

A CRITIQUE OF LANDMARKISM

DWANE GILLILAND

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to my wife Elaine for the first typing, Mark and Gale Langley for the second on their computer, to Carol Pinkston, Cindy Taylor, Teresa Pinkston, Ginger Chinn and Gail Moreland for their help with the final copy.

I have used other men's learning throughout this book and any one who is familiar with either the Ross or Thornbury refutation of Landmarkism will readily see how much I am indebted to these Brethren. I quote from them and many times I may have, and probably did, use their thoughts and words as my own without giving them the credit that is theirs – I do so now. Others I could have used warned me not to at the copyright notice in the front of their works – so I didn't. Anyone can use any or all of this book for the furtherance of truth with or without acknowledgement.

DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to all lovers of truth.

PREFACE

Since writing the landmark article four and one half years ago in which I challenged the other side to “Prove their doctrine”, about the only “proof” that has come forth is first, a good brother seeking by early Baptist writers, (Kiffen, Knollys, Denne, Collins, Collier, Barber, Cillingsworth, Blackwood, Richardson, De Laune, Drapes, Hutchenson, some 35 books in all) to disprove the article was kind enough to give me copies of the above; and in which all agreed with the other old writers quoted in the article where the subject is mentioned in any way at all; and second, another Brother in Florida, denouncing all history, and opinions of men in history seeks to set forth Landmarkism solely from scripture; and third, a Brother from Oklahoma, greatly alarmed, wrote “Church truth at a point of Crisis”, in which he devoted thirteen lines in answer to my seventy-one page article. Did he do it? Yes, if you believe his one word answer: “Farce”. But the questions might be raised, “Why should we believe him?” and, “What did he prove?”. If Baptists in the past were not Landmarkers and if no Landmarker can be found, and if no confession of faith can be found that teaches it and, contrariwise, if the old Baptist writers did teach contrary to Landmarkism, and did set forth plainly their views on Baptism, Church Organization, and a non-linked chain succession, why aren’t Modern Landmarkers, honest enough to admit it? Why don’t they say plainly that they disagree with Spilsbury, King, Kiffen, Collier, Barber, Drapes, Kilcop, (many others), and the First and Second London Confessions? Why do they keep saying they do agree with them? Huffman has the same books by old Baptist authors that I have. I copied and delivered them to him at the same time I made my own copies. I sent a copy of my article to the Baptist Examiner and Bro. Wilson said that he would try to answer it - he never has. Brother Cockrell demanded a copy and he did as I expected: no equal time granted. His denunciation of me as an “Apostate” and the continual pratings that all true Baptists of all times were Landmarkers, was the way he handled it. Proof is all that I asked for - there has been none given.

Contrary to what Huffman charged, “Come to any conclusion, then go back through the dusty pages of history to find support...” and also Hiatt, “Because they can’t find Landmarkism in history, they can’t believe it”, it would seem that the Landmark view is the one that needs history and tradition to support it. The only way they can be a true church is that the one who preceded it was a true church - a link chain delegating and granting authority. But if all history is against such ideas, how does it stand? Only by the word of today’s Landmarkers! Our side doesn’t need history and tradition to stand but as all candid students know, all history is one-sided - our side.

In this revision I will seek to set forth the following: 1. The testimonies of many other witnesses in the 1600’s complying with the ones already given, 2. The clarifying and additions to points that I made, 3. The addition of several topics: The Bride, The Kiffen Ms., Baptist views on the Universal Church, The Commission - to whom was it given?, the Age of Extremism; and, 4. A Conclusion.

The Landmarkers all say, “Baptists have always held our doctrine, all history is on our side” but they never make any reference to history; then when their opposers do they say, “We take the Bible, not history, for our faith and practice!”

I was once a Landmarker, as was Ross, McGlothlin, Lofton, and Christian; but the facts of Baptist history changed my mind as it did the above and will anyone who honestly faces the

issues. Should one confront a Mormon of our day with the “Book of Abraham” and Joseph Smith’s “Translation” of it with a true translation, (whereas such couldn’t be done in Smith’s day, scholarship had not attained to what it has in our day) and show that Smith lied, it is not the book of Abraham, Abraham isn’t mentioned at all; what it is an Egyptian Burial instruction - today’s Mormon would laugh at you saying, “It doesn’t matter what the book says in truth - it does matter what the “inspired” Joseph Smith got from it!” So with Landmarkism, it doesn’t matter if no one in the past believed it. They disregard written testimony and imagine there was testimony that was destroyed by our enemies, they premise the commission was given to the church, that the church only is local, and that the promises of Christ necessitate a link-chain succession. It doesn’t matter that no one in the past believed their theory - they will disfellowship anyone who dares to question them! If their first premise is wrong then the whole thing will fall. I personally know Brethren who will not break fellowship over the doctrine of Regeneration, but will over Landmarkism. Which is the more important doctrine? Some Landmarkers misinterpreting I Tim. 3:15 would undoubtedly say Landmarkism but, more knowledgeable Brethren would understand that without regeneration there could not even be a church.

I fully believe the statement in the appendix of the 2nd London Confession: “Let not our zeal herein be misinterpreted (of being kind and gracious to them with whom we differ, D.G.); that God whom we serve is jealous of His worship. By His gracious providence the law thereof is continued amongst us; and we are forewarned, by what happened in the church of the Jews, that it is necessary for every generation, and that frequently in every generation, to consult the divine oracle, compare our worship with the rule, and take heed to what doctrines we receive and practice”, the suppressions, denials, garbling, and outright perversions of the Landmarkers notwithstanding.

While I make no claims to be a writer, these papers reflect much reading and research of them who were, and I can’t help but feel no little disappointment in the absence of response from the above one hundred copies of the first article to brethren who are my friends and fellow ministers. I am afraid not many have read it - but just to scan through, pick up a sentence here and there – then they know where I am going - “too bad about Gilliland”. This reminds me of a statement of Servetus concerning the Spaniards, that they were, “Only half informed, yet brim full of knowledge”. Perhaps if my brethren would actually read these papers, as burdensome as it may be, they may question the apostasy in which they were raised and stand were our Baptist forefathers stood before the apostasy appeared.

INTRODUCTION

Landmarkism claims to set forth what our forefathers held. SOME may have held these things (there is nothing new under the sun) but there is no recorded evidence that has come to light to prove it. Nor, any recorded evidence of Landmarkism among the Particular Baptists of England. The burden of proof lies with the Landmarker. They are the ones who need history and tradition to substantiate their practices. The earliest writing since printing was invented shows that the Particular Baptists DID NOT hold Landmarkism. The first and second London Confessions and many good writers associated with these did not hold it, neither did the Philadelphia Association in America. If so, let it be demonstrated. I intend to demonstrate the contrary. Graves, Pendleton, and Dayton systematized this doctrine as Graves admits:

“I think it is no act of presumption in me to assume to know what I meant by the Old Landmarks, since I was the first man in Tennessee, and the first editor in this continent, who publicly advocated the policy of strictly and consistently carrying out in our practice those principles which all true Baptists, in all ages, have professed to believe.” (Old Landmarkism, p. 15, 16).

First of all, he insulted and slandered his contemporaries by calling them “untrue Baptists”, all who didn’t hold his views, and even every editor from the founding of the continent. Richard Fuller, Waller, Johnson, Manly, Howell, Dagg, Barrows, Jeter, Boyce, Broadus, Wayland, Armitage, Curtis, Spurgeon, and Benedict are some examples of the many great contemporaries of Graves who opposed Landmarkism. These weren’t “True Baptists”? Secondly, he admits his innovations among the Baptists or else, he claimed the Baptists apostatized and, from which, he received the link-chain succession. Baptism is the Golden Calf of Landmarkism. The Children of Israel were not so stupid or ignorant as to think what they had made actually had brought them out of Egypt (Gill), but, “Make us gods which shall go before us”, as a symbol, as a representation, as a standard to carry before them. Baptism does all this for the Landmarker. Let us notice some of the fantastic claims of Landmarkism for Baptism:

“Where there is no Baptism there are no visible churches.” p. 12; “Inducting by Baptism in to the Kingdom.” p. 18; “There is a scriptural connection between Baptism and preaching.” p. 26; “Can men now be ministers of the gospel who are not members of churches formed according to the gospel? I say they cannot...” p. 30; “How is the visible separation (from the world) to take place... Is it now by Baptism?” p. 31; “My position is that according to the gospel, authority to preach must, under God, emanate from a visible Church of Christ.” p. 34; “Authority to preach... Authority to baptize must come from the same source. (Baptist Church)” p. 37. (Old Landmark Reset, Pendleton).

This is Landmarkism according to Pendleton, Graves, and Dayton. Landmarkers hold many Biblical Truths, but the “Ism” is what I am writing against - that which is added to the truth, the “logic” of mere men that is not scriptural, which neither was believed nor held by Baptists of the past.

Modern Landmarkism goes much further than Graves in conferring authority from a “mother” church to her daughter, which Graves did not teach. The newly republished volume of “Alien Baptism”, by Dayton, has this in the preface showing what baptism is to Modern Landmarkers:

“When Jesus promised that “the gates of hell shall not prevail against the church,” the succession of John’s baptism was guaranteed. The church is a divine institution and baptism is a divine ordinance. Without the Lord’s church as administrator, there can be no scriptural baptism. Without such baptism there can be no church to authorize it; and, the validity of each depends upon the scriptural authority of the other.

The “Trail of Water” precedes and succeeds, “The Trail of Blood.”

But, both the old and the new, positively exclude any other system than their own from the “True” Baptist practice. “True” according to whom? The scriptures? One can read Landmarkism into the scriptures, but as we shall see, the Old Baptists never did. This system is Arminian in ecclesiology - man must work this out, not Christ and the Holy Spirit - but Landmarkism never bound the Lord! WE could list a long Bibliography of non-Baptists that the Holy Spirit raised up as witnesses for Christ (“By their fruits ye shall know them”, not their Landmark pedigree), many of whom a lot of Landmarkers do not even have the mental capacity to read; but, we don’t have to, you can see the listings of many in the Landmark papers themselves. Graves wrote:

“But to invite them into our pulpits to pray is to recognize them before the world as gospel ministers, since custom consecrates the pulpit to acknowledged gospel ministers, and therefore, when we act with them in a ministerial capacity, speak of them as gospel ministers, or receive their acts as those of gospel ministers, we plainly and “more loudly than with trumpet tongue,” proclaim them gospel ministers, and consequently their societies as gospel churches - and, if so, why not commune with them?”

Did Graves and Pendleton “receive their acts as gospel ministers when they used their “acts” (writings and scholarship) in writing their own theology books? They certainly did, many many times. Former Baptists, who were not Landmarkers, freely used the scholarship the Holy Spirit raised up: Gill used Witsius, Goodwin, Crisp and all Protestant scholarship; Boyce was educated at Princeton and followed the theology of Turretin; The second London Confession followed the Westminster and Savoy Confessions, and we could go on and on almost indefinitely, but, the truth remains: works of the flesh cannot produce works of the Spirit. “What God has cleansed, call not thou unclean.”

One cannot read very far in these learned men of God (I am speaking of Protestants) without learning some what of their Spirituality, I Cor. 12:3, if one is Spiritual himself!

The Landmarkers boast that only they have the commission, that only they have authority to do the work of the Lord; that anyone, anywhere that has done anything in the name of the Lord other than Landmark Baptists is not from Christ at all, but from Satan, in opposition to Christ. This is such a perversion of the facts of history and Biblical principles as to not even

need refutation if they were not so grossly ignorant of the aforementioned facts. The scriptures speak thusly:

“But the Prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine hear, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” Deut. 18:20-22.

Micaiah was in exact accord with this scripture when he told Ahab: “If thou return at all in peace, the Lord hath not spoken by me.” I Kings 22:28. When Paul was vindicating his office of apostleship, not by producing documents of authority from his supposed supporting church, nor yet pleading the validity of his baptism from the disciple Ananias - but the facts of the case: “If I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord.” I Cor. 9:2.

When the question of whether circumcision was necessary to the salvation of the gentiles was discussed in Acts 15 the fact that the Lord was saving gentiles apart from circumcision as related by Peter, Paul, and Barnabas convinced James with the agreement of the words of the prophets against the proposition that circumcision was necessary.

When the Doctrine of the Atonement is discussed, whether it is particular or general, the fact of its results can determine its intent and extent. So, likewise, we can understand who is commissioned and authorized by the Lord by the resultant facts. Paul said that “no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Spirit”, I Cor. 12:3. Kilcop, who was baptized by Blunt or Blacklock, a signer of the First London Confession wrote: “Disciples having ability lack not authority”. The anti-pedobaptist dissenters from the church of England who came to correct views on Baptism, as we will notice all through this paper, claimed their authority from scriptures only. Only the Landmark has the opinion that of the countless thousands who have been raised up, gifted, and enabled by the Holy Spirit to proclaim and did proclaim the mighty works of Christ had no biblical authority to have done so!

In the prayer of our Lord (John 17:20) for all the elect, He prays, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me, through their word.” Through whose word? If these words have reference to the first church, as a church, and only through its ministry, as Landmarks must interpret to be consistent with their views on the commission, then this is clearly church salvation doctrine and, without which none will be saved, none were prayed for, and none will be glorified as the next verse states. And, it does no good or clarifies anything for Modern Landmarkers to simply brand those saved outside Landmarkism as “Bogus disciples” or Pendleton’s, “I am not obligated to account for this”, or Dayton’s, “That although Christ may see fit to dispense with their baptism, he has not authorized his churches to do so”. The facts are they are saved, and not a few, but the vast majority! If no one but Landmarkers have authority to preach - then no one has authority to believe the message of anyone but that of an “authorized” minister. Who ever heard of such silliness? The Holy Spirit who gave the scriptures according to the Divine will and eternal purpose of the Godhead is not confused about whom he calls, enables, and gives His word unto on the ministerial side, and in exact accord with his calling by the same gospel (outwardly) to the hearing elect in regeneration (inwardly). Authoritatively?

That is as high as you can go on authority. Examples to illustrate the point are Newton and Toplady. No Landmark Baptist either ordained nor authorized them to preach or proclaim the word of the Lord. They wrote Amazing Grace and Rock of Ages that do preach and proclaim the word of the Lord. Can we authoritatively sing these great hymns? Landmarkers themselves do. These are only two of thousands of such inconsistencies. "Through their word" is the word of the Apostles, the scriptures; and in all subsequent ages the Holy Spirit has raised up men who have proclaimed "Their" word to the salvation of all God's elect - they were not Landmarkers either. There were no Landmarkers until just over one hundred years ago, and their theory that does not accord with facts cannot be true. Again, when the Landmarker seeks to "prove" something in depth in scripture (the "Unauthorized" translation of Protestants), he uses "unauthorized" Lexicons of the "unauthorized" Protestants - Thayer, Liddel and Scott, Vine, Young, Strong, etc., plus the commentaries of "unauthorized" ministers of Protestants - he learns from all these "unauthorized" sources (if he learns at all) to authoritatively proclaim to the ones from whom he learns and the rest of the world, that WE ARE THE PEOPLE! He is an accessory after the fact by his own judgement.

Landmarkism holds, "that if no baptism be valid without an administrator, whose baptism is regular, then there can be no valid baptism. The validity of baptism would depend on an unbroken succession of regularly baptized administrators from the days of the Apostles; and if there be a defect in this chain, that defect violates all the subsequent baptisms." "The oft exposed fiction of the apostolic succession is ridiculous enough, but the baptistical succession is even more puerile." (Fuller, in Alien Baptism by Dayton).

In our modern day we are told "since the church only has authority to preach and baptize; and since the Bible teaches perpetuity (which Landmarkers equate with succession) the God of the Bible is a liar if perpetuity is not achieved through a mother Church - daughter church- linked chain baptismal succession." Then they say, "Now we know Christ is not a liar so succession must be true." Profound wisdom! Dayton claims this:

"The presumption is that the chain is perfect. If baptism is essential to church membership, and Christ declared his Church as an institution, should continue to the end of time, and the gates of hell should not prevail against it, then it is to be taken for granted, in the absence of proof to the contrary that baptized churches have continued in regular succession from that day to this, and any particular baptized church must be regarded in the absence of proof to the contrary, as in the succession. Elder Fuller may doubt it, but for myself I cannot help believing that the Lord has kept his word." (Alien Baptism, p. 80)

Fuller didn't believe the Lord has kept his word?!! How stupid. Dayton's presumption is that his theory is correct, then puts the Lord on trial if it is not! Dayton also says:

"There were those in England after the so-called reformation, who contended that it would be right and lawful to baptized themselves, and so begin anew. But there is no proof that they did so, for we know they sent to the continent to receive a baptism which would have no suspicion concerning its validity. And thus, I do not doubt, it has ever been." (Ibid, p. 8)

Dayton “Knows” they “sent to the continent to receive a baptism” and that their practice was different from their teaching, but no one else does; i.e., among all scholarship that is not Landmarkers. Crosby states, “Some thought this the best way; and acted accordingly” (sending and getting baptism, as supposed by Crosby) and from a single account given by Hutchinson, (Covenant and Baptism), which Hutchinson says he “heard” about. Crosby says, “This agrees with an account given of the matter in an ancient manuscript, ‘said’ to be written by Mr. William Kiffen, who lived in those times, and was a leader among those of that persuasion.” This is all hear-say testimony that cannot be admitted as evidence. And, Kiffen was a leader of the Particular Baptist Persuasion - not the supposed Landmark persuasion - and it is certain Kiffen did not hold the idea of sending off to get baptism nor was he the leader of any party who did.

Kiffen endorsed Daniel King’s book, which we will notice shortly, which refutes succession of that kind.

Several discrepancies come to light between Landmarkism and the practice of former Baptists. Graves said Landmarkism was the “Policy of strictly and consistently carrying out in our practice those principles which all true Baptists, in all ages, have professed to believe” but that such is notoriously untrue can be seen by a review of the history and the writings of the early English Baptists.

CHAPTER I

EARLY ENGLISH BAPTISTS

Crosby, writing concerning succession, says,

“But the greatest number of the English Baptists, and the more judicious, looked upon all this as needless trouble, and what proceeded from the old Popish Doctrine of right to administer sacraments by an uninterrupted succession, which neither the church of Rome, nor the church of England, much less the modern Dissenters, could prove to be with them. They affirmed therefore, and practiced accordingly, that after a general corruption of baptism, an unbaptized person might warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation.

Mr. Spilsbury, who was falsely reported to have gone over to Holland to receive baptism from John Smith, declares expressly against a man’s baptizing himself, and judges it to be far from any rule in the gospel so to do; but observes, that where there is a beginning, someone must be first. ‘And because, says he, some make it such an error, and so far from any rule or example, for a man to baptized others, who is himself unbaptized, and so think thereby to shut up the ordinance of God in such a strait, that none can come by it but thro the authority of the Popedom of Rome; let the reader consider who baptized John the Baptist before he baptized others. And if no man did, then whether he did not baptize others, he himself being unbaptized. We are taught by this what to do upon the like occasions.’

Further, says he, I fear men put more than is of right due to it, that so prefer it above the church, and all other ordinances besides; for they can assume and erect a church, take in and cast out members, elect and ordain officers, and administer the Supper, and all a-new, without any looking after succession, any further than the Scriptures; But as for baptism, they must have that successively from the Apostles, tho’ it come thro’ the hands of Pope Joan. What is the cause of this, that men can do all from the word but only baptism?”

“The learned Mr. Tombes does very excellently defend this last method of restoring the true baptism. ‘If, says he, no continuance of adult baptism can be proved, and baptism by such persons is wanting yet I conceive what many protestant writers do yield, when they are pressed by the Papists to shew the calling of the first reformers; that after an universal corruption, the necessity of the thing doth justify the persons that reform, tho wanting a ordinary regular calling, will justify in such a case, both the lawfulness of the minister’s baptizing, that hath not been rightly baptized himself, and the sufficiency of that baptism to the person so baptized. And this very thing, says he, that in a case where a baptized minister cannot be had, it is lawful for an unbaptized person to baptize, and his baptism is valid, is both the resolution of Aquinas, and Zanchius, an eminent protestant. *Quaritur an is possit baptizare eos, quos ad Christum convertit, ut ipse ab alio ex illis a fe conversis baptizetur. Ratio est, quia minister est verbi, a Christo extraordinem excitatus, eoque ut talis minister potest cum illius ecclesiola consesu, symmistam constituere, & ab eo, ut baptize- tur curare.*

Whereby, says Mr. Tombes, you may perceive that this is not new truth; that an unbaptized person may in some case baptize another, and he baptize him, being baptized of him.”

“I will only add farther what is said on this head by the honourable Henry Laurence Esq; another learned Baptist, who has excellently defended the true baptism, and the manner of reviving it in these later times. It cannot reasonably be objected, says he, that he that baptizeth should necessarily be himself a baptized person: For tho’ ordinarily it will be so, yet it is not necessary to the ordinance; for not the personal baptism of him that administers, but the due commission he hath for baptizing, is alone considerable to make him a true minister of baptism. And here that expression holds not. One cannot give what he hath not, as a man cannot teach me, that wants knowledge himself; because no man gives his own baptism but conveys, as a publick person, that which is given us by Christ. A poor man, that hath nothing of this own, may give me gold, that is, the money of another man, by virtue of being sent for that purpose. So if a man can shew his commission, the writing and seal of him that sent it, it is enough here. Else what would become of the great baptizer, John the Baptist, who had a fair commission to baptize, but was not himself baptized that we read of: Or if he should be, which cannot be affirmed; yet the first baptizer, whoever he was, must at the time of his first administration of that ordinance be unbaptized.”

Tho these things were published at different times, I have put them together, to end this matter at once. It was a point much disputed for some years. The Baptists were not a little uneasy about it at first; and the Paedobaptists thought to render all the baptizing among them invalid, for want of a proper administrator to begin their practice.

But by the excellent reasonings of these and other learned men, we see their beginning was well defended, upon the same principles on which all other protestants built their reformation.” (The History of the English Baptists, Vol. I, Crosby, p. 103-107)

Landmarkers do not hold these landmarks, they will not follow the “greatest number and the more judicious,” but they take us all to Holland on the one solitary account that Hutchinson “heard”. Let Landmarkers prove their doctrine - both the General and Particular Baptists are proving theirs.

A strange thing occurs here with Graves and his fellow Landmark historians grasping at link-chain straws: they claim Blount was sent to Holland from Spilbury’s church! Ray: “an undisputed historic fact;” and so Jarrel and Orchard. Crosby says no such thing. Crosby says, “That several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregation of the dissenters about London sent Blount, etc.” Spilbury was one of “The greatest number of the English Baptists, and the more judicious,” who opposed this idea. John T. Christian, says:

“This manuscript, in which almost every statement in it can be shown false, which is rejected by most of Baptists, as by controversial pedo-baptist writers, is the only authority to prove this story of Blount going to Holland, and that the Baptists were in the practice of sprinkling. No contemporary author mentions the journey of Blount, or the names of Blount or Blacklock. There is no proof that either man

ever lived... Hutchinson knows nothing of Blount, Blacklock, or Batte. The people he mentions were all Pedo-Baptists, who had just been converted to Baptists views. This is hearsay testimony years after without any details. The first man mentioned, who was sent to Holland to get immersion was John Spilsbury, but Crosby says this was not true. The date of the going of Blount to Holland is as mythical as the Person of Blount.” (Christian’s History, p. 262-263)

In his study and analogy of this, Armitage states:

“After the formation of the seven particular Baptist churches, (and one French Congregation of the same faith), in London, and their restoration of believers baptism Me. Jessey and fifty-two others, not being satisfied with the Baptism of the particular baptists, who did not hold to succession nor think it necessary for the administration of Baptism; sent Blount to Holland etc., to import dipping. This was in 1640, Spilsbury’s church having existed since 1633.” (Armitage, History of the Baptists)

But at any rate, Spilsbury did not go, neither did Blount go from Spilsbury’s church, then return to baptized in Spilsbury’s place as Jarrel ignorantly suggests. You cannot quote these seven particular Baptists Churches in London (1643) in favor of your link-chain, all their writings and confessions are against it - find Blount, Blacklock and Batte and their churches, then maybe you can find the Link-chain. (Hard task!) The 41st article of the First London Confession states:

“The persons designed by Christ, to dispense this ordinance (baptism), the scriptures hold forth to be a preaching disciple, it being no where tied to a particular church, officer, or person extra-ordinarily sent, the commission enjoining the administration, being given to them under no other consideration, but as considered disciples.”

This is not Landmarkism. These brethren believed the commission was given to the Apostles and their successors in the ministry; vis., “a preaching disciple”. Knollys explains:

(The Shining of a Flaming Star in Zion, Knollys, p. 9) “We do not affirm, that every common Disciple may Baptise, there was some mistake in laying down our opinions, Page 14. Where it is conceived, that we hold whatsoever Disciple can teach the word, or make out Christ may Baptise, and administer other ordinances. We do not so, for though believing women being Baptised are Disciples, Acts 9:36, and can make out Christ yea, and some of them (by their experimental knowledge and Spiritual understanding of the way, order and faith of the gospel) may be able to instruct their teachers, Acts 18:26, Rom. 16:3, yet we do not hold, that a woman may preach, baptise, nor administer other ordinances. Nor do we judge it meet for any brother to baptise, or administer other ordinances; unless he have received such gifts of the Spirit, as fitteth, or enableth him, to preach the gospel. And those gifts being first tried by, and known to the church, such a brother is chosen, and appointed thereunto by the surrage of the church. p. 14:

“For we are as powerfully enabled as the first dispenser of Baptism: And we having received authority from Jesus Christ in that commission given to Christ’s Disciples so often mentioned Mt. 28:18,20; and Mark 16:15,16,17. Compared with Luke 24:33,47,48, may and do as warrantly baptise in his name (though we do no miracles nor give the Holy Spirit) as John the Baptist; for he did not baptise with the Holy Spirit, Mt. 3:11. Neither did he any miracle, Jn. 10:40,41.”

Knollys further states in his “A Moderate answer unto Dr. Baswicks Book”, the practice of some churches of God in his day.

“I shall now take the liberty to declare, what I know by mine own experience to be the practice of some Churches of God in this city. That so far both the Dr. and the reader may judge how near the saints who walk in the fellowship of the Gospel, do come to their practice, to those Apostolical rules and practice propounded by the Dr. as God’s method in gathering churches, and admitting members. I say that I know by mine own experience (having walked with them), that they were thus gathered; viz. Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the Ministry, being driven out of the Countries where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, came to sojourn in this great City, and preached the word of God both publicly and from house to house, daily in the temple, and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ; and some of them having dwelt in their own hired houses, and received all came unto them, preached the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. And when many sinners were converted by the preaching of the Gospel, some of them believers consorted with them, and of professors a great many, and of the chief women not a few. And the condition which those Preachers, both publicly and privately propounded to the people unto whom they preached, upon which they were to be admitted into the Church was by Faith, Repentance, and Baptism, and none other. And whosoever (poor as well as rich, bond as well as free, servants as well as Masters), did make a profession of their Faith in Jesus Christ, and would be baptized with water, in the Name of the Father, Sonne, and Holy Spirit, were admitted Member of the Church; but such as did not believe, and would not be baptized, they would not admit into Church communion. This hath been the practice of some Churches of God in this City, without urging or making any particular covenant with Members upon admittance, which I desire may be examined by the Scripture cited in the Margent, and when compared with the Doctor’s three conclusions from the judicious Reader, how near the Churches some of them come to the Practice of the Apostles rules, and practice of the primitive churches, both in gathering and admitting members.”

After Knollys’ Book there were still things not clear which Daniel King clarifies in yet another book, “A Way to Zion, Sought Out and Found, for Believers to Walk In” and in the introduction to King’s book, “Written by four of the most prominent Baptists of the time” (Christian): Thomas Patience, John Spilsbury, William Kiffen, and John Pearson (the first three

also were signers of the First London Confession), about mid-way into this introduction this is stated:

“The devil hath mustered all of his forces of late, to blind and pester the minds of good people, to keep them from the clear knowledge and practice of the way of God, either, in possessing people still with old corrupt principles; or if they have been taken off them, then to persuade them, that there are no true churches in the world, and that persons cannot come to the practice of ordinances, there being no true ministry in the world; and others they run in another desperate extreme, holding Christ to be a shadow, and all his Gospel and Ordinance like himself fleshy and carnal. This generation of people have been of singular use in the hand of the Devil to advance his kingdom, and to make war against the kingdom of our Lord Jesus. Now none have been more painful than there have been of late, to poison the city, the country, the army, as far as they could. Inasmuch as it lay upon some of our spirits as a duty, to put our weak ability for the discovering of these gross errors and mistakes; but it hath pleased God to stir up the spirit of our Brother, Daniel King, whom we judge a faithful and painful minister of Jesus Christ, to take this work in hand before us; and we judge he hath been much assisted of God in the work in which he hath been very painful. We shall not need to say much of the Treatise; only in brief; It is his method to follow the Apostles’ rule to prove everything by the existence of Scripture-light, expounding Scripture by Scripture and God hath helped him in this discourse, in proving the truth of churches, against all such as that have gone under the name of Seekers, and hath very well, and with great evidence of Scripture-light answered to all, or most of their objections of weight, as also those above, or beyond ordinances.”

What were the “Gross errors and mistakes” discovered by King, mentioned by these brethren? They list three: Infant Baptism, Successionism, and the Seekers. They called the way of the Seekers “Another desperate extreme; the other desperate extreme would be the one mentioned just before this extreme: Successionism. Notice: “The Devil hath mustered all his forces of late, to blind and pester the minds of good people, to keep them from the clear knowledge and practice of the way of God.” 1. “Either in possessing people still with old corrupt principles (Infant Baptism), 2. “or if they have been taken off them, then to persuade them that there are not true churches in the world, and that persons cannot come to the practice of ordinances, there being no true ministry in the world,” 3. and others run in another desperate extreme etc...” If the reader will notice in the following, King’s way of answering this extreme, subscribed to by these four great Baptist brethren, he will notice it is not the Landmark answer: “link-chain-delegated-church authority if not - Christ lied doctrine”, but that such is the extreme against which he is writing! King says “the thirteen exceptions written against our practice were briefly answered by Knollys, but some apprehend not so sufficiently as they desire...” What were some things clarified by King that could be inferred otherwise from Knollys? Keep this question in mind while we quote from King.

