certain that it does not include any works of the creature, either to be born, or to persuade one to be born! The point we wish noted is that the man himself is the object of God’s special care, even prior to the new birth. That fleshly man is a “*vessel of mercy which He had afore prepared unto glory,*” (Romans 9:23) even while it was “dead in trespasses and sins” and “*were by nature the children of wrath, even as others*” (Ephesians 2:1,3,5). In another setting, Paul referred to the fleshly man as an “*earthen vessel.*” “*But we have this treasure **in earthen vessels,** that the excellency of the power may be of God, and **not of us.***” (II Corinthians 4:7).

A “vessel” is made to contain things. This flesh is of the earth, earthy, and this vessel is made up of earth, and is an “earthen vessel,” “afore prepared of God” to hold, or contain, this “treasure”, which is the “*light of*

*the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.*” (II Cor. 4:6). The “*light of the knowledge of the glory of God,*” is that which the seed possess in the Word that begat him. As John said, “*In Him is **life**; and the life was the **light** of men*”. John came to bear witness of that light, saying of Him, “*That was the true **Light**, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*” (John 1:8). Now, while not dogmatic about this point, I will make it here. That “life” is the seed, Christ, and He is the Light that lighteth every man that comes into the world. None but the elect in seed-substance comes down into this world. All of Adam’s race were always here, and only here. They do not “come into the world.” But the spiritual children of God, at their new or second birth, do come into this world. Upon their new birth, they possess the “*Light of the knowledge of the glory of Jesus Christ,*” which enters into the “*earthen vessels,*” and they are, as their Head, “*begotten of God.*” (John 1:12-14). Reiterating: The flesh is the earthen vessel, the Spiritually produced child of God is the *treasure* in the vessel, and hence we have the **doctrine of the two men regeneration**; the fleshly man, and the spiritual man; the fleshly man being first born, and sold under sin, a earthen vessel; and the new born spiritual man, that is holy and incorruptible. Can you not see, that if you join such a diametrically opposing pair in one body, the **fight is inevitable!**

Throughout the long period of history, among all the various pagan religions, philosophies of the ancients, and even the Hebrew prophets, none ever brought to light the doctrine of the “two men in

regeneration.” That great and soul inspiring truth was reserved by the eternal Godhead to be first revealed by the Son in His incarnation. The first resplendent light on that topic, brought forth in the night, when the Lord revealed in conversation with a Jewish leader. It would seem that He would have directed it in the day, to His disciples, but it was not for them to know until after His ascension. Jesus said to Nicodemus, “*Ye must be born again.*” The marginal reading says, “*from above*” - the translators noting that the minority texts rendered it in that fashion. The marginal rendition throws very good explanatory meaning to His revelation. Turn with me, to John the third chapter.

“*Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again (from above) he cannot see the kingdom of God.*” (John 3:3). He did not tell Nicodemus how he could be so born? He did not give him a “plan of salvation.” He did not “try to get him born again.” He merely stated the fact, that unless a man was born a second time, with another birth, the one he now had was insufficient for him to ever see the kingdom of God. Much as many in this dark day, Nicodemus thought that Jesus meant that Nicodemus, body, soul, and spirit – himself – had to be born over again. He strictly looked at the natural birthing process. He “*Said unto Him, How can a man be born when he is old?*” – the “old man born over again” theory echoed here! “*can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born*” (a second time)? What we are presenting below is as difficult for the carnal mind

to comprehend as that was to Nicodemus. “It don’t make sense!” a man will say.

“*Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water,*” which the natural fleshly man is born of, “*and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.*” (verse 5) Now the Lord has set in view two separate and altogether different and distinct births, one “*of water,*” (or seminal) and the other “*spiritual.*” There is no similarity between the origins of the two births. One, obviously is “*of the earth, earthy,*” and the other “*from above,*” or “*heavenly.*” One is born in the generations of Adam; and the other is born in the regeneration of Christ. The Lord made clear that the Adam man was not the object of that spiritual birth. He said, “*That which is born of the flesh is flesh;* (verse 6). That is as easily understood as anything in the Bible. It is so obvious, that unless one is trying to make it complicated, it is a given fact of nature. “*and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*” Here we have a perfect axiom: Flesh produces flesh, and Spirit produces spirit.

Recall the discussion on all animal and plant life having seed, and reproducing their generations “after like kind”? (Page 6) A man does in fact have seed in his loins, and begets his offspring “*in his own likeness, after his own image.*” (Genesis 5:3) If, and I repeat, “IF” the Spirit begets a cross-breed, He has not reproduced “in like kind,” or “after His own image”! Hence, the eternal truth is, that the Spirit Himself procreates only another spirit, “of like kind” and “after His own image and likeness” – a spiritual offspring! This spiritual offspring

is implanted in that “*which is born of the flesh.*” It does not remake the flesh into spirit. The two cannot mate, and the one modify the other.

Jesus is speaking to Nicodemus, and reiterates: “*Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.*” (I would note that He did not say, “Ye must be born over again!”) “*The wind bloweth where it lusteth (pleases) and thou hearest the sound thereof (evidence), but canst not tell whence it cometh, and wither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit*” (John 3:8). . . . “*If I had told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you heavenly things?*” (verse 12). Now, question any Arminian you wish; or any Calvinists you wish; or even most any Primitive Baptists you wish; and ask them to explain the new birth. You will receive a **natural explanation of how this flesh is born of the Spirit!** Hence, it is not true. Jesus was speaking of heavenly things. The seed planted in regeneration comes down from heaven where it has ever been, “*hid in Christ in God,*” is conveyed by the Spirit of God, is itself also spiritual, and produces a spiritual “*new creature,*” or “*inward man,*” or “*heavenly man*” and shall at the death of the natural man, be conveyed back to heaven from whence it came; and there to await the adoption of the corrupted body, and its change into the likeness of the glorified body of Jesus. And for such that have departed and now waiting, they shall see their bodies rise first in the resurrection, and observe that those which are alive and remain yet on earth caught up together with their bodies, and “*together with them in the clouds to meet the*

*Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*” (I Thess. 4:11-17.) Can you not imagine the joyful and expectant shouts of the enormous host of departed saints, rising as a mighty anthem, “**Here they come! Look at that new-made body! Looks to me like the glorious body of Jesus! I’M breathless!** And as they slide into their new-made garment, cry loudly in praise: **Holy, Holy, Holy, ALLELUIA: the Lord God Omnipotent Reigneth!**”

## **CHAPTER SEVEN**

### **THE MARRIAGE OF THE LAMB IS COME**

“Come hither, and I will show you the Bride, the Lamb’s Wife.” We have presented the origin, characteristics, nature, and spirituality of the Bride, the Lamb’s wife. To each member of His body, a “*spirit of adoption,*” was given, and they each waited in hope for the resurrection of the dead, wherein they would fully realize the adoption, the redemption of their body. At some point in historical time, that day shall arrive with a shout! With the rising together of that innumerable number of redeemed saints, the reunification of their departed spirits and souls to these

now glorified bodies, an excitement unknown in the whole of the experience of mankind will commence. There will be a gathering together of saints of all ages, they will united as a gigantic host rise into the air, put on their new-made and glorified bodies, and pass through the second heaven, beyond the stars above, and into the eternal third heaven where Christ sits at the right-hand of the Majesty on high. He will arise and greet her, embrace her, comfort her, wipe all tears from her eyes, and an angel will announce: “**Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet Him.**” (Matthew 25:6). “*Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb.*” And if the reader has a problem with this, “*These are the true sayings of God.*” (Revelation 19:9).

Brethren, it is with fear and hesitation I have to enter into this chapter. I feel as if I am a “Uzzah” who put his unholy hand to steady the ark of the covenant, when the oxen shook it as they were carrying it home. I am not the one who ought to write upon these blazing sights of glorified scenes. I will try to stay within reasonable limits that the word reveals. God help me do it!

[I am aware that some do not believe in a bodily resurrection; that some do not believe we will recall anything after death; and some do not believe we shall know anyone in glory. I beg your indulgence, for I know not anyway to think of myself as a nonentity, without any past to contrast to the eternal present. To cover

this subject, I must go with a consciousness in the redeemed bodies of the saints.]

Down below in that dispensation of time, the Holy Gospel of the Almighty Savior was preached among every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. Many were called, but few were chosen. Where the Holy Gospel went, many embraced it, some wise and some foolish. The main difference between the two was the wise had the oil of anointing in their lamps, and the foolish were nominal believers, careless, unconcerned, and complacent about the realities of the Truth as it is in Jesus. Those of us who are here above experienced the most wonderful, astonishing, and marvelous drama unknown to mortal man.

The heavenly music echoes throughout the regions of glory, and “*at the last trump, the dead was raised incorruptible,*” and what a marvelous transformation began immediately. “We were all *changed.*” The mortality ceased, and we were clothed in glorious immortality as our Lord and Master; that which had been corruptible and corrupted was changed into incorruption in perfect harmony with our present condition; and “*death was swallowed up in victory.*” What a wonder of divine power! Words fail to communicate this awesome transformation.

We suddenly were all awakened with the sound of many voices, and excitement was all around. We gasped, as we saw our new-formed bodies rising out of the earth. Many shouted “**HERE THEY COME! EVERY ONE SO BRIGHT, AND GLORIOUS IN THE APPAREL!**”

**What a sight to behold!** Those are our new-made bodies, fashioned as His glorious body. We are going home! The clouds parted, the bodies came and we eagerly put them on, and were clothed in honor and glory. We passed through the starry heavens, and into the third heaven, the abode of the Lamb, and entered into the Bride-chamber. Here, *“to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the **righteousness of saints.**”* (Rev. 19:8). We learned then that we *“are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb.”* How unbelievable, that such as we should have such an appointment! While this was presented, an angel reassured us, saying, *“These are the true sayings of God.”* (verse 9). How consoling this! If God said it, it is a faithful and true saying. It is really coming to past!

In all the expectant excitement the waiting Bride – all the members of the church, the body of Christ suddenly saw heaven open, *“and behold a white horse appeared, and on the horse the Bridegroom sat, and He was called “Faithful and True.”* (Rev. 19:11). No more appropriate name could have been called, and she watched from her pavilion, for He had come *“in righteousness”* to *“judge and make war.”* What a magnificent General and Commander, and Lord of Hosts. *“His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on His head were many crowns; and He had a name written that no man knew, but Himself.”* (verse 12). In love and adoration, with the greatest of desire and honor, she took note of how gloriously He was arrayed. *“He was*

*clothed with an vesture dipped in blood: and His name is "called the Word of God."*

How she had been mocked and ridiculed on earth for declaring that He was the Father of all His children. The worldly religions insisted that He was impotent, and He needed them to beget His children for Him. They had various schemes of how they could do that; but we never believed a word of it! We had by direct experience been given Life and Light, and our spirit made to cried, "**Abba Father.**" And as the glorious King was seen, and His name introduced to the Bride, the whole family of God exclaimed aloud, again, "**Abba Father!**" And she bowed in courtesy to Her Lord, King, and Bridegroom. She saw His magnificence, as the whole "*armies which were in heaven followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. . . and He treaded the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.*"(verse 15). His royal ensign were very visible, it appeared on both His thigh and His vesture, and it read in bold letters, "**KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.**" (verse 16).

The heavenly Bride saw Her Husband, Lord and King, execute judgment upon the devil and all those who hated the truth, and had persecuted her, many unto death.

When the judgment verdict had been executed, the Bride in waiting, saw a "*new heaven and a new earth*" for the "*first heaven and the first earth were passed away.*" She had heard the prophecy that it would be so, for in the early days of the church, Peter had

revealed that “*the heavens and the earth were by the word of God kept in store, **reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men***” (2 Peter 3:7) and now that judgment was executed, it was so, just as Peter had revealed to her. Even back then, “*we according to His promise, looked for a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness,*” and finally it has come into being for real. As she watched the arrival of her new dwelling place, she saw the new Jerusalem “*coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her husband.*” (Chapter 21:2.) What a glorious habitation was prepared for her. How sensitive is Her Lord and Master, Her Husband, her all.

Fleetingly she recalled the Apostle to the Gentiles once saying, “*I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed **in** us.*” (Romans 8:18). He was speaking that day about us, as children of God, and as new creatures born of God, that we had been made “*subject to bondage*” in that corrupt outward man, our vessel afore prepared unto glory; and what vanity it certainly was; and this was unwilling on our part by “*reason of Him who had subjected us in hope,*” (Romans 8:20). He had, in those Gospel days, comforted us with the fact that “*the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.*” (verse 21) Back then, in captivity to the old man and his lusts and wicked works, all of us, “*the whole creation groaned and travailed in pain together. . . and not only they, but ourselves also, which*

*had the firstfruit of the Spirit, even we ourselves groaned with ourselves, while we were waiting for the promised adoption, that is, the redemption of our bodies.”* (verses 22-23). He surely was true, when he told us of our experience then, saying, *“For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for it? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.”* (verse 24-25). We were so filled with infirmities of the flesh, doubts and fears, temptations and trials, both by inward sins and outward persecutions, the hope was given us to keep us from despair. But even greater than this, Our God also, praise His eternal name, was ever present in both darkness and light, as the *“Spirit also helped our infirmities, for we did not know what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself made intercession for us with groanings which could not be uttered.* He was the one who searched the hearts and knew what is the mind of the Spirit, *“because He made intercession for the saints according to the will of God.”* (verse 26-27).

Many weak doubting individuals just could not see the hand of God in His providence directing them safely. But we certainly now know, *“that all things worked together for good to them that love God, to them who were called according to His purpose.”* (Romans 8:28). Many mocked us back then; they called us “those absoluters,” thinking that would bother us. But it didn’t, for we understood, *“that whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the Firstborn among many brethren.”* (Romans 8: 29). To us, it was

our experience, and we certainly understood that great mercy in Christ Jesus, our Husband and our Lord. While she meditated on these wondrous promises, her attention was snapped back to her present surroundings. In the Great Hall of the Bride-Chamber, she “*heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His exclusive people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God.* (Rev. 21:3) She had wondered why she had not grieved, when she saw the judgment of the Great Whore, or the nations of them that believed not. She felt no sensation of pain, even when she pinched herself to see if this body was real. And the Great Voice somewhat answered that, saying, “*And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things in the body of flesh are passed away.* And He that sat upon the throne said, “**Behold, I make all things new.**” He had told the Apostle John to reveal these things, saying to John, “**Write: for these words are true and faithful. It is done.**” (verse 4-5).

The glorious Bridegroom sent an angel to us, desiring that we should as the “*Bride, the Lamb’s wife,*” behold the “*Great city, the Holy Jerusalem, as it descended out of heaven from God.* (Rev. 21:10) It possessed the “*glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal.*” (verse 11). It was designed foursquare, and the old encampments of the tribes of Israel were copied

from her. It had twelve gates of pearl, four on each side; the walls had twelve foundations, and in the names on them were the twelve apostles of the Lamb; and the walls were also of jasper: and the city itself was pure gold. A fantastic sight to behold! The crowning glory of the city was enhanced by all manner of precious stones garnished in the walls, and the streets of the city was of pure gold, as it were transparent glass. (verses 12-21).

We used to laugh about the aliens thinking that the streets were of natural metallic gold, but when we actually saw them, we understood that metallic gold was never *“transparent as glass!”* Gold is a symbol of glory, and the whole city reflected the ultimate glory of the Eternal God, our Husband and Head, our Bridegroom.

The city had no temple in it; whereas on earth, there were religious structures all over the landscape. But here, such was of no use at all, *“for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb is the temple itself!”* (verse 22). Really, the city had no need of any moon, stars or suns to shine in it: there was no darkness anymore; and *“the glory of God lightened the city, and the Lamb is the actual Light thereof.”* (verse 23). We were made to understand that *“nations of them which are saved walk in the Light of the city: and the elect kings of the earth bring their glory and honor to it,”* (verse 24) so that there is no more an elevation of man above others in the city. *“The gates of the city were never closed,”* for safety was fully assured for eternity now, and *there is no night here*” in the new heaven and new earth. A very

comforting fact for we who have all our past lifetime warred against sin, had our souls vexed by the abominations of nations, peoples, and so-called churches, is that *“there shall in no wise enter into the city anything that defiles; neither that works abomination, or lies: but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life”* – the Holy genealogy. (verse 27)

Off at a distance from the mountain top (Mount Zion) upon which we viewed the glorious city prepared for us, we could see the majestic and glorious throne of God, and of the Lamb, and flowing right out from the throne, was a river of water of life, clear as crystal. Amazingly, there was – and how shall I describe such a thing! – the Tree of Life, and it stood on *both sides* of the river. It had spiritual medicinal value for the healing of nations. By standing on both side, everyone has easy access to its fruit, which were continuous annually. Viewing that tree, I was reminded of Cyprus trees growing in creeks and streams on the old earth, and the water could flow through cracks separating the roots above the creek’s floor. Surely, I can say, that the streams of this river of life flowed through the wounds of our Savior God, and Husband when He took my legal place and suffered for the sins I had committed in the body. Every time I see it, I think of what He has done to redeem me and engage me to Him self! What wondrous love is this, O my soul! What wondrous love is this?

The river of life and the Tree of Life assured us that, *“there is no curse left; but the throne of God and of the Lamb stands in this city; and His servants serve*

*Him: and they see His face: and His name is in their forehead in every thought. And there is no night anymore there, no one needs a candle, flashlight, neither light of any source; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they reign forever with Him.” (Rev. 22: 1-5).*

In the old earth, the Jewish men espoused their brides, and then went and built a house for their bride. Here in the new, the Bridegroom had previously promised, “*I go to prepare a place your you, . . . I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.*” (John 14: 2-3). But, ah, what a preparation this city and mansion, stubbed in all manner of glorious riches, dazzling lights, eternal glories brighter than noon day suns.

He did prepare a place for me, and now the rapturous nuptials are really and finally mine! How long I suffered in hope as a bride, longing, desiring to see my Beloved. And He has come to take me into the King’s chamber. “*Let Him kiss me with the kisses of His mouth: for His love is better than wine.*” (Song 1:2). “*The glorious King brought me into His chambers: we were glad and rejoiced in Him; we remember His love more than wine: all the upright love Him.*” He whispered such endearments as to strengthen my love to Him: “*Behold, thou art fair, My love; behold, thou art fair; thou hast doves’ eyes. Behold, thou art fair, My beloved, yea, pleasant: also our bed is green. The beams of our house are cedar and our rafters of fir.*” I sat down under “*His shadow with great delight, and His fruit was sweet to my taste. He brought me to the banqueting house, and*

*His banner over me was love.” . . . “ah, I am sick of love! His left hand is under my head, and his right hand doth embrace me.” (Song 2:3-6). “Until the day break, and the shadows flee away, I will get Me to the mountain of myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense. Thou art all fair, My love; there is no spot in thee!” “His mouth is most sweet: yea, He is altogether lovely. This is my Beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of the new Jerusalem.” “My dove, My undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her. The daughters saw her, and blessed her; yea, the queens praise her.*

***“I am my Beloved’s, and His desire is toward me. Come, my Beloved, let us go forth into the field; let us lodge in the villages.”*** (Song 7:10-12).

### ***finis***

[Publisher’s note: We are aware that very few, relatively speaking, are familiar with the doctrine presented in this publication. It is possible that some will say that the writer and publisher invented this viewpoint, and therefore we add as appendices a number of selected articles on the doctrine discussed in this book, drawn from blessed writers during the Gold Age of our American development. We recommend the reader to peruse these carefully and prayerfully, and if anything is edifying to you, give God the praise.]

## **APPENDIX A**

### **“REGENERATION” AND THE NEW BIRTH**

It has been several weeks now that I have entertained in my mind a desire to write on the subject of the “New Birth” and the direct implantation of spiritual life in an elect sinner, without any human instrumentality or natural hearing, of selected Scriptures being quoted or read. While doing so, I completed the research of the Scriptures that I plan to utilize and waited until my eyesight improved. In the meantime, I received a request to write on the subject of “Regeneration,” which subject is closely connected with that of the New Birth and yet somewhat different. If I were to divide this article into an organized treatise, I would divide the main body into three major subjects: (1) “Regeneration” as an act needful for the resurrection of the body (Matthew 19: 29 & Titus 3:5); (2) Jesus’ analogy of the spiritual birth to the natural birth process: “*Ye must be born again*” (John 3:3-6); and, (3) the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in begetting one to spiritual life: “*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,*” and, “*Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of His creatures*” (James 1:18).

Under the first heading, one will quickly detect that the writer is not using the word “regeneration” in its classical or received usage. He is using it in the very limited way it is found in the New Testament; that is, as

it is applied to Christ Jesus. Since none of us believe that Christ Jesus had to have a “new birth” experience, and hold that He is and always has been, the eternal Son of God, the “only begotten of the Father,” then, perhaps few will be upset if I propose a different concept than that which most writers present.[You may also recognize this concept, in the first division, in Elder John F. Johnson’s article on “Regeneration.”

There are only two places in the New Testament where the word “*paliggenesia*,” translated “regeneration,” are to be found. The first place is in Matthew 19:28, where our Lord used it to refer to His own up-coming experience. Watch closely the text: “*And Jesus said unto them; (His apostles) ‘Verily I say unto you; That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon the twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’*” Notice the commas. There are three thoughts in that text: First, He is addressing the twelve that have followed Him. Second, They will receive something when He is regenerated, which will be when He shall sit in the throne of His glory. And, three, the twelve will sit on the twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel. So, in this first use of *paliggenesia* (regeneration) the Lord applies it to Himself. Question: Does this sound the same as one being “*born again*”? Not at all!

The second and last reference is in Titus 3:5, which reads: “*Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy*

*Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.*” One can, if he takes this meaning away from its first introduction in Matthew, consider that it refers to a man being regenerated. This we fully admit. But in light to its earlier usage, the text can be understood quite differently. How did Christ save us? We would answer, by 1, choosing us in Christ; 2, imputing our sins to Christ; 3, bearing the penalty of our sins on the cross; 4, imputing His righteousness to us; 5, washing us from our sins in His blood; 6, dying and rising from the grave and justifying us; and 7, effectually calling us by the Holy Spirit to life and salvation. In all this, it is sure that none of it was “*by works of righteousness which we have done.*” He saved us, by the “*washing of regeneration and **renewing of the Holy Ghost.***” Wait just a moment, we would say. How can it be that there was a **renewing** of the Holy Ghost in us? To “renew” implies we had Him before. Before when? What if it does NOT means our regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, but rather, Christ’s own regeneration, which He referred to in Matthew, and the **renewing** of the Holy Spirit in Him a second time, while in the tomb, enlivening Him to awaken from the dead and rise from the grave? Is it not in this that He actually “saved us”?

Regeneration, then, is the return of a previous life to one that is dead, to enable the body, soul, and spirit to be spiritually united and raised again from the dead. It is basically generating one again.

I must hasten and add to this topic. I am pretty much a traditionalist in some matters. In this, while

this is my view, and I preach it without hesitation, yet I do not “*make a man an offender for a word*” if his views are that of the classical writers among Old School Baptists. If you speak of someone being “regenerated,” I know pretty much what you mean, although I prefer a more exact answer than that. Our Lord used a very different manner of speaking of that spiritual birth than using the Greek word “*paliggenesia*” (Which means a spiritual ***rebirth***. We do not need a spiritual rebirth. We needed a spiritual birth.)

The second topic then, is that of the New Birth. Throughout all ages there have been men that experienced a spiritual birth. Yet, as Elder H.M. Curry noted, it was left for Jesus to first use the concept of the “new birth” to express that blessed experience. “How can a man, born of woman, be clean?” asked Job. We can well raise a similar question: How can a man, who is a carbon-based creature, adapted to eat a carbon-based diet, inhale an oxygenated life source exhaled from the plant kingdom, exhale carbon dioxide for the plants to use, and all aspects of his existed composed only of such as is “earthy,” – I say, how can such a creature ever be changed into a spiritual being adaptable to a heavenly environment inhabited by invisible non-carbon-based creatures and the Creator Godhead? “Can he enter into his mother’s womb and be born again?” wondered Nicodemus. Not likely! Can an Arminian or Calvinist preacher say some choice Biblical words over him, and cause such a radical and gracious transformation? Believe it or not, there are those who think so! After they have quoted every scripture of the

Roman Road incantation, all they have is a deluded religionist, of the earth, as they are “*of the earth and earthy.*” They are still a carbon-based creation as before. They are still as visible as they ever were before!

Jesus took a word that had specific meaning, and of which the whole race of man and his history had ample time to understand, and said to Nicodemus; “*Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again*” (John 3:7). Man in his first lesson in his earliest environment was taught a principle of life he ought never to have forgotten. That is, **Life begets life**. In the first three chapters of Genesis, a reader is really thickheaded that cannot get that principle. It is repeated over and over again, of beasts, of fowl, of plants, and of man, and all having “*seed within themselves.*” Life begets life by the implantation of the seed in all the creation of God with but few exceptions.

During the Dark Ages, theologians and so-called “scientists” (“Church doctors”) insisted upon a theory of “spontaneous generation.” That is, life came from dead things! Then someone came along and placed a cloth over a piece of rotten meat. Sure enough, a few days later maggots were all over the cloth, but not on the meat! As the Bible recorded, life came from life! The “Church” doctors were wrong. Today, there yet remain some men, almost exclusively preachers, who still believe that life comes from dead sinners! – spontaneous regeneration!

Now that sex-education is taught in almost all public schools, it seems trite to have to explain these things to educated adults. But Christ first used this

analogy, and we will follow it as gently as one would a small child in a sex-education class in the second or third grade. A seed must first be planted before life can be generated. By its fruit, you can know the tree, whether it is a good tree or a corrupt tree. A corrupt seed will produce corruption, and all of Adam's fallen race has **only** corrupt seed. Thus, our Lord told Nicodemus, "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh;*" (John 3:6). Whatever else can one expect! John had written before this: "*But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were **born**, not of blood, nor of the **will of the flesh**, nor of the **will of man**, but **of God***" (John 1:12-13). Would anyone be so foolish as to say that if a man is born of John Smith, that one was not begotten of John Smith? And if that man was begotten of John Smith, would not his DNA prove that he is the son of John Smith? But, surely all enlightened ones will agree that if a man is begotten of God that he is born of God, and if born of God he is a son of God? May we reverse that thought? If a man is a child of God, he must have been **born of God**. If a man is born of God, he must have been **begotten of God**. If a man is begotten of God, he must surely have been born of **incorruptible seed**. You know this: That is exactly what the Bible teaches. If a man is born by a preacher quoting John 3:16 over him, that man is the son of that preacher.

Jesus used that concept to teach us how this spiritual birth comes about. In a natural birth, there is the implantation of the seed, that life begins at

conception and there is a long period of struggling in the darkness of the womb until the child is born. Right here, Calvinists becomes unglued with Old School Baptists. They will not have it! They, their ministry, livelihood, and “church mission” are threatened with this truth. If we admit this, we overthrow the whole foundation of carnal work-mongering to “win the world for Christ.” As one told this writer, “Preacher, if I believed that, I’d never preach a lick again.” I replied, “If you believed this, you will have to beg for a place to preach it!” And, eventually, he did, as a Primitive Baptist elder.

The Scripture clearly teaches the concept that **quicken** *to life* is by the implantation of an incorruptible seed, and this incorruptible seed is of God. “*And you **hath HE QUICKED** who were dead in trespasses and sins*” (Ephesians 1:1) “*Even when we were dead in sins, **hath quickened** us together with Christ. (by grace ye are saved)*” (Ephesians 1:5) “*And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, **hath He quickened** together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses*” (Col. 12:13). “*Being **born again**, not of corruptible seed, but **of incorruptible**, by the word of God, which **liveth** and **abideth for ever**” (1 Peter 1:18). We must note here, that this word lives, abides, and endures for ever, which cannot be said of the spoken or written word.) “*But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And **this is** the word which by **the gospel** is preached unto you.*” (At this place, I merely point out that in this text, the “word” and the “gospel” is two different things. The*

“gospel” is about this “word.” We believe we can prove conclusively that this “word” is Christ, just as we can also prove that this “incorruptible seed” is Christ. “*Now to Abraham and his **seed** were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to Thy seed, **which is Christ***” (Galatians 3:16. See 1 Peter 1:23 above).