“Now I come to prove the 2nd thing propounded: That Church or these saints being indued with the Spirit, and the gift of Prophecie may at anytime resume and take up any ordinance of God, that they have been deprived of through the

corruption of times, when God reveals to them. As to instance is the ordinance of Baptism, I shall prove, that a company of such believers may (when they see what is Christ's mind concerning that ordinance, or the subjects or it) take it up among themselves, though they know not where to have a rightly baptised person to dispense it upon them. (p. 80)

Page 84-85. And this is the very way to reform what is amiss; yea, and the people of God have reformed, and taken up ordinances upon this consideration; as of Israel's taking up circumcision when they were come into the land of Canaan. Joshua 5:2. The Lord biddeth Joshua circumcise the children of Israel: The reason was, because they had not been circumcised in the wilderness, the ordinance had been neglected. There was an ordinance neglected from the days of Joshua the son of Nun to the days of returning out of Babylonian captivity, which was to dwell in booths, in the feast of the seventh month, Neh. 8:14-end. Now here was no man extraordinarily inspired to give direction to take up this lost ordinance, after they came out from Babylon; but only they found it written in the law of the Lord, as ver. 14. And that they took a sufficient ground for them to take it up, and set upon the observation of it for the present to do it, as appeareth, ver. 16. And these things as well as other scriptures, were written for our learning, Rom. 15:4. "Whatsoever was written aforetime, etc.". Then what must we learn from this scripture but that when the church through negligence or corruption of times, hath been deprived of any ordinance of God, as soon as she findeth by the word that it is God's ordinance, she is presently, with out adoe, to set upon the observation of it.

Page 85-86. The first part of this objection, that the commission was given to them as Apostles I deny; but as disciples, not as disciples merely, but as disciples able to preach the gospel, Mat. 28:16:7,24. They have no other title in neither places but Disciples. So that if your can find a Disciple able to preach the gospel, he may baptize also by virtue of this commission; I mean a disciple that can preach the gospel so as to beget men to Christ, I mean not everyone that can say something of truth, but so to preach as to bring men to believe, for Mark, they were to make DISCIPLES, and to baptize them. To clear what I have said, I shall make good these two things; 1. That a man may be a disciple before he is baptised... 2. First, we will consider what it is that giveth a man right to preach, whether the Spirit of God or baptism? To which I say both together where they can be joined; But in case both cannot be had, the endowments of the SPIRIT doth enable a man, and inright him to preach the gospel. The 2nd reason why the church of such a company of believers may take up the ordinance of Baptism, or any other ordinance that they find to be their duty in the word of God, is, because the church is called the pillar and ground of the truth 1 Tim. 3:15. Therefore she may take up any truth that she wanteth, or saw not, and maintain it, or else how is she the pillar and stay of the truth, if some truth may be taken from her, and she hath no power to raise it again.

Page 92. Now the church being proved the greater, must needs give being to ordinances which are the lesser; for the church was not made for ordinances, but ordinances for the church, as Christ saith of the sabbath in another case. And this

is a known truth, that everything at its dissolution dissolveth into its first principles.

Page 97. But I shall leave the enlarging of the application to every saint that shall read the treatise, and apply myself to a further confirmation of what I have written, in an answer to 13 exceptions against our practice, which I find in a book written by Mr. John Saltmarsh, entitled "the Smoke of the Temple". Which exceptions have humbled some godly men and women and kept them all from submitting to the truth of God and though they be briefly answered by Mr. Knollys in a little treatise called, *The Shining of a Flaming Star in Zion*". Yet some apprehend not so sufficiently as they desire..."

In Knollys' book one could conclude a disciple is not a disciple until baptism; and that a church (a company of believers) is not such until baptism. King clears this up. Also in Knollys' account one, could conclude there was never a want for an administrator of baptism, there being "Godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the ministry, being driven out of the countries where they lived by the persecution of the Prelates, etc.", but King clears this up also - the Spirit made them such, not baptism. These were "preaching disciples" as their confession states, not baptised preaching disciples, the truth of baptism came later to the Particulars, later than what Knollys is referring, otherwise there would never have been any controversy about an administrator and no one would have needed to go to Holland and "get" true baptism, (however you do that!) as Landmarkers hold. And, notice all the writers in all their arguments with their opponents never make the Landmark brag, which they would surely have made had they believed it. (Beloved few, Baptist Bride, Authority, Link-chain succession, etc.)

Knollys is not as variance with the other Particulars of England and does not give a separate account of the beginnings of Baptists in England as is concluded by some from Knollys' "answer" to Dr. Bastwick. Here again is a classic example of reading Landmarkism "into" an account - by pure assumption to back pre-conceived ideas. Knollys tells us what he is writing about in the title page:

"A Moderate Answer unto Dr. Bastwicks Book; Called, Independency not Gods Ordinance. Wherein, Is declared the manner how some CHURCHES in this city were gathered, and upon what tearmes their Members were admitted; That so both the Dr. and the Reader may judge, how near some Beleavers who walk together in the Fellowship of the Gospell, do come in their practice to these Apostolicall rules which are propounded by the Dr. as Gods method in gathering Churches and admitting MEMBERS.

Then in his first paragraph:

"Passing by many things less considerable, because I entend brevity; In the 7th page of the Doctors booke, there is a twofold question betweene them called "Presbyterians and their brethren who are termed Independents;" The first is concerning the Government of the Church, viz. whether it be Presbyterian-Dependent, or Presbyterian-Independent? The second question is concerning the gathering of churches."

Then uses the Dr.'s own arguments to prove Independency is God's method:

"I shall give the Reader the result of all, that the Dr. hath written from page 100 to the end of his book, touching God's method, and the Apostles practice in gathering of Churches and admitting Members viz. "First. That Christ having given a Commission to this Apostles to teach all Nations, and baptize them, Matth. 28.19,20. Mark. 16. 15,16. the Apostles practised accordingly. Acts 2. 37,38. Acts 10. 44,45,46,47,48. and so did Philip Acts 8.35,36,37,38. and Ananias 9.10. 18. Secondly, That the condition or tearmes, which they were to propound unto all Nations and people upon which, they were to be admitted into the Church, were Faith, Repentance; and Baptism. Mark 16.14,16. For the commission was delivered to the Apostles, that they should admit whosoever beleaved, and would be baptized, and they, that beleaved not, and would not be baptized, were not to be admitted, pag. 102. and pag. 104. The Apostles (saith the Dr.) propounded no other condition or tearmes for making all and every one Members of the Church but Repentance, and Baptism, Acts 2. 37,38. Thirdly, that the Apostles and all succeeding Ministers of the Gospell should admit whosoever beleaved, and were baptized, to be Members of the Church, and teach them to observe no other things but what Christ commanded them, and for which they had his Word and warrant: pag. 101 and 102. Matth. 28.19,20. And this (saith the Dr.) the Apostles did practice, without requiring them to take a private covenant, or enter into the Church by way of a particular covenant, pag. 105. Acts 2.37,38. This being the summe and result of that method and practice, which the Dr. conceives should be done in gathering Churches and admitting Members, which the Scriptures will warrant, and Christ Jesus approve of as his Father's will, I shall now take the liberty to declare, what I know by mine own experience to be the practice of some Churches of God in this City."

Then he gives his own eye-witness account of how some churches were gathered in London: by preaching disciples, independent and contrary to the Dr.'s argument. He does not say whether they were Baptists or Dissenters, only, "Some godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the ministry", and since the successionists following these days of Knollys never mention them in their succession, they were clearly Dissenters from the Church of England, who came to believers baptism after coming to London, harmonizing with all other accounts by all historians concerning the rising of the Particular Baptists in England. And by Knollys' last paragraph in this book he would account the Dr. and his brethren as "godly and learned men of approved gifts and abilities for the ministry" also:

"And my humble request to the Doctor is; that he will use all meanes, that the method of God, and practice of the Apostles in gathering of Churches, and admitting Members, may be conscionably practised by his Brethren of both sides according to the revealed Word and Will of the Father."

If Knollys were a Landmarker:
He would not be answering a Presbyterian,

He would not recognize him as a Minister, brother, or having any church association,
He would not have admonished the Dr. and his brethren on both sides (Independent Presbyterians and Dependent Presbyterians) to follow the Lord in beginning churches.

But he did, and all without urging their re-baptism or reorganization. Knollys did not say:

1. You are a daughter of the great harlot,
2. You are not baptized,
3. You have no authority,
4. You are 1500 years too late to be a church.

Knollys does not even discuss the mode of baptism. In one place he uses "Baptism in water," in another he uses "Baptism with water".

Now, can anyone make out a link-chain Landmark succession from this book by Knollys? Why sure, by taking one paragraph out of the book, hiding the remainder, applying some dreams and imagination - then you've got it!

To show further Knollys position on the churches of Christ I will quote from his book on Revelation, first, in his preface, he mentions Calvin, Beza, and Austin, calling them "Learned and godly men", then he says in xi, P. 138:

"The war which the Beast shall make against Christ's Prophetical Witnesses, thereby He shall overcome them and kill them, is an open, visible, and public opposition, which the enemies of Christ, his churches, ministers, and saints do make against them, either by open hostility, as the Pope, and Emperor's forces did against the Protestants in Germany; or else by public Edicts and Laws, as the Papists did against the Protestants in England in Queen Mary's days, by a violent and bloody persecution, which hath ever been the practice of the Popes and Papists; Pope Alexander the III. about the year 1159. and the Papish Powers persecuted the Waldenses, with a great and bloody persecution: Afterwards, about 1464. The Waldenses, the Wicklevists, the Hussites, and their followers, were violently persecuted, even to death, under the name of Lollards."

This describes the persecution and slaughter of the two witnesses which Knollys identified earlier, P. 132, as:

"The two golden candlesticks in St. John's Revelation, chap. 11.4, were a representation of the true visible constituted churches of God in the latter days of the gospel; viz. Congregational Churches of the Gentiles; such as were the seven churches in Asia, (at their first planting) Rev. 1.12-20. So that we may upon those scripture grounds conclude, that by the two witnesses Jesus Christ meant and intended his Churches of saints, and his faithful Ministers in their generations."

There is no Landmarkism here, but, "Congregational Churches of the gentiles," i.e., Protestants in Germany, Protestants in England, Waldenses, Wicklevists, Hussites, and their

followers under the name of Lollards.” Knollys signed the Second London Confession which has such a beautiful non-sectarian Preface and Appendix.

John Spilsbury wrote, “A treatise concerning the lawful subject of Baptism, 1642”, and the three following points found in the title page should show anyone that he was not a Landmarker.

4. If either church, or ordinance be wanting where they are to be found, and how recovered.
5. The covenant, and not Baptism, form the church and manner how.
6. There is no succession under the New Testament but what is Spiritually by faith in the word of God.

“And this falling out so, it follows that we are now to seek for the Lord’s true Baptism, and for a case so difficult, as some would make it, two things in special are to be inquired into; first, how and where to find it; secondly, how it may be obtained, being found. For the first if any ordinance of God should be so deceased in its constitution, as that we do not know where it is afoot in God’s way in the world, so as to come by it, with a good conscience; A people in such a case, being convinced to the truth, and the necessity of their obedience to God in the same, and yet know not the way, or manner how to accomplish their holy desire, in the finding and obtaining the same, they are to go, as of old, to Christ and his Apostles, as the Godly then did; that is to the Holy Scriptures, which are the lively oracles of God; the Spirit speaking in them unto a believing hearts; so they stand in the place of Christ and his Apostles, with the same ability and authority, to furnish a man with all truth; as these scriptures compared together sufficiently prove, II Tim. 3:15,16,17; II Pet. 1:19,20; Rom. 16:25,26; John 5:39; Mat. 22:29; Luk. 24:25,27,44,45,46; I Cor. 15:3,4... for though that God hath joined his word and ordinances together, yet he hath also ordained an orderly way, as of old, even so now if any be convinced of the truth, such may receive Baptism from the hands of those whom God used as instruments to bring his truth and their hearts to be one, this being ever the way that persons come under the administrations of Christ’s New Testament, as these scriptures do witness, Mat. 3:5,6; Acts 2:38; Acts 10:46,47,48.

For where the blessing of God goes together with his word to call persons to the knowledge of his truth, there is also power to admit such unto the obedience of the same as John 1:22; Mat. 28:18,19,20; Acts 8:36,37,38; Acts 10:46,47,48.

Yet a word by the way, because of such an error that some make, and how far off from any rule of example, for a man to Baptize others, and himself unbaptized, and so thinking hereby to shut up the ordinance of God in such a strait, that none can come by it, but through the authority and Popedom of Rome. But for the opening of this cloud that seems so to darken the sky, let the reader consider who Baptised John the Baptist, before he baptised others, he himself being unbaptized, and if he was baptized, whether it were not by an unbaptized person; and all scripture being written for our learning, and this being one, we are taught by this what to do upon the like occasion. And for the continuation of the Church from Christ’s words, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it”, I confess the samewith this distinction, which Church is to be considered either with respect to her instituted state as it lies in the scripture, in the rules of the foundation, in her

constitution; or constituted form in her visible order. Against the first hell gates never prevail, the foundations stand sure, but against the last, it hath often prevailed, for the church in her outward visible order, hath been often scattered through persecution, and the like, in which sense she is said to be prevailed against, as Dan. 7; Rev. 12; Acts 8:1. Otherwise, where was their church, before it came from under the defection.

And to conclude, I fear men put more in baptism than is of right due unto it, that so prefer it above the church, and all other ordinances besides, for they can assume and erect a church, take in and cast out members, elect and ordain officers and administer the supper, and all anew, without any looking after succession, any further than the scriptures; but as for baptism, they must have that successively from the Apostles, though it come through the hands of Pope Joan. What is the cause of this, that men can do all from the word, but only Baptism?... And thus all succession from the beginning came to Christ, and from Christ to the Apostles, and from them to the scriptures, which are the headspring of all to us, so that, all succession now is only Spiritual, according to faith, and follows not the personal succession of any, but only the word, that gives being to all order and ordinances that are of God."

Christopher Blackwood states:

"Who hath the power of Baptizing?" Answ. "I will not determine this question now, as requiring a tractize itself; which I propose to handle at large in time to come; If God only for present, the persons that lay claim to baptize, They are either ordinary believers, or ministers of the churches. For believers, I will not speak anything now, onely I will cite a saying of Tertull. Cap 17.: "It remains to conclude the matter, also to warn concerning the giving and receiving baptisme; the Bishop hath power of giving it, then again the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honor of Church; which being safe, the peace is safe, otherwise the right were in the people. For that which is equally received, may be equally given... Therefore also Baptisme being Gods tribute, may be exercised of all; But how much more doth the discipline of shamefastness and modesty lye on the people, that they do not take the Bishops office. All things are lawfull, but all things are not expedient. It's sufficient that thou use it in necessary time, place, person, because he shall be guilty of the man that is lost, if he shall forbear to perform what freely he might." This was delivered by him above 1300 yeares ago.

"or else the persons that baptize are ministers; and these are of two sorts."

"First, those that were chosen by the churches, and were never ministers before; of these I will not say anything."

"Secondly, they are such as are ministers now, and were so before; of these mens power I thus reason; Either the power ministeriall that was in the former church state, is true or false; If true then are we ministers, and have the same power to administer all ordinances, as being ordained by a Bishop as well as others; if that power were false, then the subject that must receive this power, must be wicked men or believers, or else Christ hath no subject on earth to receive it; but Christ

hath a subject, and these are not wicked men but believers; and these joyning together, have power to chuse a Pastor to administer ordinances; if a new ordination for such can be had, it is expedient; but if it cannot be had, then election in the beginning of the recovery out of the apostacy is sufficient, provided that the person chosen be guifted, and blameless; my reason is, because all ordinances and offices; do resolve themselves radically into Believers, in time of generall Apostacie.” (The Storming of Anti-Christ, 1644, p. 62)

This is the same argument as King, Spilisbury and all the Particular Baptists of the day. This tells how to “Take up” any ordinance that may be wanting. These believers “joyned together” (the covenant makes the church not Baptism - Spilisbury) have power to choose a pastor to administer ordinances. (Note the quote cited from Lofton of a later book by Blackwood.) Also, another signer of the 1644 confession was Thomas Kilcop and in his book “The Unlimited Authority of Christ’s Disciples Cleared” 1651, p. 20-21, this is stated in answer to an objection:

“Objection: But the call of the present ministry, was not immediate, nor by Apostles, nor by a true constituted Church, etc.” “I answer first, doth Christ give call to the ministry, a first, a second, a third way, then they that are called the first way only, or second, or third way only; are notwithstanding rightly called, and if there be a fourth, or fifth way, though not, the first, second, or third, are notwithstanding rightly called and so the present Ministry may be rightly called, though not called either of the first three ways.” (Remember, the Third way named in the objection was “by a true constituted church.” D.G.) “But Phillip and others scattered ones, Acts 8 and 11 which were not ministers of the word before were called to the ministry of the word and baptisme.

Not by Christ immediately.

Nor by Apostles with churches election.

Not by the church, but

by a providence (being scattered) there is therefore a providential call

The evangelist Titus was left in Creta to redress what was wanting, and ordain elders in every city, only minding, that they be rightly qualified.

Paul bade Timothy not to hinder any that should desire this office, case they that desire it, are suitably qualified, this is a first way. So then if the present ministry, be thereto called, neither of the three first ways; yet are they rightly called, if by either of the three last way, Providential, Evangelical, or Desirable, if they be suitably qualified, 1 Tim. 3: Tit. 1.”

The following testimonies are referenced in George Lofton’s book “English Baptist Reformation”, and while Lofton is writing on a different subject, chiefly in defense of his friend, Whitsett, and which fully concur such notable historians as Vedder, Newman, and Gould; these witnesses also show their same close alliance with the ones I have given about church organization and Baptism. (The wording describing and explaining these statements are Lofton’s).

“Christopher Blackwood (Apostolican Baptism; or a Sober Rejoinder, to a Treatise written by Mr. Blake &c., 1645). On page 2, To the Godly Reader, he uses this phraseology:

“The true Baptisme of Jesus Christ, against the Innovation (to say no more) of Infants Baptisme.”

Like Tombes, Blackwood regarded infant baptism an innovation of the early ages upon the baptism of Christ; and in the matter of giving it to the children of believing parents it was regarded as a late innovation – but not as late as the novelty of dipping among the Baptists of England. On page 12 he says:

“Now because the doctrine of dipping savors so of Novelism; not to instance in histories, without difficulty attainable; Peruse the book of Martyrs, Edition 7 (in which he refers Blake to Augustin and Paulinus baptizing in rivers) not in hallowed fonts &c.” This is as near as he brings any example of believers dipping in England to the period in which he wrote; and he here speaks of dipping as a novelty in his time. In reply to Blake’s claim that the ordinances have been retained under the defection of Antichrist and under the implied position that if this was not true there could be no restoration of baptism, Blackwood (p. 77) says:

“I answer, suppose all Ministry and baptism were condemned, both theirs and yours (to use your words) yet is there no difficulty in setting up a right ministry and baptism, the way whereto is; 1. For believers to consider that they are the subjects to receive all ordinances in time of an apostasy, 2. That these believers gather themselves together, 3. That they make profession of their faith one to another, 4. That they consent and agree together, to worship God in all his wayes, that is or shall be revealed to them, 5. That they chuse out a Pastor (If he may be had) that may administer all ordinances to them. For Christ’s promise of the gates of Hell, not prevailing against the church or churches, against which in all ages the gates of hell have prevailed; but the body of Christ or the invisible Church, who only makes the same believing confession that Peter did: Against these the gates of hell cannot prevail to make them renounce that confession, which with heart or mouth, or both, they have made.” P. 185-186.

Thomas Lamb (Truth Prevailing against the fiercest Opposition, &c., London, 1655). This is a reply to Goodwin’s “Water Dipping, &c.,” And on page 44 he answers especially the charge of Schism preferred against the Baptists who separated from the Puritans. He asks:

“Why should our separating from you be counted Schisme more than your separating from the Parish Churches? Is not our ground the very self-same which yours then was? And what can you say to Mr. Baxter, who chargeth you with schisme for withdrawing from the National Church, which we cannot answer you with. As the fatal Apostacie from the pure Ordinances of Christ and the example of the Primitive Churches to worship, was gradually, so hath the recovery of primitive purity been; now a little and there a little, as it hath used in the reformation, but it hath been as it were by inches, and still been made costly to the names and Instruments, they all bear this burthen which now Mr. Goodwin charges us with schisme. The Pope crieth Schisme and Heresie after the Church of England... The Bishops cry Schisme after some of the Presbyterians. The

Presbyterians cry Schisme after Mr. Goodwin and all the Separatists... which withdrawals have been so many steps towards primitive purity. Now Mr. Goodwin crieth Schisme (pretty liberally) after us who have gone a few steps further in the same path (which as yet his heart serveth him not to proceed in) that we may reach the things we have heard from the beginning. 1 John 2:24; Coloss. 4:12.”

Lamb squarely admits the charge of Baptist separation from the Separatists; and he argues their same right, at a later date, to separate from the Puritans, that they had at a still earlier date to separate from other Reformers. “Is not our ground (now) the very same which yours then was?” This is precisely Kiffen’s claim in his Briefe Remonstrance; and it is what Barber and all who touch the question of Baptist separation admit.” P. 199

“Thomas Kilcop (A Short Treatise of Baptisme, &c., London, 1642), after meeting Barebone’s arguments regarding infant baptism, he proceeds to answer the charge concerning the Baptist claim that baptism had been “lost”. He says (pp. 8-11): “You deride us in your booke about the rise, matter, and manner of baptisme, the two last are clearely proved by Scripture already, the use of it being once lost, is the onely thing to clear; of that therefore a few words. Our baptisme received in our infancy (being corrupted) is notwithstanding true or false. If true, though corrupted (as you hold), then (I conceive) is more corrupted (if so much) as baptisme, as in the first use; and then it followes that you doe ill in leaving true ordinances, and true church state, and should then returne againe. Ob. We shift off the corruptions only. Ans. Then should you goe to the root and strike at the greatest corruption first, which is I conceive the subject. Your onely course then would be to let your infants remaine unbaptized, and then such as you and others (upon triall) judge to be in covenant, and precious in God’s account, you might safely baptize by virtue of your baptisme, if yours be true, though corrupted, as you hold it is; and not doing so, you go a wrong way to work to root out corruption. But for my part, I believe Christ will at no rate own the baptizing of Infants for his baptisme, and therefore not true. And then it follows that it being false, is to be renounced as well as the church state being false, and true baptisme as well as true churchstate is to be erected except we turn Familists and Libertines to let all alone and live loosely, which opinion is held out, for ought I know, only by such as are given up to their own lusts. Ob. But where is your warrant for so doing? I answer, That every Scripture that gives you warrant, or any of your judgement, to erect a church state, gives us the same warrant to erect baptisme, sith the one cannot be done without the other, for none can put on Christ (that is visibly by outward profession) but such as are baptized into Christ, that is into the way or profession of Christ, for so in the meaning. Gal. 3:29. (John Smyth).

“So that is a certain company of you agreeing in one, may become a body with every one’s mutual consent: just so might we or you take up this ordinance, too, I mean if it be so that otherwise we cannot partake of it (AS ONCE IT WAS) and also know that Christ puts no impossibilities upon us, and we are nowhere so enjoined that if we cannot know absolutely a people that have upheld it ever since John, then not to partake of it. But we are absolutely enjoined to be baptized.

Mark 16:16. Which is an impossibility if that must needs be a tie. Againe, if Christ had so tied us, then would you be put to a great strait, to prove that baptisme that you have partakt of to be so upheld which thing I believe you cannot possibly doe; you must take the Pope's word for it or else some Historie or other which I dare not credit as I do the Bible." P. 180-181

Henry Jessey (Storehouse of Provision &c., London 1650). "This book was partly written against the Seekers and partly in the interest of open communion and against the strict communionists of that day; but it tells the same story of immersion revival by the Baptists of England. On pages 12, 76 Jessey is very clear in the definition and uses of baptism as a "dipping in water;" and on pages 13-15 he squarely meets the Seekers' argument, namely, that baptism having been lost, could not be restored except by a prophet or an angel, or some extraordinarily commissioned person. Jessey agrees with Smyth that "two or three persons gathered together in Christ's name" may appoint some one according to Christ's commission, to restore baptism; and contrary to the Blunt method of going to Holland for immersion, which was evidently in his mind, he says: "Say not in thine heart, Who shall goe to Heaven, or to sea, or beyond sea for it? but the word is nigh thee. Rom. 10. So we may not goe for administrators to other Countries, nor stay (wait) for them: but looke to the word." P. 191

Then Lofton gives what the enemy said:

S.C., in reply to A.R., in two volumes under the same title (A Christian Plea for Infant's Baptisme, &c., London, 1643). says, in the second work, Preface to the Reader (p.4) of the Anabaptists that they

"Deny and disclaime the Ordinance of Baptism which they have received in the Apostacie...Yea, they entangle themselves so in the bryars and thornes of the wilderness that they are driven now to hold a Church all of unbaptized persons; and that though none of them be baptized, yet the said Church may set apart one or more of her unbaptized members, and give them authority to baptize themselves and others; and yet they grant that baptisme may be where there is no Church, and so (casting away the baptisme which they formerly received) they are driven (in taking up their new baptisme) to affirm that an unbaptized person or persons may and must baptize themselves, and after that baptize others, else true baptisme can never be had."

This is precisely the position held by Baptists at the time – except in all cases, self-baptism – as shown by Baptist authorities and especially by Bampfield.

Robert Baillie (Anabaptisme the True Fountaine of Independency, &c., London, 1646). On page 53 Baillie states the Baptist position of his day accurately:

"This is clear of baptism, for they require in a baptizer not only no office, but not so much as baptism itself, all of them avowing the lawfulness of a person not baptized to baptize, and as it seems, to celebrate the Lords Supper."

John Goodwin (Water-Dipping, &c., 1653; Philadelphia, &c., 1653; Catabaptism, &c., 1655, London). In the first work Goodwin speaks in the title, as follows:

"Considerations proving it not simply lawful, but necessary also (in point of duty) for persons baptized after the new mode of dipping, to continue communion with

those churches, or imbodyed Societies of Saints, of which they were members before the said Dipping.”

He uses the expressions “New Baptism,” and “the Brethren of New baptized churches,” New Dippers of men and Dividers of churches;” “new Baptists” (pp.8-26), repeatedly. On page 31 Goodwin says:

“To plead that a person unbaptized, may administer Baptism in case of necessity, is a sufficient plea indeed thus understood, viz.: 1. When God himself adjudgeth and determines the case to be a necessity; and 2. Authorizeth from heaven any person, one or more, for the work, as he did John the Baptist. Otherwise Uzziah had as good or better reason to judge that case of necessity, in which he put forth his hand to stay the Ark, then our first unhallowed and undiptdipper in this nation had to call that a case of necessity, wherein the sad disturbance of the affairs of the Gospel, yea and of civil peace also, he set up the Dipping Trade.” P. 231

William Swayne, &c., To Mr. Everard’s book, &c.” Everard had taken the position that Swayne, as all other Pedobaptists, was to be regarded as a heathen, because unbaptized, Matt. 16-18: In reply (P.65) Swayne says: “

“If Heathen, because not baptized after their manner, and consequently no church; then Mr. Everard and those of his judgement, were no church before they received their new Baptisme; but they were Pagans as well as others. If they were no true church, their first Administrator was no true Administrator, because there was no church to conferre an office upon him. Therefore they must say, he had his first Commission immediately from heaven., unlesse they will affirme that Heathens have power to make an Administrator of Baptisme. Now this is contrary to the Scripture, which saith, they ordained Elders in every church, Acts 14:23. Therefore in the ordinary way the Church is before the Elders of Administrators. But if they shall say there was an Administrator before a church, as John Baptist; and therefore in like manner they may have such a one. If they say this they must prove from the Prophets that the Gospel-Churches must have two Baptists, be twice planted: which supposeth no Gospel Church in the world before the Second Baptist to plant a new church.

Farther also they must say that there is a second Christ before whom the second Baptist must come as forerunner: And so new institutions, and foundations of Ordinances, Baptists, Apostles, Miracles; and whither will not this conceit come? But if they say that the Commission of Matt. 28:19, was their first Administrator’s rule, then he must be a disciple made by ordinary preaching and teaching, before he had any authority to Minister their new Baptisme, who ever he was. And was taught by some Heathen (think they), or by a Disciple, then Christ had a disciple before their new Baptisme. Therefore they that want (need) this New Baptisme, cannot be stated Heathens. And how foule then was their assertion at Withibrook, to call us Heathens out of their order? And yet have neither command nor example in Scripture for their Baptisme, in reference to their first Minister’s Commission or Authority.”

This extract needs no comment as showing the true position of Baptists and of the controversy between them and Pedobaptists. The Baptists held to the restoration of a new church

and a new ministry by a new baptism, erected, after being lost, by the Scriptures; and here we see a specimen of Pedobaptist logic based upon Pedobaptist premises – succession. P. 230-231

Thomas Wall (Infants' Baptism from Heaven, London 1692). Besides charging, on page 22, that the Baptists of England received their Baptism from John Smyth – indignantly denied by Crosby and Collins – he says:

“For as Water Baptism is confessed by the Anabaptists to be a part of God's worship, see Mr. Keach's book, Gold Refin'd, P. 47, in these words Water Baptism is a part of Instituted Worship and service of God, without an express word drop'd from Christ or his Apostles, is Will-worship. Therefore by their own Grant, the way they come by their Baptism is Will-worship, and so Idolatrous, until they can prove it lawful for a man to Baptize himself, or that an unbaptized Person should Baptize another; and then that Person so Baptized, should Baptize him from whom he received his Baptism.” P. 236-237

Paul Hobson, a signer of the First London Confession, who in 1646 wrote a “Practicall Divinity, or a Helpe Through the blessing of God to lead men more to look within themselves and to unite experienced Christians in the bond and fellowship of the Spirit.” Notice how completely unsectarian Hobson was on pages 91-93:

“Some men say this is the Christian, and some that is the Christian, and it may be mistaken in both, for they make Christians according to their own fancy: if he do but jump with them in opinion, this is enough to hold him up a Christian, oh! he must needs be the godly man, and yet see not that rule the word holds forth in the life, marrow, and ministry of it; but beloved it will be so, every man judges by what light he has; and if his light be false or dark, so needs must his judgement be. Yet in my experience I see but (as it were) a dram of that weight of glory that is to be revealed upon the sons of truth.”

“And I will tell you what my thought are; I am persuaded, ere long, God will pick out Himself a choice people; now here is somewhat to do about churches and selected congregations, but you will see (if I mistake not) ere long, Congregations pickt out of congregations; of men that have experience of this life of living with God. And the ordinances shall yet be more and more purified; and yet they will not rest in ordinances, but shall have the marrow of ordinances: I say the time will come, that there will be a people who kiss and embrace one another in Spirit, and shall live in loving and enjoying one another, farre more than ever, yet our eyes have seen.”