Any experimental saint should fully understand Christ’ analogy here; they recall that horrid struggle in Arminian or Calvinist darkness and/or unbelief. They understand David’s lament, “*The pains of hell gat hold of my soul.*” They know the guilt of sin and condemnation of the applied law to their souls. And, they rejoice in the sweetness of that deliverance when they find that “*life and immortality is **brought to light through the gospel.***” Eventually, they are reconciled to that warfare between the new man born of God that loves righteousness within them, and the old man of the flesh that loves sin and material and sensual pleasures.

In the writer’s lifetime, he has never heard anyone say a woman carrying a child in her womb had birthed the child. The word “birth” is reserved for the time of that child’s deliverance from the darkness of the womb to the light of day. This is so common and universal it is sad we must mention it, but there are preachers that seem not to know it. It is a pity that so many think one is “born again” when he joins a church, or makes a decision, or believes a preacher’s message, and any number of things that have nothing to do with the birth

process of which Christ teaches. “*That which is born of the Spirit is spirit*” (John 3:6).

It angers many for us to say that this divine quickening is without human instrumentality, but we must insist upon it. Otherwise Christ’ analogy is not complete, nor would we be Scriptural. The **quicken****ing to life** is an act produced by a process known as “begetting.” Again, in the animal kingdom, like kind can only begets like kind, and that by the seed found in itself. Does the Scripture teach this? It certainly does, emphatically. As quoted above to prove one point, we use it here for this point: “*Of His own will **begat He us***” (James 1:18). “*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ **is born of God**: and every one that loveth Him **that begat** loveth him also that is **begotten of Him***” (1John 5:1). “*We know that whosoever **is born of God sinneth not**; but he that **is begotten of God** keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not*” (1 John 5:18). And again, “*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy **hath begotten** us again unto a lively hope*” (I Peter 1:3). It is therefore clear that the Scripture carries the full analogy of Christ’ discourse with Nicodemus consistently through the entire process from the implantation of God’s incorruptible seed, which is Christ’ eternal life, the conception of a spiritual “*new creature*” in that divine quickening to spiritual life, through the experimental struggle or warfare, to the birth where the child is born of God and introduced into the Christian hope through the gospel. We refer to the latter as *conversion*, which consist of three things:

repentance, faith, exercise of all grace implanted within the born again child of God. Conversion is not my topic so I will forbear, and turn my attention to the last point. Most of it has already been proved above beyond rational contradiction.

People reared among the New School Baptists often put too much credit in their ultra-biased historians. Since the Old School Baptists opposed *classical and theological parochial* schools, objecting to one taking the revealed religion of Jesus and subjecting it to the “science falsely so-called”, the New School Baptists told the tale that Old School and Primitive Baptists were “*opposed to education.*” A few years back, I read that same junk in a church publication near Columbus, Mississippi. I wrote the author of the work, and asked him how many public school teachers were in his congregation, and how many members they had. Then I compared the number with those to whom I served, and the Old School Baptists had a greater *percentage* of educators than he.

On the bases of our supposed ignorance, we are told that where the word “Word” is found in the New Testament, it did not always mean the Eternal *Logos*, Christ. As if we didn’t know that! What I find that they seem not to know, is that the eternal *Logos*, Christ, can speak His own words (*hraymah*, or *rhema*) as well as man! That Eternal Word said, “*So shall My word be that goeth **out of My mouth**; it shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it*” (Is. 55:11). God made sure that it was clear that He was not speaking of

a preacher quoting Him. He clearly said “*that goeth out of My mouth.*” What is said about the word that went out of His mouth can never be said about the quotation of John 3:16 out of the mouth of a preacher! The preacher’s words *about* the word of God, will never accomplish the begetting or quickening to spiritual life in a dead sinner! It will always return to him void.

Almost universally, these “gospel-regenerationists” will run to Romans 10:17, which prove that their preconceived views prevent them from correctly reading the passage. It reads: “*So then **faith** cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*” How do they read it? “*So then **life** cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God.*” A dead man can’t hear, and it is strange that anyone thinks so. Life **MUST precede** faith, and so it does, as we have already fully proved. They point to the Greek word here, “*rhema*”, and say, “See, that word is not “*logos.*” We’ve never said it was. Faith does come to a quickened, born again, living, sinner by “*rhema*” or “*hraymah*”. **Life** doesn’t. But, we may note something they either willfully overlook, or would rather not notice: *i.e.*, the *hearing*, or *akoe*, through which this faith comes. The word *okoe* is found only in the following places other than this text: In Matthew 13:14, “*And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing (akoe) ye shall hear (akoe), and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive.*” This is not the common hearing that is associated with sound waves vibrating from ones vocal chords, passing through the air, and entering the ears and striking the eardrums, and conveying the codes

through the nerves to the brain of another. You find that same word in Acts 28:26, "*Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing (akoe) ye shall hear (akoe), and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive.*" Again, in Hebrew 5:11, we find the same kind of "hearing." "*Of whom we have many things to say and hard to be understood, seeing ye are dull of hearing (akoe).*" And finally, in 2 Peter 2:8, "*(For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing (akoe) vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds)*". We believe it is clear that this "hearing" is a different kind of hearing than is found in nature. It is negatively presented in all places except in our text, and in the case of "just Lot." We have no reason not to assume "just Lot" was a living child of God, and thus had "*ears to hear.*"

It is well to make this point again in conclusion. The Eternal Word, Christ, can speak words (hraymah, or rhema) as surely as any preacher may; but who in his right mind would say the preacher can speak these words better than He that gave His creatures ability to communicate! Jesus said, "*For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will.*" (John 5:21). "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. As the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself*" (John 5: 25-26). But where is there a text that says that either the Father or the Son has given a preacher "life in himself," so that he can give life to whomsoever the

preacher would quote a passage of Scripture? What preacher ever produced an offspring by quoting anything someone else said?

The Eternal Godhead is One God. There is no division of purpose in Him. As the Father is Sovereign – and Calvinists will say so; so the Son is also Sovereign – and the Calvinists will say so too; the Holy Spirit is sovereign and we know of but precious few other than Old School Baptists that will say so. Those who stumble at this word need to start in Genesis chapters 1-3, and find the first principle revealed to man, and hold consistently with it in all their studies of the Scripture. Kind begets kind, and each kind, has seed in itself. There is no such thing as “evolution of the species.” Cows always produce, or beget cows; horses produce, or beget horses; men produce, or beget men; and God produces, or begets His own children. God needs no midwives., or produces half-breeds!

### **APPENDIX: B**

#### **ZION THE CHURCH, Isa. 65:7-9**

By Gilbert Beebe, Feb. 1, 1847

In offering a few remarks in reply to the queries of brother Hammond stated in his letter, we shall confine our remarks principally to the particular points on which he desired our views, *viz*:

1. What does Zion, as spoken of in Isaiah 65: 7-9, mean?

## 2. If Zion is the church, who are her children?

Zion is a name which literally signifies, *a monument, raised up, &c.* It is the name of the loftiest mountain on which the city of Jerusalem was built, and on which the citadel of the Jebusites stood when David took possession of it and transferred his court from Hebron to it, by which it came to be called “the city of David,” and probably from his having deposited the ark there, it was called “the holy hill.” It is on the south side of the city of Jerusalem, rising about 400 feet from the valley of Hinnom.

This name is very frequently in the Scriptures applied to the church of God, both in the Old and New Testaments. The suitableness and beauty of this application to the church of God will appear from the following considerations:

### I. The church is truly a monument of the goodness, mercy, love and grace of God.

1. The church has been raised up from sin, condemnation, wrath, and death, by the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ; and being “risen with Christ, she is made to partake of those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. – Col. 3:1.

2. As the city of David, (David being an eminent type of Christ) Zion is well calculated to represent the city of our God, which He has set upon a hill, where her light cannot be hid.

3. Zion was the seat of the government of national Israel, and as such, typical of the church of Christ, in which the spiritual throne of our anti-typical David is located.

4. The strong and invincible walls and towers of Zion may illustrate the invulnerable walls of salvation with which God has enclosed His church.

5. All that was prefigured by the ark, the mercy seat, the cherubim, &c., is found in the church. From these, among other considerations, the church as a city is very appropriately called Zion, or Sion, and in this sense we understand the appellation to be used in the text.

II. "If Zion is the church, who are her children?" There may be more difficulty involved in this interrogative than one would suppose.

It would seem that the exposition given by Paul, Galatians 4: 27-31, "*For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the flesh, even so it is now. . . . So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free,*" ought to settle this point to the perfect satisfaction of all who are willing to abide by the decisions of the Scriptures; and perhaps it is, but we

know that many of the “*wise and prudent*” of the present age contend zealously that Ishmael and all the creatures of Means produced by illicit affinity with the daughters of Moab, Ashdod, Ammon, &c., (see Ezra 9:1 and Nehemiah 13:23-30,) are the legitimate offspring of the free woman. It would be very hard to satisfy Arminians that God has ordained that the bond woman and all the children of Means shall be cast out of Abraham’s house, and that none but such as are Christ’s are Abraham’s seed and heirs according to promise. It is true that Ishmael was spoken of as Abraham’s son by a bond maid; but God did not regard him as a son, when He said to Abraham, “*Take now thy son, **thine only son Isaac**, whom thou lovest,*” &c.-Genesis 22:2.) Almost if not all the religious sects which claim to be the church of God, have supplied themselves with numerous handmaids in the form of societies, by which they expect to raise up children to Abraham, and they seem as confident that God will own them **as the seed which He had promised to Abraham**, as Sarah and Hagar were that Ishmael was the son which God had promised to Sarah; and as the eleven were that Matthias was the man whom God had chosen to complete the number of the apostles; but their disappointment will be equally great when the word of the Lord shall be executed and the bondwoman and her brood of illegitimates cast out.

Brother Hammond will understand that the names Church, Kingdom, City, Flock, Zion, &c., are used as nouns of multitudes, and are applied to the church *collectively*; that none of these names are applied to the

saints individually. And while the church as a whole body is regarded as **the Bride, the Lamb's wife**, all the individual members belonging to her are known in the relationship of *children*. "*Her Maker is her Husband; the Lord of Hosts is His name.*" He has promised to bring her sons from afar and her daughters from the ends of the earth, and to raise up the sons of Zion against the sons of Greece (rationalists), and to make her as the sword of a mighty man. Hence we conclude that all the children of the promise, who **are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God**, are, as Isaac was, the children of promise; and Sarah, the free woman, which in Paul's allegory is Jerusalem which is above, which is free, "*is the mother of them all;*" and as Zion was the highest elevation of Jerusalem, so it must denote Jerusalem which is above, instead of that Jerusalem which answereth to Mount Sinai, and which is in bondage with her children.

## APPENDIX C

### THE NEW CREATION

By

Wm. Smoot

*"For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within*

*ourselves, waiting, to wit, the redemption of our body."*

Romans 8:22-23.

If our brother had diligently searched the Scriptures with that object in view, we question whether he could have found a testimony more fully revealing the entire economy of salvation, than the one which he has proposed for discussion.

"For we *know that the whole creation*" We desire first to find the creation here alluded to, and will quote from the Scriptures. "*These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness. The beginning of the creation of God.*" Revelation 3:14. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *first born* of every creature." –Colossians 1:15. But to elucidate more fully we quote John 1: 1-4. "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life; the life was the light of men.*"

In the opening chapter of Genesis we have an account of the beginnings of an earthly creation. The word *genesis* means, "the beginning;" and can well be termed "The book of the beginning of the creation of God." This is however a natural creation; but creation of which we wish to write, according to this text, is a spiritual creation, altogether different than the natural.

As in Genesis, the *first* book of what is termed

the Old Testament, we have an account of the natural creation; so in Matthew and John, the *opening book*, or books of the New Testament, we have an account of the *spiritual creation*. “*In the beginning,*” says John, “*was the Word.*” Assuredly this is **not** the beginning of anything that is earthly or natural. Jesus says by way of personification of *Wisdom* in Proverbs 8:23: “*I was set up from everlasting, **from the beginning**, or ever the earth was.*” Decidedly emphasizing that here is a beginning antedating all time. He continues, “*yet He had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.*” Here then is a church set up in Him as its head; a family eternally chosen in a seed. Not in prospect; but in *actual existence*; as surely as the Son existed in the bosom of the Father. Jesus says: “*When He prepared the heavens, I WAS THERE;*” and as surely as the developing family of Adam were created in Adam's creation, existing vitally in him, before they were developed or born of him. Here then is the Word, and “*the same was in the beginning with God.*” “*And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.*”

One definition of the word create is “*to invent with a new form, office, or character.*” We met last May at the constitution of a church near Gordon, Ohio. The members who entered into this constitution existed before they were thus **set** apart, *created*, or organized into such newness of travel.

So the members of this heavenly creation existed before their development, - "*for as the days of a tree are the days of my people.*" Isaiah 65:22.

We might quote without limit the testimony bringing to view the origin, character, and development of this creation; as being of God, *the Father*; chosen **in** Him, set up **in** Him; existing eternally and personally **in** Him, as the development necessarily exists, **in** the prior existing seed. And if **in** Him it must be **like** Him; spiritual as He is spiritual and **in** Him before all worlds were made: and indissoluble from Him in development, born of Him; "*born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh. nor of the will of man, but of God.*" John 1: 13.

We trace the development back to the seed from whence it sprang. Its identity cannot be lost when - "*I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lower parts of the earth;*" (Psalms 139: 15.) And thus the developing kingdom comes "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" (Mark 4: 28,) all of which is in **vital oneness with the seed** that was dropped in the ground; assuming new forms and manifestations in its creative development.

We desire to emphasize the truth presented in this testimony; tracing the new creation to a distinct headship, which is Christ; and that the development does not alter its spiritual identity; but seals the earthly body as an **heir of adoption**, which we will hereafter notice: but we trace the **new man** after the spiritual, not after the natural.

Speaking of this glorious creation the LORD by the

prophet says; *“For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.”* Isaiah 47:17, 18.

Here is a glorious development of a **prior existing** life; and this life John says was **in Christ**, (John 1: 4;) and *“the same was in the beginning with God.”*

This testimony traces the beginning of the Creation of which we are writing back to God as its fountain source; as *“the rock from whence we are hewn and the hole of the pit from whence we are digged.”* Isaiah 51: 1.

In the fierce controversies of former years our old brethren were charged with holding to a creation in Christ similar to a creation in Adam, applying the word creation in the same sense in both cases. But they distinctly disclaimed any such meaning. They repeatedly denied it. Referring to this false charge by John Clark, the late Elder Trott in his “CALM REPLY” page 14 says;

“Will Elder Clark now see that my views of the Person of Emanuel is, that it is so compounded that He could be a Son given, and a child born, and yet be the mighty God; that He could be the beginning of the creation of God, and yet be the I AM THAT I AM. If so he will see that he has fallen as far short of giving my views of the Person and Character of Christ as the earth is below the heavens.

*“For we know that the whole creation groaneth*

*and travaileth. in pain together until now."*

The apostle in the connection (verse 20) refers to the personal identity of the creature in this creation. He says; "*For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope.*" The creature here referred to is evidently the new creature brought to view in Galatians 6:15; "*For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a **new creature.***"

Again; "*Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a **new creature.***" - 2 Corinthians 5:17. "*And have put on the **new man**, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created Him.*" Colossians 3:10. In the last quotation the apostle speaks of this new creature as the new man; and in Ephesians 4: 24, the same testimony is more clearly presented; "*And that ye put on the **new man**, which after God **is created** in righteousness and true holiness.*" Ephesians 4:24.

Evidently the late Elder Thomas. P. Dudley was not alarmed at the use of the word Creature and Creation in the sense in which we here use the terms: we quote from his admirable Circular on the Christian Warfare the following;

"Is it not evident, then, that all "living souls" were created in and simultaneously with the "first man Adam," that they all, being born of him, necessarily partake of his nature "*and he called their name Adam?*" And that all "quickenings" were created in and simultaneously with the "last Adam" that they all, being born of Him, "born of God" as

necessarily partake of His nature? that all living souls no more necessarily descend from the first Adam than all quickened spirits necessarily descend from the last Adam; that the seed of the "first man Adam" disclose his nature, and the seed of the "last Adam" make manifest His nature.

The children of the "first Adam" are born of the flesh and are earthly in all their feelings and affections; the children of the "last Adam" "are born of the Spirit" and are necessarily heavenly or spiritual in their feelings and affections. The children of the first are born for this earth; the children of the last Adam are born for heaven. Those of the "first" are born of corruptible seed; those of the "last Adam" are born of incorruptible seed. The first necessarily partake of human nature; the last, of the divine nature. The antagonistic principles attached to the *two* men necessarily result in the warfare.

The vanity to which this creature is subject is all that pertains to time and mortality; the burden of an earthly inheritance. It is so expressed in Ecclesiastes 1:8; "*Vanity of vanities; saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity.*" "*Behold all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun.*" The reader will notice that the creature is not a willing subject to this vanity, "*-but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope.*" "*For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God*" (Romans 8: 19).

These children of God were, are, and ever have been **one with and in Him**, who is their eternal and living Head. These are they who came down from God out of heaven (*Rev. 21:2*) taking up their abode in an earthly body and these children partook of flesh and blood **before Jesus did** (*Hebrews 2:14;*) partook of it as He did; that is they are not made out of flesh and blood, as *spiritual children*, (“A spirit hath not flesh and bone”) but simply take up their abode in a body born of a corruptible seed. The children themselves, as born of God, are as pure and holy as their heavenly Father; and “**cannot sin, because he is born of God,**” - I John iii. 9.

They groaned, travailing in pain under the law until they were born from under that law in the birth of Jesus from under it; “*who was made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.*” *Galatians 4: 4, 5.*

“*And not only they, but ourselves also. which have the first-fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves.*” The apostle wrote to those who had together with themselves been first delivered or made manifest under the new covenant: who had been brought from under the law in vital union with their living Head; and yet who, like those who had been made manifest under that law, had groaned in the bondage of a body of sin and death; “*even we ourselves groan within ourselves,*”

What a striking testimony, and how expressive of the “two-fold relation of these Children of the Regeneration; *ourselves*, groaning within *ourselves*; the *new* man, groaning within the *old* man; the new

creature in Christ Jesus, groaning to be delivered from the bondage of sin and death.

The child of God (spirit, born of Spirit,) is one thing; and the body which he bears (flesh, born of flesh,) is another. And yet so intimate and vital is the relationship between the child, and the body which he bears; that it can well be termed "his body," in the flesh, as Paul traces it in Romans Chapter 7, or "I" in the spirit. "That which *I* do, *I* allow not." Or as expressed in our text; we *ourselves* groan within *ourselves*." Paul says: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but *Christ liveth in me*." Does he not here most wonderfully and accurately trace who the new creature or new man is: "*Christ in you the hope of glory*." Again; "As the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are *one body so also is Christ*." 1 Corinthians 12:12. Here is assuredly all needed testimony to show the eternal substance (Christ,) and the development of each personal child from that substance. And the dual relationship is expressed in 2 Corinthians 4: 10; "the life also of Jesus might be made manifest *in our body*." What he means by the body the apostle explains in the next verse; "that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest *in our mortal flesh*."

The apostle tells us in 2 Corinthians 5:4; "*For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened*." It is not difficult to trace this testimony in the experience of the child of grace, who groans beneath the weight of sin and death; "*earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our (his) house which is from heaven*." "Waiting for

*the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."*

In the contest of 1886-89 Silas H. Durand and men of his ilk claimed that *adoption* was a legal term. . . the late Joseph Broders of Alexandria who was one of the self-appointed leaders in the contest, held that *adoption* was an already accomplished fact. "Go ask Paul !" wrote Broders, "if this is not so." And to indicate the ignorance of Scripture testimony on the part of the Baptists who followed the leadership of such men, we have but to notice that such loose and glaring falsehoods, and many more of the same character, were readily swallowed as truth by that party.

So far as *adoption* being a *legal* term, it is not mentioned under the law any where! but stands in the forefront of the very brightest *Gospel* terms. Durand's idea on this is akin to his notion that to be born of God was one thing; to be born of the flesh another; and *to be born from above still another*. Broden's request to ask Paul whether or not we are already adopted is readily answered by that apostle in our text, when he tells us that ***we are waiting for it***. (Romans 8: 23).

It would indeed seem that there should be no question in regard to what *adoption* is when the apostle so plainly tells us that it is "the redemption of our body." In adoption the **natural man** is truly born again, as born **from the dead, (in the resurrection)** and thus adopted into the heavenly family, upon the true principle of *adoption*, which is bringing (adopting) the child of one family (Adam's), into that of another (Christ's). While in our mortal

state we receive the **Spirit of** adoption (Romans 8:15;) and by this Spirit are sealed unto the day of Redemption. Ephesians 1:13; 1:30.

P. G. Lester once remarked, that we (as **natural** men and women,) by the Spirit cry, Abba, Father. But the apostle tells us the Spirit **itself** cries, "*Abba Father.*" Galatians; 4, 6. Romans 8: 1.3. Here is surely a marked distinction. The apostle says; "the Spirit **itself** beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead (not quickened) because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness."

The reader will see from such Scripture testimony that adoption is the culmination of the glorious work of salvation. It seals the chosen vessel which holds the heavenly treasure, unto a bright and grand consummation; for "*If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you.*" Here is the "manifestation OF THE SONS OF GOD," when this corruptible puts on incorruption, and this mortal puts on immortality, and "*Death is swallowed up in victory;*" and the church shines forth in a blaze of light, in the fadeless and crowning glory of a world without end.

Precious indeed beyond all comparison such a hope as this; to one like our dear brother Cory, who has seen the fading nature, the vain character of all

beneath these mortal skies; and whose faith grasps the enduring things of eternity. For "*if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.*" "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us." "Because the **creature itself also** shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

***finis***

## **APPENDIX: D**

### **PARABLE OF A TREASURE HID IN A FIELD**

Elder J. F. Johnson on Matthew 13:44

Lawrenceburg, Ky., Jan. 1869.

MY DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I venture to resume my pen once more, for the purpose of presenting through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, to your numerous patrons, and more especially to brother D. C. Byram, of Ohio, my views on Mat. 13:44:

*"Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid*

*in a field; the which when a man hath found he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field. "*

Brother Byram requested through the SIGNS, almost a year ago, that I should write on this subject; but from the obscurity of my mind on the subject at the time, as well as from some other considerations, I neglected to comply with his request, and ought probably to have apologized to my brother for my negligence. More recently, however, my mind from some cause has been led more particularly to that portion of revelation, and I cannot feel justifiable in withholding such light as may be afforded me on that or other portions of the Scriptures. It is true that, for reasons that I need not here name, I have for some time past felt disinclined to write for the SIGNS, and even now feel some misgivings, some timorous apprehensions that an old, weak and imperfect sinner may inadvertently say something that will prove to be "a stumbling block" against which the toes of some tender-footed brother may be bruised. But, notwithstanding these fears, I will try once more to gratify a highly esteemed brother, and any others that may feel any interest at all in what I may have to say, provided you see proper to indulge me with space in the medium of correspondence which we so highly appreciate here. My desire is to keep out of sight the object of merely pleasing or displeasing anyone, and honestly and sincerely endeavor to arrive at a correct interpretation of the text under consideration; and as I

wish to be brief in my remarks, I shall not comment on the foregoing or following connection, nor very minutely on the verse before us.

My aim is simply to exhibit the (1) *treasure hid*, (2) the *field*, and (3) the *purchase* of that field as parabolically alluded to in the passage; and let me remark right here that *to hide* is not *to lose* a thing, for things are generally hidden to secure or preserve them from being lost, to conceal from the gaze, place beyond the scan and out of the reach of such as would take, destroy or harm them in any way. The *hider*, of course, knows where his treasure is hid, and where to find it. The kingdom of heaven then is like, first, *this "treasure hid;"* and I conclude so effectually and securely hidden that it never was nor ever can be lost. I suppose it will be conceded by all but work-mongers, who are doing so much to *change* natural things that can be seen by natural eyes into spiritual ones that cannot, that this treasure alludes to the Lord's *"hidden ones,"* or, in other words, the *"hidden man of the heart,"* or *"new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;"* constituting that spiritual house, and like all other spiritual things hidden from the gaze, outside of the range of and infinitely beyond the ken of mortal vision. Let us remember that it is *"the kingdom of heaven"* that is like this treasure hid; and if it is of heaven it is *"not of this world;"* and of its subjects, *"They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world."* This treasure constitutes the **"*holy city, New Jerusalem,*"** which John, when on the Isle of Patmos,

saw "coming down from God, out of heaven." The children of this kingdom had their existence, their being, their "dwelling place" in Christ Jesus, and were absolutely and actually (not in purpose only) chosen there "before the foundation of the world," before the dust of the earth was made, or shaped into the form of an earthly Adam. The two Adams spoken of in the Scriptures are essentially and radically different; one earthly, the other heavenly; the first natural, the second spiritual; and there is precisely the same difference in their respective off-spring, each producing "after his kind," like every other living thing, whether in the vegetable or animal creation, and it is no more clearly evinced in the Scriptures that the seed or family of the *first Adam* existed in him *after* the foundation of the world, than it is that the seed or family of the Second Adam existed in Him *before* the foundation of the world, for the first Adam, with the entire embodiment of his family in him, exhibits a complete "**figure** of Him that was to come." I know that Arminians quibble and shuffle when we speak of the *pre-existence* of a spiritual seed in the spiritual head, and that the offspring, like its progenitor, "is spirit," just as the offspring of the fleshly head, like its progenitor, "is flesh," and thorough-going ones even claim to be, flesh as they are, the producers (instrumentally, as they say) of the spiritual family. Others, who are not willing to go so far as to claim to be producers or manufacturers of spiritual children out of fleshly ones, seem to contend that the flesh is **changed** to *spirit* by a birth; for if the fleshly man is born of the Spirit he *is* spirit; and those

who advocate that sentiment will have plenty of help outside of the little flock, and of the Bible too, to assist them; for I have never conversed with an Arminian on the subject yet, but what was "in for it." But the idea appears to me to be an anomaly, a departure from the rule that God has established **throughout the universe**, which is, that everything that is born *is like its parent in nature*. But palpably as is this sentiment stamped upon the whole visible creation, work-mongers will oppose it because it is true, and opposed to their converting theory of changing natural flesh into spiritual children; and they are always found on the side of error. I have lived to see two large factions depart from the faith of the Gospel, or of Old School Baptists, one on the subject of *missionism*, the other on that of *means*; and there are yet spared a few of my contemporaries with my humble self who well remember how eagerly the proselyting community drew their swords and bent their bows to slay the upright, and the sequel is now palpable; for those amongst us who were too *charitable* to disown the strange bantlings, are gone out from us, mingled, married and amalgamated with the daughters of the mother of harlots; and I think it not very unsafe for those who have no better way of deciding who is right, to **watch which way work-mongers go**, and then go the *other way*. This! treasure, constituting this "*nation that was born at once*" (Isaiah 66:8), this "*chosen generation, holy nation,*" &c., composing that "spiritual house," that "*house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,*" is not the earthly house or tabernacle in which it is hid,

and which must be dissolved, which was created in and simultaneously with the earthy Adam; for those are "from above," these from beneath; those are heavenly, these earthy; those are spiritual, these natural; those shall never die, these must die, for "*dust they are and unto dust they shall return.*" This spiritual house, then, is not a natural or fleshly one; it was chosen in Christ before there was any flesh; nor is it a time one, for it existed in Him before there was any time. Now, in attending to the second proposition, the *field*, let us not lose sight of the plain import of the expression, "The kingdom of heaven." It is a simple sentence, composed of words easily understood; and I suppose that when the words are used on other occasions none would fail to understand them. For instance, I know not how often when far from my present home I have been introduced to my brethren as "brother Johnson of Kentucky," and I suppose that it was understood every time that I was *from* Kentucky. Who could understand the expression otherwise? And yet, when this kingdom is spoken of as coming "from" *heaven*, some begin to fuss and flutter and contend that it is manufactured here *on earth* by changing natural or fleshly persons into spiritual or heavenly ones. If I believed so I would go to proselyting on the Arminian plan with all my energies.