“We should now have further proceeded to the next points; namely these, from the words: ‘My Dove, my undefiled is one. Doc. 2. That Christs Dove is not a defiled, but an undefiled company. Thirdly, that Christs undefiled Dove is but one; though they be scattered and divided here to men, yet to Christ they are but one, where we should have shewed the folly of many in these days, that they by their loves only to that congregated body of which they are in fellowship with; and if they differ in judgement from them; they have no love to them; neither do they account them of the number of Christs one, undefiled Dove; This is gross

ignorance, and proceeds from weakness, pride, and folly; and is indeed neere antiChrist; and the sopperies of men: Congregated, or uncongregated, so they bee Christs dove, we ought to love them.”

Joseph Hooke, (A Necessary Apology for the Baptized Believers, 1701, P. 134).

They believe the first Order are the Successours of the Apostles, and so do we. But then we are not well agreed concerning the way by which that Succession Desends from the Apostles, to the Ministers of this age and Nation. They for the most part are for a Personal Succession from St. Peter through the Popes to Archbishop Crammer, and so on Man by Man till it come at them; and we could derive our Succession the same way too, if we approved of it; for some of us received Ordination from such as were at the first Ordained by such Ministers as had received Ordination from the National Bishops, and so we could ascend to Arch Bishop Crammer, and so through the Popes of Rome, and search our Succession that way from the Apostle Peter, as others do; but we like not that way for many Reasons, one is because thereby we should ownall the Popes, before the Reformation In England, to have been lawfull Ministers to Christ, and true Successours of the Apostles which yet we believe they were not, but had lost their Succession long before; or if they were Lawfull Ministers then, why not yet? And then why do we not submit to his Authority that is now Pope; and give up our case to the Papists? and give them leave to Reform the Church, when, and by what means they please? But God forbid we should ever prove such Traytors to Christ, as to do so. We therefore think it sufficient that we can make appear that we succeed the Apostles in Faith, in Doctrine, in Worship, In Innocency, and in all parts of their Ministry which belongs to their Successours to do to the end of the World: Being competently gifted by the Lord, allowed by the People, and chosen and called to this Work by Men who have publick Authority given to them in the congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard. We believe this is a Lawfull Succession, and that we have as good a claim to it as any professours of the Christian Religion this day in the World.”

The following are quotes from two of the most learned General Baptists of the 1600’s, and unlike the general Baptists of our day (ABA’S), they knew from whence they came and it wasn’t the Baptismal route. Gosnold:

“Baptism to continue to the end of the world – through the Apostles and their successors in the Ministry.

“And that the Apostles in their own persons were to continue to the end of the world, we suppose no man so weak or willful to imagine, that this was Christ’s meaning and therefore must be understood of them and their successors to the end of the world.” Objection. Some further object against the present practice of this ordinance, for want of a due and lawful Minister of administrator, qualified by an extraordinary call as the apostles had, and a power to work miracles. Answer: First that miracles are not required to the minister of this ordinance, because the text itself saith expressly that John the Baptist, the first great Baptist did no

miracle, John 10:41. Yet his baptism was from heaven, Mt. 21:25. Secondly, that no extraordinary call is required to constitute a lawful administrator, appears from the institution itself, Mt. 28.

The Apostles being commissioned in this ministration as teachers, go teach and Baptise. There are two things in this commission about this matter. First, there must be a teaching disciple. Both these are contained in these words: Go, teach and Baptise. Further John 4:2 Christs Disciples are said to baptize as Disciples. So also in the history of the Acts, after the commission given by Christ, which was punctually observed by them, yet we read nothing of Phillipsextordinary mission to them at Samaria, when he baptised them. Acts 8. So of Ananias that Baptised Paul, all that is recorded of his fitness or qualification to this work, is, that he was a Disciple, Acts 9:10. "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus named Ananias, etc. and he baptised him, ver. 18." Neither is it probable, that Peter baptised all the 3000 Acts 2. Thus we see, that if the next immediate Age, after the ascension of Christ, may be allowed to be the best interpreters of his mind, that a Disciple as a Disciple, is a fit and right Minister of this Ordinance.

Objection. Some yet further object, that for a long time we have lost the use of this ordinance, by that anti-christian darkness which has covered the face of the whole earth; and therefore have no power to practice this ordinance again, till some extraordinary Prophet be raised up amongst us. Ans. We have a precedent under the law what to do in this case: When the people of Israel were carried into captivity, and having there lost, by reason of their bondage, the practice of some of their ordinances; yet after their return, never stayed for an extraordinary prophet; but did reform according to the law of Moses, and thereby many lost-ordinances (as the feast of Booths or Tabernacles) were restored according to their first institution. This was our case who is true for along time in this nation lost many of the New Testament Ordinances, in their primitive purity and practice; yet now our eyes are open. What remains, but according to those Reformers under the law to ask for the old paths and walk therein, and to reform in all things, as tis written in the New testament of our Lord, that great prophet and law giver under the gospel. We have the same Law to walk by as the primitive Disciples had, and therefore must walk as they did. Read Jer. 6:16. Object. Lastly, if any shall object, that at first amongst us in this nation an unbaptised person did baptise, and so could be no lawful administrator. Answ. We conceive the answer is ready and at hand, that the first Baptiser must of necessity be unbaptised, even John the Baptist himself, and yet judged a fit administrator of so excellent a subject as our Lord Himself was. Matt. 3 latter end.

Thus we trust we have sufficiently established this great ordinance of Baptism and answered all the objections to the contrary, of such who have endeavoured to raze it to the ground, and herein have dealt more unkindly with Christ, and his ordinances, than our fore-fathers; they have indeed have corrupted it for many generations, yet have kept alive the name of it..." Gosnold, A Discourse of the Baptism of the Water and of the Spirit. Pages 4-7.

Thomas Grantham (1678 - Ancient Christian Religion, Book 2, Chap.9, sect. viii, P. 127,128,129).

“Here we meet a cloud of questions or objections, old and new; “By what authority do you do these things? And who gave you this authority? Who are you? Whence came you? What have you to do in my vineyard?” Thus the papists out of Turtullian; and sometimes the Prelatists urge us after the same manner. To the latter therefore we say, Look how well they can defend themselves against Papists, so well at least may we defend ourselves to them; because we are ready at any time to show that the grounds on which we separate from them, are everyway as clear, as those on which they separate from the Papists. Nor are they exactly at a mind about the lawfulness of their call to the ministry. Luther and Beza holding for an extraordinary call, whilst our English Reformers from Cranmer to this day rather adhere to the ordination which they brought with them from the Papists, demming it a valid ordination, the corruptions attending it notwithstanding... These things premised, we now assume that either of these ways approved of by our Reformers espectively, could we go as well as yourselves, being, 1. Many of us ordained by those who received ordination from you, and so we could run with you to Cranmer, and then proceed, etc. And as for the opinion of Luther and Beza, about their extraordinary call, it’s not impossible for us to give as fair a demonstration that we have it, as either of them; especially if we take the rules given by Beza to judge of such a call by to be cogent, vs. Good life, sound doctrine, and the election of the people. but to be short, we do not like very well either of these ways: Not the first, it is so sordid, as that the Papists themselves in deriving their call through many diabolical Popes, even witches and devils, incarnate by their own confession, make but a lamentable succession of it in the end. Nor the second, for we will not compare with Isaiah, Daniel, Amos, Zecharus, in respect of their immediate mission. But this we say; That our call to the ministry is no other wise extraordinary, than our call to believe the gospel, or as it standeth clear from all the idle ceremonies used by Papists or others in their ordinations: or as it is ordered according to the word of God. and is the sacred word of power to beget us to God and not of power to enable us to worship him in his own ordinances; this seemjustly rediculous. We make no doubt at all but that it’s easy with God, and no extraordinary thing neither, to raise a people to himself in a nation, where all are gone out of the way of the Lord, merely through his blessing upon the reading and diligent searching of the scriptures; (I speak of a nation where the scriptures are received for God’s word, as that is our case, otherwise the difficulty were greater). The truth is, all the ways of God’s worship are made ready for us, and laid at our doors; and we do but take up gladly what others let lie as useless things, that they may hug their own shadows or other mens vanities. Yea to silence a Papist forever (which one would think to be a hard thing) in this question. Do they not allow, in case of necessity, an heathen to baptize, and count it a valid Baptism? And why then may not we, when God has opened our eyes to see any other truth as well as that, enter upon the dutiful observance of it in the best way we can, all circumstances being considered. Will not necessity warrant a man to administer the Lord’s Supper, as well as Baptism? For my part I shall never believe but the one ordinance is as sacred as the other; and where churches are settled, ought to be dispenced in the

most honorable way, and by the most meet instruments; wherefore a Papist granting me so much as aforesaid in the case of Baptism I will not thank him (unless to serve him to his good) that he grant me the same power to take up the practice of any other ordinance whatsoever... So that we see from this instance (of Paul and Barnabus being ordained by men that were not under ordination, Acts 13; D.G.) a successive ordination from the Apostles and from persons ordained by them, is interrupted even in the Apostles days; and therefore we conclude, that where the truth of the gospel is received with the gifts of God's Holy Spirit, there is a sufficiency of power also on the persons so gifted with the advice and consent of the Church, to send forth, or to appoint men to the work of the ministry, whom God has fitted for such services. Although this course is not to be taken in contempt or neglect of that way which is more ordinary and regular. Howbeit to tie the power of ordination so straightly to the persons or men ordained, by those who were ordained by such as were ordained by the Apostles themselves, would in all likelihood throw the power of ordination out of the whole church of God at this day, especially if we stand on the due election and qualification of the persons so claiming a succession from the Apostles themselves, that men sent by the Church to minister in the gospel; are sent by the Holy Ghost; so that if we prove our churches true churches of Christ, (as that we have, and trust further to manifest) then the controversy about our lawful call to the ministry is at an end."

Grantham gives two opinions on the question of Authority: 1. An extraordinary call, or 2. Succession, and decides on neither; but the same power that begat us to God is the same power to obey the ordinances; that God's people may inter upon the dutiful observance of baptism without a succession. King: what Daniel King calls a church (a company of believers) who could take up what is amiss, namely baptism; Landmarkers would claim it was not a church to begin with, not being baptized. King says the people of God have reformed just as Israel reformed in their ordinances which were amiss. Landmarkers boast reformation was never needed, there being a constant succession of "true" Baptists. King says the commission was given to them as preaching disciples; Landmarkers say the commission was given only to the churches. King says a disciple may preach before baptism; Landmarkism teaches "There is a definite connection between baptism and preaching."

King and the endorsers of his book (Kiffen, Spilsbury, Patience, Pearson) did not think a succession was necessary to the observance of Baptism: That idea, is Landmarkism. Spilsbury: First, Spilsbury discussed where to find any ordinance that is lost. His advice - the scriptures; Baptism through the hands of the instruments God uses to convert them; whether he be baptized or not, the example he gives is John the Baptist. Concerning perpetuity he distinguishes between the instituted state in scripture and the rules thereof, with the visible constituted order and says the gates of hell has often prevailed against the latter, but not the former. All of the above is against Landmarkism and his last paragraph is certainly true: "Men put more in baptism than is of right due into it... preferring it above the church and all other ordinances besides; and "the succession now is only Spiritual."

Gosnold: Does not deny, but affirms, that an unbaptised disciple did begin baptism in the English nation. His scriptural example: John the Baptist, this was also the same as Spilsbury,

Laurence and Knollys (which, incidentally, shows the agreement of Knollys with the others; also he was a signer of the 1st confession in the 2nd ed.).

Graves: (Old Landmarkism P. 74)

“No one is warranted to preach, and to baptize now, without having received baptism or the ordination of some church, because John the Baptist did so. No deacon can claim the right to preach and baptize, by virtue of his office, when traveling in a strange country, should a stranger demand Baptism at his hands, because Phillip, one a deacon, baptized the Eunuch.”, Also in the Great Carrollton Debate. P. 976:

“Whatever any, one man here and there among Baptists may hold orthodox Baptist teachers do not hold that a company of christian men can start a church by baptizing themselves, and if they did, the word of God does not warrant it.”

It wasn't any “one man here and there among Baptists” but the “majority of the more wise and judicious: that held what Graves denies - they were “orthodox”, but not Landmark; they did use John the Baptist as their example of an unbaptized administrator. How blind is prejudice for its theory! Graves says “If they did”; Dayton says “There is no proof that they, did so.” - All against the above testimony of these old Baptists themselves! And for Graves, Dayton, and Pendleton, or, any other Landmark to decide who are “orthodox” and “true Baptists”, let them first admit their prejudices to their own theory that so blinds them to the facts of history and scripture, then may we pay some attention to them!

CHAPTER 2

THE KIFFEN MS.

This Ms. is used by Landmarkers to “prove” a link between the Baptists of England and the Waldenses of former times. Christian denies the authenticity of the MS. because: 1. The phrase “...none having then so practiced in England to professed believers...” (1640. 3d MO.); 2. No contemporary writers ever mentioned Blunt, Blacklock, etc. But Christian is inconsistent in denying the statement because he proves the Particular Baptists of England “Took up” the ordinance among themselves by an unbaptized administrator which would be unnecessary if Baptized administrators were available. Crosby was not troubled with the statement and shows three methods that both the General and Particular Baptists used in restoring lost ordinances: 1. Se-Baptism; 2. Importing the ordinance; 3. Taking up the ordinance by the authority of the word of God. Lofton says:

“After a most thorough investigation of the Kiffen MS and the relation of its facts to congregational and Baptist history from 1633 to 1641 such historians as Crosby, Ivimey, Evans, Neal, Newman, Vedder, Whitset, Burrage, Rauschenbusch, Barclay, Dexter, de Hoop Scheffer, and the like, do risk their reputation in declaring this document authentic...” (A defence of the Jessey Records and Kiffen Ms. Lofton, P. 42).

Indeed Lofton gives fifty-two witnesses to prove that immersion was restored in 1641 (twenty-eight Baptists and twenty-four of other denomination). All agreeing with the statement denied by Christian. A.T. Robertson said: (concerning Lofton’s book):

“Your book is a superb piece of work - so open - minded, so thorough, so exhaustive, so conclusive. How anyone can resist the evidence you present is a mystery to me. You have done the truth a lasting service.” (Ibid, some testimonials, p. 136).

But one (of the many) best proofs of the authenticity of the “Kiffen Ms” is Lofton’s final:

“A final confirmation of the Kiffen Manuscript or Jessey Records is found in the life and writings of Henry Jessey himself. In a work entitled, The Life and Death of Mr. Henry Jessey, London, 1671, written by E.W., I find on page 9 the following with regard to the division of the Jessey Church, 1640: “Upon the 18th day of the third month called May, 1640, they divided themselves equally, and became two Congregation, the one whereof continued with Mr. Jessey, the other joynted themselves to Mr. Praise God Barebone, each of the churches renewing their Covenant and choosing distinct officers of their own from among themselves.”

On page 83 the author says:

"In 1644, He held several debates with the Leaders of Several Congregations, Concerning Pedo Baptisme, for he questioned whether it could Be proved from Scripture that any others had right to that Ordinance of the Sacrament, but such as cangive account of their Faith in Christ, and their answers not seeming to him Satisfactory; He was (about Mid-summer) the year (1645) following baptized by Mr. Knowles, though his own Congregation at that time was most of them for Infant Baptisme."

This part of Jessey's history is substantially found in the so-called Kiffin Manuscript, or Jessey Church Records. The author does not mention the Blunt movement found in the same connection; but as he was writing simply the life of Jessey, who did not join with Blunt in

his movement, except in conviction and council, only that part of the history which immediately related to Jessey and Barebone is recorded." (Lofton, English Baptist Reformation, p. 101)

I'll quote from Lofton the history of the Documents and the documents themselves:

"The documents which come under the above head are found in a collection of papers entitled: "A Repository of Divers Historical Matters Relating to the English Antipedobaptists. Collected from Original Papers or Faithful Extracts. Anno 1712."

The author of this collection, without giving his name, says: "I began to make this collection in January 1710-11."

The Jessey Church Records, including the so-called Kiffin Manuscript, embrace Numbers 1,2,3, and 4 of this "collection" of somethirty-three documents as recently discovered by Dr. Geo. P. Gould, of London, but which are substantially found in Crosby's History of theEnglish Baptists, Neal's History of the Puritans, and other works.

The first document of this "collection" entitled "Number 1," has the following heading:

"The Records of an Antient Congregation of Dissenters from wch many of ye Independent and Baptist Churches of London took their first rise: ex MSS. of Mr. Henry Jessey, wch I received of Mr. Richard Adams."

All these four documents were received by the collector from Richard Adams, who was the colleague of William Kiffin in the pastorate of the Devonshire-square Baptist Church of London from 1690 to 1701, who succeeded Kiffin at his death in 1701, and who died himself in 1718. According to Crosby and Ivimey, he was educated byDr. John Tombes, and "lived to a very great age." He was evidently born before the days of 1633, and was well acquainted with Jessey and the movements of 1640-41. The "collector" of these documents must have been Benjamin Stinton, who purposed writing a Baptist history, and who doubtless received these documents from Adams in 1710-11. Crosby says (Vol. IV., p. 365) of Stinton: "He had been for some years collecting materials, in order to write an History of the English Baptists in 1738-40. These Jessey Records, including theKiffin Manuscript, are found in Crosby's history; and the inference is clear that he received them from Stinton, that it was Stinton, the collector, who received

them from Jessey and Kiffin with the view of collecting and keeping Baptist records.

Some call these documents “anonymous” because of the absence of the collector’s name; but the name of Jessey, the writer, and Adams, the holder of these papers, are so given as practically to rob them of any anonymous character - especially so if they are true to history. No doubt, we should have had the name of Stinton, the collector, had he lived to write his history; and we do have him pretty well identified by Crosby, who declares that he had been for “some years collecting materials” for an English Baptist history, among which these very Records are found, and which Crosby uses as perfectly reliable testimony. Really, they are not anonymous. Their authorship and authenticity are well established by two names at least, Jessey and Adams, who were contemporary with the collector, who was also wellknown to Crosby in 1710-12. The very connection of Richard Adams, a very aged and respectable Baptist minister, with these documents especially deserves serious and candid consideration.”

English Baptist Reformation
(From 1609 To 1641 A.D.)
Chapter VIII
The So-Called Kiffin Manuscript

“The Kiffin Manuscript”, so-called is identical with that part of the Jessey Records which include the origin of the Particular Baptist Churches, the restoration of imersion and a list of the signers of the Confession of 1644. In the collection of 1712 it is marked “Number 2;” and it is but part and parcel of the Jessey Church Records from 1604 to 1645. Crosby quotes the 1633, 1638 parts ascribed by Crosby to the Kiffin Manuscript; and if the 1633, 1638 parts ascribed by Crosby to the Kiffin Manuscript are the Jessey Records, the 1639, 1640, 1641 parts so ascribed by him are also the Jessey Records, or an abstract from them. Possibly the documents, after Kiffin’s death was found by Adams, his colleague, among his papers and so received by Crosby as his manuscript from the collector; but it is evident that Kiffin was not the original author of it by reason of its identity with the Jessey Records.

Upon this document Crosby partly founds his history of the restoration of immersion by the English Baptist, so far as the first or “former method” is concerned. He uses the Hutchinson Account before this manuscript as the basis of his history, but he gets the details out of the document. In fact, Crosby is wholly indebted to the Jessey Church Records for the origin of the first Particular Baptist Church founded in 1633-38; and it is in view of Crosby’s use of this document as a whole that I wish to examine it. It has been charged that he used the 1640-41 part indirectly as if to discredit it; but if so, he discredits the whole of it. It has also been charged that the original document as discovered and copied by Rev. Geo. Gould, of London, and recently used by Dr. Whitsitt, is a forgery; that Crosby never saw it, but only saw some such document, the substance of which he gives in history, and hence this particular manuscript is a forgery of “recent date,” not more than forty years old.

Now I wish to show that this manuscript, in its original form, ascribed to Kiffin by Gould, who found it among the “Ex. MSS. of Mr. Jessey,” was before Crosby when he wrote his History of the Baptists; and I wish to say that if this document is a forgery then all the other documents discovered and copied by Gould are forgeries, since they are all found together. Among them is the Bampffield Document, No 18, which I have verified by the work of the

author; and I am satisfied that I have found confirmation sufficient in the writings of Jessey to identify him as the author of this manuscript, or, at least, cognizant of the facts it records. I shall here give a comparative collation of what are designated as the Jessey Records, the Kiffin Manuscript and Crosby's version for substance these two documents which are identically the same, with minor exception, under their respective dates."

1633

1. THE JESSEY RECORDS. "1633. There having been much discussing, these denying Truth of ye Parish Churches and ye Church become now so large yt it might be prejudicial, these following desired dismission that they might become a Entire Church & further ye Communion of those Churches in Order amongst themselves, wch at last was granted to them & performed Sept. 12, 1633, viz: Henry Parker & Wife, Widd Fearne...Hatmaker, Marke Luker, Mr. Wilson Mary Wilson Thos Allen Jo:Milburn. to these joined Rich. Blunt, Thos Hubert, Rich: Tredwell & his wife Kath: John Trimber, Wm Jennings & Sam Eaton, Mary Greenway, Mr Eaton with some others receiving a further baptism.

"Others Joyned to them."

2. THE KIFFEN MANUSCRIPT. "1633. Sundry of ye Church whereof Mr Jacob and Mr John Lathrop had been pastors, being dissatisfyed with ye Churches owning of English Parishes, to be true Churches desired dismission & joyned together among themselves, as Mr Henry Parker, Mr. tho Shepard, Mr. Sam Eaton, Marke Luker, and others with whom joyned Mr. Wm. Kiffin."

3. CROSBY'S VERSION FOR SUBSTANCE. (Vol. I., P. 148.) (1633.) "There was a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters of the Independant Persuasion in London, gathered in the year 1616, whereof Mr Henry Jacob was the first pastor; and after him succeeded Mr John Lathrop, who was their minister at this time. In this society several persons, finding that the congregation kept not to their first principles of separation, and being also convinced that baptism was not to be administered to infants, but such only as professed faith in Christ, desired that they might be dismissed from that communion, and allowed to form a distinct congregation, in such order as was most agreeable to their own sentiment.

The Church considering that they were now grown very numerous, and so more than could in these times of persecution conveniently meet together, and believing also that these persons acted from a principle of conscience, and not obstinacy, agreed to allow them the liberty they desired, and that they should be constituted a distinct church; which was performed the 12th of Sept., 1633. And so they believed that baptism was not rightly administered to infants, as they looked upon the baptism they had received in that age as invalid; whereupon most or all of them received a new baptism. Their minister was Mr. John Spilsbury. What number they were is uncertain, because in the numbering of the names of about twenty men and women, it is added with others."

1638

1. THE JESSEY RECORDS. "1638. These also being of the same judgement with Sam Eaton and desiring to depart and not be censured, our interest in them was remitted with prayer made in their behalfe June 18th 1638. They having first forsaken us & joyned with Mr Spilsbury, viz Mr. Peter Ferrer Hen Pen Tho: Wilson Wm Batty Mrs Allen (died 1639) Mrs Norwood.

2. THE KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT. "1638. Mr Thomas Wilson, Mr Pen & 3 more being convinced that Baptism was not for infants, but professed Believers, joyned with Mr. Jo Spilsbury, ye Churches favor being desired therein."

3. CROSBY'S VERSION FOR SUBSTANCE. (Vol. I., p. 149) (1638): "In the year 1638, Mr. William Kiffin, Mr. Thomas wilson, and others, being of the same judgement, were upon their request, dismissed to the said Mr. Spilsbury's congregation."

1639

1. THE KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT. "1639. Mr. Green with Captn Spencer had begun a Congregation in Crutched-Fryars, to whom Paul Hobson joyned who was now with many of that Church one of ye Seven."

2. CROSBY'S ALMOST LITERAL VERSION. (Vol. I., p. 149.) (1639) "In the year 1639, another Congregation of Baptists was found, whose place of meeting was in Crutched-Fryars; the cheif promoters of which were Mr. Green, Mr. Paul Hobson, and Captain Spencer."

1640-1641

1. THE KIFFIN MANUSCRIPT. "1640. 3rd Mol: The Church became two by mutual consent just half being with Mr. P Barebone, & ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richard Blunt with him being convinced of Baptism yt also it ought to be by dipping in ye Body into ye Water, resembling Burial & rising again. 2 Col. 2:12. Rom. 6:4 had sober conference about it in ye Church, & and then with some of the forenamed who also ware so convinced. And after Prayer & Conference about their so enjoying it, none having then so practiced it in England to Professed Believers & hearing that some in Ye Netherlands had so practiced they agreed and sent over Mr. Rich. Blunt (who understood Dutch) with letters of Commendation, and who was Kindly accepted there, and returned with letters from them Jo: Batte a Teacher there and from that Church to such as sent him."

"1641. They preceed therein, viz Those Persons that ware persuaded Baptism should be by dipping ye Body had met in two Companies, and did intend so to meet after this, all these agreed to proceed alike together And then Manifesting (not by any formal Words a Covenant) wch word was scrupled by some of them, but by mutual desires and agreement each testified:

"Those two Companys did set apart one to Baptize the rest; so it was solemnly performed by them.

"Mr. Blunt Baptized Mr. Blacklock yt was a Teacher amongst them & Mr. Blunt being baptized, he & Mr. Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends that ware so minded, & many being added to them they increased much.

The names of all 11 Mo. Janu: begin

1. Richard Blunt	Sam Blacklock	Tho. Shephard)
2. Greg Fishburn	Doro Fishburn	his wife)
3. John Cadwell	Eliz Cadwell	Mary Millison)
4. Sam Eames	Tho. Munden	
5. Thos. Kilcop	William Willieby	
6. Robert Locker	Mary Lock	
7. John Braunson	John Bull	
8. Rich. Ellis	Mary Langride	
9. Wm Creak	Mary Haman	
10. Robert Carr	Sarah Williams	
11. Martin Mainprise	Joane)	

)Dunkle	
	Anne)	
12.Henry Woolmare	Eliz. Woolmore	
15.Henry Creak	Judeth Manning	
16.Mark Lukar	Mable Lukar	
17.Henry Darker	Abigal Bowden	
13.Robert King	Sarah Norman	
14.Thomas Waters	Isabel Woolmore	
Ellis Jessop	Mary Kreak	
	Susanna King	
		41 in all
11 th month	11 January 9 added	
understood		
as appears	John Cattope	George Wenham
above: &	Nicholas Martin	Thomas Davenant
this was	Allie Stanford	Rich. Colgrave
Jan 9th	Nath Matthon	Eliz. Hutchinson
	Mary Birch	John Croson
	Sybilla Lees	
	John Woolmore	
Thus 53 in all		

2. CROSBY'S VERSION FOR SUBSTANCE, INCLUDING LITERAL QUOTATIONS (1640) (Vol. III., P. 41.) "For in the year 1640 this church became two by mutual consent; just half, says the manuscript, being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Henry Jessey." "This (manuscript), says Crosby (Vol. I., p. 101), "relates, that several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregations of the dissenters about London were convinced that believers were the only proper subjects of baptism, and that it, ought to be administered by immersion, or dipping the whole body, in water, in remembrance of a burial and resurrection, according to 2 Colos. ii:12 and Rom. vi.:4. That they, often met together to pray and confer about this matter, and consult what methods they should take to, enjoy this ordinance in its primitive purity: That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice; because tho' some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not as they knew of REVIVED the ancient custom of immersion: But hearing that some in the Netherlands practiced it, they agreed to send over one, Mr. Richard Blount, who understood the Dutch language: That he went accordingly, carrying letters of recommendation with him, and was, kindly received by the church there, and, Mr. John Batte, their teacher: That upon his return he baptized, Mr. Samuel Blacklock, a minister, and, these two baptized the rest of their company, whose names appear in the manuscript, to the number of, fifty-three."

The italics (underlined, D.G.) mark the almost literal quotations of Crosby from the original Kiffin Manuscript, showing that the document was then and there in existence as we now have it.

Now it is clear that the original MS., as ascribed to Jessey (1633, 1638), and that ascribed to Kiffin (1633, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641), were before Crosby when he wrote his history. He took his account of the origin of the first Particular Baptist Church and the restoration of

immersion directly from these documents, as a comparison of his account with these original records will show.

1. As a rule Crosby took the liberty to quote substantially, and, as he saw fit, to make corrections (which were mostly blunders by addition, subtraction, or explication. He used the Jessey Records and the Kiffin Manuscript as the same document in his version of the secession of 1633; and in his marginal note (Vo. I., p. 149) he refers the Kiffin MS. to the "Records of that church," which were doubtless the Jessey MSS. On page 41 (Vol. III.) he brackets the exact words of the Kiffin MS. (1633), "(with whom joined Mr. William Kiffin)" as if to correct the mistake, since Kiffin never joined the 1633 secession, nor any church at that time; and Crosby himself, by mistake, puts Kiffin with Spilsbury in 1638, contrary to the later accounts of Ivimey and Orme, who place him with Jessey at that date. In the 1639 account Crosby follows the Kiffin MS., almost literally, except in adding the word "Baptist," which was another blunder. In the 1640-41 section of the Kiffin MS., so-called, Crosby combines the separate accounts of the two dates, which almost literally correspond with the document. He omits the date, 1641, but incorporates the date 1640; and most of his transcript, after the 1640 quotation, is a somewhat literal detail of the precise facts as related in the MS. There is absolutely no essential difference between Crosby's indirect and the direct statement of the document as to the matters of fact in the whole section included under the 1640 and 1641 dates.

2. But the fact that the original documents, as we now have them were in Crosby's hands is more manifest by the literal and direct quotations of sentences, phrases and words found in his transcript. In Vol. III., p.41, he quotes the very words from the original manuscript; "For in the year 1640, this Church became two by mutual consent just half, says the manuscript, being with Mr. P. Barebone, and the other half with Mr. Henry Jessey"; and on the same page (41) he quotes verbatim the bracketed clause, 1633 "(with whom joined William Kiffin)," referring the clause to the "same manuscript." Over on page 42 (Vol. III.) Crosby continues to refer to this "same manuscript" as including the 1638 and 1639 paragraphs, as in Vol. I., p. 149, written by William Kiffin; and this identifies the 1633, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, paragraphs of the original MS., ascribed to Kiffin, as all belonging to one and the same manuscript, according to Vol. III., pp. 41,42.

In the remainder of the 1640-41 paragraphs of this MS. cited (Vol. I., pp. 102,103) Crosby closely follows Blunts' conviction with others ("several sober and pious persons") that baptism ought to be by dipping, according to Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12. He mentions their frequent prayer and conference about how they should "enjoy" the ordinance in its primitive purity. He paraphrases the main sentence: "none having then so practiced it in England to professed believers," so as to read: "they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice;" and he gives a reason which makes his paraphrase stronger than the original sentence: "Because tho' some (Anabaptists) in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not as they knew of, revived the ancient custom of immersion," which, he says "had for sometime been disused."