In speaking of this field are we to consider it and the treasure hid therein without making any distinction between them? I cannot without doing violence to the language. I think that the foregoing quotations and remarks show conclusively that there is a marked

difference between the outward and inward, or old and new man, and that the treasure and field are well calculated to present an appropriate emblem of the complex character called a saint or Christian. As "God is a spirit," and that which is "born of God," "born of the Spirit is spirit," and as "the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead" dwells in us, and as our "outward man" is shown by the Scriptures to be the temple for the Holy Ghost to dwell in, an "earthly house," a tabernacle, how suitable and significant the emblem, how forcible its tendency to lead us, yea, force us to the conclusion that the field is illustrative of the *old man* and the treasure *of the new man*.

But this parable does not stand alone as being so indicative of the complexity of the people of God in their time state. We may see the same class of emblematical portraits permeating the whole book of revelation. A garden, with the fruits and flowers contained therein, teaches the same lesson. (See Cant. 4: 12,13). "*A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse; a spring shut up, a fountain sealed.*" "*Thy plants are an orchard of pomegranates, with pleasant fruits; camphor, with spikenard.*" Here is shown one garden, typifying one church; but who can fail to mark the difference between the mere plot, or soil, and the rich variety of fruits, flowers and perfumery contained therein; and who so inconsiderate as not to observe that without the implantation of seed to produce those fruits, &c., that the mere soil would be as unproductive of these fruits, as barren as is our fleshly nature as to producing any

of the fruits of the Spirit without the implanting of the spiritual seed.

Again, there is in the preceding part of this same chapter in which our text stands, as well as in the fourth chapter of Mark and thirteenth of Luke, instructing lessons for us on the same subject; and then, in the same chapters, we have the parable of the woman with her leaven and meal; and how forcibly that parable symbolizes the same people or church; and how precisely it illustrates the experience of every subject of grace! There is the meal in the vessel, no commotion, no activity, like our paralyzed natures; but along comes the woman with her leaven, and then begins the fermentation. How striking the similarity when the "holy seed," or spirit that is "born of God," is placed within us. Then begins the inward commotion which we all so palpably realize in our experience, and which must finally be as effectual as is the leaven that leavens the whole lump.

Here, then, is one that is born of the flesh and is flesh, earthy, answering to the field; and here is another that is born of the Spirit and is spirit, answering to *treasure* hid in the field. So plainly is the fact that "the generations of Adam" and "the generation of Jesus Christ" compose this complex character of the people of God, taught in the Scriptures, that the whole volume abounds with the most lively representations of the same. The holy writers, imbued with the spirit of inspiration, begin the record with instructions that in

the bud of time, the blossoming and maturity of the fruit of creation, the great AUTHOR commenced the revelation of Himself in the grass, the herbs, the trees, the fish, the fowls and the beasts; each containing *its seed in itself*, each producing its offspring after *its kind*, and crowns the whole with the formation and vitalizing of the first man with all His seed in himself, the forcible, strong and striking "*figure*," or type of HIM, the great archetype with "his seed" in Himself. Then, time and space would fail me to trace the record of those "holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," who seem literally to have ransacked creation and the vocabulary of language to find emblems and expressions to present to our view the striking portraits of the saint or church while in a state of pilgrimage, the legitimate offspring of these two respective heads. Thus we have an old and new, an outward and inward man; an earthly house or tabernacle with its inhabitants, a temple with its inmate, an earthen vessel with its treasure contained within, flesh and spirit lusting against each other; the company of two armies in the Shulamite, and many other emblems and expressions used in the Scriptures, making the matter so manifest that the church of Christ as a body, while led by the Spirit of God, has in all ages past felt, and will in all to come feel in the experience of each member its truthfulness.

Besides, to deny this position will lead us into inextricable difficulty in harmonizing the Scriptures. One may *believe* that the soul is born of God; and if

that is the case, and we sin afterward, we must sin without a soul, for that cannot sin if such be the fact. Another, that it is the mind. Can we sin without a mind? A third, that it is the whole natural man. If so, he is no more flesh, but spirit like its father. Then how are we to reconcile those texts in I John 1: 8, *"If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;"* and 3: 9, *"Whosoever is born of God **doth not commit sin**, for His seed remaineth in him; and **he cannot sin**, because he is born of God."* (I John 3:9), *"Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not."* (I John 3:6) *"For whatsoever is born of God **overcometh** the world,"* (1 John 5:4), and *"We know that whosoever is born of God **sinneth not**; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."* (I John 5:18). Arminians harp much upon the subject of changing the heart or other faculties, or the whole natural man, so as to make him something else than a sinner. It is the hobby upon which they gallop, or "galley with oars" on which they float when compassing land and sea in all their proselyting excursions; and they say (some of them) that the change is so complete that they have not sinned for months, and, as one said in Ohio where I once had some meetings, "for fourteen years;" but this theory will never do for those who "*groan, being burdened*" with the weight of this "*old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*" that war against the spirit; for the Bible says nothing about such a change, a birth has never produced such a one in anything that ever was born; the experience of all Christians teaches them that they are still sinners, the

chief of sinners, as each one is ready to acknowledge; and the *figure* that the Lord has used ought to teach us that if He should take us in hand and change all our natural faculties and powers into spiritual ones, there would not be the smallest semblance of a birth in the whole process. But perhaps I have dwelt long enough upon the nature of the treasure and of this field or earth that is so prone to produce "wild grapes," "wild gourds," or some other noxious production quite different from "*the fruits of the Spirit*," and will try to consider, thirdly, the purchase of the field.

Of course I must conclude that the man that bought this field was designed to prefigure Christ, who purchased His people, and that was a redemption purchase. And let it be remembered that it is *the field* that was bought, for there is nothing said in the parable about *buying the treasure*. I cannot agree with Mr. Parker's theory [Two-Seed-In-The-Spirit] that the seed of the second Adam or His spiritual children were "put forth in Adam (the first) and fell there, and that all that fell in Adam will be restored in Christ." Adam's children are all like himself, natural, earthy; not spiritual, not heavenly. These children are "born of God," and are spirit, born of ***incorruptible*** seed, therefore are incorruptible, "cannot sin;" they come down from God as Christ did, and when "born of God" are "partakers of flesh and blood," as Christ "took part of the same," and I can find no intimation in the Scriptures that they ever had an existence in Adam or any of his children until "born from above," (as the

margin reads,) but that they have ever been "*preserved in Christ Jesus,*" (Jude 1) and consequently needed no redemption. But the first Adam, the earthy, natural, created man, with all his children like himself created in him in the morning of time, (not chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world,) transgressed the law of God, fell under its curse, and **unless redeemed** that law must wreak its fiery vengeance on them forever. These, or just "*as many as were ordained to eternal life,*" were Christ's, not by lineal descent, as I understand, but by the *gift* of His Father. Said He, "*Thine they were, and Thou gavest them Me.*" In this relation they wandered off from Him and became strangers, foreigners, aliens. This does not look like He had been *their "dwelling place in all generations;"* which is said of Christ's seed, but their sins, their iniquities were charged to or laid on Him, and "*His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree,*" yea, "*suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God,*" from whom we had strayed so far and so fearfully. He "gave Himself for us," and this looks like giving all He had to buy the field. Now the voice of inspiration can say to us, "*Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is **in you,** which ye have of God, and ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.*" This field, these natural children, when found by Him, were "*children of wrath even as others.*" He found them in a desert land, a waste, howling wilderness; but by the culture of the husbandman, the planting of a good or "holy seed," the

wilderness, the solitary place is made glad, the desert to rejoice and blossom as the rose. The fruit of this holy seed when matured is most charming, most delightful. Here we find love, joy, peace, long suffering, goodness, &c. But like all other earth, this field has a natural tendency to produce noxious, poisonous growths; so that the hand, the vigilant, diligent hand of the Husbandman is daily and nightly required to keep them down; but He "*neither slumbers nor sleeps,*" and so faithfully and effectually will that hand be applied that He will finally and effectually destroy all its propensity to produce those baneful growths. This field is His own. His, first by gift, then lost by transgression, then His by purchase or redemption. And O, what a price, what a matchless price He paid! "*Gave His life,*" "*gave Himself,*" shed His precious blood. O, wondrous love!

"Love moved him to die, and on this we rely;  
Our Jesus hath loved us, we cannot tell why;  
But this we can tell, that he loved us so well,  
As to lay down His life to redeem us from hell. "

But He had power to take it up again, has conquered death, and was "*the first born from the dead.*" And, my dear brother Byram, sisters, all, if we are of those who "*follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,*" we

must realize just such a birth. Then, and not till then, shall we realize fully "*the redemption of the purchased possession,*" "*the redemption of our body,*" for which we must "wait." But let us wait patiently, hopefully, confidentially. Remember our Elder Brother has said, "*I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death.*" Until our vile body is changed, and fashioned like unto His glorious body, the warfare must go on, the battle must rage between the flesh and the spirit. In this conflict we must pass through the waters, and though the billows may roll high, they shall not overflow us; and through the fire, vehemently as it may blaze, we shall not be burnt, neither shall the flames kindle upon us. The din of battle must hush at His mandate, the flashing flames cool down at His nod, and the furious billows become calm at His bidding.

"Though now unseen by outward sense,  
Faith sees Him always near;  
A guide, a glory, a defense,  
Then what have you to fear?"

The treasure is hid, the field purchased, *He will have His own!*

Brother Beebe, please excuse the clumsiness and

incongruity of the foregoing. It has been written by piecemeal, and for the greater part hurriedly. My love to yourself, family, and all the saints.

J. F. Johnson.

## APPENDIX E

### THE NEW BIRTH

By Samuel Trott, 1855.  
(1787 – 1866)

Brother Beebe:- I received, a short time since, a letter from brother Davis S. Woody, of Missouri, in which he makes the following request:

“Dear Brother: For the satisfaction of some of my dear brethren, who I think do not understand you and brother T. P. Dudley, on the subject of the new birth or regeneration, I would like to have your views on that subject, and what it is that is born again. Dear brother, the reason in particular that I ask your views on this subject is that some of the brethren think that brother Dudley laid down premises which would **justify the non-resurrection principle**. If you see proper to give your views, I would rather have them through the *SIGNS*.”

In accordance with brother Woody’s wishes, I forward my answer to you for publication in the *SIGNS*, if you think it proper to publish it. If you have any objection to doing so as tending to revive controversy,

please to enclose this in another envelope, and direct it to brother Woody, Mexico, Osage County, MO. If he gets the answer in manuscript, he can probably show it to such brethren as he pleases.

Brother Woody, in replying to your enquiries, in order, if possible, for me to make my views plain, I wish first, if I can command language to do it, to explain myself on one *important point* connected therewith. The point is this: that a person, one who exists as an individual being, **may have a distinct nature from what he before existed in, SUPPER-ADDED TO HIM,** so as to be made to exist in that distinct nature, **without destroying his former personality, and yet changing his personal relations into conformity to his NEW nature, or new birth,** for since the creation of Adam and Eve, I know of no way in which an individual existence in nature is *produced except by a birth*. Many brethren seem not only entirely indisposed to admit the correctness of such an idea as the above, but also *to allow me and others to believe it*. But if the above position, in substance, is not correct, I am ignorant, and must remain so, of the testimony of Scripture concerning both the *new birth* and the incarnation of Christ; as well as concerning His spiritual Headship.

As I understand the Scriptures, the correctness of the position I have above laid down is fully demonstrated in the testimony given concerning the incarnation of Christ. According to the testimony of Scripture, "*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*" (John 1:1). Again in verse 14, it is said, "*And the Word was made*

*flesh and dwelt among us.*” And according to Galatians 4:4, “*God sent forth His Son, **made of woman and made under the law.***” Now I presume no Old School Baptist will understand by the declaration, (John 1:14), that the Word, the Godhead, was **changed into flesh**, nor by that of Galatians 4:4, that the pre-existence of the Son was **destroyed**, and that He was made the Son of God of the woman. Yet the declaration, “*made of a woman and made under the law,*” is affirmed of the Son, as in the other text, the affirmation is, “*The Word was made **flesh.***” What is it then but a fleshly nature, in which He did not before exist, was **super-added** to Him personally, as the *Word*, and as the *Son sent forth*? Here then my position is fully proved. Christ is made to exist distinctively in a **fleshly nature**, or as man, in being born of the Virgin, yet this fleshly birth in no sense **destroys** His personal identity as **the Son**, or as **the Word**, but He remains the *Son sent forth to serve*, and to *learn obedience by the things He suffered*, is still the *Word made flesh, is one with the Father*, is God manifest in the flesh, and brings into His servitude under the law, and in the things which He suffered, all the majesty, power, dignity, and even all the fullness of the Godhead. Yet while His original personality is **not changed**, His *personal relation is changed*: from being the Giver of the law, He now in *being made of woman is made under the law*, made subject to its demands: and we behold Him in the flesh of a *servant* under it, a *minister of the circumcision, come to minister, and not to be ministered unto*. So I understand Christ’s existing in the beginning, as the *only begotten of the Father*, as the

production of God, or the beginning of the creation of God, in that **Life** which is *the light of men*, and which constitutes Him the *Head of His Church, the Life of His people*, and their elder brother, to be His existing in that **super-added life to His Godhead**, and which in no sense destroyed His personal identity as God, but that He remains, whilst thus personally related to, and one with His people, to be the Jehovah, the self-existing God. The reason why some have charged me with being an Arian for holding Christ to exist in this near relation to His people is that they will not allow, notwithstanding the proof I have presented of the fact, that **a distinct nature can be super-added, of God, personally to Himself, without destroying His personal identity as God.** [Stan Phillips' note: The reader should take time to understand this position before reading on. It is a point Elder Trott will apply in his answer, and a very good and sound one.]

I now come, Brother Woody, to give you my views, briefly, on the new birth, as to what it is. Regeneration, as I hold it, is the **implanting in an individual, or adding to him, that incorruptible seed** which Peter speaks of, (I Peter 1:23) even the spiritual seed of Abraham, which **is Christ** (Galatians 3:16), "*Christ in you,*" and which is that *Life* that was in the Word, "*which is the light of men;*" for *Christ is the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world* – John 1:9. Hence this individual sees his relation and accountability to God and to the law, and sees his sinfulness as he never saw or felt it before, for "*by the law is the knowledge of sin.*" He sees this as the natural man, or flesh, cannot see it, for the "*law is spiritual.*"

And he so sees and knows the reality of these things that he cannot shake off or drive them from him as he could former impressions, which arose from mere fleshly views, or a natural conscience. The reason of this is, that whilst the implantation of this seed is of God, and of God only, and not through any instrumentalities of men, the seed itself being Life and Light, quickens the mind and conscience to such a sense of the reality of these things, that the individual feels himself as standing before a heart-searching and rein-trying God; and in the ultimate view of this, and of the purity of the law, all his goodness and doings are turned to corruption, and he falls helpless at the footstool of mercy, or at the feet of that God against whom he has sinned. Being thus stripped and killed by the law, he is prepared to be married to another, even Christ, or brought to view in his relation to a crucified and risen Jesus (Romans 7: 1-4).

The new birth I understand to be the *“being born again of the incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever.”* (I Peter 1:23). Whether by the *word of God* in this text is understood the essential Word, who is God, or, as is frequently intended by the *word of God*, that which God directly speaks or communicates to a person, is immaterial, for both ideas are true. For Christ said, *“Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live”* (John 5:25). This person being, as we showed, dead, killed by the law, is now made to hear the voice of the Son of God, the proclamation of pardon and salvation

through Christ's atonement. And every child of grace knows that it took something more than the power of man to make him hear; that it came with the power and as the word of God; and he already having Christ or the *seed of Life in him*, he is enabled to receive, believe and rejoice in that word, and feels himself standing in a new relation to God, no longer a condemned and banished one, but a pardoned, justified one; has peace with God, and is enabled to cry *Abba, Father*; that is, he feels that God is his Father. Thus in the new birth there is a striking correspondence to the natural birth; to each there is a seed implanted, and then a quickening by which life is *manifested*. And when the natural child is brought to the birth, the sorrows of the woman in travail, the fetus being broke loose from that by which it had been hitherto nourished, strongly represents the agonies and the killing by the law belonging to the second birth. But then there is a contrast in the births. In the first birth the child comes into the world in the image of Adam, an alien from God and subject to pain, disease and death, as the fruits of depravity and condemnation. In the second birth, he comes into the kingdom of heaven, where "*grace reigns through righteousness*;" has communion with God as a Father through Christ; stands manifested as one with Christ; and having a common interest with all the members of Christ's body, in all that Christ accomplished by redemption, in all the promises of God, and in that inheritance which is reserved for the saints in light.

I now come, Brother Woody, to your second point of enquiry, namely: "What it is that is born again?" If by

this enquiry, you mean what is the production of the new birth? I answer, the "*New man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness*" (Eph. 4:24). This *new man* I believe to be Christ in you the hope of glory; for Paul said, It was *Christ that lived in him*. (see: Col.1:27 & Gal. 2:20). But I presume that your enquiry relates to that which has been the matter of discussion in the SIGNS formerly. I therefore answer, our Lord said, "*Except a man be born again,*" and I know not what right I have to suppose He did not mean as He said, did not mean the man. In conformity to this I say, in reference to Brother Woody's being born again, that it is Brother Woody himself in his whole person that was born again. And here is the application of the position with which I started, namely: **That a distinct nature may be super-added to a person so that he shall actually exist in that new nature, without destroying his former personal identity, or his former existence.** This I illustrated in the case of the Word *being made flesh*. So I understand that a spiritual nature called "**Life**" has been super-added to brother Woody by the spiritual seed being implanted, and he being brought to the spiritual birth, by his being brought to life the "*Life he now lives in the flesh, by the faith of the Son of God,*" that is, as before God. Yet his individuality is **not changed**, it is still Davis S. Woody, his old man or nature is the same as it was before, his rational powers the same. And yet his personal relations by the new birth are **altogether changed**. He no longer belongs to Adam's family, but to Christ's; is a living member of Christ's body; is not under the law,

but under grace; is not of the world, as Christ is not of the world; is not under condemnation, but in a state of justification; although he feels the workings of depravity in all that he does, it is no more **he** that does it, but “**sin that dwells in him.**” He is, in a word, a son of God, and a joint heir with Christ to glory; although he has in the old man all the elements that would constitute him a child of hell if still standing in his relation to Adam and under the law. [Stan’s note: Elder Dudley expressed the above by saying that the man was “born again,” **not, “born over again.”** That, we think, is the true sense of our forefather’s on this aspect of the new birth. It is not that the old man in nature, or the flesh experiences a new birth by which the old man is eradicated or made sinless; but rather he is the subject of another birth, altogether different from his birth in nature, that having been “*born of the flesh, and is flesh*” (John 3:3) being now born by the Spirit and gaining possession of a spiritual nature thereby – or as Trott here: “super-added” to him.]

In reference to the idea that the principles laid down by brother Dudley favoring the non-resurrection notion [See Stan’s introduction with Lemuel Potter’s misrepresentation above], I will say that so far as I have understood Brother Dudley, I know of no material difference between his views and mine in relation to the new birth. And the views I have above advanced as to what is *born again* are the only views, in my estimation, consistent with the idea of the resurrection of **the bodies of the saints to glory**. For, I cannot believe that whatever is not born again of God can ever enter heaven to participate in the glory of Christ. Whilst what ever is born of God through Christ, the only begotten of the Father, must partake with Him in glory. Hence ***if*** I believed that only the souls of persons were the subjects of regeneration [As G.M. Thompson, Lemuel Potter, John Clark, William Conrad, Sylvester

Hassell, etc, taught – SCP] and the new birth, I must believe that only their souls enter heavenly glory. But believing as I do, that it is **the man** that is born again; that after the second birth he exists personally in a spiritual life, whilst he retains all that in which he before existed as a natural person, and in which he still exists in his fleshly life, and therefore believing that his whole person was represented by Christ in His atonement, I must believe that in his whole person, body, soul and spirit, he must enter glory, as a member of Christ's body, and as a trophy of Christ's redemption and of His conquest over death. And I can see nothing in this sentiment concerning the new birth that can favor the non-resurrection notion.

Thus, my brother, I have tried with plainness to give my views on these points; it is for you to examine the Scriptures for yourself, to judge of their correctness. Yours with kind regards,

*Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,  
July 27, 1853  
S. Trott*

*From: Signs of the Times: Volume 21 (1853)  
Welsh Tract Publications*

## **APPENDIX F**

### **ETERNAL VITAL UNION**

By: Wilson Thompson, 1788-1866.

Selected from Chapter 5, Part 2, of "Simple Truth."- 1821

[Editor's note: The **bold headings** to give the document an outline was supplied by the editor. They are not in the original document. The rationale for such a large collection of bold characters is that many today deny that Wilson Thompson was an "Anti-Means Predestinarian Old School Baptist. Just about all Baptists wish to claim him, but not his doctrine! Both Southern Baptists of Missouri and Conditional Primitives today claim him as one of their leading reverends or elders.]

Those and only those are interested in the atonement that were **united to Christ, BEFORE ALL WORLDS**, for the atonement could effect none else; for justice would not allow of Christ suffering for sin, **without union to the sinner**; nor could we be justified by the blood of Christ **without UNION WITH HIM**, but as **this union** is disputed by many good men, and we think mostly on account of not understanding it. I shall endeavor to treat on this subject as plain as possible, and shew the **indispensable NECESSITY OF SUCH A UNION** IN ORDER TO OUR BEING INTERESTED IN THE ATONEMENT BY JESUS CHRIST, or being saved by Him, upon the principles of equity. My present design is to render with as much plainness of speech as possible, the **reason** of my ideas intending thereby to prove at once the **necessity and utility of this UNION**, all our hopes of salvation are built upon this assertion, God is good; and that we may rightly conceive of Him as being good; it is as necessary to see Him as justice, holiness, and truth, as mercy and love; for all those are necessary to meet in **ONE**, to constitute real goodness, but where is the justice of laying our sins on Christ if we were **not so UNITED TO HIM**, as to make it just? I am sure no one would call that judge either just, or

good, that would place the crime of the guilty, to the account of the innocent; and punish him for it; but it hath pleased the Lord to lay the iniquity of us all on Him, and He was "*wounded for our sins, bruised for our transgressions;*" but is there any more justice in wounding Christ for our sins **WITHOUT UNION**, than there would be in hanging one man, because another had committed murder? but if Christ and those for whom He suffered, was **UNITED AS HEAD AND MEMBERS**; then the justice of the act does clearly appear, when the **head of the body suffers with and for His members**, then we cannot conceive of God as being good nor just in the imputation of our sins to Christ, without the consideration of **union**, if we call God holy, and yet say that He punished His own beloved Son, for crimes that He never had done, nor was in any sense united to those that had committed them, must we not of course think them holy men that sacrifice their innocent sons to Moloch? If Christ died for our sins and was **not UNITED to us**, it was contrary to truth, which declares that they "*are bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh,*" then the truth stands unimpeached, for **He and they make BUT ONE**; He the Head and they the members.

Thus we see the **necessity OF UNION BETWEEN CHRIST AND THOSE FOR WHOM HE MADE ATONEMENT**. Again, if Christ had volunteered Himself to die for us, it could not have done us any good **without union** because it would not have removed our guilt, any more, than an innocent person being hanged unjustly would remove the guilt of the highway robber.

If I am guilty of a capital crime, I remain guilty, if all the innocent men in the state of Ohio should volunteer to suffer in my stead; then if Christ died that God might be just in justifying; He must have **been united to the church**, before He suffered for them; or else the act of punishing Christ for their sins, is so far from having any appearance of justice in it; that was an earthly king to be guilty of such an act with his son, it would also cause the blood to run cold in our veins, and every heart would rise up against the cruel act of the unequaled tyrant in human shape.

But ought we not to feel a double shock when we hear men trying to place this crime to God's account! O my soul come thou not into this awful dilemma. The Christian world in general is willing to agree, that Christ and His people are united **after faith**, but not before; then it becomes our duty to examine *when this union took place*; and what the cementing bond of this union is. First, we shall examine if *faith* is this **bond of union**. Secondly, If God's breathing into man the breath of life is this union; and Thirdly, attempt to shew what this bond is, and hint at its **antiquity** and strength; and shew how it clothed Christ with the right to make an atonement.

1. We are now to examine if *faith* is this bond of union; faith is a grace of the Spirit that has to do with that **union**; but so far from being the bond or cement of it, that if we were not **united before faith acted**, it could never act; for it is an *evidence of things not seen*; but it could not be an *evidence of union with Christ*, unless such union had existed previous to the evidence

of faith; an evidence is that which witnesses to a fact, but it never can create a fact, but the fact must first be a fact, and then the evidence can bear testimony to that fact; so by faith we know the world was made; that is, by the evidence of faith we know it. Whether faith is considered as retrospective or prospective it acts on facts; if it evidences that there is a heaven, it is a fact, and was so long before faith could have given an evidence of it. So respecting this **union**, faith is an evidence of it, but it must have been a fact before faith could be an evidence of it; and thus if ever faith is spoken of in Scripture as having any thing to do in **this union** it is because it apprehends it, and bears witness of it.

Again faith has no uniting quality in it, but simply evidences to the truth; and is therefore called a "*belief of the truth*;" but if it has any uniting quality in it, it must unite us as much to bad men as to good ones; as much to the world as to saints; and as much to the devil as to God; for it bears evidence to the truth of the one as certainly as to the other; and is a belief of the one, as much as of the other, so it is our happiness that faith cannot unit us to any thing but can apprehend union where it is; and division where it is. Thus we have seen that faith is not, nor cannot be the bond of union.

2. We are to inquire if God's breathing into man the breath of life is the bond of union between Christ and His church: although this is much more reasonable than the other, yet this is equally false; for we find **this union existed BEFORE creation**, for "*In Thy book all*

*My members were written," (Psalm 139) then they were **united with Him as members**, and their names written in the Lamb's book of life slain from the foundation of the world.*

3. We shall now hasten to show what this bond of union is, and hint at its **antiquity** and strength; and show how it clothed Christ with the right to make the atonement. - The bond of union between Christ and His church is love; and this cementing bond **unites the church to both the human and divine nature of Christ, or the pre-existing** soul of Christ and God in it; for God says "*Yea, I have loved thee with an **everlasting** love,*" and Christ says, "*Thou hast loved them as Thou hast loved Me, and Thou lovest Me before the world was,*" but this **uniting bond** not only existed between God **and His people**, but between the soul of Christ and the church, for He "*loved the church, and gave Himself for it;*" love is very dissimilar to faith; first, it has an uniting quality in it; it unites husband and wife, it never can be without **union**, for union is its very nature; it is that uniting bond that cements together all that it encloses; Secondly, it differs from faith, for when faith evidences the truth of the being of wicked men and devils, love does not unite us to them because God is love and if God is love we are lost when we go to hint at the **antiquity of this union**; we can only say it **IS AS OLD AS GOD**, for God is love; but love must have an object or it ceases to be; for I cannot love, and love nothing; love is that endearing or uniting perfection of God, which could only exist, so long as the object beloved existed; nor could God be love **before the**

**object was beloved**, neither can love be controlled, for it brings forth, produces, or sets up its own object, that is, must necessarily have an object, in order to its own existence; and as God is self-existent and independent, His existence as love, brought forth its object, which was the soul of Christ **WITH ALL HIS PEOPLE IN IT**, and the very existence of God as King could only be because He had *subjects*, for a king without a kingdom, is no king at all; so love without an object is no love at all. So we see that in order to our speaking of God as being love, or His existing as love, there must be an object beloved, and in order to His being a king, there must be subjects, and thus the ***pre-existent soul of Christ***, was the object of the love of God **and His people in it** were the subjects of His kingdom, and Christ was the medium of operation through whom God exercises His authority in the government of His kingdom; for in the pre-existing soul of Christ, the subjects of this kingdom were chosen, before the world, when we speak of a choice being made ***in*** Christ before the world, were not to understand, that God was looking through Adam's posterity, and picking out one here, and another there, and writing their names in the book of life; and refusing the rest, for they were **chosen IN Christ before the world and not in Adam**, for he did not exist before creation; and the choice was not an act that took place, or was planned some time **after** the existence of God, either before the world or since, but was a consequence of, and inseparable from the existence of God as king, and this kingdom was organized in **the pre-existent soul of Christ**; in whom

all blessings, purposes, promises and grace of God were given them, or in whom the whole design of God toward them was expressed and all this not by an *act* of God, but as a thing inseparable from the *being* of God, under the name of love, mercy, king, sovereign, lord or any other name He bears, in which His superiority is implied. Thus you see, that **our union to God**, or the divine nature of Christ is a *consequence* of God's being love, and while God remains to be love **our union must of necessity continue**, without any addition or diminution, unless God increases or diminishes. And our being chosen in Christ is a consequence of God's being a king, and our being interested in those blessings and graces in Christ, is a consequence of the nature and design of God, which never can be separated from Him, unless He becomes dispossessed of His nature. This is the **nature of our union with Christ**, and this the bond of it, and to this agree the Scripture of Truth. And thus we see all the elect of God were chosen and blest, with all spiritual blessings in Christ, and thus the human soul of Christ was **pregnant with all the subjects**, blessings, and grace, of God's kingdom; and as the only active representative, it acts for them all, having **them all in it**. Thus the union between Christ and His church is **taught in the Scripture**, "*I in them, and Thou in Me;*" "*We are members of His body of His flesh and of His bones; whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it; for as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ. Ye are the body of Christ, and*

*members in particular; He is the Head of the body the church: the Head over all things to His church; which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. Ye are complete in Him; we being many are one body in Christ, and members one of another. For, both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one."*

We think it unnecessary to repeat any more Scripture here, for the above texts are a specimen of the Bible on this subject; so we have seen what the bond of union is; and have hinted the *antiquity* and strength of it, and shall now shew how it clothes Christ with the right of making the atonement, we have seen the **necessity of this union with God, in the pre-existent soul of Christ** brought forth and set up, as the certain effect of the being of God under the idea, of love or the authority of a king, or of God under either of those characters; and so Christ existed then as properly the Head of the Church, or kingdom of God, **while they were all in Him**, as Adam did exist head of the human family *when they were in him*. And as the creation of Adam gave him the right to represent his posterity in Eden before God, because they were naturally related to him; being united in him; so Christ had the right of representing His posterity, by **virtue of union with them** which as a consequence of God's existence, and ever since God a king His people or subjects were His portion; and **ever since God was love, Christ with His church in Him**, was set up as the object of that love, and ever since the Lord was God, that holy nation, whose God the Lord is, and the people whom He hath chosen for His own inheritance have been blessed. Now

we have seen that according to the nature and constitution of things, Christ was **always united to His church** as their Head and representative, and thus He has the right of making the atonement for them, and they can be benefited by it; in this way the justice of God appears, in the imputation of Christ righteousness to the church, just in the same point of view that Adam's sin or guilt, was imputed or entailed to his posterity. So God's independent existence, consequently brought forth His own medium of operation, for the government of His kingdom, clothed Christ with the right of redemption; and in Him our happiness was inseparably connected with an exhibition of the glory of God, so that the highest display of His glory is in effecting our happiness; thus all the works of God in creation and Providence, as well as in grace, are for the accomplishment of His purposes in displaying His glory in the government of His kingdom, and the whole Gospel, is only an exhibition of His eternal design or purpose; thus the very being of God secures the church in Christ; in whom they must always remain while God remains a king, for they are His subjects; and the human soul of Christ is their representative, in whom the whole platform of government is treasured and in whom God is prepared to make every display of Himself, that He ever designed to make. So when God displayed His power in creating a world, it was by Jesus Christ; when He displayed His glory in redemption, it was by the same Christ; and when He shall display His glory in judging the world in righteousness it will be by the same Jesus Christ; and

in a word, all we do know, or ever shall know of God, is in and by Jesus Christ; and as creation was a work of God, preparatory to the display of His glory; the earth became of course the theatre upon which the display should be made; and as the church or kingdom of God was the object of that display, it naturally required that Adam as a figure, of Him, by whom that great display should be made, should be the highest part of creation.

**ALL TEMPORAL BLESSING ARE IN HIM  
AND FLOW FROM UNION IN AND WITH HIM:**

And as the display of God's glory, was to be made by Christ, **who contained all His people in Him**; it was proper that all the posterity of **the figure** should be *contained in him*; and as all the spiritual blessings of God's kingdom were in Christ, so all the temporal blessings of the world must be **in a figure**, and as the whole rule of the government of His kingdom was in Christ; so the whole rule of the government of the world must be in **the figure**: thus Adam was "*a figure of Him that was to come*;" for he was the most exalted part of the creation, had all his posterity **in him**, so all temporal blessings were his; "*of all the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat*;" and the rule that should govern the world was contained in the law given to Adam and all the human family in him, but afterwards when the woman was separated from the man in person, but remaining "*bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh*," she was deceived and was in the transgression, and gave to her husband, and he not being deceived,

willingly partook of it, knowing the consequence that would follow; and as the woman united to him, "*bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh,*" had eaten of the forbidden fruit, he must eat or be separated from her and so he did eat. What a beautiful figure is Adam of Christ. Adam was created with the woman in him; - Adam was the head of the woman; - Christ was the Head of the church. Adam had the law and temporal blessings of the woman given to her in him; Christ had the law of love and all the spiritual blessings of the church, given to the church **in Him**. - Adam received the forbidden fruit from the woman after she had eaten: - Christ received the consequence of the transgression of the church after they had sinned. - Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Adam loved his wife and said "*for this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife and they two shall be one flesh:*" "*Christ loved the church and gave Himself for it,*" which was "*bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh.*" Thus the head of the woman is the man and the head of the church is Christ. And here in creation we have a beautiful figure of **the union between Christ and the church**; which gives Him the right of redemption; and shows the justice of our sins being laid on Christ. Again when God makes a display of His glory in giving the law we see a plain figure of the relationship in the case of redemption; if one of the Hebrews became poor and was sold; a kinsman was allowed to have the right of redemption. And in the fullness of time when God makes that great display of Himself; which all the other

displays were preparatory to; the **substance** of the figures in the former displays comes forward, with the glory of God shining in His face, and the whole Godhead dwelling in Him bodily; publishes the eternal counsel or disposition of God, declares Himself **united to them as their Head and Husband**, and acts the part of a kinsman in redemption. Thus we have seen that **the union between Christ and His church** clothed Him with the right to make the atonement; and now we shall show how their justification is effected by the atonement of Christ.

### **Eternal Vital Union, Atonement And Justification:**

Justification is a law term, and is the reverse of condemnation; to justify is to declare one to be just, or innocent; thus God justifies the church. Legal justification can only take place where there is no guilt or lawful charge to condemn; and thus God justifies because Christ has died; that is Christ has put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, who was the **Head of the church**, and thereby clears them as **His members** from guilt; and thus God is just when He justifies them, and in the very same sense the church is justified, for their sins were placed to Christ's account as their Head and representation and thus He was as a "*Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,*" ever since Christ was brought forth the Head and representative of His church, He has been accountable as such to God **for** all the acts of those He did represent, and though their sins could not stain Him with impurity, yet as He is

their Head and **they in Him**, their sins must be charged to Him, and the punishment due to their sins must be inflicted on Him. Therefore the sword of justice must slumber until the Head of the church comes to satisfy its demands, and then awake against Him, instead of the sheep; for "*all we like sheep have gone astray, we have every one turned to his own way; but the Lord hath laid upon Him the iniquity of us all,*" and in the same sense that Christ was accountable for the church; the church was justified in Him.

But when Christ came into this world to make the atonement, He **came with His people *in Him***, as they **always had been**, and in this sense they may be said to "suffer in Him," "to die in Him," to "rise in him," and to be glorified "in Him," and to have their "seats in heavenly places in Him," for as He is, so are we in Him; for whether one of the members suffer, all the members suffer with it, or whether one member be honored all the members rejoice with it. Thus we have seen that the nature and being of God has joined Christ and His church together, and let no man attempt to put them asunder, but thus united they stand, and Christ as their Head is constitutionally the only one that can make the atonement, and He can atone for only one such as are constitutionally the members of His body, or God's kingdom, nor will justice allow of one other sin being laid to His charge, nor of one of the sins of His people being laid to the charge of any other but Him; thus there is an indispensable necessity for Christ to make the atonement, and **all His members were in Him when He did make the atonement**, and His

dying is the same by virtue of **this union**, as if they all had died, *“for the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that He died for all, that henceforth we that live, should not live unto ourselves, but unto Him that died for us, and rose again.* Thus we have become dead to the law by the body of Christ, crucified with Christ: thus Christ’s **being united with the church as their head** and dying as such; they in Him have been represented in death, under the penalty of the law, and in Him every charge of the law is fulfilled completely; and they are as clear of guilt in Him, as if they never had committed one sin, and are justified by the atoning blood of Christ: for justice demands their justification; *“and who can lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? For it is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died.”* (Romans 8:33-34). Thus we see that Christ’s dying for the elect clears them from every possible charge so that no one can condemn, for God who cannot look on sin with any degree of allowance justifies them freely from all things not in part only but from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. Thus the atonement completely justified the **whole elect church or kingdom of God which was in Christ**, when the atonement was made, and so when He died for us according to the Scripture and we in Him; He never could have arisen from the dead while one sin stood charged to Him on our account, or against the church in Him but He having (by the atonement) obtained for us the forgiveness (or discharge) of all our sins, He rises again from the dead,

**with His church in Him** as saith the Scriptures, “*Thy dead body shall live, My dead body shall arise after two days will He revive us; in the third He will raise us up and we shall live in His sight.*” (Hosea 6:2). Thus as our justification was completed by Christ; dying for our sins; so our justification is demonstrated by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and so it is said, He died for our sins and rose again for our justification. And so Christ ascends to heaven with all His people in Him, as completely clear of sin, as they were before sin entered the world, so we see that justification is a *consequence of the atonement*, and the atonement could only justify the church, for none others *were united to Him; but they by virtue of **union with Christ***, are justified, as truly justified by His fulfilling the law as Adam’s family or posterity by virtue of union with him became condemned by his transgression of the law. Thus we see the sum of what we have said on this subject, stated by the apostle as follows, “*Whom He did foreknow them He did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first born among many brethren; and whom He did predestinate, them He also called, and whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified them He also glorified;*” (Romans 8:29) All is done, all is in the past tense; justified and glorified, as well as predestinated, and this can only be true of **us in Christ**, and in Him it is true; for in Him we have our predestination, calling, justification, and glorification, all in Him and not in ourselves; nor shall we ever be justified in ourselves, if we had the faith of all the apostles and prophets, for

faith can do no more in our justification, than **in our union with Christ**, that it can only evidence the truth of that which was a truth before it did evidence it. So faith never could have apprehended our justification, or have brought us one evidence of it, had our justification not been a truth before, for faith to apprehend and bear evidence too; thus we have seen that **union between Christ and His church**; clothed Him with the right of redemption, and that by the atonement all the subjects of the kingdom of God are justified from all things. And now we shall close this discourse, by showing where justification places the church.

### **Conclusion:**

First, - It places her clear from the curse of the law; therefore she cannot be condemned with the world. Secondly, - it puts away all her sins and therefore she cannot die eternally, for she is justified unto life. Thirdly, - it places her in a situation that regeneration will be a blessing to her and within the bounds of the Spirit's regenerating work, or in the field of His labor, for the Spirit of God does not go to work outside of His kingdom; it does not give the blessings of God's kingdom to the subjects of another kingdom, nor are the subjects of God's kingdom prepared to receive regeneration, until they are justified; for it would be a curse to them instead of a blessing, for then they would be born of the Spirit and yet under the law, and under the curse, and they would be Spiritual and the

atonement could not effect them, that is, they would be born of the Spirit and so would be spirit; and the atonement could do them no more good than it could do the fallen angels; but this is sufficiently guarded against, and I think this is clearly taught where the flaming sword was placed, to guard the way of the tree of life, lest man should eat of it, while he was under the sentence of death and so live forever, for if the tree of knowledge was a sign of figure of the law, and the tree of life, was a figure or sign of the Gospel, then the eating of the former, made the fruit of the latter dangerous; so while we are under the curse of the law, regeneration which is the fruit of the Spirit of the Gospel, would be also dangerous; and until the flaming sword is quenched in the atoning blood and is stamped with the signature of Almighty God, from end to end, saying I am well pleased for His righteousness sake; we cannot be regenerated by the Spirit; but when we are justified by the blood of Christ, we are prepared to receive regeneration; so I say justification places the church within the bounds of the Spirit's regenerating work, or in the field of its labor. But justification does not fit the church for heaven, or to enjoy God, it only clears her from guilt, because the atonement of Christ has satisfied the demands of the law in her behalf; but it effects no change in her, and therefore she must be regenerated and born again, for as I said before, so say I now, justification is a law term, and that righteousness which justifies must be according to the law, but all the graces of the Spirit, belong to the ministration of the Gospel, and cannot come under the

curse of the law, therefore, they must follow after justification, that is, they can come to those and to those only, who are free from the curse of the law; thus justification places the church in readiness for regeneration and faith, with all the graces of the Spirit, and it (the Spirit) bestows its blessings on all those, that are thus prepared to receive them.

And now reader has it bestowed them on you? Perhaps you are disputing with this doctrine, because it saps the foundation of vain glorious boasting, and human pride, defeats self-righteousness and exalts the Saviour, but pause for a moment, and ask yourself, am I a subject of the Spirit's operation; if I am not, alas for me! I have no sufficient evidence of an interest in the atonement, whether this doctrine be true or not; but if I am a subject of its operation, I have the best evidence of my interest in the atonement, and of my justification by it; and am compelled by infinite goodness, to sing with wonder and joy:

*O to grace how great a debtor,  
Daily I'm constrained to be;  
Let Thy grace, Lord like a fetter,  
Bind my wandering heart to Thee.*

---

## **APPENDIX G**

### **THE TWO ADAMS**

**By: Wilson Thompson, Harrisburg, IA., Sept. 15, 1848.**

[We selected this article because it is so consistent with the views held to by Elders T.P. Dudley, John F. Johnson, Gilbert Beebe, and Samuel Trott, and yet was contradicted in a letter reportedly written by Elder Thompson in later life, which letter this author believes to be very evidently a forged document by either Gregg Thompson or his Means Baptist editor, John Clark, or someone in their camp. This article is the same view as held to by the Predestinarian Old School Baptists (Anti-Means) during that period, and Elder John F. Johnson, in particular. The supposed letter by Thompson took Elder Johnson to task for his preaching the exact same doctrine and consistent views that Thompson presents below. The "Letter," also referred to Johnson's sermon on "Regeneration," as his "non-regeneration" sermon. When the purported "Letter" was written, Elder Johnson had already published his views, in three separate articles, in *The Signs Of The Times*. Elder Thompson knew what Johnson's views were, and this is one of about seven reasons this publisher believes the "letter" was "bogus." The storm of criticism and misrepresentations against Johnson following this, led him to resign from the editorial staff of *The Signs*, and prevented him from writing for a period thereafter.

We have broken the extra-ordinarily lengthy paragraphs into smaller ones for easier reading by modern readers. For this we apologize to any "purists."]

The apostle (I Cor. 15:45,) says, "*The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit.*" These two Adams are distinguished in their orders, first and last; also in their natures, soul and spirit. The order, here observed is doubtless, not in point of existence; but in the order of *manifestation*, in all the tangible and corporal substances of the actual animal man in this mode of being. Although Christ was brought forth, set up, &c., from everlasting; yet in the *visible* creatureship of this world, Adam, the living soul, was first; and many generations of his offspring had peopled this world before the last Adam, the quickening Spirit, literally appeared in this mode of being. It is in this sense the order of *first* and *last* are to be viewed. When God created the first man Adam, in this order he was formed or framed, in all his corporal parts, of the dust of the ground, and by direct application of air, by the agency of the Almighty, this formed man became "a living soul" (see Genesis 2:7). "*So God created man in*

*His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.*” This universal dominion over all created things, in this order, was given to Adam, the living soul, and this Adam was both male and female, with the blessings of God on them, and *the seed* in them, and the legal authority, or command of God, to be fruitful, &c. All this was in the one person of Adam, the living soul.

In this one man was the male and female, and the *seed of all the human family*; not virtually, or in purpose, as some have said; but *really* and *actually*; for the man was a living soul, and the *seed*, to be fruitful and multiply, was as actually created in this first man, as was his flesh or his bones. Here then, in the one man did God create all men, male and female, to dwell upon all the earth, and “*He hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation*” (see Acts 17:25-26; and Malachi 2:10).

After all were created in one man, all men blessed in one man, and dominion over all things in this order, was given to this one man, all other living things were named by him; the law of his Creator was given to him, and he was placed in the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to control, subdue, and replenish the earth. Thus all nations of men, male and female, were *actually* created in one man, and the earth, sea, and air, with all

their hosts were put under his authority, or made subject to him (see Psalm 8:3-8). This man in all this authority, with all men, male and female, actually created in him, was the “first man” Adam; and he was made a living soul. To him, as such, the law was given, and this law was binding on all the men, male and female, and seed, all in one man Adam.

After all this, the female was so separated as to take a distinct form, in person, but *not in essence*; she was still “*bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh*,” as really so as when she existed a rib in his side. Therefore Adam said, “*She shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man*” (Genesis 2:22-24.) This union was not only now perfect as before, but was to continue indissoluble forever; and for this cause, the indissoluble oneness, shall “*a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh*.” This test of true affection, and God’s imperatives, and man’s acknowledged obligation to *cleave to his wife*, were soon tried by a severe ordeal; for the woman, being deceived by the serpent, was in a great transgression; but Adam, the man was not deceived, yet he *cleaved to his wife*, and thus complied with the above “*shalls*,” and left all, and followed her. These “*shalls*” showed his obligation; the unity justified the “*shalls*,” and his willingly partaking at her hand, showed the strength of his love, as he was not deceived. By this one act of this one man, in cleaving to his wife, sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death has passed upon all men (upon the whole *seed* created in him,) for that all had sinned. And so

judgment unto condemnation came upon all men – the male, the female, and the seed were all involved.

This man being set over all created things in this order, the earth and all that God had formed out of it, was cursed for man's sake. Many strange speculations have been indulged in, as to what the first man was in his nature; some contend that he was spiritual, and that, in his fall, he died a spiritual death. But this we know was not the case; for the apostle says, in positive terms that he was not spiritual, but *natural* (I Cor. 15:45-48). This text speaks of Adam, as he was made, a living soul. He was truly a very good natural man, placed in a very good natural place; and invested with authority to rule over a very good natural world; and to him was given, by his Creator, a very good law, with liberty and proper prohibition, touching good natural things. Man, in this state, was possessed of a capacity for endless duration; but was subject, or liable to vanity; but he had no immortality, or death could never have passed on Him. God only "*hath immortality dwelling in the light;*" and Christ, in His resurrection from the dead, first brought it to light; or made a manifestation of it through the Gospel.

Man had a soul, a mind and rational faculties, and a strength of natural affections. God only required of him the proper exercise of the power that he possessed, either in the law respecting the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, or in the larger edition of it, as given to Moses; to love the Lord God with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might (Deuteronomy 6:5 and Matthew 22:36-39). This was required of man, and this

was no more than every natural man has; for he has a heart, a soul, a mind, and a might, and God required the exercise of no other heart, soul, mind, or might, but that which he had. Man by sin is now already condemned to death, and his heart, soul, mind and strength, have become alienated from the life of God; the mind has become carnal, and is "*enmity against God, it is not subject to the law of God; neither indeed can be.*" (Romans 8:7). This relation between God as a Creator, and man as a creature, is that upon which is founded all natural theories of religion. The natural powers, natural senses, natural exercises, and means to operate through, and upon the natural organs, and natural susceptibilities; God, as our Creator, is claimed, as the Father of all, and His pity and sympathy for His poor frail children, is argued by every teacher of natural religion. The apostle, so far from preaching salvation on this relation, shows universal condemnation, and that there is no possible salvation by any mediation in this relation; not a victim, not a priest, not a brother or a kinsman, or an intercessor possessed either the worth, the innocence, or the right to redeem either himself or his fellow. In the absence, then, of another relation, and another order of things, salvation is utterly impossible for any of the human race.

Adam, the living soul, by creation, in the order of creatureship, was the son of God (see Luke 3:38, Genesis 1:26). As the whole seed, male and female, was in one man, the sonship embraced them all, so in the order of creation, we are all the sons of God; but while

our accountability, natural obligations, guilt and condemnation, results from this relation and man's unreasonable rebellion in it, we must look elsewhere for salvation. In illustration of another relation in which alone salvation is revealed, the apostle shows us that Adam, the living soul, "*was a figure of Him that was to come*; even of Him as the last Adam, "*a quickening Spirit*" (Romans 5:14).

**We will now consider the force of this figure:**

First, Adam, was by natural creation, the son of God; Christ, by a spiritual creation, is the beginning of the creation of God, and His Son; the First Born of every creature, in the spiritual order (Rev. 3:14; Col. 1:15).

Second, Adam was made a living soul, possessing all the natural parts and mental faculties of a very good natural man; Christ possessed all the spiritual parts and powers of a quickening Spirit (see Colossians 1:18 and Ephesians 2:1). Adam was the first man of all natural men; Christ was the first of all spiritual men. Adam with all natural men created in him, as a seed, was blessed of God with all natural blessings, in earthly places; Christ **with all the spiritual family actually created in Him, as a seed, was blessed of God, with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places** (see Ephesians 1:3-4) and 2:10). **This seed shall serve Him, and He shall see it and be satisfied.** Adam's seed though actually in him was dormant except by his actions; Christ's seed which was actually **in Him**, was

also dormant except by His action. Adam received the blessings and the law of God in reference to all natural things before Eve, or any of his race were separated from his person. Christ received all spiritual blessings and the law of the Lord, before the church or any of His spiritual seed were separated from the unity of His Person. When every blessing and every natural faculty, with every prerogative to govern the natural world, and every right and every prohibition was given to Adam, his wife was in him, as an actual part of him, and she was as perfectly bound, and as responsible as he. So also was the wife or church in Christ, when every spiritual blessing, promise, gift, divine faculty, prerogative to govern all things in the spiritual world; and when every right and prohibition was given, she, as a part of Him, was as perfectly bound and responsible as He. Adam was bound to leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, after she had taken her distinct personal mode of existence, although she was still *bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh*, and they were still **one flesh**. Christ was bound to leave Father and mother and cleave to the church, after she had taken her distinct personal mode of existence, though she was still in the Spirit, identified as His body, His flesh, and His bones. (Ephesians 5:29-32 and I Cor. 12:27). Adam's wife was deceived and was in the transgression, and Adam was involved by her act, and bound to leave his father, God, and his honorable station, with his mother earth, and cleave to his wife, and this he did of choice, for the union could not be dissolved. Christ's wife the church, was also deceived, and in the

transgression, and Christ, the last Adam was involved by her act, and legally bound to lay aside His glory which He had with the Father before the world was, and cleave to His wife the church. This, justice required, and the unity legally bound Him to do, and He willingly, through His love to her, not being deceived, did. Cleaving to her, He came forward to suffer the curse, and bear her sins. The seed which was created in Adam was afterwards developed by natural generation in a multiplication of distinct forms, or persons; but still was and ever must be the very same seed that was first created in him. The spiritual seed created in Christ Jesus, unto good works, was afterwards by spiritual regeneration, born again, by an incorruptible seed, the Word of God, (Christ) developed in multiplication of distinct forms or persons, but still is, and forever must remain, no more, nor less than the seed which was first created and chosen in Christ.

Much more might be said on this figure; but this must suffice. In the natural Adam, the living soul, and in all the relations in this order there is nothing spiritual. Natural powers, natural susceptibilities, and natural obligations, all of which are properly required to be in subjection to God, our Creator, as our reasonable service, and this obligation grows out of our relation, as the creatures of His creation; but in this relation we have all become sinners, and under the reigning power of death, without one ray of hope for salvation to cheer the gloom that shrouds us in the darkness of eternal night. All the religion and religious schemes that are based on this relationship, with all the means, money,

tracts, Bibles, preachers, works, and schools, with every other engine and power, mental and physical, that ever was, or ever can be brought to bear upon any of our natural organs, senses, powers, or sympathies; nor all the zeal, logic, and pathos of others in our behalf, can ever produce one vital spark, or spiritual motion. Just as sure as it is that nature cannot produce an effect above itself, so sure it is that all the compunction of soul, penance, repentance, reformation, fear, sorrow, hope, joy, zeal or obedience that can rise from this relation, or that can be produced from any of the resources of it, upon any of our natural faculties, can never result in anything more than **natural religion**; and all belong to the first man Adam, which was **not** spiritual, but natural. It therefore remains an irrefragable truth that we must be born again, or we cannot see the kingdom of God.

We must be born of an **incorruptible seed**; “*not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,*” (John 1:12-13) before we can see, or have one spiritual sensation or emotion. The children of God in Christ, from of old, in their spiritual relation are wholly of a right seed; but when **put forth in Adam** they became “*partakers of flesh and blood;*” and here they stood in both the spiritual and natural relations. In the spiritual relation they **are one with Christ**, and in the natural, they are **one with Adam**. Christ, to whom all these children of God had been given, seeing them now in the flesh and blood, lost and legally condemned, willingly “*took part of the same flesh and blood; and with the whole seed of Abraham upon*

**Him**, was made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law. Here then was a full flesh and blood relationship, legally tangible and capable of suffering the legal penalty, and of obeying the precepts of the law. Sin was a transgression of the law; the penalty was legal; Christ was made under the law, to legally fulfill it by a legal righteousness for our legal justification.

This was the righteousness for our legal justification. This was the righteousness wrought out by Christ and as to His spiritual, personal righteousness, which was **always theirs as they were one with Him**. He was “brought forth,” “set up,” “ordained,” and “appointed heir of all things,” and “*given to be the Head over all things to the church, which is His body*,” was in the fullness of time manifest in the flesh, for us, in a nature capable of obeying and suffering legally all that the law could demand. He bare our sins in His own body on the tree, and put them away by the sacrifice of Himself; and through death destroyed death, and him that had the power of death. Therefore He could not be holden of death; but rising again has brought life and immortality **to light**, (not the old natural life of Adam, but immortal life.) The suffering body now becomes a glorious, spiritual, and immortal body; and here the resurrection of the bodies of all the saints, to a glorious, spiritual and immortal state is clearly and fully established.

This long letter contains only a hint of the two Adams, and their respective families. Our evidences that we are of the natural Adam are, that we are born of

flesh, and feel the effects and fruits of that relationship; so our evidences that we have a standing in the Spiritual Adam – Christ, are that we are born of the Spirit, are led of the Spirit; that we bear the fruits of the Spirit, and that we worship God in the Spirit, rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh, or in any fleshly or natural system of religion. May these fruits of the Spirit be in us all and abound.

Yours, in the best of bonds,  
Wilson Thompson  
Harrisburg, IA., September 15, 1848.

## **APPENDIX: H**

### **CORRUPTED MAN AND THE HEAVENLY FAMILY**

By Thomas P. Dudley, 1861.

#### **CIRCULAR LETTER**

of the Licking Association of Particular Baptists of Kentucky, now in session with the Church at Bryant's, Fayette County, Kentucky, to the Churches of which she is composed, sendeth Christian salutations.

Very Dear Brethren and Sisters in the Lord:- In accordance with our former custom, you will, as we suppose, expect a circular from us; and feeling a willingness on our part not to disappoint you, we have concluded to send you the following epistle; resting assured, that you have heretofore been well and ably instructed, and much edified in your former circulars

from us to you, written from time to time by brethren well qualified to teach and to write, explain and bring to view the great principles of salvation by grace, so that it seems to us we cannot present you with any other Scriptural light than that you have already had offered, and recommend you the example of the noble Bereans,- Acts 17:11. And finding you have, a "*Thus saith the Lord*" to sustain your position, "*contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints.*"- Jude 3. "*And this I say lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.*"- Col. 2:4. For there are some who hold men's persons in admiration and are led off into error; from such turn away, even if he were above the capacity of men, "*or an angel from heaven.*"- Galatians 1:8.