(English Baptist Reformation, Lofton, P. 91-97)

Crosby also paraphrases the, reason for Blunt's going to Holland which is not stated in the "Kiffin" MS. "They could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice." Crosby admits he got his idea from Hutchinson. This mis-interpretation of Crosby from the Records has been propagated by most historians since, but -

LET US NOTICE EIGHT WITNESSES AGAINST CROSBY'S INTREPRETATION:

1. The manuscript itself does not say Blunt was baptized in Holland, but in England (also see the histories of White, Torbett and Christian who agree on this point):

“Mr. Blunt baptized Mr. Blacklock yt was a teacher amongst them and Mr. Blunt, being baptized, he and Mr. Blacklock Baptized ye rest of their friends that ware so minded...”

The present “being baptized” is showing clearly, when Blunt was baptized, i.e., after Blacklock was baptized - in England not in Holland! Had Blunt been before baptized in Holland the phrase would have been, “And Mr. Blunt having been before baptized”, according to the MS.’ own language. Notice the preceeding statement of the year 1640:

“The church became two by mutual consent just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richard Blunt wth him, being convinced of Baptism yt also it ought to be by dipping in ye Body into ye water, resembling Burial and rising again. 2 Col. 2.12. Rom. 6.4 had sober conference about in ye church, and then with some of the forenamed who also ware so convinced. And after prayer and conferance about their so enjoying it, none having then so practised in England to professed Believers and hearing that some in ye Netherlands Had so practiced they agreed and sent over Mr. Rich. Blunt...”

Notice also, the following words: “and Mr. Blunt being Baptized, he and Mr. Blacklock Baptized the rest of their friends that ware so minded, and many being added to them they, increased much.” No one would assume these “many being added to them” were actually added before this account, and why assume “and Blunt being baptized” was actually baptized before in Holland! We have to take the language as it is, not assume there is something there that it does not say.

But why send Blunt to Holland? To confirm their new beliefs by others who believed the same. Blunt returned with letters undoubtedly confirming their faith - not landmark letters of dismissal from their church into which he had supposedly been baptized; nor a letter of authority to baptise them in England into the church in Holland (and at the same time their dismissal to form a church authoritatively), as our second witness will clearly show.

2. Document Number 4, 1644:

“An Account of divers Conferances held in ye Congregation of wch Mr. Henry Jessey was Pastor, about Infant baptism by wch Mr. H. Jessey and ye greatest part of that Congregation ware proselyted to ye opinion and Practice of ye Antipedobaptists.

being an old M.S.S. wch I received of Mr. Adams, supposed to be written by Mr. Jessey, or transcribed from his Journal.”

“1643 ABOUT BAPTISME. QU: ANS:

“Hanserd Knollys our Brother not being satisfied for Baptizing his child, after it had been endeavored by ye elder & and by one or two more: him self referred to

ye Church then that they might satisfie him, or he rectifye them if amiss herein which was well accepted.

“Hence meetings were appointed for conference about it at R Ja: & B. K & B. G. & each was performed with prayer & in much love as Christian meetings (because he could not submit his judgement to depend on with its power – So yielded to)

“Elder – The maine argument was from these fower conclusions

“1. Those in Gospel Institutions are so set down to us. – those not cleare

“2. Whatever Priviledg God hath given to his Church as a Church is still given to all Churches.

“3. God hath once given to his Church as a Church this privilege to have their Children in Gospel covenant, & to have its token in Infancy Gen. 17.7.10.

“4. Baptism seems to be in ye rome of Circumcision.

“Conclusion: to be now to Churches Infants.

“H. K. Ans:

“To ye third on wch ye weight lyes, that it wants ground and proof from Scripture. That Gen. 17 proves it no more to be given to a church as a Church, for their Infants to have this token of Covenant in Infancy, than for the Churches Servants all bought with money &c without exception of Religion to be Baptized: and yt not only ye Chil: but Childrens Children to many Generations though neither Father nor Grandfather were faithful must be Members; for thus it was with Abraham’s posterity: therefore this was not with it as a Church, but as Jewish or as peculiar to Abrahams seed Naturall. Unless we may say of the Children of such wretches that certainly the Lord is their God and they his people, contrary to 1 Cor. 7.14.

“Elder.

“Ma: All such as we ought to judg to be in Gods covenant under promises should have ye token of ye Covenant

“Mi: Thus of ye Infants of Believers especially Church members.

“Ans. (B. K. Argumt)

“To ye first proposition or major its not ye Covenant yt interests to ye token of itselfe, but God’s Institution, proved thus

“1. The Lord’s Supper is a token of the New Covenant, it must be to such children as being in Covenant, if Argument good

“2. Enoch, Methusala, Noah, Sem: ware in Covenant & to be judges so & Abraham at 75 years old & Isaac at two days old: these then must have circumcision if major be sound, but not so besides being in Covenant there must be a word on Institution touching the time & adjuncts &c. In Gospell times wherein all these are New there are now subjects, Gentiles: a new way of taking them in; new Ordinances, new time to them; as ye Lord’s Supper so Bapt: As we must not goe to Moses for ye Lord’s Supper, its time, Persons to partake &c but to New Testament so we must for Baptism. Now in New Testament is no Institution of Infant baptism.

“The being ye seed of Abraham would not qualify them for Baptism Matt:3. This is the substance of what was discussed in all Love for many weeks togeather.

"Issue hereof was the conviction of Bro., Jac. & S. K. B. S. now against Pedobap: & ye staggering of more, whereof some searched ye Scriptures, some prayed earnestly for light, & had such impression on their Spirits against Pedobaptisme, as they told ye Elder on his enquiry, that he could not but judge there was much of God in it, yet still he then remaind in his judgement for it: though thus 16 ware in a weeks space against it, wth little or no speach each with other. This was about the 17th of Mo 1643-4. Having had weekly loveing conferance with prayer from ye midst of 11 Mo 1644. 1644.2,28. Concluded that to our friends yt then live in ye county (about 12) a letter sould be writt from Church to each with tender care, exhortation and consolation.

"1644. 3.29. At Mr Fountains ye Church considered not futher to do. some judged yt ye Church censure should pass, others not.

"Conclusion was to desire ye advice of ye Elders & Brethren of other Churches, wch was done 1644.3.27: at Mr Shambrookes where ware present these

"Mr Barebone, Rozer, Dr Parker, Mr Erburg, Mr Cooke, Mr Thomas Goodwin, Mr Philip Nye, Mr G. Sympson, Mr Burrows, Mr Straismere.

"These by enquiry not satisfyed that in these absenters was obstinacy but tender conscience & holyness & not disturbing in our proceed advised us

"1. Not to Excommunicate, no, nor admonish wch is only obstinate.

"2. To count them still our Church & pray & love them.

"3. Desire conversing together so farr as their principles permit them, so waiting till either (1) some come in, or (2) some grow giddy & scandalous then proceed against them, to this we agrees and so parted.

"The names of some of our Dearly beloved Friends yt scrupled about ye administration of Baptisme &c and in tenderness forbore ware these

B)	S. Knollys
) Jackson	S. Keneston
S)	B. Hen. Jones
B)	S. Pickford
) Nowell	S. Dorrell
S)	Eliza Phillips
S. Bayh	S. Reves
B. Berry	B. Wade
B. W. Hulls	
S. Phillis Atkinson	

and afterwards these

S. Eliza Alport	S. Wade
S. Eliza Michael	"After some time all these
	in the
S. Lydia Strachen	2nd Row were satisfied
	vide in
S. Kath Prodage	their scruple and judged
	supra
S. Cotheldy	yt such disciples as are
	gifted

S. Agnes Nadinam to teach & evangelise may
 also
 B) baptize &c &c and ware
 baptized
) Golding
 S)
 S. Kent (yt dyed)

Some before H. Jessey and the rest of ye church ware convinced against Pedobaptism. And hence desired to enjoy it where they might, & Joyned also, some with Bro. Knollys, some with Bro Kiffin, thus These

B. S. Knollys	B. Ford
B. S. Wade	B. Potshall
B. Couver	S. Dormer
S. Jane Todderoy	S. Pickford
S. Eliza Phillips	S. Reves
	B. Darel
	B. Blunt

“After H. Jessey was convinced also, the next morning early after that wch had been a day of Solemne seeking ye Lord in fasting & prayer (That Infant Baptism were unlawful & if we sould be further bap-tized &c, the Lord would not hide it from us, but cause us to know it) First H Jessey was convinced against Pedobaptisme & then that himself should be baptized (notwithstanding many conferences with his honored Beloved Brethren Mr Nye, Mr Tho: Goodwin, Mr Burroughs, Mr Greenhill, Mr Cradock, Mr Carter &c &c. with Mr Jackson, Mr Bolton &c). 1645 4 Mo Vul June 29. And was baptized by Mr Knollys, and then by degrees he baptized many of ye Church, when convinced they desired it. “Then in time some of those before named returned to communion wth this church as

S. Kenaston	B & S. Wade
B. Hen. Jones	S. Dorrell
S. Buckley	S. Huddel als.
	Levill”

Lofton, English Baptist Reformation, p. 262-265

Notice this:

“After time all these in ye 2nd Row were satisfyed vide in their scruple and judged supra yt such disciples as are gifted to teach and evangelise may also baptize &c &c and ware baptized.”

They “scrupled” about the administration of Baptism, but then were satisfied that “such disciples as are gifted to teach and evangelise may also baptize.”

B. (rother) Blunt is listed as being with them at this time and if their “scruples” about the administration of baptism included successionism which is clearly implied by which they afterward had changed their mind and were “satisfied” about in a Baptized administrator - Blunt would have filled the bill, if he had been baptized in Holland; all which shows he wasn’t; and also shows their agreement with the confession of the seven particular churches in London who had formed their confession the same year (1644).

3. The Testimony of Jessey.

“1640. 3d. Mo.: The Church became two by mutual consent just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey. Mr. Richard Blunt with him...”

Jessey being Blunt’s and the others pastor, I can’t help but believe that he had some sway over the practice and opinions of the members, and his opinion was:

“Say not in thine heart, who shall goe to Heaven, or to sea, or beyond sea for it? but the word is nigh thee, Rom. 10. So we may not goe for administrators to other countries, nor stay (wait) for them; but looke to the word.” (Storehouse of Provision, etc. London, 1650)

Jessey is clearly refuting the Seekers (extraordinary administrators) and successionism. The sending of Blunt by Jessey and this Church was to confirm their opinion, not to import baptism.

4. The testimony of Barebone.

Barebone had the other half of this membership: “just half being with Mr. P. Barebone, and ye other halfe with Mr. H. Jessey.” (1640), and quoting from his book: A Discourse Tending to Prove the Baptisme in or under the Defection of Anti-Christ to be the Ordinance of Christ. and etc. London, 1642.

“I have spoken for the ordinance of Christ which he (R.B.) hath peremptorily condemned, and yet doth, denying the Baptisme of all the reformed churches & separed Churches, & also of all other Christians either Reformed or yet in defection, only those two or three excepted that have within these two or three years or some such short time, bin totally dipped for Baptisme, by persons at the beginning unbaptized themselves.” P. 30.

Barebone is writing against a book by R. B. who could very well have been Richard Blunt (no one knows) “within these two or three years”... “by persons at the beginning unbaptized themselves” which would certainly be inclusive of Blunt.

“And R. B. cites the scripture (2 Tim. 2:6) as the authority by which, having faith, baptism, “in an extra-ordinary case,” could be restored by an unbaptized person - in precise accord with Spilsbury, who is here instanced (p. 18) as citing the case of David, though not a priest, eating shewbread in the tabernacle.” (Loften - English Baptist Reformation, p. 177)

Another Baptist Barebone writes against is Barber who claimed in his book on Baptism that he was one of the first that, "The Lord should, amongst some others, raise up mee, a poore tradesman, to devulge this glorious truth, to the world's censuring..."
(Preface)

"Now we can understand Barber both in his Treatise as a whole and in his reply to Barebone in the latter part of his tract, where he says:

"Beloved, since part of this Treatise was in Presse there came to my hand a book, set forth by P. B. which could I have gotten sooner, I should have answered more fully."

"He goes on, under the first head of his answers to P. B., to agree with him that Christ is not a Widower nor his church without a head, although the church, or is the ministry, is not always visible on the earth." So much for the church and its ministry; but under the second head of his answer he says:

"2. We grant the Ordinance being lost, none but a Christ, a Moses, Elias or a Prophet from heaven can raise it; but believers having Christ, the Word and Spirit have this," that is, the authority of Christ, or the commission of a Moses, Elias or Prophet to "raise it" or restore it; and he cites the Scriptures, "Mat. 18:19,20; 11:11; Luke 7:28; Rom. 10:6,7,8," in proof of such authority, or commission, to "raise" again or restore the "Ordinance being lost." (quoted from Lofton, P. 169)

Because Landmarkers can't, or won't understand Barber, I'll quote Barebone again showing he understood Barber's statement precisely as Lofton did:

"His second exception is to what I propounded, that if Baptism was lost and fallen out of the world none but a Christ, a Moses, and Elias, or at least a Prophet from heaven might restore, &c: To this he sayeth that he granteth that an ordinance lost and fallen out of the world none but a Christ, a Moses, Elias or Prophet from heaven can raise it. Baptism was lost he acknowledgeth, when did Christ, Moses Elias or any Prophet from heaven, come to raise it again &c; But this hee thinketh may serve, believers having Christ, the Word & Spirit, so he sayth may do it, &c."(P. 55, 56.)

Barebone mentions "two or three churches within these two or three years", and the Three Baptists he mentions are Spilsbury, Barber, and R. B., pastors of the three known Baptist Churches in London at the time. R. B. must have been Richard Blunt and his church which was "one of the first and prime churches of the Anabaptists now in these latter times" and that it "broke into pieces, and some went one way, some another divers fell off to no church at all" (Edwards, Gangreana, part III, p. 112-113), which would also explain Blunt's return to Jessey in Document #4, 1644. All three of these Baptists held the same thing concerning the Administrator of Baptism - they were not Successionists.

5. The Bamfield Document. The following is taken from Lofton's Book, A Review of the Question and Reviews of Newman and Vedder. (The wording in this, other than Bamfield, is Lofton's - I numbered the different examples.) (Bamfield was a very famous Baptist; and before becoming a Baptist, was famous in the state church, then among the non-conformists. A very learned scholar - Crosby).

THE BAMPFIELD DOCUMENT.

I have selected the following document (No. 18), from "A Repository of Divers Historical Matters relating to English Antipedobaptists. Collected from original Papers or

Faithful Extracts. Anno 1712.” These “Papers,” among which are the “Jessey Church Records,” were recently copied by George Gould, of London, for Dr. Whitsett, by whose permission I have examined them. No. 18 reads as follows:

An Account of ye Methods taken by ye Baptists to obtain a proper, Administrator of Baptism by Immersion, when that practice had been so long disused, yt there was no one who had been so baptized to be found, wth the Opinion of Henry Lawrence, Lord President, on ye Case.

Mr. Francis Bampfield in ye Historical Declaration of his Life, tells us (p. 15, 16, 17). That after he had been convinced yt ye True Baptism was by Immersion & had resolved to be so baptized himselfe, he was a long time in doubt about a fit administrator of it. Whereupon he set himself to enquire diligently after ye first Administrator of Baptism by Immersion, Since ye revival of yt practice in these latter times. wt account he obtained of this matter he gives in the following words. Namely. That being in London and making Enquiry there, his dissatisfaction grew on; for upon such search being made concerning either a first, or after Administrator of this Ordinance; He was informed, either by printed Records, or by Credible Witnesses, That ye Administrator was

1. Either a Selfe Baptizer: But he knew no such Administrator to his Satisfaction; for if ye Historian have not wronged some of ye first so baptized in Holland, wch is too usual; (Ainsworth’s Defence of Scrip. p. 3; Clifton’s Christn Plea, p. 181, 182; Mr. Jessop’s Discovery of Errors of ye Anabaptists, p. 65). One John Smith a member of Henry Hainsworth’s Church there, being excommunicated for some scandalous offence, is reported to be one of ye first, who baptized himselfe first, afterwards baptized others.

2. Or two men according to their Principle in their judgement altogether unbaptized before, did Baptize one another at ye first, & afterwards did baptize others; & so ware many of ye Baptizings in London, originally reported to be in one, if not in two instances, where also no extordinary call from God thereunto, yt ever he heard of yet, is pretended.

3. Or else, a private baptized Brother, no lawfully called Minister of Christ, nor rightly ordained officer in a true Church, did baptize others; & so he understands ware some of ye choicest and best Baptizings in ye esteem of Several of ye baptized ones in London; carried on by one who always refused to be any Minister or ordained Officer in ye Church. He has been credibly informed by two yet alive in this City of London, who ware members of ye first Church of baptized Believers here, yt their first Administrator was one, who baptized himselfe, or else he and another baptized one another, & so gathered a Church; wch was so opposed in Publick and private yt they ware disputed out of their Church State & Constitution, out of their Call to office; that not being able to justifie their principle and practice by ye Word, they ware broken and Scattered

4. Or such one or more, whom such a company of Believers who had no lawfully called, rightly ordained Minister or Church officer amongst them before, Nor any such Minister of Ministers. Officer or Officers to ordain or Commission Such & Yet do choose or undertake to ordain by laying on of hands, they being all private Brethren, some private Brothers or Brethren into ye Ministerial Office & to send him or them forth to preach & Baptize

5. Or else some such one who however pretending to be called and sent forth by men, Yet is not gifted, graced and qualified according to ye requirements of Christ in his word for such an honorable office & weighty work.

6. Or otherwise some such who say they ware at first passing under this Ordinance under an unavoidable Necessity of doing somewhat this way beyond and beside ye ordinary stated

Scripture Rule & way, wch they hope ye Lord did accept of, they giving to him ye best they had according to their then understanding. Thus farr Mr. Bampfild Henry Lawrance Esqre, in his Excellent Treatise intituled of Baptism discourses in ye last Chapter of ye Minister Of Baptism wherein he shows, etc.”

Since this document was found with the other documents of the Jessey Church Records and the so called Kiffen MS., it has the same historical authority. The example numbers two and three agree with the Blunt - Blacklock action of Document #two; and Bamfield had been “credibly informed by, two yet alive in this city of London”; which was also “ye esteem of several of ye baptized ones in London.” Bamfield became a Baptist in 1676, and his, living witnesses and the testimony of “several baptized ones in London” would be far more credible than what Hutchinson “Heard”, writing also in 1676. Bamfield set out to find the first Administrator - the examples he gives does not mention “Imported” baptism, nor succession, nor any other Landmark notion; It, does state that, no baptized administrator could be found, with the opinion of Henry Lawrence, again showing Blunt didn’t import Baptism. (Bamfield needed Dayton, Graves, Jarrel, Ray and our modern Landmark scholarship to “interpret” the facts for him!)

6. The other three witnesses (six, seven, and eight) can be grouped together; three prominent Baptists who were baptized by Blunt or Blacklock, listed in Document #two along with the other fifty - Kilcop, Munden, and Shephard. As we have given quite a lot of the writings of Kilcop elsewhere, from another of his books (see pages) we will only give here his testimony from his “A short Treatise of Baptisme, &c., London, 1642”.

After meeting Barebone’s arguments regarding infant baptism, he proceeds to answer the charge concerning the Baptist claim that baptism had been “lost.” He says (pp. 8-11)”

“You deride us in your booke about the rise, matter, and manner of baptisme, the two last are clearely proved by Scripture already, the use of it being once lost, is the onely thing to clear; of that therefore a few words. Our baptisme received in our infancy (being corrupted) is not withstanding true or false. If true, though corrupted (as you hold), then needs must the other ordinances be true, the church also true, for nothing (I conceive) is more corrupted (if so much) as baptisme, as in the first use; and then it followes that you doe ill in leaving true ordinances, and true church state, and should then returne againe. Ob. We shift off the corruptions only. Ans. Then should you goe to the root and strike at the greatest corruption first, which is I conceive the subject. Your onely course then would be to let your Infants remaine unbaptized, and then such as you and others (upon triall) judge to be in covenant, and precious in God’s account, you might safely baptize by virtue of your baptisme, if yours be true, though corrupted, as you hold it is; and not doing so, you go a wrong way to work to root out corruption. But for my part, I believe Christ will at no rate own the baptizing of infants for his baptisme, and therefore not true. And then it followes that it being false, is to be renounced as well as the church state being false, and true baptisme as well as true church state is to be erected; except we turn Familists and Libertines to let all alone and live loosely, which opinion is held out, for ought I know, only by such as are given up to their own lusts. Ob. But where is your warrant for so doing? I answer, That every Scripture that gives you warrant, or any of your judgement, to erect a church state, gives us the same warrant to erect baptisme, sith the one cannot be done without the other, for none can put on Christ (that is visibly by outward profession) but such as are baptized into Christ, that is into the way or profession of Christ, for so is the meaning. Gal. 3:29. (John Smyth.)

“So that as a certain company of you agreeing in one, may become a body with evry one’s mutual consent: just so might we or you take up this ordinance, too, I mean if it be so that otherwise we cannot partake of it (AS ONCE IT WAS) and also know that Christ puts no impossibilities upon us, and we are nowhere so enjoined that if we cannot know absolutely a people that have upheld it ever since John, then not to partake of it. But we are absolutely enjoined to be baptized. Mark 16:16. Which is an impossibility if that must needs be a tye. Againe, if Christ had so tied us, then would you be put to a great strait, to prove that baptisme that you have partakt of to be so upheld which thing I believe you cannot possibly doe; you must take the Pope’s word for it or else some Historie or other which I dare not credit as I do the Bible.” (quoted from Lofton’s English Baptist Reformation, p. 180-181)

Kilcop clearly calls successionism an impossibility and tells how to “take up” the ordinance and “erect” baptism all in exact accord with the rest of the Particular Baptists of the day: by the Word of the Lord only, and in another book:

(This is stated in answer to an objection): “Objection: But the call of the present ministry, was not immediate, nor by Apostles, no by a true constituted church, etc.”

“I answer first, doth Christ give call to the ministry, a first, a second, a third way, then they that are called the first way only, or second, or third way only; are notwithstanding rightly called, and if there be a fourth, or fifth way, though not, the first second, or third, are notwithstanding rightly called, and so the present Ministry may be rightly called, though not called either of the first three ways.” (Remember, the third way named in the objection was “by a true constituted Church.” D.G.) “But Phillip and others scattered ones, Acts 8 and 11. which were not ministers of the word before were called to the ministry of the word and baptisme.

1. Not by Christ immediately
2. Nor by Apostles with churches election.
3. Nor by the Church, but
4. by a providence (being scattered) there is therefore a providential call.
5. The evangelist Titus was left in Creta to redress what was wanting, and ordain elders in every city, only minding, that they be rightly qualified.
6. Paul bade Timothy not to hinder any that sould desire this office, in cast they that desire it, are suitably qualified, this is a fixt way.

“so then if the present ministry, be thereto called, neither of the three first ways; yet are they rightly called, if by either of the three last ways, Providential, Evangelical, or Desirable, if they be suitably qualified, I Tim. 3: Tit. 1.” (A short Treatise of Baptism, &c. pp. 8-11)

No mention of Blunt or the supposed successionist theory. And along with Munden and Shepherd, Kilcop signed the Ist London Confession which in itself repudiates successionism - linked chain baptismal authority:

“The persons designed by Christ, to dispense this ordinance (Baptism) The Scriptures hold forth to be a preaching disciple, it being no where tied to a particular church, officer, or person extaordinarily sent, the commission enjoining the administration, being given to them under no other consideration, but as considered disciples” (Article 41).

Kilcop said if baptism were, tied to succession it would involve an impossibility to perform it - this confession states "(Baptism) is nowhere, tied to a particular church", same expression. Blunt (or Blacklock) baptized these three Brethren (listed with fifty others) who did not believe in successionism and even wrote against it - all which shows that they didn't think Blunt was going to Holland to "Import" baptism, or any such ridiculous thing, or as "Obtaining Church Authority", but rather to simply confirm their beliefs by others holding the same.

These eight witnesses - Document #2, Document #four, Jessey, Barebone, Bamfield, Kilcop, Munden, and Shephard -, all who were the actors or the recipients of the action in 1640 of the Jessey - Barebone churches, repudiate successionism and also Crosby's assumption based on what Hutchinson "Heard". Besides, the Messengers (plural) that Hutchinson "Heard" that were sent to Holland to obtain baptism, cannot be the, singular Blunt the "kiffin" Ms. mentions. Crosby clearly mistakes the purpose of the sending of Blunt.

Another error of Crosby (as he is understood by most writers) is his statement concerning Kiffen "who lived in those times and was a leader of those of that persuasion" (vol. 1, 101). "That persuasion" is understood by most writers as the supposed "successionist" persuasion (perhaps by Crosby himself). But the facts are: Kiffen was a leader of the, Particular Baptist persuasion, which was not in the supposed successionist persuasion. I've seen nothing of any Baptist of the day who advocated successionism unless it were Hutchinson writing thirty years later about what he "Heard". Kiffen, a signer of the 1st London Confession, also helped write the Introduction to King's book where successionism is called "a desperate extreme" and a "a gross error and mistake", and praises King "whom they judged a faithful and painful minister of Jesus Christ." So Kiffen definitely was not of the supposed successionist persuasion, and anyway, the successionist theory is only mere assumption, Not among the Particulars of the day but from Crosby writing about them.

Let's notice today's "scholarship" in one item in view of the above eight witnesses. The theory is the usual Landmark that the commission was given to the Church and Church only; which means baptism must be performed by the church and church only; any male member can be authorized to perform it in the pastor's absence or in his presence - but usually if the Pastor is present and able, he baptizes for the church. No visiting minister may baptize for her - authority can't be granted to anyone outside the membership to perform baptism. One of the author's "Proofs" that a church may authorize one of its members to baptize in the absence of her pastor is the following:

"For some years John Spilsbury, a well educated Minister, had been pastor of one of the Calvinistic Anti-pedobaptist congregations. He repudiated with great earnestness the theory that baptizedness is essential to the administrator of baptism, maintaining that it was popish in its tendency" (Newman, Hist., p. 289).

"To further highlight (says Mink) Newman's statement concerning Spilsbury's Church (1633 - London) and views of his church on baptismal authority: I submit the following from W. A. Jarrel's - Baptist Church Perpetuity: "As now, owing to sickness or other causes, pastors have others baptize for them, so Blalock may have baptized for Spilsbury" (p. 356). (Baptism: Preacher or Church Ordinance? Second Treatise, O. B. Mink p. 8)

While I won't pretend to guess why Mink, a strict Landmark, quoted Newman's account of Spilsbury in 1633 - (Spilsbury's views on baptism was published the 1st time in 1642, and Newman did not believe Spilsbury was a Baptist until after 1640), Mink himself believes Baptism is the door to the church, and the church only can baptize - Spilsbury's view was: an

“unbaptized one may administer baptism:, which is not Mink’s view; but the latter quote by Jarrel is what I wanted to note: Landmarkers, assume that Blunt who baptized Blacklock was baptized in Holland; they, assume Blacklock baptized for Spilsbury (but there is no connection between Blacklock and Spilsbury); they assume those in Holland were in the link-chain succession and these assumptions are based upon Crosby’s assumption, of why Blunt went to Holland, which was based upon the hearsay testimony of Hutchinson! None of the above is true as we saw with our eight witnesses. Crosby gives “three Methods” of restoring Baptism among the early Baptists: “1. The supposed se-baptism of John Smith; 2. “Importing” Baptism from Holland; 3. “Taking up” the ordinance among themselves by the authority of the word of God. Crosby states these last “Two Methods” he finds “acknowledged and justify’d in their writings”; but from our eight “witnesses” we see Crosby misinterpreted method #2. the only “writings” he gives of this method is found in the so called Kiffen Ms.

Landmarkers who make such high claims - far above anything that has ever been known of former Baptists - base all their ecclesiastical hopes on mere assumptions, such as the ones noted!

Ray says:

“Here we have the undisputed historic fact, that the Baptists of London were so careful to obtain valid baptism that they delegated Richard Blunt, formerly a Pedo Baptist minister, to visit a regular Baptist Church at Amsterdam, in Holland, which belonged to the old Waldensean succession. And after the baptism of Richard Blunt by John Batte, by the authority of said church, he returned to London and baptized Samuel Blacklock, and they baptized the rest of the company, to the number of fifty-three members; and thus was formed a Baptist Church, which was afterward recognized as a Particular Baptist Church. And from this influential church has flown the stream of succession down to this present time.” (Baptist Succession, p. 139).

Dayton says:

“There were those in England after the so called reformation, who contended that it would be right and lawful to baptize themselves, and so begin anew. But there is no proof that they did so, for we know they sent to the Continent to receive a baptism which would have no suspicion concerning its validity. And thus, I do not doubt, it has ever been: Alien Baptism, p. 81).

Hardly a word of truth in any of these statements, “proofs” are simply not backed by facts - simple assumptions, preconceived ideas, reading their theories into history - all a dream which produces such fanatical zeal, (bordering on the cults); such a sham to be propagated on the people of God!

CHAPTER III

EARLY AMERICAN BAPTISTS

Having shown the position of the particular Baptists in England up to 1645, let's consider Roger Williams in America. What was wrong with what Roger Williams did? He only did what both the general and particular Baptists of England did, and the Tunkers of Germany. Or if what Dayton said were true: "They agreed it was alright to begin baptism anew, but there is no proof that they did so," then Williams only followed their advice; but Landmarkers repudiate most vigorously the action of Williams, because it destroys their Link-chain. Williams eventually became an "unbaptised" Landmarker who left his church and spent the rest of his life seeking the succession, and never found it. Jarrel upbraids him thoroughly for not going to Clark or Knollys to be Baptized. But if Clark came from Spilsbury's Church as Graves thought, he knew he would find no succession there as Spilsbury writes, "he knew nothing of any succession, only the Spiritual." Knollys didn't either as he was in agreement with the other particular Baptists of England and according to Backus Knolly's wasn't a Baptist yet when he was in America. Review document #4 quoted earlier. So it is plain Williams knew more about succession than either Jarrel, Ray, or our other modern wise men - he knew he couldn't find it; and he was a learned and thorough scholar.