And now, dear brethren and sisters, if there has been anything doctrinally heretofore presented to you in any circular from us, and not sustained by the Word of God, we erred in writing and sending it to you; and if you were aware, on examination, that we had done so, then you have erred too, in receiving it, and have done wrong in not pointing out to us that error.

But upon a Scriptural review of the subject matter of our former circulars, we have found no "*Thus saith the Lord*" to condemn us, and we have had no Scriptural exceptions from you; hence, we are led to the conclusion, that you have received it as Bible Truth, in the love of it, not because we wrote and sent it to you, but because our Lord authorized us so to write. It has at all times been our aim "*to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,*" and so now we write that man in the fall, was and is dead in trespasses and

in sins; and in his best estate was only a good natural being, and so says the Bible.- Genesis 1:31; 1 Cor. 15: 46-47.

Now, notwithstanding the many exceptions that are taken and have been taken by those who are called the worshipers of God and profess to be conformed to His divine image, they read His reveal will, and say they take it as their guide, yet by their practice, they stand opposed to it, which certainly does say if language means anything, that they are not “reconciled to God.”- 2 Cor. 5: 20. And this being their true condition, “*The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they (spiritual things) are spiritually discerned.*”- 1 Cor. 2:14. And when they thus express their unreconciliation, we do them the justice to say, we believe them to be honest, but at the same time, we think them honestly mistaken. How can it be consistently otherwise, we ask? Because they are carnal, and “*to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God neither indeed can be.*”- Romans 8:6-7. And again, they are of the world, and the world loves its own; and as such, they are taught the wisdom of the world and hence, they are often heard to boast of their position; often quoting the traditions and words of the wise of this world; in order to sustain them in their position. But this does not help them any, as long as it is written, “*For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the*

*foolishness of preaching to save them that believe*”- 1 Cor. 1:21. And hence, we see it written “Cursed is the ground for thy sake;” “For out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.”- Genesis 3:17,19). So we see the ground is cursed in consequence of sinful and unreconciled rebellious man.

And so the Scriptures inform us that this is the corrupted source from which corrupted man has sprung and continues to spring. “*Shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me.*” -Psalm 51: 5. “*The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the feet even to the head there is no soundness in it.*”- Isaiah 1: 5, 6. Thus we see is brought to view, man’s outward pollution.

Now let us turn and see his inward pollution. “*Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes*” (Romans 3: 13-18). If this is not pollution outwardly and inwardly, then we confess we know not what language can express it. And now the question is asked, “*Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one*” (Job 14:4). And again it is asked, “*Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil.*” Here we think is a lifetime work proposed for poor sinful and depraved man, which he never performed and never will. We might introduce many other

witnesses from the Word of God if we deemed it necessary, to prove the sinner's entire depravity and **inability** to restore himself in whole, or in part; but are admonished that "*In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established*"- (I Cor 13:1). And again, "*they have Moses and the prophets; and if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced though one rise from the dead.*" And here we leave the sinner "dead in trespasses and sins,"- (Ephesians 2:1), to be quickened by the God of all grace, and say, if it is the will of God,

"Prepare them, gracious God,  
To stand before Thy face;  
Thy Spirit must the work perform,  
For it is all of grace."

and hasten briefly to bring to view "***The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.***" – Ephesians 3:14,15. "*Who hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" "*In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*" "*In whom their Life is hid with Christ in God; and when He, Christ our Life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory.*" In union with Him as children to a father; hence He teaches them to say, "*Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name,*" &c.- (Matthew 6:9). In union with Him as the *branch* with the Vine; "*I am the vine: ye are the branches.*"- (John

15:5). He hath a title to them, "*For the Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance.*"- (Deuteronomy 32:9). Again, "*The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before the works of old.*"- (Proverb 8:22). They are His children, beloved sons; hence it is said, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God."- (1 John 3:2). As such, they are "Heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."- (Romans 8:17). Heirs to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled; heirs kept for the inheritance by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, seeing that we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, all testifying for you, with such a glorious Captain, the Captain of your salvation, you have nothing to fear; victory is yours as certain as your Savior lives and reigns. You shall and will be brought off as conquerors, and more than conquerors, through Him that loves you and has given Himself for you, and although in the last conflict

"This flesh and heart shall fail,  
And mortal life shall cease,  
You shall possess within the veil,  
A life of joy and peace."

And although the Old Man is a son of the bond woman, and is not born to this inheritance as the New Man, yet your King, the King of Zion, who reigns in righteousness, has passed the decree that the Old Man of His children shall be adopted into the heavenly

family, but shall appear there in the likeness of God the Savior, and through reigning triumphant grace gain the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Then the children of the kingdom will hear the welcome plaudit: *“Enter ye, ye blessed of My Father, into the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.”* Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

And now, dear brethren and sisters, although iniquity abounds, and the love of many is waxing cold, and the world appears to be ripening for its destruction, and although in the midst of the crush of worlds and the work of wreck of matter and universal destruction, yet the Church of God is secure in Christ, the Ark of their eternal safety, and shall live and reign with Him over death and final destruction. And now, in conclusion, we bid you farewell.

Done by order of the Licking Association.

Thomas P. Dudley, *Moderator.*

Attest. A. F. Dudley, *Clerk.*

## **APPENDIX I**

### **UNITY OF CHRISTIANS AND CHRIST AND THE CHURCH**

By Elder John Gano, 1796.

Circular Letter of The Elkhorn Association 1796

[Editor's note: We apologize for the numerous **bond** lettering within this article, but have done this because Elder William Conrad, at Williamstown, Ky., in his splitting the Licking Association, that this

doctrine was entirely new, and that John Gano did not believe it. John Gano was the first Moderator of the Elkhorn United Baptist Association, which association adopted Fullerism, causing Ambrose Dudley, Thomas P. Dudley's father, and a large number of churches to withdraw from the Elkhorn and form the Licking Particular Baptist Association. That false accusation is today on the Internet, and we feel it should be corrected.]

Dearly Beloved:

We shall at this time address you on the important and interesting subject of **“Unity”** – as we were a united body of professed Christians, and having set up and continued our associating thus together, for the very purpose of maintaining and increasing our spiritual communion and unity; Also, that there was no subject, more God and Christ like, which administered more consolation to the godly, and conviction to sinners, or encouragement to seeking souls, than to observe all the people of God walk together in unity, and is in fact the foundation of all Christian communion. On the other hand, the *Enemy* of all righteousness, and his *Emissaries*, were and are by unwearied attempts, endeavoring to destroy Christian unity. All the miseries that ever befell our world were by the Devil tempting our first parents to break union with God. And there never was a child truly happy since, until brought to see, and acknowledge their fault, and acquiesce in God's medium of *union*. The original bond of **union** is the free, unbounded, self-moving love of God. Hence all the people of God were predestinated and elected in, and **united to Christ before the world began**. And it is from this *union* flows God's sovereign, free, and unparalleled love. Their predestination, unto the adoption of children here, and glory hereafter, is

entirely owing to God's love, uniting in such an indissoluble *union*, **between Christ and His spouse, the church**; that every individual member **shared** in His electing love. **Head and body** were united in the counsel, and covenant of His grace. That He stood in their stead; and they justified in His righteousness. This answers to Christ's prayer: (John 17:21 and onward.) They are one with Him; united in the same covenant, He as the **Head, and they as the Body**. And this lays also the foundation for their **conjugal union**. **They are married to Christ**. They are one in a law sense. Their great debt becomes Christ's. And they are interested in His great Estate; and He made of God to them, "*Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Eternal Redemption.*" As they are Christ's, He makes them a willing people, in the day of His power, (Psalm 110:5) effectually calls them by His Spirit and grace, and makes them acquainted with themselves, as sinners; both in heart and life, and that in them is no good thing, and consequently helpless without the mere grace of God; hopeless, and justly deserving His wrath; that if ever grace is extended, it must be sovereign, and free in God. He also acquaints them of Himself, as a pure and holy God, and with His holy law, as extending to the thoughts of their hearts. The Spirit also calls them to a view of this glorious Christ, as the only begotten of the Father; full of grace and truth – and to that blessed *union* in God, in our nature, and standing in our law place.

Light, Life, Repentance for sin, and joy in the Holy Ghost, are wrought in the regenerated man. Thus

having communion with the Father, in and through the Son of God, effected by the Holy Spirit. They also have and seek to obtain fellowship and communion with the saints on Gospel principles, conforming to the laws and ordinances they profess Christ, join the church relation, united in Christian love one to another. Their motives are one: In their love to God, His ways, and people, their end is one: God's glory in the world, Christ's honor, and the advancement of His kingdom; the subjection of sinners to Christ and His laws by the Spirit; a stop to vice, intemperance, and vanity of every kind, and good will to man. In these things they are one in spirit and communion; as all believe in, and walk by the same rule: God's revealed will. Thus the members of the first Christian church were of one heart, and one way, joined and united in one spirit of love and zeal. They commune with God in prayer, bring all their wants before Him, tell Him all their complaints, confess all their sins, crave pardon, direction, and protection. He communes with them by His Word and Spirit, opens up His Truth, reveals Christ in His promises, doctrines and ordinances of the Gospel. They have communion with the Son, the Savior; He communicates out of His own fullness, of that grace that was treasured in Him, for them; and they with Him by receiving from, and exercising all that grace received on, or in Him; following His leadings, treading in His steps, He exercises His offices in them, they subject to and approve Him in His offices. There is a reciprocity between them, in His relations and benefits; they have communion with the Holy Ghost; He bestows His gifts

and graces in them; they exercise them under His divine influence. What we have said, shows that saints are so closely united to each other in God's love, in Christ as His body and members, and of one another, that there must in course, be one common love, faith, and practice, between the members themselves.

Their views, motives, aims, and ends, are the same, and consequently must be common with each other. In all these respects it ought to be looked for, to see that the greatest affection, sympathy, harmony, and tenderness should prevail in them, toward each other, both in spiritual and temporal things, prosperity and adversity. These thoughts exclude temporal distinctions of great and small, rich and poor, wise or weak Christians; but lay a foundation for the purest communion. In discipline, the same watchfulness and care, over and for each other' without hypocrisy or partiality; having the same mind of Christ in them, they see not their own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's. It is not improbable, but that for the want of more of this temper; realizing these things, and acting consistent with them, that the cloud has gathered so thick over our churches; and such doleful complaints meet us, from most of our churches' letters – of want of life and zeal – barrenness in the cause of Christ among us. And as it is the end of our meeting this season together, to study the things that make for peace, and that whereby we may edify each other, and that God may get glory in His churches through Jesus Christ; we recommend to ourselves and to you, to contemplate much, and to endeavor to realize that astonishing love

of God throughout the whole economy of our salvation in Jesus Christ; and in an especial manner, **that near union in which we stand in God's love in Christ, and to each other**, and the obligation it lays us under, to study peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. O what gratitude should we feel to God the Father, Son and Spirit. What nearness towards each other. What mutual obligations it lays us under, to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.

These thoughts would prompt to a holy and reverend confidence in God, a weanedness from the world, and an engagedness in the cause of Christ; a devotedness to the service of the church, and a steady and constant attendance on its public and private meetings; to prize communion in it, to be faithful to its discipline, sympathizing with the weakness of its members; but abhorrent to their sins, contending for the faith in the doctrine, ordinances, and discipline administered in it; and with that with such a Gospel temper, as would be most likely to serve its real interest, and make it shine as the light, and terrible as an army of banners. Were all our hearts and lives governed by the powerful influence of such principles, so well calculated to inspire, they would make us uniform professors of Christ, in private and in public; at home and abroad we should be useful and comfortable members of society; whether in church or state – cut off occasion from those that seek occasion – stop the mouth of gainsayers; our Holy lives and godly conversations, would soon remove the cause of those

complaints our letters are fraught with – might have the most happy tendency to expose hypocrisy and error – and put even infidelity to the blush – strike conviction to all around, of the reality and advantages of religion in our families and our neighborhood – the church and world would be advantaged by us – we should have the approbation of God, of Christ, and of our own consciences. We should live to advantage, die in peace, and, although regretted, and the loss of us lamented, yet the memory of us would be blessed, and an abundant entrance admitted into the church triumphant above, and Christ’s plaudit before all worlds: “Well done thou good and faithful servant.”

**finis**

**APPENDIX: J**  
**ETERNAL VITAL UNION OF**  
**CHRIST AND THE CHURCH**

By  
Thomas P. Dudley, 1847

The Father of Lights, in whom there is neither variableness or shadow of turning, in His kind and unerring Providence, has permitted us to meet in our associate [*Licking Association of Particular Baptists of Kentucky*] capacity, and to hear from you through the medium of your letters and messengers, and to avail ourselves of the opportunity of addressing you briefly on the three following propositions, *viz:* **First**, That

Christ and His Church are one. **Secondly:** That their oneness is vital and spiritual. **Thirdly:** That it is eternal.

That they are one, is proven by the testimony of Paul, (1 Corinthians 12:12). "*For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.*" Here the *oneness is so complete* that the body or church is called "Christ." "*So also is Christ:*" that is, Christ the Head, and the Church, His body, are one. (Verse 27). "*Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.*"

That this union is "*vital,*" or "*living,*" we think is clearly proved by the fact that the Spirit of Christ, which testified through the Holy Scriptures, in setting this doctrine forth, has used the strongest figures known, *viz:* **Head, Husband, Vine, Shepherd,** &c. But the limits of a Circular will not permit us to particularly notice more than one of these at present. We therefore pass to Romans 5:14, "*Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the **figure of Him** that was to come.*" Now, we ask: Was not the reign of death considered by the Apostle as a *consequence* of vital oneness with the *first* Adam? And if he was not a "figure of Christ" in relation to this oneness, why did Paul allude to that subject? In the figure, as a unit, we behold the *substance of all the seed* **in** Adam. Now how came it there? Not by being born of the flesh; not by being quickened; but by the **creative act of God.** Genesis 1:26, "*So God created man in His*

*own image; in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them.*” This vital (living) relationship to the first Adam preceded and is the foundation of every ordinary birth into the natural world. But how shall we apply this? Shall we say that all the seed of Christ are one with Him by virtue of the creative act of God? Will not some one charge us with teaching that the blessed Redeemer is a “created being?” Paul said in Ephesians 2:10, “*For we are His workmanship, **created in** Christ Jesus, unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.*” And, in Ephesians 1:4, “*According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love.*” And now we are saved and called, “*according to His own purpose and grace **which was given us in Christ Jesus** before the world began.*” (II Timothy 1:9). And in view of our becoming partakers of flesh and blood, God, that cannot lie, promised us, in Christ, eternal **life**, before the world began. (Titus 1:2). All of which leads us to the conclusion that it is our creation ***in*** Christ that gives us literal oneness with Him, *as His seed*, and hence we are “born again,” “born from above,” “born of an incorruptible seed” – “born of God.” But, in order that you may more fully understand us, we will premise that the nature in which the Church stands, and has stood from the foundation of the world related to Christ, is not His Godhead; but His manhood, in which, according to Proverb 8: 22,23, “*The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the*

*beginning, or ever the earth was.” He was constituted Mediatorial “Head over all things to the Church which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.” “Who is the image of the invisible God; the first-born of every creature: for by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether that be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers, all things were created by Him, and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist; and He is the Head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things He might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father, that in Him should all fullness dwell.” That is, as we believe, in the “Man” Christ Jesus. As to His Godhead, He was never brought forth, never set up, never *made* Head over all things, - never was the first-born of every creature, but is uncreated, underived, unbegotten Deity. “For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man; the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” (1 Timothy 2:5).*

Now a Mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one. Just as ancient then as is the date of Christ’s Mediatorial Headship, is His manhood. But you are not to suppose that what the Scriptures denominate *The Man Christ Jesus*, or He who is the Mediator between God and man, existed in flesh, blood and bones, before the world began, (as has been charged against us.) Nor yet, that His incarnation constituted Him as the Mediator. “And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul. The last Adam was made a

quickenings Spirit. Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but natural, afterwards that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.” (I Corinthians 15: 45-47). The first man Adam was first only in development. And no man has ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. – (John 3:13). God dwells in this Man, and He is God. (John 14:10,11)- “Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of Myself, but the Father that dwelleth in Me He doeth the works. Believe Me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the very work’s sake.” In view of the foregoing are we not justified in believing that the oneness of the first Adam *with his seed* was figurative of Christ and *all His spiritual seed*? But again, Adam is not only a figure as a unit, but after the development of His Bride, He recognizes her union with Him. Genesis 2: 23-24 – “And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh.” Compare this with Ephesians 5: 23-32. “For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is Head of the Church, and he is the savior of the body – for we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery; but I speak concerning Christ and the Church.” Here is an

**indissoluble bond**, a vital (living) relationship which is as old as the constitution of man. We regard our mother Eve as representing figuratively the same that the Apostle represents Sarah, the wife of Abraham, *viz.:* “*Jerusalem which is above and is free, which is the mother of us all.*” Thus God is, through Christ the Everlasting Father of His people, while Jerusalem, which is above, and is free, is their mother. But, according to the decree of predestination, these children were regarded as partaking of flesh and blood. Hence the two-fold character of the Church. The one *earthy*, the other *heavenly*; in her earthy relation she was liable to, and did become corrupt, but she did not thereby sever the bond which united her to Christ. “*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.*” – Hebrews 2:14. Here we are taught that the flesh and blood relation that the Savior assumed in His incarnation was not to make them children, but because they were children. If what we have said in reference to the spiritual vital (living) nature of the oneness, be true, it follows of course, that it is **eternal**. We see already that it has led to the incarnation of the Son of God. He is now, in all things made like unto His brethren, and in an attitude to meet the claims of the law and justice. The Father looks justly to Him as the Head, Husband, Shepherd and Surety. The iniquities of them all are laid on Him, and heaven’s own voice sounds the battle-cry, “*Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, against the Man that is My Fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts. Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will*

*turn My hand upon the little ones.” He cries, “It is finished!” and gave up the Ghost. Yes,*

*“He paid whate’er His people owed,  
And cancelled all their debt.”*

He finished transgression, made an end of sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness. Much more might be said upon this subject, dear brethren, but lest we weary you, we will close for the present, in the beautiful language of Psalm 40: 5-8, *“Many, O Lord My God, are Thy wonderful works which Thou hast done, and Thy thoughts which are to us-ward: they cannot be reckoned up in order unto Thee: if I would declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered. Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; Mine ears hast Thou opened: burnt offerings and sin offering hast Thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of Me, I delight to do Thy will, O My God: yea, Thy law is within My heart.”* “By the which will,” said Paul, *“we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.”*

May grace, mercy and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, be with you all, Amen.

**Finis**

**APPENDIX: K**

**ETERNAL VITAL UNION**

By Elder William Smoot, 1890

Taken from the Circular Letter of the 1890 "Virginian Annual Meeting of Anti-Means, Old School, Predestinarian Baptists."

*To All of like precious faith, greetings.*

Dear brethren: We hail with joy the favored opportunity of addressing you in the holy and precious fellowship of saints. Gathered together "*with one accord in one place,*" we would write you of the things of that kingdom "*whose God is the Lord.*" We realize anew the gracious power and sweetness of that which binds us together as one people, knowing no North, South, East or West, but kindred in Christ, and "*companions in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ.*" Though separated from you by many miles, dear brethren, yet there is a nearness, an eternal, vital oneness, and we feel the holy fervor of that sweet fellowship which permeates the whole body of which Christ is the eternal Head, and which glows in living, immortal power in every member thereof.

What subject could we write you of greater interest than that salvation experienced by us all, and by which lost and helpless sinners shine in immortal perfection before the throne of God? For nearly forty years our brethren here have been accused of denying the salvation of sinners, with many other absurd and false accusations circulated against them. We know of nothing calculated to comfort and encourage the saints in their mortal pilgrimage but a revelation of the Truth

as it is in Jesus in the salvation of His people from sin and death.

We must follow the divine order, however, in presenting the subject of Gospel salvation. The eternal, unconditional, and personal election of the church ***in*** Christ, the *chosen seed*, comes first in that order. Before all worlds were made, or time was brought into existence, this eternal choice in Christ, the chosen Head of all the members of His body, was in an eternal oneness. Let it then be distinctly understood that this is **not** the election of *sinners of Adam's race*. This would make the election **in Adam**, and **not in Christ**, which the Scripture plainly teaches (Eph. 1:3-5). Nor is it the existence of a **family of spirits** in full development in all eternity as we are falsely accused of believing. But it is the existence and choice of the church in the chosen Seed thereof, which seed develops the "generation of Jesus Christ." (Matt. 1:1). In that spiritual birth by which this development is made, the personal existence of the child of God in Christ is *manifested*. The birth develops that existence; hence the Redeemer says, "*That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*" That spiritual child was in Christ as the spiritual seed when He "*was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.*" The birth simply develops this personal existence. We see this in Adam "*who is the figure of Him that was to come.*" The natural birth of an earthly child simply develops the personal existence which this child had in Adam when Adam was created; hence the Master says, "*That which is born of the flesh is flesh.*"

The eternal choice is in Christ and not in Adam, and the birth manifests the chosen child whose existence was thus "*hid with Christ in God, the Father,*" before the world was made. Not the natural man born all over again, and he, the natural man, by that birth becoming the child of God, entering into, or seeing the kingdom of God. For it is manifest that if the man born of the Spirit is the man who sees and enters into the kingdom, and if the natural man is born of the Spirit, then he must after such a birth see and enter into that kingdom. This reasoning contradicts the testimony of the apostle where he declares that the "*natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they* (the things of the Spirit of God) *are spiritually discerned.*" - 1st. Cor. 2:14. But the development of this generation of Jesus Christ is in these vessels of mercy, called in the Scriptures the "old man," the "strong man," the "natural man," the "outward man," "the earthen vessel," the "vessel of wrath fitted to destruction:" while the indwelling child of God, and that which is born of God, is called the "new man," the "stronger man," the "spiritual man," the "inward man, and "new creature."

Take notice that this is **not the natural man** born over again, or born *of God*, exhibiting one *natural* man with **two natures**; in one of which nature he is born of the flesh, and in the other nature he is born of the Spirit. But each birth reveals an existence in the parent seed of the flesh, and of the spirit of Adam and of Christ. Nothing, we suppose, is more clearly taught in the Scripture than the existence of these two men, each

the parent seed of his family - the one family natural, the other family spiritual, the one the **figure** of the other. "*The first man Adam,*" we are informed, "*was made a **living soul**; the last Adam was made a **quickenin**g spirit.*" - 1st Cor. 15:45. In the development of the generation of each of these two men, by a birth, we trace the lineage of the child born back to the parent seed. This is what we understand the Master to have said in the language, "*That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.*" This exhibits a natural and a spiritual seed, a natural and a spiritual birth, developing a natural and a spiritual generation.

Notice that this is **not** the regeneration of the natural generation, and this regeneration constituting the generation of *Jesus Christ*, but it is the development of two characters of seed manifesting two orders of birth, and developing a natural and a spiritual generation. "*The book of the generation of Jesus Christ*" (Matt 1:1) unfolds and reveals this heavenly generation in these vessels of mercy, **yet not made out of them**. To this agree the inspired testimony: "*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.*" - Heb. 2:14. The blending of these two generations in one duplex being, in which "*the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh,*" and wherein the old man, after the order of his father, "*is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts,*" and the new man, "*which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.*" - Eph. 4:22-24, reveals the wonderful "*mystery of godliness.*" The

regeneration of this spiritual generation, in their being brought from under the law in the person of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the eternal and chosen Head of the Church, brings us to a brief discussion of the subject of salvation.

We should bear in mind that it is the child *of God*, and not the child *of Adam*, which is the subject of Gospel address; that the *new man* is the motivational power in that duplex being to which we have referred, and not the old man. Instead of its being the same feet that once carried us to the gambling den that now *carries us* to the house of God, thus making the old man carry the new man; it is the old man which is brought *into subjection* by the new, as it is written in type, *the elder shall serve the younger.*"- Genesis 25:23.

But now let us regard the child *of God* as a partaker of flesh and blood, as developed or made manifest in a mortal body, in a vessel of mercy "afore prepared unto glory," in an outward man, a man that is born of the flesh and is flesh. In this relation only is he subject to bondage. And the revelation of this eternal, spiritual life, the manifestation of this inward man, who is born of God, is the eternal and abiding testimony, the everlasting seal of the salvation of the **mortal vessel** which holds this **heavenly treasure**. In this mortal body he groans, longing to be delivered, and hungering and thirsting for the things of the heavenly kingdom. "*We ourselves groan within ourselves.*" This groaning is not the result of the quickening of a dead sinner into spiritual life, but it is the manifestation of that "which is born of God." The quickening is in the spirit and not

in the flesh. "*It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.*" -John 6:63.

The child of God, in his mortal pilgrimage, realizes ever the weakness, the mortal passion, the sin and death of that which is born of the flesh. When he would do good, "*evil is present with him.*" The good that he would he does not, but the evil which "*I would not,*" he says, "*that I do.*" Tempted, distressed, beset on every side, weary of earth and sin, he looks with heavenly longing to the unending rest of his immortal home. 'Tis there that he is delivered from earth, himself, and sin, and filled with the fullness of God. In this mortal body he groans, "*waiting for **the adoption**, to-wit, the **redemption of the body**;*" - Romans 8:23. Waiting for the adoption of that which is born of the flesh, but is not born again, or born of God; waiting for the birth from the dead (as Christ is the first-born of the dead) of that which is thus born of the flesh; waiting for the appearing of our Lord from heaven, "*Who shall change our **vile body**, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious **body**, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself*". - Phil. 3:21. Most assuredly this world is not his home! "*Here he has no abiding continuing city.*" Bound with a mortal chain, and oppressed with many a care, he clings with undying devotion to the Cross of the dear Redeemer as his only refuge. The hope which animates him is the hope of salvation, the abiding testimony of the Spirit, "*the anchor of the soul.*" Amid all the storms that beat upon him this hope abides, "*entering into that within the*

*veil.*" All that he has, is, or hopes to be, rests upon that which is embraced in the Christian's hope.

The hope of the Gospel! What thoughts cluster around it! What affections are there! In the love they bear it, saints have forsaken the friendships of earth, its nearest and most tender ties, its wealth and fame, yea, all, to follow Jesus. Through commotion and division, through flames and flood, they follow where He leads. They know by precious experience that they have not yet attained unto the resurrection of the dead. But when this mortal body falls in death, when the glorious and wondrous change of the resurrection is complete, when that which is **born of the flesh is born from the dead**, and the royal army of Heaven in bright phalanx shall stand, redeemed from every nation and kindred of earth; when, in immortal splendor. "*the saints of all ages shall in harmony meet,*" then, and not until then, shall they comprehend the fullness of that salvation, the "*volume of his deep decrees,*" which embraces every chosen vessel of mercy, every heir of immortal promise, which raises from the dust of earth to the splendor of eternity, adapting the sons of earth, changing their vile bodies, fashioning them like unto the glorious body of our Lord. Can more be done for the natural man? Can there be more perfect salvation for a lost and helpless sinner?

In the hope of this salvation we greet you, dear brethren, believing that we "*are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being*

*the chief corner-stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."* Eph. 2: 19-22.

We have enjoyed a refreshing season, we trust, from the presence of our God. A large and attentive congregation has attended our meetings, and our brethren feel comforted, and are led to rejoice in the testimony of the Lord's unfailing goodness.

Wm. M. Smoot, Moderator; James Possy, Clerk

[Stan says: Just note the importance that is put to the resurrection of **the body**. Gregg Thompson, William Conrad, John Clark, and other Means Baptists, said, as did Elder Lemuel Potter, that we who believe this doctrine do not believe in a resurrection of the body. These men must have, as a certain female candidate for the presidency said she did, -- miss-spoke! The truth is all those I've read behind believed in the bodily resurrection as an absolute necessity. These objectors also said we did not believe that Christ did "anything for the natural man." Again, they must have miss-spoken. The entire process of redemption and satisfaction was for the saints' bodies, in which and by which they had committed sins. The inner, or spiritual man, born of God, **cannot** sin, and hence Christ need not die for it.]

## **APPENDIX: L**

### **REGENERATION AND THE NEW Birth**

By Thomas P. Dudley, 1868

My Dear Brother Beebe:- I have read with deep and abiding interest, and decided approval, your very kind and brotherly reply to both Elder Vanmeter of Illinois, and Elder Wright of Indiana, and feel disposed, with

your permission to subjoin some thoughts on the interesting topics you have discussed in those replies.

The word of God teaches: *“That which is born of THE FLESH is FLESH, and that which is born of the SPIRIT IS SPIRIT.”* I take it for granted that the Savior has fully conveyed the doctrine that everything, whether body, soul, spirit, feelings, affections, susceptibilities, appetites, hungering, thirsting, rejoicing, or mourning, pain or pleasure, that is “born of the flesh, **is flesh.**” Hence the exhortations, “mortify the deeds of the body,” “Crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts,” “I keep *under my body and bring it into subjection.*” “Let not sin therefore reign in YOUR MORTAL BODY, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, but yield yourselves unto God, as those who are ALIVE FROM THE DEAD, and your members as **instruments of righteousness** unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” All the reproofs, admonitions and exhortations, with which the Gospel is so richly stored, and which are addressed to the churches, or to individual members of the body of Christ, are predicated upon the acknowledged fact that she and they are yet “in the body” – that she has not yet reached her “perfect state,” where they would be inappropriate; Where “*the Lord God and the Lamb are the light of the city;*” Where the “candle” will not be necessary to her furtherance in the divine life.

The disciples are here composed of THE “OLD MAN, *which is corrupt, with his deeds,*” and A NEW MAN, “*which is after God, CREATED in righteousness and true holiness*” between whom there exists direct antagonism of life, of nature, of instincts, of hopes, desires, appetites, enjoyments, pleasures and pains, which are ENTIRELY IRRECONCILABLE. “*The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, **neither indeed can be**; so then they that are in the flesh **cannot please** God.*” “*To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.*”

Some contend that the corrupt feelings, affections and lusts ARE THE “old man.” But the apostle seems not to have adopted this view, or why did he say the “old man is corrupt, WITH HIS DEEDS”? Acts pertain to agents; hence he concludes the corrupt actions illustrate the corrupt nature of the agent from whom they proceed. I am unable to perceive what they gain by their assumption. Do they intend to assert that man is born all over again, and that all belonging to him has become spiritual by the new birth? Can it be that the “new man” is not only the subject of holy desires, spiritual enjoyments, and strictly of the Christian walk and conversation, and yet that the same man belongs to the same category with those for whom the law was made? “*The law was not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murders of fathers and murders of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, and if there be any other thing that is contrary*

*to sound doctrine.*” Or do they mean to convey an idea that the disciples of Christ do no wrong? If the latter be their teaching, then Peter did no wrong when he “*denied his Lord, and cursed, and swore he knew not the man.*” Is this what they design to teach? If it is, why, when his Savior looked upon him, did Peter go out and weep bitterly?

Now, if all that a man was, and was possessed of, was born over again, then indeed he could not sin. “*Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, because his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God*” (I John 3:9). The unerring testimony does not contradict itself. There we learn, “*If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*” Let me ask, in all sincerity, Does the word of the Lord anywhere say, “*Except a man’s soul, or any other part of man, be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*”? Why is the soul, in contradistinction to the other parts of the man (soul, spirit and body), selected as that which is said by some to be born again? Paul considered the soul as likely to contract blame as the body, or the spirit; hence he said, “*And I pray God that your whole soul, body and spirit be **preserved blameless** unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*” If the soul be born again, why pray that it be preserved blameless, when the apostle knew full well that it could not contract blame, if indeed it be born again? Allow me to enquire: Did not man sustain that name (Adam) *before the* Lord God breathed into his

nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living *soul*? Did not the man exist, according to the divine testimony, *antecedently* to being born of the flesh? Now of what elements was man originally born? The answer is, “*of the FLESH.*” “*Adam begat a son, in his own likeness, after his own image, and called his name Seth.*” Was there anything born of the flesh that had not a previous seminal existence in the flesh of Adam? If not, the figure is a perfect one. The elements of the sinner are found wholly in the flesh, as emanating from the “*first man, who is of the earth earthy.*” The elements of saints are found wholly in their divine nature, imparted to them by the “*last Adam,*” “*the Lord from heaven,*” “*born of God.*” The *natural* progenitor could impart to his offspring none other than the nature he possessed. “*As is the earth, such also are they that are earthy.*” The heavenly Progenitor could impart none other nature to His offspring than that He possessed. “*And as is the heavenly, such are **they** also that are **heavenly.***” Paul said, “*As He is, even so are we in this world.*” He was here with TWO WHOLE AND DISTINCT NATURES - the human and the divine. His children, “born of God,” are possessed of two whole and DISTINCT NATURES, neither nature contributing anything essentially to the existence of the other. A *part* of the divine nature did not compose “the MAN Christ Jesus,” neither does a *part* of our human or fleshly nature compose any part of the divine nature, of which “we are made partakers.” The paternity of each, the old and the new man, is radically different as holiness and sin. The old man is “born of the flesh, and IS flesh,” the

new man is “born of the Spirit, and IS spirit.” “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have,” said Jesus. I have ever conceived that “the corn of wheat, which falls into the ground and dies;” contained within its germ everything, and nothing more, that will spring up and grow out of it. The idea that the *soul of the natural man*, or any other part of him, is born of the Spirit, in the absence of proof that *that* soul or part existed seminally in the Spirit, is a reversal of the doctrine taught in Genesis, that “every seed will produce his kind.” We do not look for a crop of onions from the potatoes we plant. My flesh, simply considered, without an intelligent principle, is as incapable of sinning as my horse’s flesh. It is true my flesh has life, so has my horse’s flesh have life. It is **mind**, or rational intelligence, which distinguishes beings capable of violating the Law from those incapable of contracting guilt from that source. “*Sin is the transgression of the law.*” “*By the law is the knowledge of sin.*” “*I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*”

The disciples of Christ are “not without law to God, but under law to Christ.” Their comfort is, “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” Yet being under law to their King, what do we hear them exclaim? “I find a law in my members, [are those members devoid of a rational intelligent principle?] warring against the law of my mind, [what mind? Certainly not the carnal mind, but “the mind of Christ,” which they have in the new man,] and bringing

me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? If our carnal mind is “born of God,” worked over, or by any other process made spiritual, how is it that “their mind and conscience is defiled?” If man be “born over again,” by which intelligence assumes altogether a spiritual type, and has cast off the natural, or flesh, whence the complaints of sinful, wicked, vile and presumptuous thoughts, of which Christians so universally complain?

The Bible nowhere teaches that the new birth obliterates or changes the natural birth – that imparting spiritual life destroys the animal life previously had, or that the creating holy desires, imparting appetite for the “bread of life,” or a thirst for the “waters of salvation,” destroys sinful pleasures, proneness to sin, and a thirst for the natural elements which sustain our dying natures, but everywhere teaches the “putting off the old man, which is corrupt according to its deceitful lusts,” practically. “Let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ” – *“putting away lying, let every man speak truth with his neighbor.”* “*Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is good and acceptable and perfect will of God.*” “*This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God, be careful to maintain good works; these things are good and profitable unto men.*” But the NEW MAN is said to be *“born not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and*

*abideth forever.*” Now, I ask, was anything born of that incorruptible seed which was not in the germ thereof? Was the natural seed deposited in Christ? I think brethren will answer each of these questions in the negative. How then can they contend that *some part* of the old man is born of God? [For, I have not met with one who contends that the *entire* Adamic man, was born over again]. The natural intelligence of man is not changed by the birth of the Spirit. He subsequently, as antecedently to the new birth, investigates natural subjects, arrives at natural conclusions from natural facts disclosed, partakes of natural food and drinks, partakes of the pleasures and pains attendant on our mortal state, and is subject to all the ills to which flesh is heir.

We are told that the views we here propagate are too deep and mysterious to be published. I reply, Are they sustained by the record God has given? Is it more inconsistent with the Bible to contend that the “holy seed” had seminal existence in their spiritual Head “from everlasting, or ever the earth was,” than that the natural seed existed seminally in their natural head (Adam) from his very creation? Is the one proposition more unreasonable or anti-Scriptural than the other? Shall we reject either because we cannot fully comprehend it? Let us remember, “*Great is the mystery of godliness; God manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory;*” and “canst thou by searching find out God?” Can you find out the Almighty unto perfection? “*Therefore the world*

*knoweth us not, because it knew Him not.*” Is not the implication irresistible, that if the world had known Him, it would have known His brethren? *“We have known Jesus Christ after the flesh, but now henceforth know we Him no more.”* How was the Son of God manifested on earth? As we have just seen, *“God was manifest in the flesh.”* How are His children manifest to each other in this world? *“They are born of God.”* They *“show the work of the Spirit, written in their hearts.”* They *“deny ungodliness, and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.”* *“The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him; He will show them His covenant.”*

I grant the subject is profoundly mysterious, how two whole and distinct natures dwell in the people “born of God.” Yet it is not more mysterious than how two whole and distinct natures dwelt in their “Elder Brother.” I rejoice to know that there is a great and infallible Expounder of the sacred testimony. *“But God has revealed them now to us by His Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.”* *“He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you.”*

Brother Beebe, I have read my Bible to little profit for the last fifty years, if in the divine economy our God has ordained that a spiritual stock shall grow out of a natural seed or root – that the product shall be essentially different from the seed which produces it, or that beings should spring from the germ of immortality, who had no seminal existence in that germ or immortality.

These views on this important and interesting subject are the result of much reflection and anxiety to have a solution of the mystery within me. After many long months, struggling and toiling to obtain a righteousness in which I could be accepted with God, and finding myself helpless, and almost hopeless of obtaining the divine favor, realizing that “in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not,” and fully assured that:

“The law’s demand I can’t fulfill, For I have nought to pay.”

At a time, unexpected to me, I was led to a discovery of the Lord Jesus as the “end of the law for righteousness unto every one that believeth.” For a short space I “rejoiced with joy unspeakable, and full of glory,” and adopted the language,

“All over glorious is my Lord,  
Must be beloved and yet adored;  
His worth, if all the nations knew,  
Sure the whole earth would love Him too.”

My joy did not continue long, until I found the “Canaanite is yet in the land.” I soon found I still had a wicked heart and wandering mind, which led me to fear I was deceived. I found too, that vain, foolish and wicked thoughts were still bubbling up within me – was tempted to go to church and tell them they were deceived in me; that no Christian had so wicked and rebellious nature as mine. And to add to my distress, I

occasionally heard from the pulpit that “the new birth changed the soul from the love of sin to the love of holiness.” That sentiment seemed like a dagger to my heart. I felt, if that be true, I am not the subject of the Christian religion. But this was not all. I heard it proclaimed from the pulpit, “Regeneration, or the new birth, *slays the enmity of the heart.*” I asked myself, Is the enmity of your heart slain? If so, whence the rebellion you feel at your domestic affliction? I was dumb, concluding the preachers were good men, speaking advisedly, and felt like resigning all hope.

My great distress, however, induced me to go to my Bible, and try to pray to God, that I might understand its teachings. After a severe conflict, which lasted some time I read, “*When I would do good, evil is present with me.*” Who is the speaker? the apostle Paul. Was Paul a Christian? O, yes; but you should not take comfort from this. Paul was not so rebellious, so irreconcilable as you. I read on, when I came to this other expression of the same apostle: “*The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.*” This is Paul’s experience. He is right and the preachers wrong, responded my poor hitherto distressed heart. The more I searched the divine record, the stronger were my convictions that the preachers, who taught the change of heart theory, by the new or spiritual birth – that the enmity of the heart is slain by that gracious work, were in error. I knew if they were right I was wrong. Strong as was my confidence in their piety, and call to the work of the ministry, I was

nevertheless fully convinced they were wrong in this matter. The Bible nowhere, as I read it, taught that the man – the soul, the heart, the mind, the affections, the instincts of the natural man- are changed; but rather that “a new heart and a right spirit;” an entirely new and higher order of life was given, the result of which was new views, new desires, new breathings, new appetites, new employments, new aspirations, of a spiritual, higher and holier character than those belonging to the natural old man; that his elder, or old man, “shall serve the younger,” or new man. Now are the saints desirous to “walk in the spirit,” as a result of that holy implantation, to “keep under the body, and bring it into subjection,” to “mortify the deeds of the body,” to “crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts.” I said, forty years ago, in trying to preach, “The Lord does not make Christians as the hatter sometimes makes hats; namely, take an old hat, work it over, and put a little napping on it, and call it a new hat. That is, God does not take an old sinner, and work him over, and put a little dressing on him, that he may be a new saint!

Brother Beebe, I have not in forty-eight years found any other system of exposition that will, in my judgment, meet my needs. If it be heresy, as charged by some, I pray God to deliver me from the heresy; but if the truth, may God grant that we be enabled to proclaim it, though “our names may be cast out as evil.”

I blame not any for differing with us on this subject, if they can enjoy more peace and happiness in

contemplating a different theory. God forbid we should endeavor to disturb that peace, further than to proclaim, "The Lord saith," and be sure that we teach nothing as truth which our God has not sanctioned in His divine word.

The conclusion is, then, that instead of any part of the Adamic man being "born of the Spirit," "a new man created in righteousness and true holiness," is developed. A spiritual man, "born of the Spirit," possessed of eternal life, with new or spiritual powers, perceptions and susceptibilities, who is expected to bring the old man into subjection, to control him, keep him under, and thus produce a change of *practice*, and thus, as a "branch in the true vine," to "bring forth fruit unto holiness." "Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, so shall ye be My disciples." "Show me your faith without your works, and I will show you my faith by my works." "As the body without the spirit is dead, even so faith without works is dead also."

I have thrown together some of my reflections on the subject, which if you think will subserve the cause of truth, and tend to a further consideration of the doctrine involved, you are at liberty to publish, otherwise throw this communication aside.

As ever, most truly and affectionately your friend and brother in hope of eternal life, Thomas P. Dudley,  
April 20, 1868.

**END OF BOOK I**



**BOOK II**

**THE BAPTIZED CHURCHES OF CHRIST**

*A BOOK ABOUT THE MILITANT CHURCH IN HER  
EARTHLY PILGRIMAGE BELOW*

By

Stanley C. Phillips

**THIRD EDITION ENLARGED**

209

Published by:

The Predestinarian Publisher  
1159 County Road 420  
Quitman, Clarke County, Mississippi 39355

United States of America

2009

**PUBLISHER:**

**The Predestinarian Publisher  
1159 County Road 420  
Quitman, MS 39255**

e-mail: stan420@xfoneusa.net

**The Baptized Churches of Christ**

**Volume II**

By Stanley C. Phillips

210

Published 2009

*Printed in the United States of America*

*a.d. 2008*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	214
Definition Of Terms: . . . . .	220
Historical Origins of “baptized Churches of Christ” . . . . .	226
Origins of “Baptists” . . . . .	232
The Great Awakening . . . . .	237
Commencement of The Modern Great Apostasy . . . . .	243
Practical Aspects of The Churches of Jesus Christ . . . . .	262
Doing All Things in Decency and in Order . . . . .	273
The Government of the Church . . . . .	280
How So Rapid An Apostasy . . . . .	290
Addendum To The Baptized Churches of Christ . . . . .	304
Appendix A: London Confession of 1644 . . . . .	333
Appendix B: Elder Reuben Ross Preached First Arminian Sermon in TN	358
J. M. Pendleton’s Description of Baptists Preaching in Ross’ time	366

Appendix C: The Rising Opposition to Modern Missionary Movement	374
Miami Baptist Association in Ohio, 1814. . . . .	376
Flint River Baptist Association in Tennessee & Alabama, 1814	377
Alexander Campbell’s Circular Letter in Redstone Association.	379
Appendix D: Public ADDRESS by Daniel Parker, 1820 . . . . .	380
Appendix E: Kehukee Baptist Declaration, 1826, . . . . .	410
Appendix F: The Black Rock ADDRESS, 1832 . . . . .	412
PROSPECTUS of the Signs Of The Times, 1832 . . . . .	435
Appendix G: Miss.’ Bethany Association’s REASON AND APPEALS,1844.	436
Appendix H: White River Regular Baptist Circular Letter, 1844 . . . . .	439

## **Chapter One: INTRODUCTION**

After having published BOOK I, “COME HITHER, AND I WILL SHOW YOU THE BRIDE, THE LAMB’S WIFE,” which book has to do with the Church Triumphant in Eternal Vital Union with Christ; we here republish the former title, “The Baptized Churches of Christ,” assigning it as Book II, and it is altered to conform to this reorganization. This volume is on the “Church Militant,” here in time on earth.

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. An Addendum is added to this Volume, and 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 his report of the doctrinal preaching of Baptists before the mission movement began; The **Flint River Baptist Association, 1814-1817** of Tennessee and Alabama’s actions in 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**, on the history of the Modern Missionary Movement; Mississippi’s **Bethany Primitive Baptist Association’s REASONS AND APPEALS, 1844**, on separation from the Mission Movement; *and* other documents of special interest. An Addendum to this Second Edition is added

particularly for our own members and believers in the Little Zion churches. 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. The printed **Address** demonstrates the New School Baptists' Machiavellian dishonesty.

We have rather deliberately selected our heading 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 desirous 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.* 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 Boston," *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 221).

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 joyfully 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 far cry difference between an *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 United 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*"), 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 Mission 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, who denied that Christ had saved His people from their sins, but that He only "put all men into a **savable state** where the influence of the gospel could save them through preaching, printing, and persuasion", that **none stood to oppose them!** Missionaries 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 bless writer and reader to enter into this most important arena of theological thought. We highly recommend that the reader acquire the first and second volumes of "**Editorials**" of Gilbert

Beebe” in “The Signs of the Times”, published by Elder James Poole and the Welsh Tract Publications. These volumes cover the early rise of this anti-christian movement, and takes a decided stand in opposition to all the then innovations being introduced. They may be had from Hoyt Sparks, 486 Choate Dairy Road, Sparta, NC, 28675-9249; and *The Remnant Publication*, P.O. Box 1004, Hawkins, Texas 75765. Credit for the publications of the present seven volumes is given to Elder Jim Poole for the laborious work of he and his wife, Peggy, and Doctor Tomas Jackson, in bringing these materials out into the public domain. I warn the reader, these volumes are not sentimental and humanistic correct issues. They are befitting the seriousness of the rise of this branch of anti-Christ.

## Chapter Two: **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*** and ***with*** 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." [As sprinkling sand on a horse and saying you *buried* it!]

**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.

**Sunagogue-** In New Testament Israel, "an *assemblage of persons*, either the "meeting" or the "place" of the meeting: synagogue.

**Exposunagogue** – 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, and the highest ecclesiastical authority, under God, on earth. No association, class, synod, convention, or peace council is Scripturally

above it; nor is it subject to any other auxiliary or institution 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, and was for all mankind; denied the total inherent depravity and inability of man in salvation, and advocated a conditioned election based 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

at this date (2009), 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 adopted from the Catholic theologian, Thomas Aquinas, in his “*Summa Theologiae*,” and introduced into the Particular Baptists’ churches which view taught 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 pro-offered “*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.

***Original or Old School*** – Those Baptists that did not adopt the *New Divinity Theology* of Andrew Fuller; 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 Southern Regular and Separate Baptists of the Old School pattern of worship. The “Separate” group of Old School dominates the Southern “Primitives,” whereas the “Regular” or “Particular” group dominates the Northern churches.

The appellation “Primitive” is mostly connected to the Southern wing of the Old School Baptists.

**Conditionalists or “Limited” Predestination** – The designation of the greater number of Primitive Baptists and refers to their doctrinal development 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; tend to universalism, or Socianism; and embrace Arminianism in the daily salvation “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.

### CHAPTER THREE: **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*.” 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, 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 is, his salutation is not addressed 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 they necessary in any age of time, other than as a help to identify themselves to others who may not know them intimately, and distinguish them from others with whom they cannot be 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 hand of God in His Providence to “*add to the church daily such as should be saved*” (Acts 2:47). This last position is a cardinal principle of the churches of that fellowship of which this author has a name.

Where, and when, did the first large division take occur in the early church? 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. The last great pagan persecution is referred to as the *Decian Persecution* which 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. The corrupt members appeared to outnumber the experimental believers sufficient to gain the control of the large bishoprics. This brings us to the first great schism in the apostate Church.

The baptized church at Rome had multiple elders, called, *presbyters*. Two of them were Cornelius and Novatius. During the Decian Persecution, Cornelius

apostatized 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*, meaning "Puritans." The bishop of Rome stood with the corrupt party, and Cornelius became 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 the 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.

For centuries prior to Constantine, Rome freely allowed various religions to flourish in Rome. The Senate appointed a governing council over the 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 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. Under this heading we conclude with this single point: All the offspring of the State Religion of Rome have likewise set up state religions and enforced its laws 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

Fredericksburg, Va.) that he would offer it as an amendment to the Federal Constitution upon Congress' first session. He did what he promised.

#### CHAPTER FOUR: **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 260-261. 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* in London, 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. These ministers, churches, and congregations were faced with the problem: “Where do we go to find the ordinance that they found 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. 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, 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 Pembroke, 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 two 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.

## CHAPTER FIVE: **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 a blaze 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 2<sup>ndly</sup>, 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 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. 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.” 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.*”

## Chapter Six: **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? If the Congregationalists could do it, 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 Separates from positions of leadership in the Congregational churches to position of leadership in the Baptist churches provided a stimulus which, although immeasurable, 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 Calvinian 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; and others, were set up by the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. 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 headlong into a mass 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, neither of which were Scriptural, or had 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 410, and Elder Reuben Ross' Introduction of Arminianism, in **1817** at Port Royal, Tennessee, page 328-331). 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 338 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, disorder and decline 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.

## CHAPTER SEVEN: **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 priest-craft 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 expressed 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” (ecclesia) 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” (ecclesia) was even more restrictive than an assemblage of people. Why? Because, the ancient *ekklesia* (ecclesia) of a Greek city-state was their **ruling body**! All Greeks were not citizens. All Greeks in a city-state were not citizens, or members. 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 304-307].

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 grace 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 yet qualified. 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, or resend, 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: The minister 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.*"

Practical information for those in the Lord's congregation may be of encouragement to them. The whole human race is accountable to God for their deportment, and for this reason the law was given. "*Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*" (Romans 5:20), ". . . for then how shall God

*judge the world?” (Romans 3:6). But in a very special way, **all believers** are much more accountable to God for their deportment, for as the Lord taught, “For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be **much required**: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more” (Luke 12:48). Seeing then that God has granted a believer a knowledge of, and love for, the truth of His free grace, and knitted his heart to the fellowship of the saints, it behooves the members of the congregation to walk circumspectly before both the world and the Church. Carelessness on the part of believers in the truth of grace draw as much reflection on the cause of Christ and His Church as does that of baptized believers. Therefore the Church’s congregation is as much expected to do as Paul relates, “But I keep under my body, and bring **it into subjection**: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway” (I Cor. 9:27). If it has been the believer’s blessed portion to love the truth and the fellowship of Christ’s Church, one might expect that having been given to a congregation with a faithful Church, the Lord might possibly be preparing that one for membership in that Church. How ought, then, should his walk and conversation adorn the Gospel he loves? As all believers, both those baptized and those in the congregation, all should “*mortify (kill) the deeds of the body by the Spirit*” (Romans 8:13). The moral standard of all believers is the same, and members of the congregation should give special care to set as high an example of Christian conduct as is possible. This is*

extremely important for those with children, for children learn decent conduct by observation more readily than by lectures. Therefore each believer should continuously set the highest examples of virtue, morality, and conduct; and thereby adorn the doctrine of God our Savior before the world and the true Gospel Church.

## CHAPTER EIGHT: **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 them selves. 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 are 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 commend 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.”

## CHAPTER NINE: **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. (To follow “Robert’s Rules” would in itself be disorder. Because these rules are not drawn from

the unanimous consent of the church as taught in the Scriptures.) 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. A member, thinking he will disagree with the majority, cannot act alone upon what he “thinks.” The church must discuss issues before one makes up his mind on an issue. If the majority cannot persuade him he is wrong, then, and then only, is the issue to be tabled. 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 are 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 are 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**. If the Church does 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! And such association is *Anti-Christ*.] 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 New Testament 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.** What then shall we conclude relative to the evil institutions of “*peace councils*,” as used by Primitive Baptists, or “*Inquisitions*” used by Catholics? They are dangerous innovations. These institutions draw upon the “Jerusalem council,” or “traditions from Constantine the Great as an example; but there are no *Apostles* present in these!

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 hire, 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 *per se*. 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. 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, page 304] 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." They were all in seed-substance in Christ from eternity, and thus "preserved in Christ Jesus," (Jude 1). So, each time one of them dies and goes home 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. That day does not seem far off today, as one examines the very few that can qualify as members of orderly Gospel churches. [Modern lifestyles, fornication, adultery, the drug and alcohol cult, *etc.* all are diminishing the likely prospects for future members in true Gospel churches.] 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. That apostasy is now coming to its climax.

## CHAPTER TEN: **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 eternal vital union of Christ and His church; the total depravity and inability of the Adam 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 committed in their natural bodies, and the consequent imputation of His righteousness for their own; the finished and accomplished salvation by Christ on the cross; and the full adoption of the bodies of the elect at the resurrection of the last day. 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 four-fold hypothesis: (1) The time had then arrived for the fulfillment of the prophecy 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. (3) They had filled their churches with the “*wood, hay and stubble*” of work mongering believers. And, (4) 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” – raising money!]: *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 both 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 we 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 filled their churches with “*wood, hay and stubble*, work mongering members. As long as the church was made up of “*gold, silver and precious stones*,” these members could see through the glaring snares of corrupted flesh, and could never have been deluded by a fleshly, humanistic zeal. But the Great Awakening had filled the churches with “followers” of those actually called of God, and came into the churches in massive numbers; and the great Baptist Separation in 1814 through 1832 was a direct result of this careless mistake. Again, in the Frontier revivals, which appear much more satanic, churches desiring members, gladly received these deluded souls into their churches, and paid the heavy price of division in the 1850’s with the rise of the “Means” Baptists. Again, the desire for numbers and prestige led Elders Chick, Durand, and Dr. Waters to merge the Means Baptists with the Old School predestinarians, in order to build a “National Old School Baptist” denomination, and the resultant division in 1900 to 1930’s produced the two large tyrannical groups known as “Conditional Primitives and Absolutists Primitive.”

Fourthly, “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 had 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 ages 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 errors. 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).

We hope the above epistle is God-honoring, and that both members of the Church and of the congregation can hereby see that real union that exist within God’s present Kingdom here in the earth,; and the relationship and roles the Church and congregation have one to the other.

**ADDENDUM**  
**TO**  
***THE BAPTIZED CHURCHES OF CHRIST***

Upon reading “**The Baptized Churches of Christ**,” we received the following question from a reader: “*I’m curious about your research on the fourth ordinance of the church (feast of charity). I have never known a congregation to observe that one. Are there any congregations, other than yours, that observes the feast of charity?*” Answer:

Yes, Old Baptists all around you partake of the *feast of charity* – they just either (1) do not know it, or, (2) incorrectly refer to it, or, (3) as so many among us, do not defer to it with the *sacredness* with which it should be considered; and/or, (4) they no longer observe it as given by example in the New Testament. The “*feasts of charity*” are most often simply referred to as “dinner-on-the-ground,” or “lunch after services”. **THAT** is one reason it has lost the *sacredness* it deserves as a sacred ordinance. “Dinner-on-the-ground” is what outsiders called it, and in time, that title became popular, and resultantly, less sacred.