Backus writes:

"An evident cause of Mr. Williams's refraining from a farther proceeding in church ordinances, was an apprehension of the necessity of a visible succession of regular ordinations from the apostles to empower men to it, which succession he could not find. Yet how fond are many ministers in our day of this successive notion? A minister's preaching upon it was vindicated in the Boston Evening Post of May 9, 1774, which informs us that the preacher said, - "God the Father sent forth the Son; he sent forth the apostles as the Father sent him; they sent forth others, with command to commit these things to faithful men. And the preacher said, that Christ had never committed this power (to put into office) to any but such as were in office." But I am not afraid boldly to assert, that I verily believe, according to this doctrine, that there is not a minister this day under heaven but what must stop from administering baptism, as Mr. Williams did, if he is as honest as he was. A minister in Connecticut a few years ago published a pamphlet to support the above opinion; wherein, to get over the difficulty that arises for want of any proof of such a lineal succession, he observed that none under the law were to be priests but the lawful posterity of Aaron, yet supposing a bastard son of that family should have posterity, in so long a succession that the knowledge of his illegitimacy was lost, he asserted that such priests might well be admitted into office with the others.

According to which doctrine, knowledge must be very detrimental to such priests, and ignorance must be the mother of such devotion. The minister who published said pamphlet is a trustee of Yale College; and likely he is better acquainted with philosophy and school divinity than he is with his Bible, or else he would have known that Ezra the priest, a scribe of the law of the God of heaven (in distinction

from earthly gods) refused to admit or suffer men upon negatives; and such as sought but could not find “their register,” were “as polluted, put from the priesthood.” Ezra ii 62. And if we review the text that is now so much harped upon, we shall find that the apostolic succession is in the line of “faithful men;” and no others are truly in it, though false brethren have sometimes crept in unawares.”

(Then Backus quotes here out of Crosby’s Hist. Spillsbury’s argument against succession, then says:) “The learned Mr. John Tombes also in that day produced the foregoing passage from Zanchy, for the same purpose that I have now done.” (Backus Hist.,P. 90-91, 1871 ed.)

So, this learned Backus was for Williams and against succession. The learned Benedict has this to say of Williams:

“This church, which is the oldest of the baptist denomination in America, was formed in March 1630. Its first members were twelve in number, viz.: Roger Williams, Ezekiel Holliman, Stuekley Westcot, John Gree, Richard Waterman, Thomas James, Rubert Cole, William Carpenter, Francis Weston, and Thaman Olney. These men were probably most of them heads of families, and it is reasonable to suppose that some of their companions were among the first members of the church. But upon this point no information can be obtained.

As the whole company, in their own estimation, were unbaptized, and they knew of no administrater in any of the infant settlements to whom they could apply, they with much propriety hit on the following expedient: Ezekiel Holliman a man of gifts and piety, by the suffrages of the whole company was appointed to baptize Mr. Williams, who in return, baptized Holliman and the other ten.

Some of our writers have taken no little pains to apoligize for this unusual transaction, but in my opinion it was just such a course as all companies of believers who wish to form a church in such extraordinary circumstances should pursue.

Any company of christians may commence a church in gospel order by their own mutual agreement, without any reference to any other body; and this church has all power to appoint any one of their number, whether their minister of anyman to commence anew the administration of gospel institutions.

This is the baptist doctrine of apostolical succession, which they prefer to receive from good men rather than through the polluted channels of the papal power.

In ordinary cases this is not advisable, and is but seldom done; but in such a state of banishment and exile, or in any condition of a similar nature, none need to hesitate to follow the example of the founders of this ancient community. (Hist, 1848 ed.)

Since it is clear Holliman baptized being unbaptized and “started” the Church in providence, Graves “proved” the succession of Baptism came through Clark in Newport, whom Graves said came from Spillsbury’s Church, which got their baptism from Holland. But we have Clark’s own confession of faith taken from Backus’ History:

“I believe although God can bring men to Christ, and cause them to believe in him for life, yet he hath appointed an ordinary way to effect that great work of faith,

which is by means of sending a ministry into the world, to publish repentance to the sinner, and salvation, and that by Jesus Christ; and they that are faithful shall save their own souls and some that hear them. 24. I believe that they that are sent of God are not to deliver a mission of their own brain, but as it is in the Scripture of truth, for holy men wrote as they were inspired by the Holy Spirit. 25. I believe that precious gifts of the Spirit's teaching were procured by Christ's ascension and given to men for begetting of souls to the truth, and for establishment and consolation of those that are turned to the Lord; for none shall pluck them out of his Father's hand. 26. I believe no man is to rush into the ministry without a special call from God, even as gospel ministers had of old, which was the call of the Holy Spirit, with some talent or talents to declare the counsel of God to poor sinners, declaring the grace of God through Jesus Christ, even to those that are yet in the power of Satan; yea, to bring glad tidings by and from the Lord Jesus Christ. 27. I believe this ministry is to go forth, and he that hath received grace with a talent or talents, as he hath received freely of the Lord, so he is freely to give, looking for nothing again but the promise of the Lord. 28. I believe none is to go forth but by commission, and carefully to observe, the same according as Christ gave it forth without adding or diminishing; first to preach Christ, that is to make disciples, and then to baptize them, but not to baptize them before they believe; and then to teach them what Christ commanded them. For as the Father had his order in the former dispensation, so hath the Son. In former times the Lord spake in divers ways and manners, but now hath he spoken by His Son. 29. I believe that as God prepared a begetting ministry, even so doth he also prepare a feeding ministry in the church, where a called people out of the world, by the word and Spirit of the Lord, assembling of themselves together in a holy brotherhood, continuing in the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking bread and prayer. 30. I believe such a church ought to wait for the Holy Spirit of promise, on whom it may fall, and to choose out among themselves either pastor, teacher, or elders to rule, or deacons to serve the table, that others may give themselves to the word and prayer, and to keep them close to the Lord, and their fellowship clear and distinct, not to have fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them. 31. I believe the Church of Christ, or this company gathered, are bound to wait on the Lord for the Spirit to help them, and have liberty, and are under duty, that they may prophesy one to one. 32. I believe that the true baptism of the gospel, is a visible believer with his own consent to be baptized in common water, by dying, or as it were drowning, to hold forth death, burial and resurrection, by a messenger of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Here it is clear Clark was no Landmarker, unless we accept Dayton's argument of silence to the contrary, which is the same pedo-Baptist argument for infant Baptism, which they think accounts for the silence about infant Baptism in the New Testament, it being no new nor strange practice; vis., since Clark didn't teach against Landmarkism, he must have been a Landmarker! Clark understood a "Church, where a called people out of the world, by the word and Spirit of the Lord, assembling of themselves together in a holy brotherhood..." No baptized believers

stressed here, and no “confering” of authority of a “mother” church; and the administrator: “A Messenger of Jesus.”

In introduction to Hassell’s History of the Church of God, he says:

“According to the entire tenor of the New Testament Scriptures, what we are to look for is, not such outward succession, but a spiritual succession of principles, of inward vital, heart felt religion. Names are nothing, principles are everything, in the true Kingdom of God. In all ages and countries, that people who, in all spiritual matters, acknowledge Christ as their only head and King, form a part of the true church of God. They have mostly been dissenters from “State Churches” and political religions...” P. 18,19

The Landmark statement “like produces like”. and the implication only like produces like, “a clean cannot come from an unclean”, simply does not hold here: The spirit of God does call multitudes out of Babylon, and the cry from Landmarkers: “Calvin and Luther were Catholics” received Catholic baptism started their own churches, 1500 years too late to be a church of Christ, etc., is not true; the Spirit of God called them out. Wycliff and Brute, forerunners of the Reformation were Baptists called out of Babylon, Baptized believers, started Churches; the Lollards were followers of Wycliff, where did they get their Baptism? From a God-called Minister! And most historians claim Wycliff never left the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER IV

THE SECOND LONDON CONFESSION

Many early English Baptists were ministers of the Church of England, while they were Baptist ministers. Benedict says:

In 1662, the act of Uniformity was passed, in consequence of which, upwards of two thousand eminently godly, learned, and useful ministers were obliged to leave their livings, and were a number of the Baptist denomination, but how many cannot be determined with certainty. We are sure, however, that among the Baptist ministers were Henry Jessey, A.M. William Dell, M.A. Francis Bampfield, M.A. Thomas Gennings, Paul Frewen, Joshua Head, John Tombes, B.D. Daniel Dyke, A.M. Richard Adams, Jeremiah Marsden, Thomas Hardcastle, Robert Browne, Gabriel Camelford, John Skinner, – Baker, John Gosnold, Thomas Quarrel, Thomas Ewins, Lawrence Wise, John Donne, Paul Hobson, John Gibbs, John Smith, Thomas Ellis, Thomas Paxford, Ichabod Chauncey, M.D.

Crosby has mentioned the names of a number of these ejected ministers, of whom it was doubtful whether they were Baptists, and Ivimey has omitted the names of some of whom it has been determined that they had become Baptists before this event. And among them was John Miles, who founded the Baptist church at Swansy in Massachusetts.

“It is rather wonderful,” says Ivimey, “that any Baptists were found in the churches (church of England, D.G.) at this time, when it is considered that the first act, which was passed, after the restoration of the king, contained an exception of all, who had declared against infant baptism from being restored to their livings. It is probable also that amongst those, who had been expelled to make room for the old incumbents, some were of this denomination. The Act of Uniformity completed the business, and after this we do not find that any person who rejected the baptism of infants continued in the establishment.”

Some may be surprised that so many Baptist ministers should accept of livings in the parish churches. But it appears to have been a very common custom before these times. It is not unfrequent in this country (America, D.G.) for Baptist ministers to preach to, and receive salaries from Pede-baptist congregations; they do not administer ordinances amongst them, unless that now and then they find some disposed to go into the water, and they commonly preach more or less to Baptist churches at the same time. And in much the same way these ministers conducted of whom we have been speaking. Whatever fault a Baptist may be disposed to find with such a procedure, it is sure that the Pedobaptists have generally the most reason to complain in the end.” (1813 ed.)

Landmarkers would call down fire from heaven on these: “Compromisers, deceivers, playing with a daughter of a harlot, etc.”, but look over these names - some of David’s mighty men are there. Were these Baptists “soft” on other denominations?

In 1677 the Baptists again put forth a confession showing their agreement with the first confession (two of the signers also signed the first - Kiffen and Knollys); and in parts of the preface and the appendix we notice some very un-landmark statements.

Courteous Reader, - - It is now many years since divers of us (with other sober Christians then living and walking in the way of the Lord, that we profess), did conceive ourselves to be under a necessity of publishing a Confession of our Faith, for the information and satisfaction of those that did not thoroughly understand what our principles were, or had entertained prejudices against our profession, by reason of the strange representation of them, by some men of note, who had taken very wrong measures, and accordingly led others into misapprehensions of us and them: and this was first put forth about the year 1643, in the name of seven congregations then gathered in London: since which time, divers impressions thereof have been dispersed abroad, and our end proposed in good measure answered; inasmuch as many (and some of those men eminent both for piety and learning) were thereby satisfied that we were no way guilty of those heterodoxies and fundamental errors which had too frequently been charged upon us, without ground or occasion given on our part. And forasmuch as that Confession is not now commonly to be had, and also that many others have since embraced the same truth which is owned therein, it was judged necessary by us to join together in giving a testimony to the world of our firm adhering to those wholesome principles, by the publication of this which is now in your hand.

And forasmuch as our method and manner of expressing our sentiments in this doth vary from the former (although the substance of the matter is the same), we shall freely impart to you the reason and occasion thereof. One thing that greatly prevailed with us to undertake this work, was (not only to give a full account of ourselves to those Christians that differ from us about the subject of baptism, but also) the profit that might from thence arise unto those that have any account of our labours, in their instruction and establishment in the great truths of the gospel; in the clear understanding and steady belief of which, our comfortable walking with God, and fruitfulness before him in all our ways, is most nearly concerned. And therefore we did conclude it necessary to express ourselves the more fully and distinctly, and also to fix on such a method as might be most comprehensive of those things which we designed to explain our sense and belief of; and finding no defect in this regard in that fixed on by the assembly, and after them by those of the Congregational way, we did readily conclude it best to retain the same order in our present Confession. And also when we observed that those last mentioned did, in their Confession (for reasons which seemed of weight both to themselves and others), choose not only to express their mind in words concurrent with the former in sense, concerning all those articles wherein they were agreed, but also for the most part without any variation of the terms, we did in like manner conclude it best to follow their example, in making use of the very same words with them both, in those articles (which are very many) wherein our faith and doctrine is the same with theirs.

And this we did the more abundantly to manifest our consent with both, in all the fundamental articles of the Christian religion, as also with many others whose orthodox confessions have been published to the world, on the behalf of the protestants in divers nations and cities; and also to convince all that we have no itch to clog religion with new words, but do readily acquiesce in that form of sound words which hath been in consent with the holy scriptures, used by others before us; hereby declaring before God, angels, and men, our hearty agreement with them, in that wholesome protestant doctrine, which with so clear evidence of scriptures they have asserted. Some things indeed, are in some places added, some terms omitted, and some few changed; but these alterations are of that nature, as that we need not doubt any charge or suspicion of unsoundness in the faith, from any of our brethren upon the account of them.

These things we have mentioned, as having a direct reference unto the controversy between our brethren and us; other things that are more abstruse and prolix which are frequently introduced into this controversy, but do not necessarily concern it, we have purposely avoided, that the distance between our brethren and us may not be by us made more wide; for it is our concern, so far as is possible for us (retaining a good conscience towards God) to seek a more entire agreement and reconciliation with them.

We are not insensible, that as to the order of God's house, and entire communion therein, there are some things wherein we (as well as others) are not at a full accord among ourselves; as for instance, the known principle and state of the consciences of divers of us, that have agreed in this confession is such, that we cannot hold church communion with any other than baptized believers, and churches constituted of such; yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our spirits that way; and therefore we have purposely omitted the mention of things of that nature, that we might concur in giving this evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves, and with other good Christians, in those important articles of the Christian religion, mainly insisted on by us; and this, notwithstanding we all esteem it our chief concern, both among ourselves and all others that in every place call upon the name of the lord Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours, and love him in sincerity, to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; and in order thereunto, to exercise all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love.

And we are persuaded, if the same method were introduced into frequent practice between us and our Christian friends, who agree with us in all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith (though they do not so in the subject and administration of baptism), it would soon beget a better understanding and brotherly affection between us.

In the beginning of the Christian church, when the doctrine of the baptism of Christ was not universally understood, yet those that knew only the baptism of John were the disciples of the Lord Jesus, and Apollos an eminent minister of the gospel of Jesus.

In the beginning of the reformation of the Christian church, and recovery from the Egyptian darkness wherein our forefathers for many generations were held in bondage, upon recourse had to the scriptures of truth, different apprehensions were conceived, which are to this time continued, concerning the practice of this ordinance.

Let not our zeal herein be misinterpreted; that God whom we serve is jealous of his worship. By his gracious providence the law whereof is continued amongst us; and we are forewarned, by what happened in the church of the Jews, that it is necessary for every generation, and that frequently in every generation, to consult the divine oracle, compare our worship with the rule, and take heed to what doctrines we receive and practice.

If the ten commandments exhibited in the popish idolatrous service-books had been received as the entire law of God, because they agree in number with his ten commands, and also in the substance of nine of them, the second commandment, forbidding idolatry, had been utterly lost.

If Ezra and Nehemiah had not made a diligent search into the particular parts of God's law and his worship, the feast of tabernacles (which for many centuries of years had not been duly observed according to the institution, though it was retained in the general notion) would not have been kept in due order.

So may it be now as to many things relating to the service of God, which do retain the names proper to them in their first institution, but yet through inadvertency (where there is no sinister design) may vary in their circumstances, from their first institution. And if by means of

any ancient defection, or of that general corruption of the service of God and interruption of his true worship and persecution of servants by the anti-christian bishop of Rome, for many generations, those who do consult the word of God cannot yet arrive at a full and mutual satisfaction among themselves what was the practice of the primitive Christian church, in some points relating to the worship of God; yet inasmuch as these things are not of the essence of Christianity, but that we agree in the fundamental doctrines thereof, we do apprehend there is sufficient ground to lay aside all bitterness and prejudice, and in the spirit of love and meekness to embrace and own each other therein, leaving each other at liberty to perform such other services, wherein we cannot concur, apart unto God, according to the best of our understanding.”

This shows their “heartly agreement with them, in that wholesome Protestant doctrine”, i.e., agreement with the Westminster assembly and the Savoy Confessors: They call them “societies of Christians” i.e., churches (note art. 26 par. 5 where the clause has “societies or churches” in the confession); and they “participated of the labors of those whom God hath endued with abilities above ourselves, and qualified and called to the ministry of the word”; and declare that: “Inasmuch as these things” (namely Baptism) “are not of the essence of christianity, etc.”; Well, Baptism, is the essence of christianity to Landmarkers; i.e., practical christianity: no baptism, no inducting into the Kingdom; no baptism, no perpetuity; no baptism, no authority; no authority, every thing toward God is null, void, empty, pretentious, hypocritical, deceiving, from the mother of Harlots; and finally, from Satan himself!

An important observation is made by Gould on the article “Baptism” in the Second London Confession (1677):

CONFESSION OF ASSEMBLY

“Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with Him in His death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into Him; of remission of sins; and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life.”

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION:

“Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Visible Church; but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the Covenant of Grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of Regeneration, of Remission of Sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life. Which Sacrament is by Christ’s own appointment to be continued in His Church until the end of the world.”

“This repudiation by the Baptists of the statement, that Baptism is ordained by Jesus Christ for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church,” is worthy of especial notice, because we know that the Confession was avowedly formed as nearly as possible in the same words as the Westminster divines had used. The omission of the clause, therefore, furnishes incontestible evidence that Baptism was not regarded by the compilers of this Confession as a sine qua non of membership in a Baptist Church.” (Gould, Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich p. cii)

Landmarkers fully adopt the Protestant “Baptized into the church” (see also Dabney, p.) but not the Old Baptists. Were the Baptists of 1677 different in opinion than the Baptists of

1643? Not at all, they claim “the same truth which is owned therein”, and “adhering to those wholesome principles” (17th and 19th lines of the preface).

Concerning the preceding general Article on “Baptism and the Lords’ Supper”: The phrase: “To be continued in his church (Mt. xxviii, 19,20; 1 Cor. xi, 26) to the end of the world”, as against the Seekers and Quakers who taught that once the ordinance was lost it could not be recovered. It is not teaching successionism at all - these Baptists repudiated successionism.

Landmarkers reading this through their “Local” Church only eyes will never understand the confessors. The old Baptists equated the church with the Kingdom and with the family of God. Baptism wasn’t a local church ordinance at all with them but a ministerial ordinance - a preaching disciple being stirred up and gifted by the Spirit of God - was the administrator of baptism. They did not believe in the perpetuity of the Local Church, but in the perpetuity of the invisible: Blackwood, p.; Spilsbury, p.; Barber, p.; Grantham, p.; Drapes, p.; Also Gill, p.; and Hiscox, p.; (page numbers in this article).

The local companies of saints would choose these gifted disciples to administrate the ordinances to them. If they needed to be baptized - and they all concluded that they did around 1641- they used these self-same ministers. Look how backwards the Landmark is here: “They couldn’t even be a church or a ministry without baptism”! and that “by a link-chain succession to other baptized churches”! Notice the witnesses I gave: Spilsbury, Tombs, Laurence, Knollys, King, Kiffen, Pearson, Patience, Grantham, Gosnold, Kilcop, Cox, Lamb, Blackwood, Jessey, Drapes, Collier, Williams, Clarke, Cornwell, Barber, Bamfield, Hobson, Hooke - and besides these twenty-six witnesses, there were twelve others who signed the 1st edition of the 1st London confession; Five more who additionally signed the 2nd edition; with Cox’s appendix also in agreement; and sixteen churches in the country with Collier who also were in exact agreement. The statements of the enemies against the practice of the Old Baptists were exactly like the statements of the Landmarkers today - therefore the Landmarks Graves reset were the Landmarks of the enemies of the Baptists.

The Old Baptists did not hedge, nor were backwards, in using the terms “Reform” and “Taking up the ordinance” - nor were they ashamed to be called “Dissenters”.

In 1751 John Gill wrote “The Dissenter’s Reasons for separating from the Church of England, occasioned By a letter wrote By A Welch Clergyman on the Duty of Catechising children, Intended chiefly for the use of Dissenters of the Baptist Denomination in Wales.” The title is self explanatory.

The famous Gill, esteemed by all lovers of the truth to have been one of the very greatest of Bible scholars and “to have trodden the whole field of human learning” was so ignorant of the facts to not know that the Baptists of Wales came by succession from other Baptists and were not dissenters at all! So dream the Landmarkers! But this is in accordance with Crosby’s history, and hence, Ivimey, Christian, etc., and the facts.

They were Dissenters of the Dissenters carrying their reformation further than the Dissenters of the Church of England. According to Kiffen and Barber, there was not an Ana-Baptist among them. The main reason for the 1st London Confession was to vindicate themselves from the charges of being Ana-Baptists and to prove their orthodoxy as the Ana-Baptists were heretical in those days. (See Lofton, English Baptist Reformation; and, Belcher and Mattia, A Discussion of Seventeenth Century Baptist Confessions of Faith).

Edward Barber stated:

“And therefore did the Church of Rome or England, Baptize believers only confessing faith and sins, desiring it, wee would never separate from them, much lesse remove their baptism, as false, because it is God’s Ordinance in itself, but so was never the Sprinkling of Infants” (Baptism, p. 28)

William Kiffen stated (In reply to Poole’s charge that he received from their congregations “Silly seduced servants, children or people”):

“We answer, it is well known to you, we receive none as members with us, but such as have been members of your church at least sixteen, twenty, or thirty years.”

In reply to the charge of schism, Kiffen says:

“Now, for our part, we desire all and everyone of these amongst you to be true and therefore do, separate from you; so then when you have made satisfaction for your notorious schisme, and return as dutiful sonnes to their mother, or else cast off all you filthy Rubbish of her abomination, wech are found among you, we will, return to you, or show our just grounds to the contrary” (Brief Remonstrance, p. 10 and 13. Cited from Lofton, English Baptist Reformation, P. 122).

So then if Gill were not correct, then neither were Barber, or Kiffen, who lived in the time of separation and who neither knew nor understood about what they were writing!

(Our modern Editors in the Landmark papers use writers who condemn Gill; contrariwise, the Philadelphia Association wanted all their ministers to have and learn Gill’s writings; all of which would suppose our modern editors want everyone to be as ignorant as their own writers are. We desist.)

They also declare as they did in the first confession that the commission was given to the ministry, not to the church, see art. 26, par. 8; and art. 28, par. 2.

In par. 4, art. 26, they declare: “The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church, in whom, by the appointment of the Fathers, all power for the calling, institution, order, or government of the church, is invested in a supreme and sovereign manner...” Par. 5: “In the execution of this power wherewith He is so entrusted, the Lord Jesus calleth out of the world unto Himself, through the ministry of His word, by His Spirit, those that are given unto Him by His Father, that they may walk before Him in all the ways of obedience, which He prescribeth to them in His word. Those thus called, He commandeth to walk together in particular societies, or churches...” Par. 7: “To each of these churches thus gathered, according to His mind, declared in His word, He has given all that power and authority which is anyway needful for their carrying on that order in worship and discipline...”

So the confession taken with the preface and appendix certainly is not Landmark. Christ is the head of the church: with the power in which He is invested He calls by His word and Spirit, all His elect in particular societies (not, some of the elect, out of which some will be in the bride, etc.) “In a supreme and sovereign manner”, not delegated through a succession of baptism; over against Catholicism (mentioned) which does hold “succession” and “authority”; but, “By His word and Spirit”; and “to those, thus called He has given all that power and authority, etc.” Now this is not Landmarkism because they recognized others than Baptists as

being churches and their ministers “called and qualified” by God. They didn’t believe all the elect (“those given to Him by the Father”), were Baptists, they called others “Christians,” and “Brethren” all through the preface and appendix, which practice (calling others than Baptists, “Brethren”) according to Moody in the preface to the third edition of “An Old Landmark Reset”, Pendleton would have written against, in a forth coming issue had he lived!

Therefore, as King wrote, Baptism does not make a church, but The Word and Spirit; these confessors believed there were churches nonetheless, and that their ministers were called of God; which churches and brethren, we should own and embrace in Christian love and fellowship. If the Lord loves them - why shouldn’t we? We are commanded to do so.

CHAPTER V

THE PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION

Graves did not reset any Landmarks the Particular Baptist of England held - did he of the Philadelphia Association of America? On page 238 of the minutes of the Philadelphia Association this is found:

15. In answer to a query from the first church in New York, of last year, held over to this time, respecting the validity of baptism administered by a person who had never been baptized himself, nor yet ordained; we reply, that we deem such a baptism null and void: First. Because a person that has not been baptized must be disqualified to administer baptism to others, and especially if he be also unordained.

Second. Because to admit such baptism as valid would make void the ordinances of Christ, throw contempt on his authority, and tend to confusion: for if baptism be not necessary for an administrator of it, neither can it be for church communion, which is and inferior act: and if such baptism be valid, then ordination is unnecessary, contrary to Acts xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 14; Tit. i. 5, and our Confession of Faith Chap. XXVII.

Third. Of this opinion we find were our Associations in times past; who put a negative on such baptisms in 1729, 1732, 1744, 1749, and 1768, 1806.

Fourth. Because such administrator has no commission to baptize, for the words of the commission were addressed to the apostles, and their successors in the ministry, to the end of the world, and these are such, whom the church of Christ appoint to the whole work of the ministry.

This action 1788 was reaffirmed by the Association in 1792 but protested by Abraham Booth of England in 1791 and by Caleb Evans who wrote Manning:

"I am astonished at the resolve of your association about rebaptizing, but refer you to a letter of Mr. Booth's upon the subject, I believe to you, surely you are more narrow than the Papists upon this subject" (Early History of Brown University, p. 476)

Note also the view of J.M. Peck, a famous pioneer Baptist (Memoir, p. 282); his views were with Booth and Evans. I've never seen Booth's letter, but in another letter by Booth to Manning in 1790, Booth, referring to this Baptism, understands this to be a baptism by a Pedo-Baptist minister, which Booth held to be irregular, but valid (Ibid, p. 475). But according to the record of the Philadelphia Assoc., this man was unbaptized and "unordained", an "officiating teacher or minister of a religious society", (P. 299), not a regularly ordained Pedo-Baptist Minister. And it is recorded earlier in their minutes, 1765, that it was "proper to receive a person into communion who had been baptized by immersion by a minister of the Church of England." Also it was recorded earlier (1771), "That two clergymen of the Church of England, preach Jesus Christ with unusual warmth"; And Comer (Diary) relates: "The ministers of the Episcopal Church have some of them received the primitive and Apostolical order of Baptism by a total immersion in water." The modern argument that the church of England, written with a little "c", meant the general Baptists from England will not hold because: Where else in all literature are the general Baptists referred to as "the church of England"? And the mode of baptism is

specified as "Immersion". Edwards uses church of England with a little "c" all through his materials. And in Edward's materials we find: Morgan Edwards came to be pastor of the Philadelphia Church through the recommendation of Gill - he began to be Pastor in 1761 and continued ten years. Edwards tried to unite all Baptists into one association (Firstday, Keithian, Seventhday, Tunker, Mennonist) and records the Philadelphia Baptists recognized Presbyterians as churches and their ministers as those of Christ. In a letter to the Presbyterians signed by John Watts, Samuel Jones, George Eaton, Thomas Bibb and Thomas Potts this is stated:

"We do freely confess and promise ourselves that we can and do own and allow of your approved ministers who are fitly qualified and found in the faith and of holy lives to pray and preach in our assemblies... that so each side may own, embrace and accept one another as fellow brethren and ministers of Christ; and hold and maintain christian communion and fellowship." And Edwards further tells us in his materials, P. 114 of an Independent church who "having scruples about infant baptism declared openly for the baptism of believers. But now the same question puzzled them which has puzzled others in both the Englands and Germany, etc. viz. "whether baptism administered by an unbaptized person be valid?" "For they considered infant baptism as nullity," however they resolved the question in the affirmative from the consideration of necessity: accordingly Mr. Marsh was baptised by Mr. Elkanah Fuller and then Elkanah Fuller by Mr. Marsh... these 8 persons were nov. 14, 1756, formed into a Baptist Church... Two years, after they joined the association."

The Tunkers (German Baptists) came about the same way: A group of believers, being Presbyterians and Lutherans, "not knowing there were any Baptists in the world. However, believer's baptism and a Congregational Church soon gained upon them, in so much that they were determined to obey the gospel in these matters... They cast lots to find who should be the administrator...then formed themselves into a church." Edwards Materials, P. 32) also, see Jarrel's History.

In the minutes of the Phil. Assoc. of 1806 a query: "Whether can an orthodox Baptist Church receive a person who has ben baptised by a Tunker Universalist, without baptizing him again? The person has renounced Universalist principles." Answer: "Yes."

Also, there were churches in the Philadelphia Assoc. which began in Wales through the missionary activities of Mr. John Miles, called by Thomas, Backus, and Cathcart, (with reservation): "The father of the Baptist churches in Wales. Thomas says: "It is, supposed that Messrs. Miles and Proud were baptized in London:" and again: "The number then amounted to forty-three, including Miles and Proud who, probably were baptised in London." (Pages 42,43 of Thomas' History, "The American Baptist Heritage in Wales.")

October 1, 1649. The beginning of which their records describe thus - We cannot but admire the unsearchable wisdom, power, and love of God, in bringing about his own design, far above and beyond the capacity and understanding of the chiefest of men. Thus to the glory of his own great name, hath he dealt with us; for when there had been no company or society of people, holding forth and professing the doctrine, worship, order and discipline of the Gospel, according to the primitive institution that ever we heard of in all Wales, since the apostasy, it pleased the Lord to choose this dark corner to place his name in; and to honor us undeserving

ones, with the happiness of being the first in all these parts, among whom was practiced the glorious ordinance of Baptism, and here to gather the first church of baptized believers.”

From this church others spread. Some Brethren and families from many of, these churches formed themselves into a church and came to America as a church and united with the Phil. Assoc.

What does all this do for the Landmark succession? The modern baptists of Wales (since the darkness of the Papacy), either were linked to the particulars in London or began themselves, as the particulars of London. The Tunkers began themselves. Williams and the Providence Church began themselves and, continued and spread according to Backus, Edwards and A. Broadus.

Notice these facts about the Phil. Assoc.: 1. They held the same confession as the London Churches. 2. They recognized other than Baptists as Churches and Ministers; 3. They recognized Tunkers who began themselves as Churches; 4. The commission was given to the Apostles and their successors in the ministry, to the end of the world, and these as such whom the church of Christ appoint to the whole work of the Ministry.”