During the New Testament age, when people received the gospel, it is said: “*as many as gladly received the word and were baptized.*” These believers **immediately** went from “*house to house, did eat their meat with gladness,*” “**breaking bread,**” and “*continued in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and breaking bread.*” We have often referred to it among our people here as the “*feast of charity*” to get that point across, as I also use the term “meeting house” rather than “going to church.” Both terms ought to be thoughtfully and accurately used, rather than “dinner-on-the-ground,” (which is never true today, and “painting or roofing the Church”, which is never done either! The “church”, or *ekklesia*, is the composition of true baptized believers when gathered together – not buildings). It is hoped that some day our people will drop these Arminian words and return to the New Testament concepts instead. It is our view that all of the ordinances of the New Testament Church should be continued in the Gospel Church so long as it remains on earth, and their *sacredness* be felt and cherished.

Allow me to set in order the ordinances as delivered to us; yet realizing there is no way they can be so isolated one from another as to place them in a numerical order. I will commence with one no longer even considered an “ordinance,” let alone a **sacred one**. I mean that of the ***ordination of Gospel and church officials***. I put it

in the classification of an *ordinance* because (1) Christ instituted it in the first Church [Mark 3:14; John 15:16], (2) the apostles practiced it and set the standard of qualifications for those offices, [Acts 1:22; Acts 14:23; Acts 16:4; 1 Timothy 2:7] and (3) those who are made officials in the Church are done so by “**ordination.**” [1 Timothy 3: 1-15; Titus 1: 5-9] Hence, it is an *ordinance*, and certainly if practiced in a true Church under the auspices of the Holy Spirit, as it ought to be done, it is *sacred*, and ought to be highly esteemed as such. The men placed in God’s service by this ordinance also ought to be held to higher esteem than they now are, and be held to a higher degree of accountability to its qualifications.

That it is *not* considered either an *ordinance* or *sacred* today is self-evident. When the first ordination was practiced, before any man was ordained, the Church set aside a period of “*fasting and prayer*” antecedently to that sacred function. No one today bothers about such “*trivia*” (as they seem to consider it to be). The fact that an embarrassing number of Church ministers (elders and deacons) do not qualify to be in the membership of a Gospel Church (due to an unrepentant state and violations of the criteria set forth for such officers), yet alone actually ordained by the Church as elders and deacons, - and that many of them can neither preach nor are “apt to teach”- is sufficient proof of how the Church looks upon this ordinance. This declares loudly and clearly that the Church no longer views either office as *sacred*. Such are reaping the results of this denigration of this most sacred ordinance – the churches are being abandoned by the Holy Spirit and are dying out rapidly.

We must consider the ordination of the Gospel ministry as being a ***Gospel Church’ Ordinance***. One must be a member of the “*ekklesia*,” or “Church” to be ordained to the ministry; and if any are set aside in discipline by **the church**, such can no longer be considered an ordained minister of the Gospel. It is the *Church* that is “the pillar and ground of the truth,” – not the elders or deacons.

But certainly they, of all members, ought to be grounded in “*the faith which was once delivered unto the saints*” (Jude 3) **before** being ordained to these high and sacred offices! Sadly, in our day, we have seen a horde of elders ***changing*** both their doctrines and practices, and introducing these into the church. This is clear evidence that they were never *established* in that faith of God’s elect prior to their ordination.

I’m reminded of an exchange I had some years ago with an elder in the Correspondence. He desired to discuss with me the subject of the ordination of divorced and remarried elders, and indicated that he thought such was proper. I answered him, telling him that I was not interested in discussing the subject; that I was satisfied with what I found in the Scriptures. He wrote back, stating: “I see that you have a *closed mind*.” My last exchange with him was to the point: “Yes, you are correct. I do have a **closed mind** on that point and all the Church’s doctrines, and would think **every elder** should have a ***closed mind*** on the doctrines and practices of the Church **before** a Church ever had hands laid upon him.” The Scriptures in 1Timothy and Titus gives the Holy Spirit’s direction as to the **qualifications of men** (not women!) to His ordinance. These directions are to be **narrowly followed** or the Church pays a higher price than for which it bargained. It seems clear to me that no Church has a right to violate the *qualifications* for the office of an elder, and then expect to **impose their sad act upon other churches**. No church should ordain anyone they do not call to serve themselves. If they do not need an elder, let some other church that does need one ordain him and institute him in their ministerial office. It is pretty bad to hear someone speak of an ordained elder, “He would not even make a good Sunday School teacher!” – seeing that the Church does not have Sunday Schools.

Until we are led of the Spirit to consider the ***sacredness*** of this ***ordinance***, I fear we shall decline more and more; for it seems

certain that such uninspired and carnal men cannot “*feed the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood.*”

Next, I think **baptism** should be discussed. Baptism is an act performed by an ordained minister and he is a member of the Church. [Note: The Baptists who wrote the London Confession of 1644, citing the case of Saul’s baptism by “a certain disciple,” Ananias (Acts 9:10), considered it proper for any baptized male member to administer this ordinance.] We would note that the minister is representing the Church. He does not need to take a candidate back to his home church to get permission each and every time he baptizes a believer. He has that charge by his ordination. There is no single instance of anyone in the New Testament Church doing such a thing. The practice grew out of the Modern Mission Movement’s desire to usurp the ministerial prerogatives and control the ministry under so-called “church-authority.” Throughout the ages, God-called and Church ordained ministers have traveled throughout the world “whithersoever the Lord sent them.” Again, it does not take multiple actions of the Church to “*authorize*” God’s ministers to perform their Gospel functions. Once was enough for Paul and Barnabas in the Church at Antioch. That one act for them was not repeated in subsequent itinerancies that carried them throughout the Roman Empire (Acts 13:1-4). It is well that we quote this passage in this place. It reads: “*As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, they laid hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus. And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the **SYNAGOGUES** of the Jews: and they had also John to their minister.” We often wonder what modern-day Old Baptists would say about them being members of a Church, preaching in, of all*

places, a Jewish *Synagogue!* A point to make here is: Ministers of the Gospel are to preach the Gospel *wherever* a “*door of utterance*” is given them. They certainly should not ask permission of man if God impresses upon them to go somewhere to preach! And it is equally as certain that no man can orderly call them into question for “*obeying God, rather than man*” (Acts 5:29).

In the New Testament Church, it is said: “*And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues (languages)*” (1 Cor. 13:28). Again, in Ephesians 4:11, we read: “*And He gave some, apostles, and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.*” Of these offices, three of them are considered by many as *extraordinary offices*. That is, they ceased functioning when their vocation had been completed. These three gifts had specific *signs* that accompanied them. When Christ sent out the seventy (evangelists), He told them, “*Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you*” (Luke 10:19). When He sent out the apostles, we read: “*And these signs shall follow them that believe; In My name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues (foreign languages); they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover*” (Mark 16:17-18). It is obvious that these signs no longer attend the preaching of the true Gospel. Hence, these offices no longer exist in the Church.

However, the offices of *pastor/teacher*, or bishop or elder and deacons remain. We stress this here. All our people should beware of those that claim to possess those offices without the signs that are to accompany them. The Mormons have their so-called “apostle,”

Evangelicals of all sorts have “evangelists,” and fanatical cults have their “prophets.” They mimic the New Testament offices without their antecedent *signs*. So when someone invites you to come hear “Evangelist So and So,” you should know up front you will be hearing a charlatan. Be sure to leave your billfold or pocketbook at home! Don’t “raise your right hand,” nor “walk down the aisle.” If you do, you’ve been “*took*.” Your Church has elders (bishop, if serving the Church, but still an “elder”) and deacon(s). The elder is the servant of God to the Church; the deacon is the servant of the church. [Recently someone seriously asked: “Who decides who should be a deacon?” We answered: “God.” He was surprised at this answer, and asked, “But who determines that?” My answer was: “Just wait. There is no need to hurry. At some point the deacon will be manifested. You ordain the man that actually *deacons*. You should not ordain someone that is not the servant of the church.” The Church can observe who it is that has the care of the physical and outward necessities of the Church; who is honest in their dealing; loves hospitality; holds to sound doctrine; and whose daily deportment commends Christ, the Gospel and the Church. That is whom the Church should ordain. Being a deacon is ***NOT AN HONORARY POSITION OR TITLE. It is an office of servitude.*** The deacon is not the *overseer* of the Church. That is the function of the elder or bishop. [Acts 20:28 “*Take heed therefore unto yourselves (speaking to elders – verse 17), and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood.*”]

One of the Scriptural functions of the *deacon* is “*to serve tables.*” Our forefathers listed three of these: (1) the Lord’s Table (Acts 6:2) (2) the pastor’s table, and (3) the table of widows and orphans, if the church has such that are “*widows indeed*” (1 Timothy 5:5-9). Since this is one of the functions of the deacon(s), we will here discuss the ***ordinance of the Lord’s Supper.*** Because

one of the qualifications of the widows being taken into the number of the Church's welfare, and hence served by the deacon, is that she must have "*washed the saints' feet*" (1 Timothy 5:10), it seems appropriate to cover both ordinances together.

In introducing the subject of the Lord's Supper, we feel it appropriate to note that the Supper was observed during a "*feast.*" Under the Jewish economy it was referred to as the "*feast of unleavened bread,*" that preceded Passover (Exodus 23:15) and at that time of year they observed the "*sacrifice of the feast of the Passover*" (Exodus 34:25). It was a *sacrificial feast*, emblematic of Christ Himself as one who was made a sacrifice for the sins of the Church. As such, it is a *figure*, in the same sense as *baptism*. We stress that it is a **FIGURE**, not the **substance** of the Passover.

We stress this because the lack of this understanding was one reason the earliest heresies pertaining to both *baptism* and the *Lord's Supper* took root in the early Church, and the apostate "church" gave these figures magical powers to save. In so doing, these figures became *sacraments* in the hand of the so-called "Church" making the so-called "Church" of vital necessity unto salvation. The "Church," "baptism," and "communion," all became superstitious means of salvation. In truth, neither of them have anything to do with the spiritual salvation of believers. One is saved by the sacrifice of Christ, and may never see a true Church; may never be immersed in water; and may never partake of communion in the figure. Hence, these are not *means* of salvation; nor are they *necessary to salvation*. But as a *figure*, they each point to the salvation of God's elect by the sacrifice of Christ – His death, burial and resurrection in behalf of His sheep. Christ alone is the Savior of sinners.

Just as the Roman "Church" used these figures as magical incantations to hold the recipients in superstitious bondage to the priest-craft, so too, the early Baptists' missionary system in some

regions did the same. In Jamaica, missionaries gave *certificates of baptism* to those baptized, and encouraged them to believe these to be tickets to heaven. The superstitious subjects feared to die without these *certificates* being placed in their coffins. Closer to our day, there is a group of Primitive Baptists that preach that anyone that is not baptized in water (H<sub>2</sub>O) will not be housed in heaven in ages to come. Again, mistaking the *figure* for the *substance* and using the fear of being only a member of a Congregation as a compelling motivation for asking for membership in the Gospel Church. So, the conclusion of this matter is, that members of both the Church and the Congregation are better served by understanding the true nature of these ordinances.

When our Lord had His last supper with those *close* to Him, He told them in advance that one of their number would betray Him. It is rightly referred to as the “Last Supper,” for it was a general meal preceding the eating of the Paschal Lamb of the Passover. According to the Law, there was to be no leaven in all their households, or in their towns and cities. This is why it is referred to as the “*feast of unleavened bread.*” This gives us a clue as to what kind of bread should be used in the communion, although this is not expressly stated. Scripturally, *leaven* is a symbol of sin, and Christ had no sin. Christ is declared by the apostle to be the *Passover*: “*as ye are unleavened. For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us*” (I Cor. 5:7; John 19:14). He is the substance; the bread and wine are the *figures* of “*His flesh and blood.*” “*And as they were eating (the feast of the Passover, verse 19), Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is My body.*” It seems indisputable that it was not literally His body, nor was it, as Catholics claim, *changed into His body*, for He was standing directly before them in their sight! He could only have meant it as a *figure of His body*, representatively or symbolically. He then “*took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying,*

*Drink ye all of it; for this is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matthew 26:26-28).* Again, it seems clear that He spoke figuratively, or symbolically. There is no mention of drawing blood from His body and putting it in the cup. Rather, in fulfilling the Old Testament type of the feast of the harvest, real wine was used.

There is, in this statement, a clear indication of the doctrine of *particular atonement, or redemption*. “This,” He said, “is My blood of the new testament.” The word “*testament*” means a *bequest*; and a bequest in one’s will is for his heirs – not for the whole world, as Arminians would have us to believe. To preach universal salvation, or general atonement, is surely an example of “*casting the children’ bread to dogs*” (Mark 7:27).

As with the bread, the wine is also *unleavened*. We must not let the foolishness of the Temperance League stand, which says that Christ used *unleavened grape juice!* There is no such thing in nature as *unleavened grape juice*. If it is grape juice, it has leaven in it, and immediately upon squeezing out the juice, the leaven mixes with the natural sugars in it, and the process of fermentation is *immediately begun*. It is not unleavened until that fermentation process is completed. The leaven dies, settles to the bottom, and is poured out as “*lees*.” What remains is pure wine. If it yet has leaven, it is not yet wine. This **pure wine** is designed as the symbolic nature of Christ’s blood that was shed for us for the remission of our sins. If His blood has impure, or sinful, He would then have His own sin for which to suffer, and could not have been an adequate sacrifice for the sins of others.

I realize one can go to the market today and purchase *unleavened grape juice*; but it is **not wine!** Louis Pasteur, an alchemist, learned that one could bring **grape juice** to a boiling point and kill the leaven in it. But this was not until the mid-1800’s. Louis Pasteur lived between 1822 and 1895. The Church had over 1800 years of

communing before Pasteur discovered how to **pasteurize grape juice**. Both the symbolic body and blood of Christ are unleavened, “not having *spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*” (Ephesians 5:27) even as the body of Christ – the Church. Pasteurized grape juice still has the leaven, albeit, dead, still in it.

The *broken bread*, as the *broken body of Christ*, is symbolic of the suffering in His flesh the penalty due His people for their many sins. His “*shed blood*” was the ransom price to relieve them from the awful bondage of sin, for “*whosoever committeth sin is the servant (bond-slave) of sin,*” and His blood was shed for the “ransom of many,” as contrasted with *all*. Both together express the exceedingly painful and humiliating suffering for the ones He loved. It would be expressive indeed, if He suffered for *one man’s* sins; but how incomprehensible is the thought of Him bearing the penalty for **all** of the sins of **all** of His people collectively! “What love is this? Oh, my soul? What wondrous love is this?” “*Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin,*” and hence by the shedding of blood the sins of those for whom it was shed are remitted – gone ! What an astounding thought! If He had not said it, we would have no right to believe such a seemingly impossible hypothesis!

The “beloved apostle” – John - added one outstanding part to the narrative of that event recorded in Matthew 26. John included the instance of His *washing the disciple’s feet*. In our churches, we include it as much as *an ordinance* as any other. When the Blessed Lord of heaven and earth says: “*ye ought also wash one another’s feet,*” due to the superlative character of Him who said it, His “*ought to*” for us is surely an “*ought to.*” We see no Biblical reason to modify that statement in any such manner as to conclude, “**We ought not to.**” The statement is plain enough to warrant a believer doing what the Lord said he “ought to do.” Our churches believe they ought to do it and therefore they do. “*If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.*” That is their experience.

It is clear that the Lord connected the event then to the *washing* that it symbolized. “*If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me,*” He said to Peter. “*He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all*” having reference to Judas. This proves it to be a “Church” ordinance – not a personal act.

The Old Testament antitype was as this: There was a brazen altar where the sacrifice was made. It was in the outer court, and being of brass spoke of *judgment*. It was there the lamb, bullock, pigeon, etc., were offered, and their blood sprinkled upon the altar demonstrating the “putting away of sins” that were imputed to the sacrifice. Inside the Holy of Holiest, there was a Golden Altar, upon which incense was burned as a sweet-smelling savor unto God. The fire that light that fire on the golden altar was taken from the coals on the brazen altar and demonstrated the connection between the two. Before there was an intercession, there must be a sacrifice. **Between the two altars stood a brazen basin of pure water for the priests to wash away the blood upon their hands.** According to the law, nothing was more unclean than dead bodies and blood. It is here we emphasize the act of “*washing the saints’ feet.*” Upon the brazen altar, Christ made the true sacrifice by the shedding of His blood. At the Golden Altar, Christ makes intercession for His people. Their sins are all already put away “*as far as the east is from the west.*” “*I will remember them no more.*” But ***we remember them! As the ministering priests, we become defiled even in our devotions.*** The washing of the saints’ feet symbolizes the washing away of the defilement of our daily walk, and stands between Christ’ sacrifice for us, and His intercession for us. We are thereby still confessing that we are yet sinners but depending upon the work of Christ for our cleansing, our sanctification, our purification, and our salvation.

Yes, it IS an *example of humility* **IF IT IS PRACTICED.** It is no example of anything if it is not practiced! It is a *sacred ordinance*, and ought to be always approached with the solemnity due our august and sovereign God!

The next ordinance we wish to discuss is *baptism*. It is a sacred ordinance, and ought to be attended with the solemnity it rightly deserves. God instituted it in His earthly kingdom, of which the Church (ecclesia) is the ruling assembly. The church being the “*pillar and ground of the truth,*” it is the institution to preserve the ordinances of the kingdom until it is fulfilled at the Lord’s coming to receive it, and deliver it over to His Father. We do not say, with the Missionaries, that baptism is the *door to the church*. It is not. The church’ extending the privilege of church membership to members of her Congregation, and its reception of such that are qualified and desire it, is the door into its membership. How many individuals can you find in the New Testament that were baptized, and went on their way rejoicing? the eunuch, Lydia, Philippian jailor? etc. Ordained ministers have authority to baptize believers, and are commanded to do so. But baptism does not make them members of a local church; nor is it required that they be made such in areas where none exist, or in any too distant to faithfully attend. As it is said of the law, that it is good if used lawfully, so too, baptism is good so long as it is not wrapped up in the filthy garments of legalism! It is too precious to be abused as it so often is by denominationalists. It is not meant to ensnare the believer into carnal formality! Rather, “*whereunto baptism doth save us, not with the putting away the filth of the flesh, but an answer of a good conscience before God.*”

Particularly, baptism is a *figure* of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. The believers that “gladly receive the word,” are valid candidates for the ordinance if their daily conduct is freed from those things of which the apostle declares to be such as one

cannot enter the kingdom of God. (I Corinthians 5:11; Romans 16:17). It publicly states that the candidate believes he has an interest in the truth of God and work of Christ in such a manner as that he is now “*dead to sin,*” has a hope in being baptized with Christ in His death, and is raised up together with Christ to walk in newness of life. By that act, the candidate publicly takes on Christ and His cause, to fellowship the doctrines of the apostles, and fellowship God’s people. It is an ***identifying act*** that provides a basis for membership in a Gospel Church if one is nearby, and with all those of like faith and practice with the doctrines of God our Savior wherever they exist.

The last ***ordinance*** is outside of the church, yet is for believers as sacred as any others. That ordinance is the marriage of one man to one woman so long as they both shall live. It is ***divinely instituted,*** and is the ***oldest ordinance*** on earth, and is ***universally established*** in all the nations of the earth. It, too, is under attack by all the forces of evil men, women, courts, legislative bodies, so-called “churches,” and authorities in high places. But, however viewed by the ungodly world, it is of ***divine origin,*** is sacred, and in God’s view, unbreakable. “*Whatsoever God has put together let no man put asunder.*”(Matthew 19:6, Matthew 19:8, and the reason: Matthew 19:9) Vain is the whole subject of who God has “put together,” how one can know this, and all such sophistry. When God says, “***I hate putting away***” (Mal. 2:16), it is no longer a point of debate whither God has changed since He said it, seeing that He is immutable (Mal. 3:6). When He declares that one that is put away is still married, we believe He meant exactly what He said. (Mal.2:14).

We do not hereby consign one to the Lake of Fire, as so often falsely charged against Biblical Christianity. Christ’ answer for such is that they are to become “***eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake***” (Matthew 19:12). Such that “*is able to receive it, let him*

*receive it*” (Matthew 19:12b), and thus rest content in the Congregation of the Lord where God has given such a place for them. But to violate the Biblical injunction brings that one and the Church into disorder if such is received in an unrepentant and unqualified state. If **all** so-called “Churches” finally depart from the Biblical doctrine and order, where then shall those poor elect souls go who wish to truly and faithfully follow their Lord? There is one thing that is certain: since almost all Predestinarian Old School Baptist churches now have accepted those into the church that are in such a state, these few churches remaining faithful to the New Testament do not hinder **anyone from being a member of “a church.”** There are plenty around for them. The ones that are hindered are such that believe in the sanctity of marriage and cannot find a church standing fast in that persuasion.

Before continuing, we inject this additional argument. We now have had fifty years to observe the course of the abandonment of the institutional marriage state among Old School Baptists. All our readers are familiar with the heart-rending effect of divorce proceedings, the sad effects upon children losing their security, the resultant children’s personality changes and deterioration, the falling standard of living for these families, and the unknown psychological distress upon all parties involved. Can there really be a Christian that would desire that their children and/or grandchildren be so taught that marriage is an inconvenience, and should be abandoned immediately upon the realization that there are problems in it that must be resolved? Can a true Christian really want the Scriptural sanctity of the *marriage* state be totally destroyed in the earth? It is one of the strangest and most mind-boggling facts, that today most “Christians” actually condemn churches and Christians that do not agree with the doctrine of the Pharisees, that a “*man may put away his wife for every cause,*” and

actually take the Pharisees' position against Christ's arguments given in Matthew 19! Now to proceed further.

Marriage was instituted in the very beginning between one man and one woman. Not between two perverted men, or two perverted women. Divorce was allowed by Moses because of the "*hardness of men's hearts,*" and Moses authorized a writing of divorcement, but Jesus said, "*in the beginning it was not so*" (Matthew 19: 8). God has not authorized any government, priests, church or earthly power to abrogate His institution, for it was given for the good of the social order. It has always been good for society, the protection of women, and security of children. The contrary brings a chastening rod, social disorder, Church disorder, the breakup of homes, financial duress, and a lifetime of psychological insecurity and dysfunctional personalities (some mild, others severe) to the innocent offspring. Where there is a sense of well being and adjustment, let it be credited to the mercy of God alone; but He is under no obligation to extend mercy to anyone. If He does, it is pure grace. Let all such honor their place in the Church's *Congregation*, enjoy and rejoice in His doctrine, and thank Him daily for the fellowship of the saints among whom they worship. But for all such not yet affected by this judgment upon the Church and world, may they be mindful to obey the Scriptures, honor their mates, and dwell peacefully together, bring up their children by example in the fear and admonition of the Lord, and remember daily that the Lord "*hateth putting away*" (Malachi 4-16). God cannot change. Let all believers abide by the injunction of the Holy Spirit to "*avoid fornication,*" and "*Thou shalt not commit adultery.*" It is always best to obey God rather than follow the fashions of this perishing world. He has commanded the women to not "*depart from their husband,*" "*but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried.*" Likewise, the husband is commanded to "*not put away his wife.*" (I Corinthians 1:10:11). **No other alternatives are given.** The Lord taught His disciples, saying, "*that*

*whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication* [See Deuteronomy 24:1, “some uncleanness,” or unclean communication] ***causes her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery***” (Matthew 5:31-32). The individual may ignore these truths, and many do; but the church cannot ignore them without destroying its precious relationship with the blessed Spirit. If one is a believer, and it has been their lot to be in a contrary condition to what the **Church** (*ecclesia*) can endorse, then the place for such an individual is either as “a ***eunuch*** for the kingdom of heavens sake,” (**Matthew 19:12**, and hence may be in the membership of the Church) or remain in the Congregation where God in His providence has placed him.

In as much as this **ADDENDUM** is designed to clarify some things published in the “BAPTIZED CHURCHES OF CHRIST,” it seems appropriate to answer a frequent question on this subject before moving on to the next. “What if a person in the Congregation is divorced, but has not remarried? Are they on this point qualified for membership in a gospel church?” The short answer is, “Yes, all other things being equal.” We realize that the question is on “divorce and remarriage,” but our answer depends upon another issue: Is the individual under consideration in a state of ***adultery*** or of ***fornication***? The qualification for baptism is (1) “*faith* toward God,” (2) “*repentance from dead works*,” and (3) “*works meet for repentance*,” **not** what their marital state might be! We know they can be related, but for the purpose of this answer, let us keep them separate.

In light of what our Lord said regarding the consequence of divorce and remarriage while one’s spouse is yet alive, the individual is committing adultery. In our day, large numbers merely live together without marriage or have children without benefit of a present father (single moms). Such cannot be members of a Gospel Church while in such a state of condition. ***Repentance is necessary***

*for baptism, and this entails a cessation of such an act.* If one's circumstances change (For example: If one spouse dies, or the individual becomes a "*eunuch for the kingdom of heaven's sake,*") then this condition is no longer a factor, and if the believer demonstrates faith, repentance, and works meet for repentance, they may apply for baptism. However, the Church still reserves its right to receive or reject membership in the *ecclesia*. This right the elder cannot usurp by administering the ordinance of baptism. If such ever were to be the case, the individual is yet a member of the Congregation as before unless he/she should withdraw. In that case, it would become evident the Church made the correct decision.

Paul reinforced this point in order to prove another in Romans chapter 7. The Roman church had some familiar with the Law of Moses, and Paul address these, saying, "*Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that **know the law,**) how that the law hath dominion over a man **as long as he liveth?** For the woman which hath an husband is **bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth;** but if the husband **be dead,** she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband **liveth,** she **be married to another man,** she shall **be called an adulteress:** but if her husband **be dead,** she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man"* (Romans 7:1-3). The Church cannot be concerned about all the subterfuges, allegories, "what ifs" and other devices men and believers may concoct to evade the plain meaning of Paul's words and accommodate the modern lifestyle of fleshly and worldly "Christians". The Church, if the true Gospel Church, must imperatively keep that "*faith once delivered unto the saints*" (Jude 3). It has no orderly alternative.

**FIRST,** The real issue, then, is **not** about getting a **divorce**, or being **separated**. While there is no Biblical authority given to remarry, yet there are reasons for separation. An orderly church must abide by the teaching of the Scriptures as written. The plain

and ordinary meaning of the scriptures above is absolutely necessary for Paul's point to be valid. Here is his application: "*Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are **become DEAD TO THE LAW** by the body of Christ; that ye should be **married to another**, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God*" (Romans 7:4). Do you not see that if you modify the previous statement in any way to destroy its plain and ordinary meaning, you must, to be consistent, so modify this verse as to deny the very experience of grace necessary for the gifts of faith, repentance, good works, and baptism. One **cannot be married or joined to Christ so long as he is alive to the law. That is Paul's point.** It is also the saints' experience. Whatever Scriptures one might give for taking on another spouse while the legal one is yet alive can also be used to prove the theory of "falling from grace" and that God is not "*immutable*" (Malachi 2:14-16).

Examine I Corinthians 6:9-11. The words "*were*" and "*are*" are important words in this text. Paul enumerates the works of the flesh that hinders one from "*inheriting the kingdom of God.*" These are: fornicators, idolators, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankind (Sodomites or homosexuals), thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, and extortioners. None of these are subjects for baptism, nor can they be orderly members of the Church. Note that each of these words is in *the present tense*. Then read the next verse, and notice the tense used: "*And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the **Spirit of God.***" (verse 11).

If a believer is *actively* engaged in any one of these works of the flesh, he cannot be a subject of baptism and church membership. Of almost that entire list above, if any repent and turn from them, that action benefits others. Turning from them cannot hurt anyone. There is *one exception however*: In the case of marriage that places one in the category of fornication and/or adultery, turning from it

hurts the social relationships with wives, husbands, and children. The Church cannot be put into such a position as to advocate separating from this act and destroying those relationships. Such a solution aggregates the problem, not resolving it. The place for such believers while they wait for deliverance is in the **Congregation**, rather than in the Church. This answer may also answer why the true Church of God does not allow homosexual ministers, women bishops (elders) in their membership – let alone in their pulpits! If, - and we say “IF” – *active engagement in fornication* is allowable for CHURCH membership, then there is no hindrance to membership **and** ordination of Sodomites (homosexuals) to the gospel ministry! For sodomy **is** fornication!