The church in the Landmark sense? of course not - but according to their confession, already referred to, which includes all the elect of God in the first place; and called into particular assemblies in the second; this again not in the Landmark sense, but according to the word and Spirit of God. They were very definite in their teaching on the administrator of Baptism. Only ordained ministers, but not strictly Baptists, no lay Baptisms were accepted. Grime (Alien Baptism) shows also subsequent associations everywhere took the same position. I will grant that Landmarkism is beginning to come forth, through unscriptural associations lording over churches; but it hadn’t arrived yet. The following minutes of the same year (as this query on Baptism) strongly recommended Mr. Booth’s “Apology for the Baptists” and “Paedobaptism Examined and Refuted”, as “worthy the perusal of all inquirers after truth, as affording the most convincing and demonstrable evidence in favor of the principles and practice of our churches...” In Booth’s Preface to ‘PaedoBaptism Examined’ he states:

“While, however, we think it our duty with a resolute perseverance to maintain the purity and importance of baptism, as divine institution; we are far from considering ourselves as the only disciples of Christ, or our own communities as the only Christian Churches..”

And he quotes Owen to the same effect. Some Landmarkers today think Booth very liberal, an unsafe guide, but not the Philadelphia Association. Also in the circular letter of 1806, this is stated:

“We will mention but one missionary principle more, namely, - That the means by which, instrumentally, the great work is to be effected, is the ministration of the Divine Word.” “The commission of Christ directs his ministers to “go out into all the world.” “Many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased.”

Then the author gives a brief history of missions of many denominations: Church of Scotland, the Dutch Reformed, Presbyterians, as well as Baptists, and concludes:

“We wish them everyone success, so far as truth is maintained, in the name of the Lord God of Sabaoth!” Futher: “The object of missionary societies, beloved brethren, is great, greater indeed than the Reformation itself. That aimed at the overthrow of the beast; this at the destruction of the dragon from whom the beast derived its power: “For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.”

This was not just some lone sermon preached and forgotten, the quicker the better, by one unlearned novice who hadn't learned “Church truth”, this was a circular letter sent to all the churches of the Association. Surely anyone should see the Philadelphia Association was not Landmark.

Reference was made in the 1744 minutes and other places to their “Discipline” written by Griffith, which sets forth procedures of Church organization and baptism only by ordained ministers, etc.; and in this you find no outsider “confering” or “Mothering” them or any other such gloss on scripture - They organized themselves, procuring “such neighboring helps as they can”. Griffith says he used Keach, Morgan, Owen, and Goodwin in preparing the Discipline – were they Landmarkers?

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In Graves' introduction to Dayton's Book “Alien Immersion”, composed of former articles from the “Southern Baptist Review”, edited by Graves, this is stated:

“Why were they called Ana-Baptists? Because they baptized all who came to them from the Catholic Party, or any sect, which they regarded as heretical. Why did they reject the immersion - for immersion was the prevailing practice for more than 1300 years says Wall himself - of the catholics and of heretical sects? Because they believed that a, corrupt or unscriptural Church could not give valid baptism.”

This is a gross understatement by Graves. This wasn't believers baptism administered by the Catholics, but baptismal regeneration to infants; and of course it follows from this they were not true churches of Christ and not vise versa.

Another statement from Graves on Landmarkism quoting from the “Georgia Index” of 1843 by J.L. Reynolds, D.D.:

“The conclusion is irresistible that they did not consider even immersion valid when it was the act of an unimmersed administrator. The principle of action doubtless was, that there could be no valid baptism, unless the administrator was authorized to baptize, by a properly constituted church. Hence, in vindication of the Baptists of London in 1615, the ground is taken, that “all baptism received either in the Church of Rome, or England, is invalid: because received in a false church and from Anti-Christian ministers.” (Crosby Vol. P. 273) They refused to sanction the acts of any administrator, who derived his authority from churches which perverted the ordinance of baptism. This is firm baptist ground, and the position is impregnable.”

These were, general Baptists, and what they say is true - anyone who corrupts Baptism into baptismal regeneration - should be rejected; but Landmarkism is hurting here as also the conclusion of Reynolds, and hence, Graves, because Christian quoting further in this same

document says: "They denied succession to Rome and declared succession not necessary to Baptism." They affirmed: "That any disciple of Christ, in what part of the world soever, coming to the Lord's way, he by the word and Spirit of God preaching that way unto others, and converting, he may and ought also to baptize them." (Christian's Hist. P. 219, Vol. 1) Which shows they weren't Landmarkers with link-chain succession, and shows Reynolds, Graves, and company as merely grasping at Landmark straws, reading their theory into historical accounts that simply is not there.

Graves places all protestantism with catholicism together in Anti-Christ or babylon quoting the Waldensian "Treatise concerning Anti-Christ" written in the year 1120, some 400 years before the reformation: "He teaches to baptize children into the faith, and attributes to this (baptism) the work of regeneration, with the external rite of baptism." Graves asks: "Do not all the protestant sects do this as well as the mother church, of which they are the branches, or the daughters?" Admittedly, to the Baptist mind, they border on Romanism here, but certainly not in the same way, (See Dargan's review of Hodge on this in 'Ecclesiology'), and it is a fact: All the Reformed Theology, denies Baptismal Regeneration (See Dabney's review of Campbellism in 'Discussions'). But charging Baptismal Regeneration to the Reformed is a very different matter than proving it. Here is a small quote from Dabney against Campbellites that should help some Baptist's minds:

"They, (Campbellites), claim, with much clamor, that the Reformed divines and symbols, and especially the Westminster and the Thirty-Nine Articles, teach their doctrine; and that we have really forsaken our own standards on these points. Their supposed proof is that the Confessions say baptism is not only a sign, but a, seal of the remission of sins, our engrafting into Christ, etc. It seems hard to make them see that they have leaped from one idea to another wholly different, in thus confounding the attestation by a sacrament, of a blessing already conferred on terms entirely non-formal and spiritual, with making the sacrament the essential term for conferring the blessing. To our minds the difference is clearly enough expressed in the words of Paul: circumcision was to Abraham a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised. Every one sees that the sphragistic nature of the sacrament is destroyed by assigning it an opus operutum power. For visibly to effect a work is one thing, to attest its performance by an invisible agent is a different thing. As fruition excludes hope, so the former supersedes the latter." (Dabney, Discussions, Theological, p. 343).

In the Campbell - Rice debate, Lexington, Ky., 1844, notice Rice's statement against Campbells' baptismal regeneration:

"...that the sins of infants are remitted in baptism. We teach no such doctrine, as he ought to know. He says, he understands Presbyterianism, Now I make the unqualified assertion, that he cannot produce one respectable Presbyterian, in ancient or modern times, who ever taught, that infants had their sins remitted in the act of Baptism. No Child is taught so. I never say a Presbyterian writer, nor heard a Presbyterian preacher who thus taught. If I knew a minister, in our church, who entertained such views, I should be prepared to table charges against him before his presbytery. I am sorry to discover that my friend knows so little of Presbyterianism" (p. 538).

D.B. Ford (Studies in Baptism, P. 313) quotes the famous John Owen (respecting baptizmal regeneration): "The Father of lies could not well devise a more effectual plan to lead mankind blindfold to perdition."

And speaking of these Anti-Christ heretics (!) Wonder why a Presbyterian republished Gills' comm. on the Bible in 1811; and also an Episcopal Clergyman did the same some years after in Ireland? Strange way to deceive! Dabney says of Gill in his evangelical discussion, P. 659: "Dr. Gill from 1763, unsurpassed, perhaps unequaled, by any commentator since, who wrote on the whole Bible." And, while I am far from defending the Reformed position on Baptism, I wonder if they have corrupted the ordinance anymore than Landmarkers have. It is a far cry from the simple believers Baptism (and that only) of the scriptures. The scriptures do not put any more prominence on the one ordinance than the other - simply symbols of the gospel; and if the corruption of the Lord's supper at Corinth didn't unchurch them - why would the corruption of the other ordinance unchurch anyone else? And in many sound Baptist churches today, some use grape juice, some use wine (both abomination to the opposites) - but it doesn't unchurch them! And if either should come to the "truth" on the matter, should they shut the whole thing down and "go get" the true ordinance somewhere? Be reorganized? No, they simply start obeying the Lord in the matter. The above suggestion is silly on the Lord's Supper and why not on Baptism?

Another chief difference between Baptists and the Reformed is church membership. Baptists believe in a regenerated membership, but we do not exclude our children from our assemblies - we preach to them, sing with them, pray with them - they do assemble with the assembly, and rightly so. Others baptize them into their membership to mark a difference between them and the world: "The promise is unto you and your children" (they say) and they bring together the same covenant to Abraham and his seed with the spiritual children and their seed. Being a Baptist I think they are wrong, but I wonder which is more offensive to the Lord: The Baptism of infants, bringing them under the covenant and the Reformed Churches; or the bringing in of unsaved multitudes through the Arminian moral suasion to the Baptists? Sovereign Gracers reply: "We don't do that;" but, the Arminian Baptisms are in the link-chain - from whence they came - this supposed "pure" Baptist line. In earlier days Baptist Baptism was accepted and interchanged among almost all the churches. Pendleton boasted 4,000,000 Baptists strong. Grime in "Alien Baptism" says: "All branches of the Baptist family have always been recognized as a part of the same church." (P. 31) Many of those in the "New Light" stir would lose control of their bodies, roll on the floor, bark like dogs, etc., Many were Baptists: some would be baptized before conversion and when they changed membership would not be re-baptized, (see Semple, Spencer and Benedict Histories); many of these churches (separatists) and associations of churches came into the United Baptists and later were absorbed into the Southern Baptist Convention, what happened to the succession of "true" Baptism?

If it is claimed that all this is deviate Landmarkism, or not true Landmarkism at all - then, by whose definition? Landmarkism is neither a Biblical term nor a Biblical practice - that's why it is always changing. In Graves' teaching a "mother" church was not necessary to the organization of a "daughter" church. This isn't true to Modern Landmarkers. In "Baptist Church Perpetuity", by Jarrel, (P. 1):

ŸThe Late and lamented scholar, J.R. Graves, L.L.D., wrote "Wherever there are three or more baptized members of a Regular Baptist Church or Churches convened together to hold and

teach, and are governed by the New Testament, etc., there is a church of Christ, even though there was not a presbytery of ministers in a thousand miles of them to organize them into a church. There is not the slightest need of a council of presbyters to organize a Baptist Church.”

And again in the Carrollton Debate. (P. 975):

“It is true that two or three Baptized individuals can organize a church, provided they adopt the Apostolic model of government, and covenant to be governed by the sole authority of Jesus Christ.”

Note the addition of Graves over the determinations of Spilsbury, King, Kiffen, etc.: “Baptized members” and Baptized individuals” can organize a church, whereas the earlier Baptists claimed “a company of believers, or church, can take up baptism among themselves, etc.” “That Baptism doesn’t make the church, but the word and Spirit.” Graves added baptism, but our moderns add much more: The transmitting of authority. They reason:

“There must be Divine authority present before you can have a New Testament Church. To ignore this fact is to turn one’s back upon the revelation of God. To have a cow is to have a mother cow. No one but an infidel evolutionist believes otherwise. There cannot be a calf without a mother cow. The same is true of a church. God’s immutable law is that everything brings forth “after his kind”, (Gen. 1:24-25). “You cannot have a New Testament church after the Apostolic order unless you have a mother church – a church which has a perpetuity back to the first church at Jerusalem. For believers to organize a religious society apart from the aid of an already existing church of Christ is to give the world another Synagogue of Satan. God forbid that men ignore the Bride of Christ if they desire to begin a church. I am here today with a letter of authority from my home church to constitute the baptized believers in this place into a true church. That is the purpose of this service. Today Calvary Baptist Church will have a child – she will bring forth after her kind. I am here, aided by Elders Ostor Mink, Harry Balmer, and Willard Pyle, to confer by the authority given to Calvary Baptist Church by Christ all the rights, powers, and privileges upon this assembly possessed by any New Testament Church.” (How to Organize a Church-Cockrell).

We read in many places in Dayton’s “Alien Baptism” about “confering” baptism - now we read of a man “confering” authority. This is more than a Papal Blessing - ignore it is to ignore the Bride of Christ, and to become a Synagogue of Satan - that’s, all that makes the difference! It’s embarrassing to comment on such crass ignorance. The Divine authority is in Christ and has never left Christ - it was not delegated from Christ to his church and then from church to church down through the ages. This kind of Authority cannot be delegated. The Pope of Rome assumes this kind of authority - so do Modern Landmarkers. Christ said, “He would pray the Father and He shall give you another comforter, that He may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth whom the world cannot receive...” (Jno. 14:16,17). And, “...He shall teach you all things...” (ver. 26); and “... He shall testify of me.” (15:26); “He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement..” (16:8); “he shall glorify me...” (ver. 14). Paul says this in Heb. 8:10, “For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach everyman his

neighbor, and everyman his brother, saying, know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the lowest to the greatest.”

All this describing the work of the Spirit to ALL THOSE UNDER THE NEW COVENANT. If no one has the truth but Baptists - then none are saved but Baptists, because the Spirit would “convince the world (elect) of sin (the world, non-elect, cannot receive Him) and then “guide them unto all truth” - as well as “abide with them forever.” The same Spirit quickens all the elect. All the elect are in the New Covenant. All the elect are led into the “all things” of the Spirit. “My sheep hear my voice and I know them and they follow me.” (John 10:27), and: “That they all may be one...” (Jno. 17:21). The appendix to the 2nd London Confession is the best commentary on the above that I have ever read. Tolerance to them with whom we cannot agree - not damning them! Any assembly of Christians covenanted together to follow Christ is just that - an assembly. And since they are bought by Christ why can't they be an assembly of Christ? They can and are. They do follow Christ in all His commands in their honest convictions. Landmarkism says they are honest deceivers! But we have example after example in the New Testament of erring churches - that were not unchurched by their errors. In Colosse, some were wanting to go back under the shadows to worship God - But the Body that cast the shadows is Christ; and it is striking that there is no quarrel over the doctrines of grace with the Reformers, fbut there is over the symbols (shadows) of the gospel? At one time Bunyan thought it would be better to let the symbols go for a season rather than let the same cause so much division and strife. We can't let them go, and we can't compromise, but we need to agree to disagree, and leave each other to stand or fall in the Lord.

Landmarkism assumes a position (a changing one at that), that has been demonstrated to have not been followed by the vast majority of Baptists - an ideal church that absolutely excludes all others, but as mentioned, we have scriptural examples of good and better churches. A good analogy to this are the scriptures themselves. We are promised repeatedly “that the word of the Lord endures forever”, that “heaven and earth shall pass away but my word will not pass away.”; But it is a fact all the churches of Christ have not always had all the Word of God. Catholicism kept the scriptures from the people for centuries, and still do; many of the Lord's people had to memorize portions of scriptures to have any; and what most of us have today aren't nearly so good as the originals, as anyone knows, who has studied the languages. The Idioms in each particular language prohibit exact translation and without exact translation we can't have exact meaning. But the promises of the Lord have not failed - His purposes are always accomplished; and it is the same way with churches - some are more or less scriptural than others; and we can say with Spurgeon concerning Baptists: “Our own belief is that these people are the purest part of that sect which of old days was everywhere spoken against, and we are convinced that they have beyond their brethren, preserved the ordinances of the Lord Jesus as they were delivered unto the Saints. We care very little for the “historical church” argument, but if there be anything in it at all, the plea ought not to be filched by the clients of Rome, but should be left to that community which all along has held by “One Lord, One Faith, and One Baptism.” (History of the Church Meeting in the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Ch. 1).

Let's notice a paragraph from Dagg's Theology concerning Landmarkism:

“Conclusions so unfavorable to the entire Pedobaptist ministry are revolting to the minds of multitudes. They see in many of these ministers proofs of humble piety, sincere devotion to the cause of Christ, and deep concern for the salvation of souls. To these manifestations of the proper spirit for the gospel ministry, are added high degree of Scripture knowledge, and a talent for imparting instruction. When such men are seen devoting their lives to arduous toil for the

conversion of souls, and when God appears to crown their labors with abundant success, it is difficult to resist the conviction that they are truly ministers of the gospel acting with Divine authority and approbation.”

Also, R.L. Dabney writes against Dayton’s Theodocia Earnest:

The odious ecclesiastical consequences of the Immersionist dogma should be pressed; because they form a most potent and just argument against it. All parties are agreed, that baptism is the initiatory rite which gives membership in the visible Church of Christ. The great commission was: Go ye, and disciple all nations, baptizing them into the Trinity. Baptism recognizes and constitutes the outward discipleship. Least of all, can any immersionist dispute this ground. Now, if all other forms of baptism than immersion are not only irregular, but null and void, all unimmersed persons are out of the visible Church. But if each and every member of a pedobaptist visible Church is thus unchurched: of course the whole body is unchurched. All pedobaptist societies, then, are guilty of an intrusive error, when they pretend to the character of a Church of Christ. Consequently, they can have no ministry; and this for several reasons. Surely no valid office can exist in an association whose claim to be an ecclesiastical commonwealth is utterly invalid. When the temple is nonexistent, there can be no actual pillars to that temple. How can an unauthorized herd of unbaptized persons, of whom Christ concedes no church authority, confer any valid office? Again: it is preposterous that a man should receive and hold office in a commonwealth where he himself has no citizenship; but this unimmersed pedobaptist minister, so-called, is no member of any visible Church. There are no real ministers in the world, except the Immersionist preachers! The pretensions of all others, therefore, to act as ministers and to administer the sacraments, are sinful intrusions. It is hard to see how any intelligent and conscientious Immersionist can do any act, which countenances or sanctions this profane intrusion. They should not allow any weak inclinations of fraternity and peace to sway their consciences in this point of high principle. They are bound, then, not only to practice close communion, but to refuse all ministerial recognition and communion to intruders. The sacraments cannot go beyond the pale of the visible Church. Hence the same stern denunciations ought to be hurled at the Lord’s Supper in pedobaptist societies, and at all their prayers and preachings in public, as at the iniquity of “baby-sprinkling.” The enlightened immersionist should treat all these societies, just as he does that ‘Synagogue of Satan,’ the Papal Church: there may be many good, misguided believers in them; but no church character, ministry, nor sacraments whatever.

But let the student now look at the enormity of this conclusion. Here are bodies of ministers adorned by the Lord with as many gifts and graces as any Immersionists; actually doing the largest part of all that is done on earth, to win the world to its divine Master. Here are four-fifths of Protestant Christendom, exhibiting as many of the solid fruits of grace as any body of men in the world, doing nearly all that is done for man’s redemption, and sending up to heaven a constant harvest of ransomed souls. Yet are they not churches or ministers, at all: Why? Only because they have not used quite enough water in the outward form of an ordinance! What greater outrage on common sense, Christian charity, and the spirituality of Christ’s visible Church was ever committed by the bigotry of prelacy or popery? The just mind replies to such a dogma, not only with a firm negative, but with the righteous indignation of an “incredulus odi”. When we remember, that this extreme high-churchism is enacted by a sect, which calls itself eminently spiritual, free and Protestant, the solecism becomes more repulsive. Only a part of the

Immersionists have the nerve to assert this consequence. But their dogma involves it; and it is justly pressed on all. (Theological Discussion P. 243)

Notice the second sentence in Dabney's quote: "All parties are agreed, that baptism is the initiatory rite which gives membership in the visible church of Christ." This is, not particular Baptist doctrine - see appendix I and II, but this is Landmark doctrine. This is another case where Graves was following Protestant doctrine and not Biblical doctrine. And the supposed "consequence" arising from such "dogma" which Dabney was so perturbed about did not exist from Particular Baptist doctrine - but from Landmarkism which came from protestantism. The only scripture modern Landmarkers can give is I Cor. 12:13 to support their notion that Baptism is the door into the Church (Graves gave John 3:5 also). But does the verse teach it? "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be jews or gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink in one Spirit." It has been said, "The verse can't be settled by argument - too many possibilities (Lange, comm.). There are four main interpretations:

1. The most common interpretation in christianity general, is the one by Wuest: "By means of one Spirit were we all placed into one body," meaning the Spirit of regeneration, and into the Universal Invisible Church. But as Carroll points out: If this were true then regeneration wouldn't be the same to all of them.

2. The next is "By one spirit (little "s", i.e., the spirit of unity) we are all baptized (in water) into one body..." Since the Greek was written in capitol letters, at that time, we have no way of knowing whether a capitol was meant or not - some say. But the other eleven times the word is used in this context it always means the Holy Spirit, so it is completely unreasonable to suppose a different meaning here.

3. The next is: "By one Spirit" i.e., being led by the Holy Spirit, "we are all baptized (in water) into one body..." This is the Landmark interpretation (most of them). If the verse merely read: "Ye are all baptized into one body", they might have a point, and that is the way they want to read it - but the scriptures do not say this, the Scriptures say "In one Spirit were we all baptized, with reference to one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free; and have been all made to drink of one Spirit." Carroll follows Broadus in translating Els: "We believe that it would be a decided improvement to render Baptize ELS everywhere by 'unto' (Comm. on Mt. 28:19); and Broadus followed the critical comm. of Fritzche, Meyer, Weiss, and Hodge: "In one Spirit were we all baptized with reference to one body" etc.

Some Facts: The first preposition is not "By", it is "In"; the second preposition "EIS" is not "Into" but "With reference to"; the third preposition probably is not even in the text at all, many Mss do not contain it.

"The Preposition EN is always expressed when baptism in the Holy Spirit is spoken of, but often omitted when baptism in water is referred to - perhaps because the local sense is sufficiently expressed by the verb when followed by the customary element for immersion, while it needs to be made certain when that element is spiritual." (Hovey, on Acts 1:5, American Comm.)

The Holy Spirit is not the administrator - Christ is: Matt. 3:11, Mk. 1:8; Lu. 3:16; Jn. 1:33; Acts 1:5, 11:16 - these six times and nowhere else do we read that Jesus was to baptize in the Holy Spirit. And that the Holy Spirit is meant is evident from the context: Paul is writing concerning "Spirituals", these came from the Holy Spirit. What kind of Baptism? The scriptures speak of three: in sufferings, Mt. 20:22; in water; and in the Spirit. Our text does not say "in one (kind)

of sufferings or afflictions are we baptized; nor does it say “in one water are we baptized.”; but, “In one, Spirit were we all baptized...” If we believed the text we would not have so much trouble with it, and, of course, this baptism was for the Apostolic age only (more later). Many say the baptism in the Spirit was at, one time and one time only, at Pentecost. That is simply not true according to Peter’s statement in Acts 11:15;

“And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God?”

Luke uses the same words in Acts 10:45, that he recorded earlier in Acts 2:17 quoting from Joel, “...I will, pour out my Spirit upon all flesh...” While Peter was preaching the household of Cornelius began speaking in tongues and magnifying God; Luke says the Holy Spirit was poured out on them; it made Peter remember the Lord said He would baptize in the Holy Spirit; and Peter says “God gave them the like gift (baptism in the Spirit) as He did us.” And the distinctions some make in “fillings with the Spirit” or “gifts of the Spirit” with “Baptism in the Spirit” are unwarranted: Peter calls this “Baptism,” this “pouring”, this “gift” all the same thing which shows clearly the baptism in the Spirit, was not a “one time event” at Pentecost. And why not at Corinth also? That is what the text plainly says: “In one Spirit were we all baptized”, they had the gifts of that one Spirit and the latter part of the verse employs a figure that directly harmonizes with the passage relating to the baptism in the Spirit: “and have all been made to drink of one Spirit,” (the second “into” is not in many texts, but if it were it would not change the meaning as we will see later). Paul uses the figure “To drink of one Spirit.” Certainly not alluding to the Lord’s Supper, no one literally drinks of the Spirit, or “drinks into one Spirit” anymore than he is baptized (with water) into Christ. We are not Sacramentalists or Campbellites - we are Baptists, so was Paul. The figure “drink” harmonizes with the scriptures we have already noticed about the Spirit being “poured out”, but especially does it in John 7:37-39:

“In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying if any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. “But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.”)

But this spake he of the Spirit. These are the words of the evangelist, explaining the figurative expressions of Christ; showing that by rivers of living water, he meant the Spirit in his gifts and graces; and which is the plain sense of the passages referred to by him, particularly Isa. xlv. 3. Joel ii. 28, and which, as before observed, the Jews supposed were intimated by their drawing and pouring water at the feast of the tabernacles. Which they that believe on him should receive; the apostles, and others, that had believed in Christ, and had received the Spirit, as a Spirit of regeneration and Sanctification; as a Spirit of illumination and conversion; as a Spirit of faith and adoption; but on the day of Pentecost they were to receive a larger, even an extraordinary measure of gifts and grace, to qualify them for greater work and service.” (Gill, Comm.)

The verbs “were Baptized” and “were made to drink” are both aorist passive, both referring to the same event: when they were baptized in the Spirit, they were made to drink of the Spirit. (See Meyer and Hodge).

B.H. Carroll takes the passages from

Joel: "I will pour forth my Spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:28).

Peter: "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit for the promise is unto you, and to your children, even as many as many as the Lord our God shall call" Acts 2:38-39.

and comes up with the following:

"Acts 2:1-6 shows that the Jew received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, Acts 8:14-16 shows that the Samaritans received it. Acts 9:17 with I Corinthians 14:8 shows that Paul received it. Acts 10:44-46 shows that the Romans at Caesarea received it. Acts 19:1-6 shows that the Greeks at Corinth received it" (Comm. on Acts).

and evidently the same was true of the churches of Galatia - Gal. 3:2,5.

But Carroll, a Landmarker, missed the primary reason of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It was not the accreditation of the Local Church that Christ was supposed to have built during His earthly ministry, supposed by Carroll to be the New Temple (Zech. 6:13), endowed with power and authority to begin its earthly mission to the end of the age, and which Carroll thinks was typed by the Lord's filling the earthly tabernacle and temple, and prophesied by the filling of Ezekiel's new temple. This was a far greater accreditation than that of a Local Church which the Landmarkers vainly imagine to give glory to - it was the accreditation of the new covenant itself: "When He is come, He will testify of me" said the Lord - not of the Landmark system! And the fire and shaking at Sinai at the inauguration of the first covenant would more closely type the inauguration of the second - see Heb. 12:18-28. He did fill His house like the tabernacle and temple but it wasn't merely in the local church sense - it was in the universal. Cornelius and his household were baptized in the Holy Spirit, before they were baptized in water, (Acts 10); also Paul in chapter 9; and the Ephesian disciples of Acts 19 were not an organized landmark Baptist Church when they were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was the inauguration of the New Covenant, the Confirmation of the gospel, the accreditation of the Apostolic witness to the resurrection of Christ. The following is the best I have seen on the subject:

1. It is a grave error to suppose that New Testament signs and wonders, in the shape of Tongues, Healings and Exorcisms are intended for the Church today.

The pentecostal baptism of Acts 2 was the visible and audible inauguration of the New Covenant. The outward signs were necessary to express in evidential form the removal of the Old Covenant and the establishment of the New under the authority of the apostles. The mighty signs and wonders, extending even to the raising of the dead, showed the nature and power of the new dispensation.

The transmission of the pentecostal gifts to those who were not present at the first outpouring or who were converted subsequently, was entirely an apostolic prerogative. See Acts 8:14:14-18, Acts 10:44-45 (while Peter was ministering the Word), Acts 19:6. There is no recorded instance of a non-apostle exercising this right. Even the case of Ananias in Acts 9 carefully avoids any statement that Paul received the manifestation at this man's hands. His sight was restored but it is not said that he there and then received the pentecostal manifestation. On the contrary he tells us in Galatians that his apostleship - the greatest of all the gifts of the Spirit - was not of men, neither by man, but (directly) by Christ Himself.

In Hebrews 2:3-4 we are told that the signs, wonders, and diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit were God's attestation of the testimony of those who "heard" the Lord Jesus (i.e., in the flesh); or in other words, who were direct witnesses of His life, death and resurrection. If this was the purpose of the outward signs -, to attest the authenticity of the apostolic witness -, then the signs could not outlive those who had seen our Lord in the flesh and who were competent witnesses of the events which inaugurated the Everlasting Covenant. All history proves that the signs did not in fact outlive the generation of living witnesses, and all attempts to recover them since have ended in disappointment, and sometimes even in charlatanry and moral dilemma. Those who today (sometimes earnest believers) lay hands on others that they might receive these apostolic gifts are in grievous error. They had better ascertain first whether they be themselves apostles, and those who submit to their ministrations should likewise have a care, for these gifts are "the signs of an apostle" (II Cor. 12:12). (C.D. Alexander) (Cited from the Berean Ambassador, Feb. 1988)

And so taught Dabney before him (Theology, p. 753); and Gill before Dabney; (Comm. I Tim. 4:14); and a most remarkable teaching on the subject found in a circular letter of the Phil. Asso. Minutes by T.B. Montanye follows:

† CIRCULAR LETTER.

By Rev. T.B. Montanye.

The elders and messengers of the Philadelphia Association,
To the churches they represent send Christian salutation.

Beloved brethren, - We were highly pleased, and much gratified, in the enjoyment of such a general representation of the churches, and the kind reception we met by our sister church at Hopewell, while the cause of our convening in this place gave us pain. Philadelphia being once more visited by trying dispensations of Providence, her situation demands our united cry, that God would turn away this calamity from her, and her inhabitants to himself.

Anxious for your increase in knowledge, and to be instrumental in advancing the kingdom of our Lord the Messiah, we have chosen as the subject of this our epistle - The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. In making this choice at the present time, the following reasons have guided our pen:

1. That though this point has been often mentioned, we think seldom clearly explained; and for want of a right idea of it, the glory of the Gospel lessened.
2. It has, almost universally, been so blended with the work of regeneration and sanctification, that it is commonly called the inward baptism, and the only necessary preparative for heaven; whereas, it was never inculcated in this light in the Gospel, and we think ought not to be considered as constituting any part of the office work of the Divine Spirit in renewing the heart.
3. That haply we may be of use to some of our respected friends, by showing them, that, though they may be regenerated, and enjoy the highest consolation in the sweet incomes of the Holy Comforter, and the most sensible communion with Christ; yet, as all this does not constitute the baptism of the Holy Spirit, nor is designed by it in the sacred Scriptures, it follows of consequence, that, rejecting the water baptism, they have no baptism whatever, and ought cheerfully to submit to that prescribed in the example of Jesus Christ.
4. It being extremely absurd to hold one point of the Christian religion under the denomination of another, especially when there is no well founded evidence of its present existence.

To render this subject plain, and the truth of it familiar, we call your attention to the following considerations:

The term baptism of the Holy Ghost, is only to be found in the New Testament, and was first taught by the harbinger of Jesus Christ, Matt. iii. 11, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" confining it wholly to the office work of the Saviour, in executing the trust committed to him by the Father; and so in Acts ii. 33, "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," which evinced the power of Christ, and confirmed the divine mission of John.