**SECOND**, God’s **forgiveness** of the sins of such as are divorced and **remarried** is **not** the issue here either. God does not require that a church act upon “*secret things that belong to the Lord; but those things that are revealed belong to us and to our children*” (Deuteronomy 29:29). Who God has, or has not forgiven is not one of those things that are revealed *to the church*. How the church is to conduct its business relative to this issue *is revealed*. The forgiveness of sins may very well be revealed to a poor sinner’s heart, but in the absence of repentance, the church has no means of judgment in the matter. Many, many individuals show intense love of the truth, of the church, and of Christ, and this gives us great hope in God’s mercy having been bestowed upon them. That fellowship among church members and the congregation is exceedingly sweet. But we all also are familiar with some who “*fell by the wayside,*” “*had no root in themselves,*” and *withered*” away after so great and cordial fellowship had been extended to them in the CONGREGATION of the Lord. So in this matter, the church cannot make sufficient judgment. God knows! And that should be sufficient to a believer for his satisfaction and peace. This issue remains: the church is to **preserve** *the faith and order of Christ and*

*the holy apostles as given.* It is not the role of the church to “forgive sins,” [that is Catholicism!] nor to make judgments as to one’s forgiveness and/or salvation.

The Church is not under the law. It is *the law* that gives a “writings of divorcement.” (**Deuteronomy 24:1**) Interestingly, our Lord said that it was “**Moses**” who gave the writing of divorcement “*because of the hardness of your hearts.*” (Matthew 19: 8) and then reiterated “*in the beginning it was not so.*” His reference to that passage is also very interesting. After having pronounce a death sentence upon all manner of fornication and adultery, Moses gave a “*writing of divorcement*” for only one: “*for some uncleanness.*” Our Lord called this “*some uncleanness*” found in Deuteronomy 24:1 as “**fornication.**” But what is it? In 49 passages in the Old Testament out of a total of 50, where the word “*ervah*” is used in the Old Testament it is translated “nakedness.” In this one text alone, it is translated “*uncleanness.*” Why this discrepancy in translation? Because in this single place the word “*ervah*” has a *modifier* prefixing it. That modifier is “dabar” (or, ge’bar) translated “some.” So what does it mean? The Hebrew word for “*some*” is “dabar.” It is found over 3300 times in the Old Testament, and is *always* translated into some form of **communication**: spoke, speak, law, commanded, reasoned, thought, *etc.*, to name but a few. A foil-mouth person is a *fornicator*, in the sense used here, and such speech is *fornication*, and for **this cause only** can a man put away his wife according to Moses’ law. The Pharisees were putting away their wives for “every cause,” and this is what Christ was rebutting! Under the rules of the New Testament Church, where the law does not apply, the rule Christ gave is so simple: “**What God hath put together let no man put asunder.**” That is so simple any poorly educated person can understand it. There is no need for sophistry, “but what if,” and other subterfuges. The rule of the Gospel Church is: “*I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from*

*her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried [Same as in Matthew 19: 12.], or be **reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife**” (I Corinthians 7:10-11). **No other alternatives are given.** Either one believes this or he does not believe it; but Christ said it first, and Paul repeated it!. There is no middle way. Some can receive this, as Jesus said, but to others “it is not given.” (Matt. 19: 11 “*All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given*”) We must believe, however, if it is given to anyone to believe it, surely it is given to His church!*

We have not, nor does the church, concluded that this is an **unpardonable sin**. It is not. David is sufficient proof against that! The experience of all our churches is that many individuals in our Congregations are not qualified for church *membership* under the rules that Christ and the apostles have enjoined upon the church; yet they truly love and delight in the free grace of God and rest under the shadow of His wings, having a hope in this world and the world to come. They adorn the Congregation of the Lord as much as the ancient Gentiles who lived in Israel who adorned the Court of the Gentiles where they had such sweet repose. They love the Church of God that He has purchased with His blood, and would never think to bring reproach upon her or her Husband. They are as much a part of God’s divine order as any others in their gospel place.

In conclusion, all these ***ordinances are sacred***, and should be treated as such by all believers, both those that have been added to the Church, as well as those given to its Congregation. The end for respecting and esteeming God’s ordinances is peace and joy in believing, and holding a good conscience before God.

The initial impetus for this article on the ordinances of the Church was a question relative to the practice of keeping “***the feast of charity.***” We partially covered the subject in the introduction to these ordinances and will complete the article with an in-depth discussion of the feast of charity. First,

It is rather understandable that with Christianity developing as an integral fulfillment of the Jewish Law, those feasts observed by Israel according to that Law would, for a time, be observed by the early New Testament Church. When examining the subject, however, we find that the *feast of charity* was an immediate result of the conversion of sinners to the faith of Christ. The joy, happiness, and kindred fellowship held in common among believers produced these feasts. The ancient Jewish feasts certainly did not dissuade them in feasting together, and the general custom of other religions sometimes led them to abuse the feasts, as seen by I Corinthians 11.

The Scriptural references on this subject are appropriate to start the discussion. As ancient a record as Job, believed to be the oldest book of the Bible, it is recorded that “*his sons went and feasted in their houses, every one his day; and sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them. And it was so, when the days of feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all; for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts. Thus did Job continually*” (Job 1: 4,5). Granted, this text offers little to nothing in contribution to the subject being a *divine ordinance*. It does provide some insight into the ordinance, and the precariousness of its sanctity when left in the hands of corrupt-minded men. Job recognized the *possible* abuse that Paul found in the early church even that far back in antiquity. Paul found it a point of division in the Church, as he wrote: “*For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What? Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not*” (I Corinthians 11: 21-22). This clearly was an abuse of the feast. Paul’s solution was to separate the feast from the

Lord's Supper. Feasting is better suited in one's own house if he is eating his own meal without sharing with any who have no food to eat. It is customary today among the baptized churches of Christ to eat the feast first, and follow it with the Lord's Supper as a separate ordinance. Those that observe the *ordinance of washing the saints feet*, include it at the conclusion of the *ordinance of the Lord's Supper*. Usually, they conclude the latter ordinance by embracing one another while they sing a song as the Lord and His disciples did. Usually these services are not concluded with prayer.

Under the Law of ancient Israel, "*These are the feasts of the Lord,*" and they are sanctified as "*holy convocations*" (Leviticus 23:4). This chapter gives the "*feast of unleavened bread,*" followed by the "*feast of the Passover,*" then the "*feast of tabernacles*" (verse 34), a "*feast of seven days,*" (verses 39-41). The chapter closes with these as *ordinances* of the Lord: "*And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts of the Lord*" (Leviticus 23:44). Of the feast of the Passover, we read this: "*And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever*" (Exodus 12:14). It was specifically **this ordinance and feast** our Lord enjoined upon His disciples (John 13:1,2 and Luke 22:15), saying, "*As oft as ye eat this bread*" "*Do this in remembrance of Me*" (Luke 22:19, I Corinthians 11:22).

Israel was enjoined to keep a "*feast unto Me*" three times in each year. These were: "*feast of unleavened bread,*" the "*feast of harvest,*" and "*feast of ingathering*" of the harvest. "*Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God*" (Exodus 23: 14-17). Before hearing the reply from a reader that all these were "under the Law," allow me to respond by pointing out that the early believers in the Church were accustomed to these feasts, and many of them continued keeping them in the festive spirit of their childhood experience. These periods were very important for

preserving both the family units as well as the Law those members observed. It is not strange to find so many references to them in the early Church. Let us then, look at these New Testament records.

We've pointed out that these feasts were spontaneous. "*And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in **breaking of bread, and in prayers***" (Acts 2:42). Again, "*And they, **continuing** daily with one accord in the temple, and in **breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart***" (Acts 2:46). This practice seems clearly to have continued after the dispersion of the church, for we find these words by Paul in Acts 20: 6,7) met specifically to keep a set feast. "*And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of **unleavened bread**, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days.*" (Seven days after the feast of unleavened bread placed them in time at the feast of the Jewish Passover). "*And upon the first of the week, when the **disciples** came together to **break bread**, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.*" This record continues with a young man falling out of a window, and was taken up dead. Thereupon, Paul raised him up again, and afterwards in the same night, they returned and "*broke bread and ate, and talked a long while, even to the break of day.*" When Paul gathered the elders of the church together at Ephesus to bid the farewell, he refused their pleas to continue with them longer, for he said, "*I must by all means **keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again to you, if God will***" (Acts 18:21).

After Paul had given instruction to the church of God at Corinth separating the feast from the Lord's Supper (I Corinthians 11:21), he completed his instructions in this regard by saying: "*Wherefore, my brethren, when ye **come together to eat**, tarry one for another. And if any man be hunger, let him eat at home; that ye **come together not unto condemnation***" (verses 33-34).

Both Peter and Jude makes reference to an abuse of the *feast of charity*, by ungodly individuals “sporting themselves” during the feast. Peter wrote: “*As natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed*” (Yes, that is exactly what he said these were made for!) “*Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you; having eyes full of adultery, and cannot cease from sin*”, etc. (II Peter 2:12,13). Jude’ reference is “*These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear,*” etc. (Jude 12).

As pointed out, these feasts are “holy unto the Lord,” and as such are to be approached with solemnity and thanksgiving. In fact, they are referred to as such that one “*shalt keep a solemn feast*” (Deut. 16:15) and the psalmist refers to them in this manner - “*on our solemn feast day*” (Psalm 81:3).

From the standpoint of the secular history of New Testament Christianity, the *feast of charity* was one of the most common and universal aspects of the Church. The Christian churches did not have public property, or own their own meeting-houses for the first two-hundred years of Christian worship. They met in private homes of Christians, and/or in places of accommodation provided by the donation of wealthy patrons. The central function of home churches, apart from divine worship, in the home were the “*feasts of charity.*” Christian families met together for worship, and it was quite proper for them to dine together. In 110 *a.d.*, Ignatius the Great was arrested and taken to Rome for trial and execution. As with Paul earlier, he was allowed to hire guards to escort him to prison in Rome, and these hired guards allowed him the freedom to meet with Christians in their house worship *en route*. All along the way, Ignatius exhorted these house churches to combine together, and appoint a single bishop over them. He thought that by organizing themselves along the lines of the political structure of the cities and provinces, that Christians would be better protected from public

persecution. This commenced the movement in that direction. In time, history reveals the sad results of that fatal movement, for it led eventually and unerringly to the establishment of a religion copied after the Roman Empire, and enforced by Constantine the Great into the first manifestation of the Antichrist. In the long development, the simple and lovely *feast of charity* underwent changes to meet the evolving condition: it was finalized formally into the Roman Catholic *Eucharist*, profaned as a “*sacrament*” and its beauty sullied. However, the Scott Anabaptists kept it alive in the Highlands of the Piedmont, and it still survives as a practice among Old School and Primitive Baptists throughout the southern United States.

It is the writer’s desire that our churches and congregations continue these feasts; not as a mere “dinner-on-the-ground,” but as a sacred gift of God’s fellowship granted to His called children. There is much to commend these gracious and sweet periods to believers. We conclude with some of the advantages the believers have by participating in these feasts; hosting such events; and urging them to do as the “noble Bereans,” who having “*received the word with all readiness of mind,*” used the time to “*search the scriptures daily, whether those things were so*” (Acts 17:11).

Once one is mindful that the gathering together of believers is a solemn and holy blessing, surely there would be more discussions on the Scriptures than on deer-hunting, fishing, NFL, NBA, NHL, and national or world politics, *etc.*

There is nothing new or strange about this subject, insofar as all believers are rather familiar with it. During meetings of associations, union meetings of churches, the feasts at local churches after services, and all such special gatherings when someone hosts a meal for members and visitors – the fish fires, the barbeques, the pot-luck (I don’t like that term: there is no “luck” for absolute predestinarians!) suppers, *etc.* It is not that there is no *feast*

*of charity*; the problem is that the *solemnity it deserves* is too often missing. Let every member of the church or congregation think what it would be like if they were, as thousands are today, scattered too far away from other free grace believers, and ask themselves if this is not an awesome blessing to be able to feast together with others of like precious faith; to be able to discuss the scriptures, and their own experiences in their present pilgrimage. We believe we each would magnify this blessing above all other earthly fancies!

Of all the ordinances we have discussed, the *feast of charity* is the one in which all believers, whether in the Church' membership or in the Congregation can equally enjoy, and it is the single one that binds the Church and Congregation together in bonds of Christian union. Surely it cannot be considered more holy or precious than baptism or communion, but neither should it be ignored as a sacred institution in the church of God on earth.

We close this work with a passing exhortation is these "last days." We are called upon to sacrifice so little, to suffer so little, and to be in poverty so seldom, that we tend to take all blessings for granted. Can we not forebear anything for the cause of God and truth? All around us, the world flows endlessly on from fleshly pleasure to fleshly pleasure, and none denying anything to take up their cross to follow their god. Stop and pause but a moment: The pagan world gave Rome her idolatries: Christmas trees, that Jeremiah 10:2 tells us not to observe; Easter fertility cults, the eggs, the bunnies; the ancient Druid's their mistletoe, under which the young virgins were burned in a bonfire to drive evil spirits away; the cross of Talmuz, that today hangs around the necks of Arminians everywhere; all of which are accepted into modern "Christianity," because they were too superstitious practices for the Christian Church to overcome. So, the so-called "Church," since they could not beat them, joined them.

One thing so far is good: while the vain people still hang onto them, yet at least they have not been set up in Old School Baptist Churches, as others around us.

Today, in 2009, we hear much about the “Culture War.” We hear it mostly from members of the news media, who to the man, are Roman Catholics. What is this “Cultural War” of which they speak? Is it a war by the liberals against churches worshipping according to their consciences? No. Is it a war of political liberals against political conservatives? No. Is it a war against our freedom of worship? No. We can answer “No!” because all of our liberties are still intact, nor is there any movement to outlaw our religions in the United States. What then are these media personal complaining of? They are complaining that many people, both liberals and conservatives, are tired of having their taxes used to support religious programs in *publicly owned properties or institutions of government*. What, in specific, are they referring? They are referring to the restricting of religious institutions from using public property, public taxes, and public schools and facilities to promote religion of any kind. But more narrowly, what is the real outcry? It is about the public display of Christmas and Easter on public property. It really is a non-issue, or a “made up issue” – a smoke and mirror issue. There is not a private home or church in the United States that cannot have a Xmas Tree or manger scheme on its property. No one is attempting to deprive anyone of such a freedom. Is it not strange that of all religious differences between Catholics, Protestants, and others, only Xmas and Easter is receiving such a fuss? Simply: these holidays are *idols*. People actually worship them. We think there is a reason, and the complacency of believers have allowed religions to embed themselves into the tax-teals of the American public. For those who know these things are pagan in origin, false religious notions in reality, based upon actual lies and falsehoods, and still claim they

are “alright,” because little children like them and that there is no harm in giving presents, and families ought to cultivate strong ties, such individuals are being rather naïve. Why cannot a parent still give gifts, observe a family *Christian feast of charity* and teach their children the *truth*. Why is it so all-fired necessary to bow toward Rome? Why not Mecca too?

One should never conclude that he can violate God’s commands, and be spared the just recompense the disobedience calls for. “*Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen*” (I John 5:21). Again, “*Come out of her, My people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.*” (Revelation 18:4).

---

## **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 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*.

## 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*

*John Spilsbery*

*George Tipping*

*Thomas Skippard*

*Thomas Munday*

*John Mabbatt*

*Thomas Patience*

*Samuel Richardson*

*Thomas Gunne*

*John Webb*  
*Paul Hobson*  
*Thomas Goare*  
*Edward Heath*

*Thomas Killcop*

*Joseph Phelpes*

## **Article I**

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

## **Article II.**

That God is of Himself, that is, neither from another, nor of another, nor by another, nor of another: 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 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 Father being from Himself, the Son of the Father from everlasting, the holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.

### **Article III.**

That God hath **decreed in Himself from everlasting touching ALL THINGS**, effectually to work and dispose them according to the counsel of His own will, to the glory of His Name; in which decree appeareth His wisdom, constancy, truth, and faithfulness; Wisdom to that whereby He contrives all things; Constance is that whereby the decree of God remains always immutable; 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; Faithfulness is that whereby He effects that He hath decreed, as He hath decreed. And touching His creature man, 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, leaving the rest in their sin to their just condemnation, to the praise of His justice.

### **Article IV.**

In the beginning God made all things very good, created man after His own Image and likeness, filling him with all perfection of all natural excellency and uprightness, free from all sin. But long he abode not in this honor, but by the subtlety of the Serpent, which Satan used as his instrument, himself with his Angels having sinned before, and not kept their first estate, but left their own habitation; first 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 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 loved with an everlasting love, are 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 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.**

This therefore is life eternal, to know the only true God, and whom He hath sent Jesus Christ. 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.

### **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.

### **Article IX.**

Touching the Lord Jesus, of whom Moses and the Prophets wrote, and whom the Apostles preached, is the 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 when the fullness of time was come, was made man of a 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 all things like unto us, sin only excepted.

### **Article X.**

Touching His office, Jesus Christ only is made the Mediator of the new Covenant, even the everlasting Covenant of Grace between God and Man, to 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 authority of the Father and in respect of His Manhood, from the womb called and separated, and 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 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 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 choosing, foreordaining, sending. Choosing respects the end, foreordaining the means, sending the execution itself, 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.

## **Article XIV.**

This Office itself to which Christ was called, is threefold: of a Prophet, of Priest, and of a King: this number and order of Offices is showed; *first*, by men's necessities grievously laboring under ignorance, by reason whereof they stand in infinite necessity of the Prophetical office of Christ to relieve them. *Secondly*, alienation from God, wherein they stand in need of the Priestly Office to reconcile them: *Thirdly*, our 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 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 a Doctor, and the Apostle of our profession, and the Angel of the Covenant; but also the very wisdom of God, and 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 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, 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 own Person to man.

### **Article XVII.**

Touching His Priesthood, Christ 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; 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 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 of Melchizedek, not by a carnal commandment, but by the power of an endless life, not by an order that is weak and lame, but stable and

perfect, not for a 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 Priest, according to both natures, He was a sacrifice most properly according to His human nature: 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 divine nature, namely, that the Son of God did “offer Himself for us” He was the 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, 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 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, 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. 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.

### **Article XXI.**

That Christ Jesus by His death *did* bring forth salvation and reconciliation only for the elect, which were those which God the Father gave Him; and that the Gospel which is to be preached to all men as the ground of faith, is, that 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 **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 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.

#### **Article XXIV.**

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

#### **Article XXV.**

That the tenders of the Gospel to the conversion of sinners, 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 a sinner and ungodly to receive Christ, as crucified, dead, and buried, and risen again, being made 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 soul still through

all duties, temptations, conflicts, sufferings, and continually whatever a Christian is, he is by grace, and by a constant renewed 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 all believers** in their fullness, in relations, as Head and members, as house and inhabitants, as Husband and wife, one with Him, as Light and Love, and one with Him in His inheritance, and in all His 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, present, and to come, by the blood of Christ; which justification we conceive to be a gracious and free 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 sanctified people, and that sanctification is a spiritual grace of the new Covenant, and effect of the love of God, manifested to the soul, whereby the believer is in truth and reality separated, both in soul and body, from all sin and dead works, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, whereby he also presseth after a heavenly and evangelical perfection, in obedience to all the Commands, which Christ as Head and King in His new Covenant has prescribed to him.

### **Article XXX.**

All believers through the knowledge of 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 Covenant, peace with God, and reconciliation, whereby they that were afar off, were brought nigh by that blood, and have (as the Scripture speaks) peace passing all understanding, yea, joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by 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.

### **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.

### **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 Saints, called and separated from the world, by the word and 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 Ordinances, commanded by Christ their Head and King.

#### **Article XXXIV.**

To this Church He hath 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; 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.

### **Article XXXVI.**

That being thus joined, every Church has power given them from Christ for their better well-being, to choose to themselves meet persons into the office of 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.

### **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.

### **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.

### **Article XL.**

The way and manner of the 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 washing the whole soul in the blood of Christ: *secondly*, that interest the Saints have in the death, burial, and resurrection; *thirdly*, together with a 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. [Editor's note: Notice this: it is to refute the false charge that the Old Baptists baptized in the nude.]

### **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***.

**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.

**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.

**Article XLIV.**

And as Christ for the 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 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.

### **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.

### **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.

[We omit Articles XLVIII through LII because they cover political institutions of the times in which these Churches were first established.]

### **APPENDIX: B 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**. [To read the actual document for the constitution of the first Missionary Baptists in the United States, see: "Appendix: Proceedings of the Baptist Convention for Missionary Purposes, May 1814, in The Select Writings of Thomas P. Dudley," pages 423 cf, Predestinarian Publisher, 2007.] 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 409.)

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 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. - Editor]

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 instant 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 peruse 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.]

## **APPENDIX: CC**

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 DISCRPTION 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, is 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 already 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 out-breaking 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.)

---

## APPENDIX D D

### FIFTY YEARS AMONG BAPTISTS: 1805-1855

It seems well to insert here David Benedict's remarks on the origins of the mission and benevolent movements among Baptist. David Benedict is the first "Historian" produced by the Missionaries, 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. [Alexander Campbell was converted to this position.] 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.**" [We recommend the reader acquire a copy of this while it is still in print.] 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. . . .”**

[Editor’s note: 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 paedo-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, let alone 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 E E**

### **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 meetings. It then prints this report in Minutes of the Association, which in turn are then sent to the member churches composing it, and to 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. Vedder, A Short History of The Baptists, page 332.) Note: Vedder was the historian for the American Baptist Convention in 1907, a Missionary historian.

## **APPENDIX F F**

### ***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.)

[Editor's note: Sugar Creek Church was one of the first "Conditional churches of the "Means" Baptist in Ohio. It divided, the majority being Conditionalists, were rejected by the Miami Association. The minority called Elder Wilson Thompson to serve them. See: Wilson Thompson's Autobiography, page 221]

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.)

## **APPENDIX G G**

### ***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 ( est.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 which 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.

## **APPENDIX H H**

### **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 I I**

### **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 12 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 have 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 views 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.” For 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 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 move 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 than 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 J J

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

## ANNOTATION:

Elder Rueben Ross had preached the first Arminian sermon among Baptists near Port Royal, Tennessee in 1817 (See Page 381). 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 (est.1707). It was the Philadelphia that had been seized by William Staughton and the New Divinity gang and steered 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 K K***

## 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 of *authority 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 receive 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

---

<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.

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.

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

---

<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.

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,

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 hording 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**

---

<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.

**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 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 provide for 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

## **APPENDIX L L**

## **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 M M

### 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 N N**

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

ANNOTATION: In 1844, this association was affiliated with the Licking Association of Particular Baptists of Kentucky; the Lebanon Anti-means Predestinarian Baptist Association of Indiana; the Anti-Means Miami Association of Ohio, the Mount Pleasant (Anti-Means) Association of Kentucky; and the (Anti-Means) Conn's Creek Association in Indiana. In the divisions of 1850, it too divided, with Wilson Thompson serving one church in it. [Thompson was Anti-Means.]

**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, Patrobrusians, 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 **divinely 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 those **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 baptized. 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.

## CONCLUSION

We have historically traced the history and issues of the "Baptized Churches of Jesus Christ," and discovered the rise of the Great Apostasy foretold by the Apostles of our faith. We have, in **Book I**, presented the Triumphant Church in her glorified state, both before her development in this time world, while she was yet preserved in seed substance in Christ her Bridegroom, Husband, Father, and Elder Brother in vital union

in and with Him; and in this **Book II** have traced her historical development as she entered into the apostasy, to the present setting sun upon her earthly pilgrimage.

There are large numbers of religious institutions with signs in front of their meeting palaces, that declare themselves “a church,” “a church of Christ,” “a Baptist church,” a “Primitive Baptist church,” a “Predestinarian Primitive Baptist church,” and even “Predestinarian Old School Baptist church,” that no longer hold to the doctrine of Christ; that deny that “Christ is come in the flesh;” that have no moral objection to “ungodliness,” and only a precious few really desire to be clothed upon with Christ’s garment, eat His spiritual food, and actually be united eternally in vital union to Him. The prophecy has come to pass: “*And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by Thy name, to take away our reproach.*” (Isaiah 4:1) In truth, today, the abominations in the so-called churches are no longer considered by anyone but God and a few of His children to even be a “*reproach.*”

We do still find those who believe they are decidedly “absolute predestinarian,” yet who hold to such for themselves, and express to others, “You should not do this,” or, “Why did you go there?” “Why don’t you be like us?” etc.; clearly showing an Arminian tendency – a “freewill absoluter,” if you please!. Some do not even know what the term “eternal” means; others, what “fornication is,” and most do not know, or care, what “adultery” means. Almost none know what Gospel order is, and of course, care less. It has now come to pass in this “latter day,” that: “*For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath **closed** your eyes; the prophets and your rulers, the seers hath He covered. And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of **a book sealed**, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed: and the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am*

*unlearned. Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near Me with their mouth, and with their lips do honor Me, but have removed their hearts far from Me, and their fear toward Me is taught by the precept of men; Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvelous work among the people, even a marvelous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid.”* Isaiah 29: 10-14.

This blindness is easily seen: One ordained minister said, “As long as Matthew 19 is in the Bible, I cannot do otherwise than accept the divorced and remarried into the church.” Yet, it is in Matthew 19, that Jesus said when asked by the Pharisees, “Shall a man put away his wife for **every cause?**” Jesus immediately answered: “*Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain **shall be one flesh?** Wherefore they are no more twain, but **one flesh.** What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.*” (Matthew 19:4-6) That is what Matthew 19 says for the church to hear. Paul refers back to this in I Corinthians 7:10-11, “*And unto the married I command, **yet not I, but the Lord,** Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let **her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband:** and let not the husband **put away his wife.**” That is an example of “Gospel order;” the contrary is disorder.*

“But, you deliberately did not finish the quotation in Matthew 19!” You are right, if you thought this. Why did I do so? Simply, the rest of that quotation is a difference between what the Pharisees said Moses allowed – “for **every cause,**” and Jesus’ correction of their error, for Moses did not so teach. He gave it for only **one specific cause**, “words of nakedness,” or “fornication.” In no way does Moses give the CHURCH its Gospel order, for the church is not under the law of Moses. If I were to finish that context, I would have to discuss this: “*All*

men cannot receive this saying, **save they to whom it is given.**” To discuss this, we must conclude it to be the very reason men cannot see what Christ and Paul both taught on that subject so simply understood. They are blinded to it by God Himself, for whatever reason He so blinds them. But to His disciples, the Lord explained: “*For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men (as the Ethiopian eunuch Philip preached to,) and there be eunuchs, which have **made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake.*** (As Paul), *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.*” (Matthew 19: 11-12.)

Look around you. What church can survive today in Gospel order? What are not aborted, are given over to sexual promiscuity to such a degree that few remain to be added to the church. Examine the present churches’ offspring, and how many are left to be blessed with membership in a true Gospel church? It is this writer’s hypothesis that this is the last generation before the Lord comes, for the next generation will be so few and scattered so far apart, churches of the New Testament order will be unknown to most. Of course, there will still be *six women* that will lay hold on one man saying, . . . . .

*“Behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I an Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. I Jesus have sent Mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star. Surely I come quickly.”* (Revelations 22: 12,13,16,20.)

***“And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the Bride, the Lamb’s wife.”***

*“My beloved spake, and said unto me, Rise up, My love, My fair one, and come away. For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle dove is heard in our land; The fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell. Arise, My love, My fair one, and come away . . . . .”* (Song 2:10-13). The trumpet sounds! The earth quakes! The graves burst suddenly open! The Church soars away to the Hill of Zion, the Bridegroom comes! The Bride arises, homeward bound. What wondrous love is this, O my soul; what wondrous love is this! **“Thou art all fair, My love; there is no spot in thee.”** (Song 4:7).

***finis***