The subject itself is the fulfilment of prophecy and the accomplishment of the promise made by Jesus Christ to this disciples, Joel ii. 28, and recorded Acts ii, from the 16th to the 22d verse, "And it shall come to pass in the last days," saith God, "I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," &c.; also in Luke xxiv. 49, "And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high;" which promise is again mentioned by Luke, in Acts i. 4,5, as the ground on which the apostles went to Jerusalem, and there in holy concert joined in prayer and supplication for the accomplishment of such qualifying aid, to promulge the knowledge of their exalted Redeemer.

The nature of this baptism, most clearly evinces it to be distinct, and materially different from that of regeneration. The one a still small voice, saying, "This is the way;" the other, that of "a rushing mighty wind." One invisible, "A white stone, and a new name given, which no man knew save he that had received it;" the other, to be seen, "Cloven tongues of fire sat on them." One internal, filling the heart with secret consolation, joy and pleasure; the other external, "The whole house where they sitting."

This renders the term baptism proper, because they were immersed in the fountain of the Spirit, and thereby made partakers of such extraordinary and miraculous influence, as in regeneration and conversion were never promised.

The design of this baptism, is another important argument in favor of this idea. To qualify otherwise ignorant and unlearned men, to cope with all the greatness of this world, and to meet the wisdom of men, in all their formidable attacks, putting them to silence. To establish the greatest doctrines in the councils of heaven, or among men, God and man dwelling in one Christ; and that Jesus of Nazareth, crucified by the envious and treacherous Jews, was he; and, though the master was exalted, the disciple could effect, in his name, visible evidence of his Godhead, and by signs and miracles, as well as Scripture prophecy, prove him to be the Messiah promised to the fathers.

To establish the gospel dispensation, by the instrumentality of a few illiterate persons, raised up in the land of Judea, (who declared that the whole economy made known to the ancient fathers, the costly grandeur of the temple and the expence of its worship, was fulfilled, and all its glory exceeded, in him who expired on the accursed tree,) needed the power of omnipotence, to make its way against the formidable force raised in opposition. Another reason was to assure the apostles, primitive Christians, and all subsequent believers, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and only Saviour of Jews and Gentiles. For which reason, the Holy Ghost, in his miraculous gifts of speaking with divers tongues, fell on the Gentiles in a visible form, as upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, Acts xi. 15, 16, "The Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning;" which extraordinary gifts served to confirm Peter that he was doing right, in hearkening to the vision he had seen; and to satisfy the church of the divine right of all nations in common to partake of salvation by the cross of Jesus Christ.

The subjects of this baptism differ essentially from those of regeneration. The work of grace is upon the hearts of the unregenerated, bringing them from a state of moral death to life, from darkness to light, and from the power of sin, and service of Satan, to the liberty of the gospel, and the enjoyment of fellowship with God. Whereas, the baptism of the Holy Ghost was upon the apostles; who, having experienced the work of grace upon their souls, and being thereby made partakers of all that is peculiar to regeneration, could not be regenerated by the descent of the sacred Spirit, which being a work only once in the divine life, could not be effected again. As an assurance of this fact, they are declared to have "their names written in heaven," and Jesus Christ had manifested the Father to them, (John xvii. 6,) and "that they had known surely Christ came from God, and had believed on the Son of God," (verse 8.) "Flesh and blood had not revealed it unto them, but the Father in Heaven." They are called by every near and dear appellation, that could express the love of God to them. And as for Cornelius, he had intercourse with God, and was acquainted with the power of renewing grace, as the cause of sending for Peter. As for the twelve on whom Paul laid his hands, none can doubt of their previous interest in Christ: for they are said to have believed. To render this point more clear, not only regeneration is not the baptism of the Holy Ghost, nor yet the receiving of the sacred Spirit; this is most clearly manifested in the case of the disciples, who, after the resurrection of Christ, were visited by him, and he breathed on them and they received the Holy Ghost, (John xx. 22,) no doubt as much, if not more, than believers in common; and yet, notwithstanding, they are ordered to tarry at Jerusalem until baptised of the sacred Spirit. All which join to show, that whatever any Christian may have gained in the experience of grace, he has no right to the term, baptised by the Spirit, unless such a person professing this miraculous attainment, for no other is called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, prove it by signs and wonders, as did the primitive Christians.

The effects which followed this baptism: Casting out devils; Paul dispossessed the damsel that had a spirit of divination, commanding the spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her, and it did; and also of others, by the power and in the name of Christ; speaking with new tongues - not such as all others were ignorant of, but such as they had never learned or understood before; taking up serpents without injury - so Paul had a viper fastened on his hand, which he shook off, and to the amazement of the beholders, received no harm, but their united testimony that he was more than mortal; drinking deadly poison, without hurt; laying hands on the sick, and they recover; the father of Plubius was healed of a fever and the bloody flux; the lame man from his mother's womb made whole, and the shadow of Peter effected the cure of many; (Acts v. 15, 16;) others were healed by handkerchiefs and aprons taken from the body of Paul: (Acts xix. 12;) all of which were then necessary for the confirmation of the gospel, and the establishment of Christianity in the world.

Here it is proper to remove some apparent difficulties, which are a means of puzzling the minds of many. First. What baptism the apostle denominates one baptism? We answer, The instituted appointment of Jesus Christ, which he authorised after his resurrection, which remains a standing ordinance in the church, and which Peter, when filled with the Holy Ghost, enjoined on Cornelius and the rest of the believing Gentiles, even after they were baptised with the Holy Spirit; though the baptism of the Spirit was never an essential prerequisite to water baptism; but a striking evidence to the Jews of the salvation of the Gentiles, and confirmation of the existence of grace in the heart; as only such were the subjects of his miraculous operations.

The next we meet is in 1 Corinthians xii. 13: "For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." By attending

to the chapter, you will at once perceive that the scope of it is upon the extraordinary work of the Spirit, and indeed miracles are named in verse 10, and divers tongues, which, as we have shown, were given to the Gentiles as well as the Jews. The former stood now, under the gospel dispensation, on an equal ground with the latter, and had come into the fellowship of the saints, by the same miraculous evidence from heaven; and to us there seems no absurdity in saying that the same Spirit influences all nations to yield an obedience to the instituted appointments of Jesus Christ, and so come into the union of the body the church. As for sundry other Scriptures, such as Rom. vi. 3,4, Col. ii. 12, 1 Peter 3. 21, Gal. iii. 27, they have an evident relation to water baptism, and are no way connected with, nor yet refer to, the work of grace in the heart. The narrow limits of a letter call us to a close. We must, therefore, leave you to gather further instruction from the few inferences deducible from the whole.

1. That though regeneration and sanctification be essential to the character of a Christian; yet neither of them constitute the baptism of the Holy Ghost.
2. However much you may enjoy of the Spirit, as the Spirit of life, light, and love; you have no Scripture grounds to call this inward baptism, and so the one baptism, and thereby live in the neglect of the appointments of Jesus Christ.
3. That as the baptism of the Holy Ghost was given for the confirmation of the gospel dispensation, it has effected its design; the sacred prophecy is fulfilled, and it has ceased.
4. That as the extraordinary work, and no other, is known in the gospel as the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that took place after faith in Christ, or regeneration, we have no right to call regeneration baptism.
5. Though we are the hopeful subjects of divine grace, and live in the smiles of heaven; it is both our duty and privilege to submit to the appointments of Jesus Christ, as laid down in his word.

And now, dear brethren, you may perceive, that our intention is not to deny any of the blessed operations of the holy Ghost upon the human mind; but to distinguish between truth and error. While we write these things to you, we hope that God may give you and us more of his Spirit, that we may live unto Him, who has died for us. And as churches, we would exhort you to live in the Spirit, and grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed until the day of redemption. In the mean time, pray for us, that as instrumental of your joy, you and we may honor our profession by holy living, in the smiles of God's gracious Spirit.

Signed by order of the Association.

HEZEKIAH SMITH, Moderator.

BURGISS ALLISON, Clerk.

(pp. 372 - 376)

Now, in view of such clear writings above, it should be clear what the primary meaning in the scriptures is concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit: The inauguration of the New Covenant, the confirmation of the gospel, and the accreditation of the Apostolic witness to the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

With this in mind, let us look at the text again and see if there are other texts in scripture with the same wording and same meaning.

I Cor. 12:13 "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." (Landmark: "so also is Christ's body - a local church") (Most Comm.: "so also is Christ's body - the invisible church")."

But no less a critical scholar than Meyer says, "HO CHRISTOS is not the christian church but Christ himself." then it would read: "So also is the Christ, one, he is not divided (chapter 1:13); or, so also is the Christ, one, though Prophet, Priest, and King". And it is in reference to that one Christ that the next verse treats:

I Cor. 12:12 "For also in one Spirit were we all baptized with reference to one body" - (The Christ, just mentioned), "Whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free -" (This fully agrees with the parallel scriptures):

Eph. 2:16 "And that he might reconcile both (Jew and Gentile) in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." (There are differences of opinion whether "Body" here means "Christ" or the "Church" - but the parallel in Colossians would seem to determine the question).

Col. 1:21-22 "And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death.."

Gal. 3:27-28 "For as many of you as have been baptized with reference to Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male or female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Thus, the "Baptized with reference to one body" in I Cor. 12:13, harmonized with the parallel passages with the same wording (Jews and Gentiles - Bond or free) would have the, same meaning as the parallels have, not a new and a different meaning, taught nowhere else in scripture. "And were all made to drink of one Spirit." The two Aorists (were baptized - were made to drink) describe the same primary experience under opposite figures (Expositor's Greek Testament, Hodge also). The baptism in the Spirit was with reference to the work of Christ.

The repetition in verse 14 of what he had said in the beginning of verse 12 clearly shows the resumption of Paul's simile which he fully develops in the next 13 verses. The digression of the Apostle in verse 13 tells the, reason of the baptism of the one Spirit, and it is in verse 27 that he says "Ye are Christ's body", genitive case, not in the nominative of verse 12. One Spirit, one body (Many gifts, many members);, one Christ, one baptism in, one Spirit with reference to the, one Christ; and taking up again of how this applies to the Corinthians, he continues in verse 14 with the simile of the human body.

This harmonizes with scripture and avoids two new interpretations not found in scripture: 1. Baptism in the Holy Spirit (meaning regeneration) into the universal church, and 2. Baptism by water into a local church. Neither doctrine is taught elsewhere in scripture.

But if the phrase "so also is Christ, mystical, is referring to his church (the common interpretation), still the interpretation of the EIS in verse 13 wouldn't be "into" but "with reference to", with reference to the practical working of the Spirit through the gifts bestowed in the baptism in the Spirit for the edification of the saints at Corinth, and that in strict unity. This would be the secondary reason of the baptism in the Spirit - still no help for the Landmark and his interpretation.

For arguments sake, let us think of this as water Baptism. We are no more baptized "into" the church than we are baptized "into Christ", Rom. 6, and Gal. 3 (K.J.). Why Baptists will blast Campbellites for their misinterpretation of this preposition, "Baptized 'into' Christ", "Baptized 'into' the remission of sins"; or the Mormons, "Baptized 'for' the dead (in behalf or, in order to remission of sins; etc.)", and then hold "into" in I Cor. 12:13 is beyond reason. A preposition, is

a weak peg upon which to hang a doctrine, especially since it is taught nowhere else in Scripture. What church did John Baptize “into”? What church was the eunuch baptized “into”? Or Paul? Or the twelve believing disciples at Ephesus? Or anyone else in scripture? Baptism does two things only: It is a public profession of faith symbolizing the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and it also symbolizes our death to sin and rising again to newness of life, our union with Christ. Nor, are we baptized (in water) with reference to the Church - what sense would that make? The truth is: Both Baptism in water, or in the Spirit, is with reference to Christ.

The one great error of Landmarkism is assuming to control the Spirit of God. I mentioned earlier this system is Arminian in ecclesiology and notice how this appears: They believe besides the Spirit of regeneration, common to all the elect, there is a further special guidance (comforter) of the Holy Spirit - just for the Lord’s “true” Churches, and if the “Authority” is not transmitted either from a “mother” church, (modern Landmarkism): or through Baptismal Link-chain Succession (old-Landmarkism) a church cannot have this work of the Spirit. If they would let the Lord determine the adjective “True” they would be on safe ground - but they don’t. They determine themselves who are “true”. Baptists have always despised Transubstantiation of the Catholics; and Consubstantiation of the Lutherans in the one ordinance, nothing “passes through” the elements - it is only symbolic; but what of the other? The ramifications of their system teaches it, something is passed through: authority, candlestick, (is this in reality the Holy Spirit?) - something you receive by the hands of men, or lose by disobedience? But as Ross points out: (This Kind of) “Authority is something you can have and not know it, or not have and not miss it.” (Old Landmarkism). Nothing is “passed through” in either ordinance. There are remarkable similarities between Landmarkism and Catholicism - all that the Catholic holds in salvation, the Landmarker holds in church doctrine and both “Blaspheme the saints of God,” in different ways: Catholicism places at least one above Christ, prays to many others, decides who are saints or not; and the Landmarker will not recognize any assembly of Saints as assemblies of Christ, other than their own, and call these assemblies all kinds of names. Paul warns us to not boast against the saints of God...

The Westminster confession is known to be the most beautiful ever written. The Independents changed some things to suit the congregational way: The Baptists changed some things to suit the Baptist way - but the main principles of christianity were stated very well. Did their teaching on administrations and symbols veto the beauty of the teachings of Grace? The Lord said: “My word... shall not return unto me void, it shall accomplish that which I please, “ not man’s word returning unto the Lord; the Spirit takes the Lord’s word and makes it effectual, accomplishing His pleasure. Does the seeming demon in our flesh veto the quickening Spirit - of course not; even so a saved man may hold many things contrary to the word of God, in human ignorance, upbringing, and environment which will not endure. Many Sovereign Grace Baptists will admit being saved in Arminian Churches - it was not the Arminian word the Spirit used to save the man, but the Word of God contained in the message that was made effectual. Gill says this in Isaiah 4:4; “When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, etc.” “By Zion is meant the Church of Christ in general, his mystical body, the general assembly and church of the first born, written in heaven, Heb. 12:22; and her daughters particular churches, that go by the name of Christian Churches, who are called the reformed churches, being such as are separated from the church of Rome.” It is a fact that Local Church only doctrine is a pillar of Landmarkism. And it is another fact according to all known history, the majority of Baptists have always held two churches; either the universal visible and the local, or the Invisible and the Local. Landmarkism cannot deny this. The third fact is the theory of Landmarkism and the

theory of either of the universal are completely incompatible - so what does this do for Landmarkism?

At the risk of committing a sacrilege (to some) let us review Landmarkism in the light of John 9. Wholesome Protestantism is the blind man, the neighbors (world) asks how he could see? All the great works of the Puritans tell the world - the grace of Christ. The Pharisees (Landmarker) say: "This can't be of God, only our kind have the commission, authority, etc." "And there was a division among them" (true of Landmarkism); so they called his parents (Catholicism) and they reply, "We know this is our son and that he was born blind, but by what means he now seeth we know not." "We are blind ourselves and we certainly don't see how he can see!" "Then again called they the man that was blind and said unto him, Give God the Praise, we know that this man is a sinner." "Give God the Praise - we'll take sovereign grace says the Landmarker, if we alone can proclaim it." Protestantism explains about "the so-called sinner" the Holy Spirit - how He works when, where, how (minister, testimony, church, word of God, etc.) He pleases. The Landmarkers revile him "Thou wast altogether born in sins and thou teaches us?" "We are blinded to the beautiful truth you teach by our own prejudices." "And they cast him out." Robert Robinson (1735-1790) wrote:

"Uninterrupted succession is a specious lure, a snare set by sophistry, into which all parties have fallen. And it has happened to spiritual genealogists as it has to others who have traced natural descents, both have woven together twigs of every kind to fill up remote chasms. The Doctrine is necessary only to such churches as regulate their faith and practice by tradition, and for their use it was first invented." (Ecclesiastical Researches, P. 475).

It does not matter how sorry, how no-account, how useless a church has become in their own personal lives and ministry in their location, they are vitalized by their fantasies of succession - their dreams of grandeur of the future supported by succession as the choice among the elect, the special ones, no others have it. Result: a constant barrage of bragging, claiming martyrship by being in the succession; but what is your standing NOW?! We hear so much now "If only all the facts were in", "If our enemies just had not destroyed our records, we would have the Link-chain revealed." The argument from silence! The early English and Welsh Baptists were, not silent: Perpetuity is not achieved by link-chain succession, but by the Word and Spirit. But modern editors and "home" missionaries prating in their sophistry, sets forth this "lure" and make others two fold more a child or error than themselves; renouncing the former work of Christ (in a supreme and sovereign manner) and the work of the Spirit in the Word of God, reorganizing already organized churches - pronouncing upon them, conferring upon them the authority that Christ Himself only has and can give. Arminian Ecclesiology! They set forth this "Lure", that all our kind of Baptists believe it", and "you aren't 'True' unless you believe it"; they will create doubt about how you were organized, where your Baptism came from, and since any church wants to do the "right" thing - they have got you in the Landmark Snare! In Cockrell's "How to Organize a Church", noted earlier, he states: "Dare we even suppose that Christ left the work of evangelizing and baptizing to some lone unbaptized believer as our Reformed Baptist friends assume? A thousand time no! Jesus Christ would never have made such a foolish, silly, stupid blunder!" Let me place alongside this statement, the statement of Gosnold: "Lastly, if any shall object, that at first amongst us in this nation an unbaptized person did baptize, and so could be no lawful administrator. Answ: We conceived the answer is ready and at hand, that the first baptizer must of necessity be unbaptized, even John the Baptist himself, and yet judged a fit

administrator of so excellent a subject as our Lord Himself was. Mt. 3 latter end.” I do not know to what Cockrell refers, or what he thinks the Reformed Baptists assumed, he does not give their quote; but if it were the beginnings of both the General and Particular Baptists in both Englands, the Tunkers of Germany, Williams at Providence, or any of the several individual churches who began themselves with a “lone unbaptised believer”; it was not Christ who made the “foolish, silly, stupid, blunder,” but Cockrell! The way the Lord has always started any Reformation is by the Spirit and the word, so that the arm of the flesh (succession) will not get the glory - but the Lord! When the Lord calls by His Spirit - the man will preach, has to preach, will die preaching - he cannot do anything else; and these thus called, to preach His word are also commanded to baptize under the same commission, the church does not control the Spirit, the Spirit controls the churches. But these men steeped in Landmark succession say Reformation is never needed, not wanted, never brought about by the Lord - was in fact done by Satan. They assume there has always been a Baptist Church and an administrator of Baptism ready at hand, at all places and at all times, and in their futuristic interpretations of all prophesy, they cannot reconcile the scripture with history - they are stuck to their theory and the Lord is a liar if it is not true, or has made a foolish, silly, stupid, blunder. It is only through the long suffering and forbearance of God that such are left to prate and delight in their wickedness, to follow their golden calf, to the great detriment of the truth of scripture, history, and Christian common sense. A statement heard frequently from Graves’ time to the present, is: “That any church started since the days of Christ can’t be a true church. That Christ only built one church and that any church that in not in a link-chain succession from this one church, cannot be a church.” Another like statement: “Christ’s church was Baptized in the Holy Spirit on Pentecost and if your church (today) is in the succession from that church, then your church has been baptized in the Holy Spirit, i.e., at Jerusalem.” All of this at the same time holding strictly local church doctrine! Christ did not build, one church - He built and is building thousands. Many are in a succession but it is not the succession that makes them a church - there are Arminian Landmarkers, Hardshell Landmarkers, Sovereign Grace Missionary Landmarkers - and, Catholic Landmarkers. I know of a very young Landmarker, not much more than a novice, who told an old soldier of the cross, that he wished he would be re-organized, and get “Authority”, so that the two could fellowship together! The old soldier was pastoring a church that had organized themselves having nothing else than “suitcase letters”, so the lack of “proper authority” from a mother church un-churched them according to the novice. Another case: an organized body of baptised believers having been shown they were not “organized the Landmark way” were all re-immersed “into” another church, lettered out to form a new, and authority transmitted from the mother church. The only difference now and then is a piece of Paper! All is a far cry from the simple believers baptism of the Scriptures; and the assembling by the Spirit to worship their Redeemer. Our case here in Bowring is similar to the dissenters of England. The church was organized from a mission of the Southern Baptists in 1948. At times during her history there were many “revivals”, 30 or more people “saved” at different times. About a year later (after every revival) there would not be 10 people regularly in church. But the Lord started teaching Sovereign grace to many and in 1971 the church declared itself Independent, excluded over 100 on the “roll” who were no longer interested in the church, and we have continued since with an average membership of about 30. We were not re-organized - we believed we were already organized by the Spirit. We repudiate our succession or we would never have left Arminian Babylonianism. Authority? Our authority is from the Lord - and that is all we want. And, we could care less of

man's opinion; we would not be brought under a system that would un-church us, because, we know better.

Hiscox, in his New Directory of Baptist Churches, used by many, for many years, has this to say about Perpetuity and ministerial authority:

□ 5. Perpetuity. This has reference, not to a continuance of official administration, as in the previous note, but to visible and corporate Church life. And, strange to say, some Baptists have been courageous enough, and indiscreet enough to assert that an unbroken succession of visible, organized congregations of believers similar to their own, and therefore substantially like the primitive churches, can be proven to have existed from the Apostles until now. Such claims may well be left to papal audacity. For those who learn from that storehouse of sacred truth - The New Testament - what are the spirit, doctrine, ordinances, and polity of a Church of Christ, and practice the same, it matters nothing whether the chain of organic perpetuity may never have been broken, or broken a thousand times. They are the true disciples of Christ who have His spirit; the true successors of the Apostles who follow their teachings, and imitate their lives. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." - Acts 2:42. "And you being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind, by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled, in the body of His flesh, through death, to present you holy and without blemish, and unreprouvable before Him; if so be that ye continue in the faith, grounded and steadfast, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel." - Col. 1:21-23.

Strictly speaking, perpetuity is predicated of the invisible Church only. It is "the kingdom of heaven" on earth; "the Messiah's reign," which is perpetual. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." - Dan. 2:44. "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." - Dan. 7:18. "Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." - Matt. 16:18. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." - Matt. 28:20.

But visible churches - local congregation - are largely subject to the mutations of human society. They rise and fall; they grow and decay; they flourish, decline and disappear. Many a "candlestick" has been removed out of its place, and many more will be. But the cause is imperishable, and the foundations shall never be removed.

VII. THE SOURCE OF MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY.

Whence does the minister derive his authority of the exercise of ministerial functions? For preaching, administering the ordinances, and other prerogatives? "For no man taketh this honor unto himself." - Heb. 5:4.

Whence is it then? Not from the Church, for no Church holds in itself any such authority to bestow. Not from a Council, since councils possess no ecclesiastical authority. Not from the State, for the State has no right of interference in matters of faith and conscience, and possesses no control over, or authority in, ecclesiastical affairs. The minister, therefore, derives his credentials as a preacher of righteousness, and the right to minister as a priest in spiritual services from no human source, but directly from Christ, the great Head of the Church, by the witness and endowment of the Holy Spirit; He who calls endows and authorizes. He sends forth His heralds with authority to preach the Gospel to the end of the age.

All that a Church or a Council can properly do is to recognize, and express approval of a man's entering the ministry. The force of ordination is simply a recognition and sanction, in a public and impressive manner, of what is believed to be the divine appointment of the candidate to the

sacred office. The object of Church and Council action is not to impart either ability or authority to preach the Gospel, for these they cannot give; but to ascertain if such ability and authority have been divinely given, and if so to approve their public exercise. If not in so remarkable a manner, yet probably just as really is every true minister called and invested as was Paul: "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." – Gal. 1:15,16.

Note 6. – Any one who believes himself called and authorized of God to preach the Gospel, as one under law to Christ, and ultimately accountable to Him alone, has a right to preach the Gospel, though churches and councils should oppose his course. But he would not have right to preach in any congregation without their consent.

Note 7. – The right of any man to be the minister and pastor of any particular Church is derived from that Church itself. No man, no body of men can make him a minister to them without their consent. While on the other hand, if they so determine and choose him, he is a minister to them though councils and churches should forbid it. Others are not obliged to recognize or fellowship them or him, but they cannot interfere with them. A man's right to preach the Gospel, and administer the ordinances comes from God alone; a man's right to do this in any particular Church comes from that Church alone."

Concerning the organization of churches Dargan (Ecclesiology) says: "We have nothing definite in the scriptures as to how the Apostles proceeded in establishing Churches." P. 194, and P. 196, he states: "The church constitutes itself."

Waller says: "We are no successionists. Our churches, ordinances and ministry are all derived, as we believe directly from the scriptures and hence, had there been no Baptist churches previous to those now in being, it would no at all affect our notions of ecclesiastical existence." The Western Baptist Review, vol. IV, Frankfort, Ky. Jan. 1849.

Cole says: "There is no account in the N.T. of any mode of procedure by which churches were organized. Baptist Churches come into being today somewhat after this manner. A group of believers in a community wish to become a church. The members in conference will make this known to other churches, and these churches send messengers to council them in accomplishing their desire. For the sake of order and recognition these messengers will enquire into their belief, and if it is thought wise, the visitors endorse their articles of faith and recommend their constitution as an independent church. Since the church is to be self-governing, it must of necessity and logically be

self-constituted. And so those wishing to become a church enter into a covenant to that effect; and another church is born. The help from the outside is for the sake of order and fellowship and is not absolutely essential." C.D. Cole, Def. of Doctrines, vol. III, P. 6.

A church organized today on the basis of New Testament teaching would be a New Testament church if none other like it had existed since the first apostolic church. W.Pope Yeaman, S.T.D. Gill and Keach in their writings on the subject never have "authority conferred", or a mere human being "pronouncing" any persons anywhere a church.

Benedict, who wrote a History of the Baptists in 1813, another in 1848, and later "50 Years Among the Baptists", was well acquainted with Baptist practices, had this to say in the last book named:

† ON CHURCH ORGANIZATIONS.

Arguments in Favor of the Early Christians Copying, in Substance, the Model of the Jewish Synagogues.

In my long experience in our own church concerns I have paid considerable attention to what is generally called church discipline in the general, rather than in the corrective sense of this term.

My main object, in all my inquiries into these matters, has been to ascertain as near as possible, without note or comment, the doings of Christ and the apostles, and of those who lived nearest to the apostolic age, as I consider this kind of information of much more importance than all the creeds and commentaries of after times. But still, in my historical pursuits in church affairs, I have attentively perused a large number of the most approved works by our own men, and those of other communities, pertaining to church building and management, preachers, preaching and pulpits, ministerial and pastoral duties, clerical manners, and other things of this kind, with a view to give our younger ministers my own experience and advice upon them.

I have not expected to give any new ideas to our reading men, but my object has been to present to some of our younger and less favored ministers the substance of many works, old and rare, with which they may not be acquainted.

But as a portion of my manuscript has disappeared from the hands of the publishers, now, at a late period, and in a hasty manner, I must reproduce most of the following articles in a greatly abridged form.

After I began in earnest my inquiries into the manner of forming churches by the early Christians, the first questions that occurred to me were, Did the church builders copy after any model? did Jesus Christ and the apostles lay down any rules for the prosecution of this business? or did the disciples collect together, without much formality, in private houses, in the synagogues, or wherever they found favorable places for their meetings, and thus commence church operations?

In looking over the list of the primitive churches, according to the New Testament records, I find the first one arose in Jerusalem, and that soon it became very large, and the new churches out of Palestine, it is natural to suppose, in the language of Giesler, formed themselves after the pattern of the mother church. Their presidents were the elders, officially of equal rank, although in many churches, individuals among them had a personal authority over the others. Under the superintendence of these elders were the deacons and deaconesses. * * * The duty of teaching, as an office, was by no means incumbent on the elders, although the apostle wishes that they should be apt to teach.*

I infer that the whole membership of the Jerusalem church, at first, and for some years after it arose, consisted wholly of converted Jews, for as yet no conversions had been made among the Gentiles.

At Antioch arose the first church among the Gentiles, and this body also, at an early period, became very large, and was a center of operations for the Christians in that quarter. During the apostolic age, a large number of churches arose in Palestine, and in the surrounding countries, whose names appear in the New Testament narratives. But relative to the manner of their formation, in no one case is the least information given. All at once the names of these churches appear; some incident, or the name of some person or persons connected with them is given, but nothing in particular is said as to the time, or the circumstances of their origin. Although the foundation of many of the first Christian communities, were no doubt, laid in Christian houses,

yet but three household churches are mentioned in the New Testament naratives, the most important of which I am inclined to think was that in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, whose praise was in all the churches of the Gentiles. We also read of churches in the houses of Nymphas and Philemon. But of no others, then in being.

In only one case do I find mention made of the church in the wilderness, which evidently refers to the Old Testament economy.

As my object in my researches into this matter was to find out as nearly as possible just how the early Christians managed in getting up their churches, I laid aside all expositions and went for the plain matters of fact in their doings, and as I found them much in the synagogues, and joining in the services of these humble sanctuaries, and appeared, for the most part, to be as much at home in them as if they had been prepared for the use of Christians, this consideration led me to inquire into the history of these Jewish places of worship; their origin, the manner of conducting religious worship in them, their officers, their principles of government, and of the number of them in Judea and elsewhere. In pursuing these inquiries I examined the old Latin work of Vitringa, the title of which is *De Vetere Synagoga, Concerning the Ancient Synagogue*, Jahn's *Archaeology*, Neander, and other works on the subject. The result of my examinations was, that synagogues originated during the Babylonish captivity as a substitute for the temple worship, of which the captive nation was wholly deprived; that in most cases these resorts of the pious Israelites were plain and humble edifices; that the reading of the law and the prophets, or the Old Testament Scriptures, with free speaking upon them and exhortations to the people, constituted the substance of the religious services performed in them, with the omission of the sacrifices of the tabernacle and the temple; that their officers and internal operation were in many respects like those of the early Christians; and finally, that synagogues were found wherever there were Jews, in their own land, or in the nations in which they were dispersed.*

The abundance of synagogues among the Jewish people may be estimated from the fact that in the Saviour's time there were thirteen in Tiberias, four hundred in Jerusalem, including prosauchas, or small chapels for prayer.

The few following passages show how frequently and freely the synagogues were used by Christ and his apostles and followers. When the high priest asked Jesus of his disciples and of his doctrine, he answered him, "I spake openly to the world, I ever taught in the synagogues and in the temple. whither the Jews always resort, and in secret have I said nothing." Paul at first persecuted the Christians in all the synagogues, in his way to Damascus, by the authority of the Jewish rulers, but after his conversion, while at Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, "as his manner was, he went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging," etc.

This whole matter is well explained by Coleman in his work on Primitive Christianity.

"The apostles and first disciples were Jews, who, after their conversion, retained all the prejudices and partialities of their nation. * * *

"With the temple service and the Mosaic ritual, however, Christianity had no affinity. The sacraficial offerings of the temple, and the Levitical priesthood it abolished. But in the synagogue worship, the followers of Christ found a more congenial institution. It invited them to the reading of the Scriptures and to prayer.* It gave them liberty of speech in exhortation, and in worshipping and praising God. The rules and government of the synagogue, while they offered little, comparatively, to excite the pride of office and of power, commended themselves the more to the humble believer in Christ. The synagogue was endeared to the devout Jew by sacred associations and tender recollections. It was near at hand, and not, like the temple, afar off. He

went but seldom up to Jerusalem, and only on great occasions joined in the rites of the temple service. But in the synagogue he paid his constant devotions to the God of his fathers. It met his eye in every place. It was constantly before him, and from infancy to hoary age he was accustomed to repair to that hallowed place of worship to listen to the reading of his sacred books, to pray and sing praises unto the God of Israel. In accordance, therefore, with pious usage the apostles continued to frequent the synagogues of the Jews. Wherever they went they resorted to these places of worship, and strove to convert their brethren to faith in Christ, not as a new religion, but as a modification of their own.

“In their own religious assemblies they also conformed as far as was consistent with the spirit of the Christian religion, to the same rites, and gradually settled upon a church organization which harmonized in a remarkable manner with that of the Jewish synagogue. They even retained the same name as the appellation of their Christian assemblies. ‘If there come into your, synagogue, assembly, a man with a gold ring’ etc. Their modes of worship were the same as those of the synagogue. The titles of the officers they also borrowed from the same source. The titles Bishop, Presbyter, or Elder, etc., were all familiar terms, denoting the same class of officers in the synagogue. Their duties and prerogatives remained, in substance, the same in the Christian church as in that of the Jews.

“So great was the similarity between the primitive Christian churches, and the Jewish synagogues, that by the Pagan nations they were mistaken for the same institutions. Pagan historians uniformly treated the primitive Christians as Jews.* As such they suffered under the persecutions of their idolatrous rulers. * * *

“In support of the foregoing statements authorities to any extent, and of the highest character, might be adduced.”

Neander is here quoted on the subject:

“* * * The disciples had not yet attained a clear understanding of that call, which Christ had already given them by so many intimations, to form a church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy; to that economy they adhered as much as possible. * * * Hence the establishment of a distinct mode of worship was far from entering their thoughts. * * *

“As the believers, in opposition to the mass of the Jewish nation, who remained hardened in their unbelief, now formed a community internally bound together by the one faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and by the consciousness of the higher life received from him, it was necessary that this internal union should assume a certain external form. And a model for such a smaller community within the great national theocracy, already existed among the Jews, along with the temple worship, namely, the, synagogues. The means of religious edification which they supplied took account of the religious welfare of all, and consisted of united prayers and the addresses of individuals, who applied themselves to the study of the Old Testament. These means of edification closely corresponded to the nature of the new Christian worship. This form of social worship, as it was copied in all the religious communities founded on Judaism, (such as the Essenes), was also adopted, to a certain extent, at the first formation of the Christian church.” Neander also shows that this organization of Christian churches was the most natural under existing circumstances, and the most acceptable, not only to the Jewish converts but to those who were gathered from the subjects of the Roman government.

Archbishop Whately avows views similar to those of the great German author, which, with his usual independence and candor, are thus expressed:

“It is probable that one cause, humanly speaking, why we find in the Sacred Books less information concerning the Christian ministry, and the constitution of church governments than

we otherwise might have found, is that these institutions had less of, novelty than some would at first sight suppose, and that many portions of them did not wholly originate with the apostles. It appears highly probable, I might say morally certain, that wherever a Jewish synagogue existed, that was brought - the whole, or the chief part of it - to embrace the gospel, the apostles did not, there, so much, form a Christian church (or congregation * ecclesia,) as to, take an existing congregation Christian, by introducing the Christian sacraments and worship, and establishing whatever regulations were requisite for the newly adopted faith, leaving the machinery, if I may so speak, of government unchanged, the rulers of synagogues, elders, and other officers, whether spiritual or ecclesiastical, or both, being already provided in the existing institutions. And it is likely that several of the earliest Christian churches did originate in this way, that is, that they were, converted synagogues, which, became Christian churches as soon as the members, or the main part of the members, acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah.

“The attempt to effect the conversion of a Jewish synagogue, into a Christian church seems always to have been made in the first instance, in every place, where there was an opening for it. Even after the call of the idolatrous Gentiles, it appears plainly to have been the practice of the apostles Paul and Barnabas,* when they came to any city, in which there was a synagogue, to go thither first and deliver their sacred message to the Jews and devout Gentiles, and when they founded a church in any of those cities, in which there was no Jewish synagogue, that received the gospel, it is likely they would still conform in a great measure to the same model.*

“It is, then, an admitted fact, as clearly settled as any thing can be by human authority, that the primitive Christians, in the organization of their assemblies, formed them after the mode of the Jewish synagogues. They discarded the splendid ceremonials of the temple service, and retained the simple rites of the synagogue worship. They disowned the hereditary aristocracy of the Levitical priesthood, and adopted the popular government of the synagogue.

“We are here presented with an important fact in the organization of the primitive churches, strongly illustrative of the popular character of their constitution and government. The synagogue was essentially a popular assembly, invested with the rights, and possessing the powers, which are essential to the enjoyment of religious liberty. Their government was voluntary, elective, free; and administered by rulers or elders elected by the people. The ruler of the synagogue was the, moderator of the college of elders, but only *primus inter pares*,* holding no official rank above them. The people, as Vitranga has shown, appointed their own officers to rule over them. They exercised the natural right of freemen, to enact and execute their own laws, to admit proselytes, and to exclude, at pleasure, unworthy members from their communion. Theirs was ‘a democratical form of government,’ and is so described by one of the most able expounders of the constitution of the primitive churches. Like their prototype, therefore, the primitive churches also embodied the principle of a popular government, and of an enlightened religious liberty.”

From all the above statement, in the absence of any precept or example for the manner of constituting the New Testament churches, after mature deliberation I have settled down in the belief, that the ecclesiastical polity of the Jewish synagogues was very closely copied by the apostles and primitive Christians, in the organization of their assemblies.

The candid reader cannot help but be struck by the lack of “Landmark facts” concerning the baptisms of Kiffen, Knolly, Clark, Spilsbury, Miles; their church affiliations and authorizations. Landmarkers cry, “our enemies destroyed our records.” There never were any records of Landmarkism because these men were not landmarkers. We have the life of Knollys written by

himself, the last part by Kiffen - no record of his baptism, no record of any church authorizing him to do anything; We have his book on Revelation - No Landmarkism. We have Clark's confession, Spilsbury's treatise on Baptism - we have these books, but the enemies destroyed their records on Landmarkism! These men did believe succession and perpetuity - the scriptures teach these things; but not baptismal succession, baptismal perpetuity: Baptism is only incidental to the succession and perpetuity, not the rule - the rule is the Word of God. Another fact the candid reader will notice is that the greater Baptist Historians were not Landmarkers. Why? They were the ones who labored year after year through the records and histories. Did their findings make them "liberal" and "untrue" Baptists? Or were they "liberal" and "untrue" before they started and could not find enough "Landmark" facts in history to convert them? Here is a listing of Historians who were not Landmarkers: Crosby, Robinson, Armitage, Backus, Benedict, Christian, Edwards, Hassell, Lofton, Jones, Thomas, Newman, Davis, Vedder, Cramp, Ford, Underwood, Overbey, and Orchard. The only two Landmark Historians that I know are Jarrel and Ray and they prove perpetuity - not link-chain baptismal succession; their theology reads that into their histories, not their facts. Here is Jarrel's statement:

"Every Baptist church being, in organization, a church complete in itself, and, in no way organically connected with any other church, such a thing as one church succeeding another, as the second link of a chain is added to and succeeds another, is utterly foreign to and incompatible with Baptist church polity. Therefore, the talk about every link "jingling in the succession chain from the banks of the Jordan to the present," is ignorance or dust-throwing.

The only senses in which one Baptist church can succeed another are that the church leads men and women to Christ, then through its missionaries or ministers baptizes them, after which the baptized organize themselves into a Baptist church; or, in lettering off some of its members to organized a new church; or, in case the old church has fallen to pieces, for its members to reorganize themselves into a church.

All that Baptists mean by church "Succession," or Church Perpetuity, is: There has never been a day since the organization of the first New Testament church in which there was no genuine church of the New Testament existing on earth."

Landmarkers today mean more than this. Jarrel would describe it as "Ignorance and dust-throwing".

Baptismal Successionists try to blend the old carnal covenant in with the spiritual. The law was the legal administration of the covenant of grace. That administration has no glory in comparison to the new (II Cor. IV). There is one covenant but two administrations of the one covenant. Landmarkism answers to Israel of old in administration. I read recently, "It does not matter how sound your church is, if your beginning is not right (according to, our notions) you are not a church of Christ." We had better let Christ decide who are His churches and who are not. When Christ said "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock, and one Shepherd" (Jno. 10:16); and, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word" (Jno. 17:20); and, "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," (Jno. 16:13); He virtually laid the axe to Landmarkism, for by their own admissions, they believe others are saved outside their churches: "By far most of the saved today are outside of the true churches of Christ", (Brong and Cockrell). But, "Hearing the voice of Christ", "Through their word", Landmarkers say pertains only to commissioned Landmark churches! If the Spirit

works outside Landmark churches why do they claim they are the only ones commissioned to preach? They take the commission much like this:

And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Now, I am just going to say this, one time, and, one time only, and you get it good, do not mess up - for if you do you will unchurch all who succeed you, Go, ye therefore, etc.” Well, Saul made havoc of the first church and scattered it, but the commission did not die; The Corinthians evidently had their champions for baptism, “I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ,” as well as their other corruptions, still the commission did not die; suppose you could trace link-chain succession back to the churches of Galatia - Paul “stood in doubt” of them! Or Sardis? or Thyatira? Will there be sorrow in heaven? “We could have been in the Bride, but someone back down the line broke the chain.” The word of God is living, I Pet. 1; Heb. IV; will never pass away, Mt. 24:35; was given by the Spirit, II Pet. 1:21; administered by the Spirit, Jno. 14,15,16; not through carnal link-chain baptism. Baptism is good - as a symbol; the gold the Israelites asked of the Egyptians was good until it was made the calf. We do not have to worry of our standing before the Lord by reason of others standing in the past - we do not have to answer for them - we will not be judged for their actions. As Knollys stated: “For we are as powerfully enabled as the first dispenser of Baptism: And we having received authority from Jesus Christ in that commission given to Christ’s disciples so often mentioned...” Not by virtue of succession (John was unbaptised) but by virtue of being disciples. We can do all things by the authority of God’s word; baptism follows the word of God, not proceeds it.

I would urge and recommend everyone to read Bob Ross’ book ‘Old Landmarkism’ for a far better arranged study of the subject than I have given. Order from: Pilgrim Publication, Pasadena, Texas 77501. A warning: his book is pure heresy to Landmarkers; and although Ross has never been refuted they have plenty to say of him.

Some questions for Landmarkism:

1. If only landmarkers have authority to preach, why does the Lord call and use others? Does not that suggest dis-unity in the Godhead?
2. If others are called to preach, why cannot they baptise under the same commission? to claim the church only was commissioned is arbitrary. Paul was called and commissioned before baptism.
3. Why cannot they teach, or assemble under the authority of the scriptures? They can and do. Paul commended the Thessalonians for being followers of the churches of Judea. The Lord Jesus said, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them.” “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.”
4. If Landmarkism be true, as simple as it is, why have not Baptists always believed it? and practiced it? And for Landmarkism to be true today it would have always had to have been believed and practiced, which simply is not true.
5. Would something that is scriptural promote bigotry, arrogance, pride, and a sectarian spirit? All which is against the Spirit of grace.
6. Would you subscribe to the first and second London Confessions? Without any reservations? Article 41 in the first? If not, why do you claim these Baptists in your succession?
7. Is not arbitrary interpretation of Mt. 28:18-20 and I Cor. 12:13 and the first part of verse 28 equivalent to claiming Divine inspiration?

8. Why would anyone think Baptismal succession is necessary for perpetuity? If so, then Baptism is not, only a symbol and we do not walk by faith only, but by sight. “Having begun in the Spirit are ye now made perfect by the flesh?”

CHAPTER VI

THE AGE OF EXTREMISM

Mormonism, Campbellism, New-School Baptist, Hardshellism, Darbyites (from which has come modern dispensationalism), the change from the Westminster confession to the Arminianism of the Camberland Presbyterians and the change from the Second London Confession to the more moderate New Hampshire - out of this age of change and upheaval came Landmarkism, extremism. but there were some mighty Baptists who protested and held to regular Baptist belief. Following are some of these men and some points at which they differ from Landmarkism.

1. John Dagg.

"It (baptism) is not the door into a local church; for, though it is a prerequisite to membership, men may be baptized, and remain unconnected with any local church:" (Theology, p. 135).

"If our doctrine of strict communion be correct, baptism is a prerequisite to membership in the local churches; and since the administration of baptism properly belongs to the ministers of the word, the local churches are, in this particular, dependent for their existence on the ministry. Local churches cannot originate the ministry on which their own existence is dependent. The Ministry originated before the local churches, and might have been perpetuated without them, if the Lord had so willed. The power from which the ministry originates is not that of the churches, but of the head of the church; and His call to office is the highest authority. John was sent to preach and baptise, without being baptized or ordained; yet the evidence of his mission was clear, and the people believed it. Paul was commissioned to preach the gospel while he was unbaptized and unordained; and the call was not conditioned on his being afterward baptized and ordained. The call was complete and unconditional... In the view which we have taken, the Christian Ministry is an institution of surpassing importance. It does not grow up from the churches, but comes down from heaven" (Ibid, p. 262).

Now whether Dagg was acquainted with the Baptists and their writings in the 1600's, he does not say - but he has the exact same opinion as they had in restoring baptism and organizing churches:

"As a question of mere theory it may be asked, whether a breach in the succession would render a new revelation necessary, to Set aside any command of Scripture would require a new revelation. But to depart from the order which Christ has instituted is one thing, and to return to it after having wandered from it is quite another thing. For the latter we need no new revelation. The wisdom from above, given by the ordinary influence of the Spirit, is sufficient for such an emergency, without a miraculous inspiration. If holy men of God have had the responsibility thrown upon them of returning to the good old path after it had been deserted, they doubtless sought wisdom from above to direct them, and the success of their efforts to regain the lost way, is a sufficient assurance to us that the Lord gave them the necessary wisdom."

“But is there any wall built along the wayside to prevent the return of wanderers? So far as I can see, the whole difficulty is resolvable into the question whether ministers of the word, called to the work by the Holy Spirit, may, in any case perform the full duties of the office without the regular ceremonial induction into it. According to the view which we have taken, the call of the Spirit is complete in itself; but the same Spirit teaches the called to respect the order instituted for ceremonial induction into office. An obligation to respect this order, when it exists, imposes on them the duty of deferring the exercise of the ceremonial functions until they have been ceremonially inducted; but in the case supposed the church order does not exist, and therefore the obligation to defer does not exist. Their duty is to respect the order when it exists, and to restore it when it does not. The Head of the church designed that the ministers of the word should make disciples, baptize them, and teach them to organize churches, to celebrate the Lord’s supper, exercise discipline, and walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. The ministers of the word are officers of Christ’s spiritual church, and derive their qualifications and call from the Holy Spirit. Like other men, they are bound to observe what Christ commanded, and therefore to regard established church order. But if church order has become prostrate, their call by the Holy Spirit requires them to restore it, and not to teach that it must now for ever be neglected.” (Ibid, p. 259-260).

In 1887, J. L. Burrows wrote “What Baptists Believe” with a prefatory note by, Hon. Horatio Gate Jones in which the last sentence states: “All true Baptists will thank Dr. Barrows for giving to them his discourse entitled “What Baptist Believe”. On page 8 this is stated:

“The aggregate of believers, without reference to locality or formal organization, is sometimes called the Church of God - what we sometimes call the invisible church - of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and which includes all regenerate disciples as such.

“As to organization, - Baptist Churches organize themselves. Wherever a sufficient number of converted and Baptized disciples desire to become a church and to meet regularly for worship and mutual edification and usefulness, they simply enter into covenant with each other, appoint their officers and agree to meet statedly for religious service. No outside permission or authorization is needed. They are now a church. If they wish for approval and fellowship of neighboring churches, they ask such churches to send delegates to meet with them and give them the sanction of their approval and fellowship - to give them what we technically call, recognition. This unites them with all churches of, like faith and order. If not so recognized they may still be churches, but unassociated churches, out of harmony with the neighboring churches...”

Do all “True Baptists” thank Burrows according to Jones? Landmarkers certainly do not - such is heresy to Landmarkers - both statements. Who was this Jones? What did he know? Cathcart states:

“...in 1848 became a member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and in 1849 its secretary, a position which he held for eighteen years, and in 1867 he was chosen one of its vice-presidents and still holds that office; in 1856 he became connected with the Welsh Society of Philadelphia, of which he is now president, in 1858 he was elected clerk of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, and filled the office for fifteen years, when he was chosen moderator. He has been president of the board of trustees of Philadelphia Association for thirteen years.

He was elected in 1865 by the councils of Philadelphia a director of Girard College. He has been secretary of the board of trustees of Crozer Theological Seminary for thirteen years. In 1874 he was elected to the state Senate from Philadelphia, and re-elected in 1876, and in 1878. Mr. Jones is a member of the historical societies of Rhode Island, New York, Delaware, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Florida; and also of the Moravian Historical Society, the New England Historic Genealogical Society, and the American Antiquarian Society; and in 1877 he was elected an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of Great Britain." (Baptist Encyclopedia).

From the above we understand the qualifications of Jones to make the statement that "True Baptists will thank Dr. Burrows for his Book" - he knew what True Baptists were. Barrows (as well as Cathcart, Jeter, and others) was one with whom Graves disagrees in his "Old Landmarkism" and classifies as "Liberal", etc. But the Liberal is the one who changes and Graves was that one.

2. Thomas R. Curtis, in 1855 wrote "The Progress of Baptist Principles in The Last Years, and in which are no Landmark Dogmas, but a very timely statement on page 323:

"Wherever Roman Catholic missionaries have gone, they have first taken pains to establish the authority of the Church, just where we put that of the Bible."

Recently a Baptist Missionary came from India where he had been (I understand) since 1972, and where the Lord had richly blessed his ministry with many converts and the establishment of some 48 churches. Coming in contact with a strong Landmark church in California he was converted to Landmarkism, rebaptized, and re-ordained. Now the Landmark and the newly converted missionary returned to India to rebaptize and reestablish the 48 churches. One of the first books he has translated and published for distribution in India is Graves' "Old Landmarkism, What is it?". This is all just as scriptural and similar as the Catholic Missionaries noted above.

3. J.B. Jeter, Baptist Principles Reset:

"He (Paul) was a divinely authorized founder of churches; but whether he was a member of any local church, in the since in which the phrase is now understood, is very doubtful. If he was a member of any church we do not know which it was." p. 104.

"The gospel was given to the apostles, in trust for their successors - not their official successors, for they had none - but their successors in faith, Spirit, aims, labors, and usefulness - their true successors - "alway, even to the end of the world" (ibid, p. 131).

"The personal Ministry of Jesus was preparatory to the constitution of churches....during His life no church was organized..." (p. 20).

"The ordinance occupies an important place in the great commission which Jesus, after His resurrection, gave to the apostles for evangelizing the world. Mt. 28:19,20." (ibid, p. 27).

4. W.B. Johnson, (died 1862). For three years president of the Triennial Convention of the United States. And he was the 1st President of the Southern Baptist Convention. "In no section of our country was any Baptist minister more highly honored by his brethren", (Cathcart, Encyclopedia).

The following is from his book "The Gospel Developed Through the Government and order of the Churches of Jesus Christ" - 1846, (Compare this with Landmarkism).

"This term (church), then, as designating the people of God, has, as its first leading sense in the New Testament, the whole body of the redeemed, from Adam to the last believer." (p. 4).

"Now, it is worthy of particular attention at this point, that the church at Jerusalem was the first church, and that it was formed under the immediate guidance and supervision of the Apostles, who were acting under the commission of their divine Lord, by which they were required to teach the baptized disciples to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them." (p. 5).

"Now, as far as I can understand the New Testament, I see no authority given to a church of Christ to transfer its power or authority to any other church or body of men on earth." (p. 7).

"It is the part of the duty of evangelists to baptize believers. The proof of this is so clear, from the commission already quoted, and the practice under it, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, that nothing is required on the subject in this place. In the performance of this duty, the whole responsibility rests upon the evangelist. No church or individual is to share it with him." (p. 18).

"In these scriptures, we have a satisfactory account of the formation of the mother church at Jerusalem, one accord, mutual consent in the truth as it is in Christ, constituted the principle on which the church was formed. The Apostles taught the disciples the duty, and the principle, of the church relation, and they complied with it. But no official act of the apostles beyond teaching, do we learn, gave validity to its existence. With the pattern thus clearly given, and the record of numerous churches in different places, we are taught, that wherever a sufficient number of believers in Christ, baptized upon a profession of faith in him, live sufficiently continuous to each other for the purposes of the church relation, they should unite together in such relation on the principle of ONE ACCORD, mutual consent in the truth. The Bible is their only standard of doctrine and duty." (p. 19).

5. Andrew Broaddus. Another famous Baptist from the late 1700's to almost the middle 1800's was Andrew Broaddus. On his essay about baptism (introduction) he was seconded by Elders Ryland and Stringfellow through, The Religious Herald in which he says "Baptism is a gospel ordinance; but not a church ordinance..." (Writings, p. 435). In the second treatise on the "Query Concerning Baptism" notice the Polity of the Baptists of his day:

"The query alluded to is in effect as follows: "Ought a minister in our connection to baptise a candidate for the ordinance who gives satisfactory evidence of faith in Jesus Christ, but acknowledges, at the same time, an intention to unify with a Presbyterian Church?" I took the affirmative, qualifying it, however, with a certain condition. These brethren have unqualifiedly taken the negative. And thus we are at issue on this question... With Bro. Walker I can Say, "I do sincerely wish, that there could be more uniformity in our practice touching this matter." (Ibid, p. 439).

"Well, but 'it has been admitted,' says brother T., 'that baptism is the only door into the christian church.' No, my dear sir, No! You thought so, I have no doubt; but this is a mistake. It has not

always been admitted, that baptism is, do facto, the door into the church. There is, indeed, as far as I know, but one door into the church; but that, I am persuaded, is not, properly speaking, baptism. What then? it may be asked. I answer, mutual consent, compact, or agreement." (Ibid, p. 443).

And concerning the commission Broadbush had stated earlier that "The commission was given to the Apostles," p. 178, and later, that the term "church" is used in three senses in the New Testament - the universal invisible, the universal visible, and the local, P. 442; and in the next essay, which I will give in full so that there can be no misunderstanding his views, anyone can see that he was in line with the Old Baptists - not the modern Landmarkers.

6. The Case of Xenoi.

"Without admitting the appellation with which your correspondent, 'A Pigmy', has thought proper to honor me in the Herald, an appellation which, by the way, he might as well have omitted, I feel disposed, in deference to your suggestion, and to the importance of the case, to offer some remarks, which I earnestly desire may throw light on the subject, and afford relief to those who may be personally interested in the matter.

I could wish the circumstances of the case had been stated by Xenoi a little more explicitly; as I think it might thus be treated in a more definite and satisfactory manner, than by an answer to the queries which are subjoined.

Your applicants, it seems, have been baptized, i.e., solemnly immersed, upon a conviction of the scriptural requisition, and their consequent duty and privilege, as believers in Jesus Christ. But in accomplishing this object, there was, as I understand the matter, some irregularity. And this irregularity, I take it for granted, was, namely: That the series of baptisms was commenced by an unbaptized individual; for, so the statement seem to imply. It says, that "after much serious consultation and fervent prayer, it was unanimously resolved, that one of the Elders, being immersed, the work should go on," &c. And the apology for this irregularity, appears to be the non-existence of any Baptist church, of scriptural faith, "within their knowledge or reach." Thus, as I apprehend it, stands the case; and the question arising out of it is can these persons be considered as baptized with a valid baptism, and received accordingly? This, it must be admitted, is an important matter, and one not to be settled at a single stroke. It presents one of those difficulties which irregularity is apt to involve; yet it requires to be settled, and in the best manner that circumstances will admit.

Let us inquire, can any degree of irregularity be admitted, in the performance of those divine ordinances, called positive institutions, without destroying the validity of the performance?

And deviation from the original plan, the divine model, must be allowed, in such a case, to be dangerous, and I should say, that as positive institutions possess in themselves no intrinsic virtue, but derive their worth from the authority and command of the institutor, a change in the form or the subject of the institution must subvert the ordinance, and render the performance nugatory. To which I may add, that the same effect would follow, where the action, on the part of the administrator or the subject should appear to have been performed in the spirit of mockery, or without regard to the solemnity of the object.

Take, for instance, as it regards form and subject, the ordinance of baptism, a positive institute. Christ says, "He that believeth and is baptized," &c. If you take one who is confessedly an unbeliever, or one incapable of faith, while Christ gives no such authority, you do, by changing the subject, radically change the ordinance, and destroy the validity of the performance. Further: Christ says, "baptizing them," &c., i.e., immersing them. If you sprinkle or pour a little water on

the subject, you change the form, and the form is here the thing itself; and so again you radically change the ordinance: it is not baptism: you might as well attempt to prove that a triangle is a circle.

Again; take, for instance, as it regards the spirit in which the action appears to be performed, the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. The Corinthians or many of them, celebrated this solemnity in an irreverent manner; and the apostle tells them, "this is not to eat the Lord's Supper." They perverted the great object of the institution, and rendered the performance worse than nagatory.

But the question recurs: Can any degree of irregularity be admitted, in the performance of a positive institution, without destroying the validity of the performance? I would now answer, that in some cases, the subject, the form, and the solemnity of the object being all observed, some degree of irregularity may be excused. If, indeed, the plain, expressed will of Christ cannot be complied with, I would have no substitute; he does not require impossibilities; and to put a thing of human invention, in any case whatever, in the place of a positive institute, is a gratuitous offering which he will reject. But if the irregularity consist in mere circumstances, not radically affecting the ordinance itself, it may, according to my view, be excused, and the performance be deemed valid - the difficulty of the case being considered as an apology for the want of a more regular observance of circumstances.

Now, to the particular case before us. The plea of difficulty here urged, I take it for granted, is a reasonable one; and the irregularity, as before presumed, consists in the commencement of the series of baptisms by an unbaptized - perhaps an unordained individual. But it was all done upon solemn conviction, of divine requirement, upon profession of evangelical faith; and in due form, according to Christ's expressed will as to the action. Does the apparent defect in the circumstances here stated, invalidate the baptism? I am persuaded it does not.

I will not plead as a precedent, the case of the baptism of Roger Williams and his congregation in Rhode Island, from whom many of the Baptists of this country have sprung; if that was wrong, it cannot make this right. Nor am I disposed to deny, that baptizers in the apostle's days were all baptized persons; though, by the way, the first baptizer was not so; but this is to be admitted rather as a matter of course, all believers being then baptized straightway; - that is, where it could be done. It ought to be so now; and in that case, there would probable have been here no difficulty. The baptizer who commenced this operation, ought himself to have been baptized before this period; but it does not follow, that because he was not baptized, and now perhaps could not be, that therefore he ought not, under existing circumstances, to have engaged in this work. George Whitefield, who was a Pedobaptist and never baptized, ought to have been baptized before he went forth to preach; he might have been too, if he would; and yet I should be loath to say, that George Whitefield, though he ought to have been baptized, ought not to have preached at all, unless he had been baptized. And so of many others.

The baptizer ought himself to be previously baptized. This is readily admitted; and though for anything that appears to the contrary, the obligation lies on him rather in the character of a believer, than in that of an administrator, where the nature of the case does not render it necessary. The conduct of some Pedobaptists, both on the part of the administrator and the subject, presents an anomaly which can neither be justified nor excused; - the subject submitting to be immersed by an unbaptized administrator, who has no faith in the act!

With regard to any defect on the score of ordination, I would say, it does not appear clear to me, that the validity of baptism depends, under any circumstances, upon what we term ordination; I mean, ordination to the office of bishop or evangelist. That the Lord's Supper may be duly celebrated without the presence of such a minister, I have no question; and I am much disposed

to think that we should contravene no authority, by appointing a deacon, or any other grave and godly member of the church, to the work of baptizing.

If the case of your applicant is embraced in these remarks, it seems to me unnecessary to go into a discussion of the queries subjoined to the statement of Xenoi. If, however, there should be anything in any of those queries involving the case, and not herein satisfactorily noticed, I would willingly, upon its being pointed out, lend my aid, as far as I am able, towards a solution of the difficulty.

These remarks, in which I have aimed at much plainness and simplicity, are affectionately submitted to the attention of all concerned, with an earnest wish, that as far as consistent with divine truth, the Head of the Church may attend them with his blessing. (Andrew Broaddus)

But the questions might be raised by modern Landmarkers who never even heard of Broaddus: Who was this Broaddus? Do his opinions have any historic significance? J.B. Jeter, who wrote his biography, has this to say:

Few ministers received more flattering offers to settle abroad than did Elder Broaddus. If he remained in his native Caroline, it was not because fields wide pleasing, and full of promise were not opened to him. He was invited to accept the pastoral charge, or was corresponded with on the subject of accepting it, by the following churches: - the First Church, Boston, in 1811 and 1812, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the death of Dr. Stillman; the First Church, Philadelphia, in 1811, to supply the place of Dr. Staughton; the First Church, Baltimore, in 1819; the New Market-street Church, Philadelphia in 1819, the Sansom-street Church, Philadelphia in 1824, the First Church, Philadelphia again in 1825; the First Church, city of New York, in 1832; the First Church, Richmond, 1833, not to mention other calls of minor importance. These invitation to settle in cities and towns, in prominent positions, with wealthy and flourishing churches, paying their pastors generous salaries, he deemed it his duty to decline; partly because he was averse to change, and reluctant to leave his old and tried friends, but mainly, because of an unfortunate nervous sensitiveness, which rendered him timid among strangers, and, in a great measure, disqualified him for laboring in new and exciting circumstances. (Ibid, p. 17-18)

At the request of the Dover Association he drew up a form of Church Discipline, scriptural in its principles, and filled with judicious counsels, which was printed and circulated among its churches by that body. (Ibid, p. 22)

It would be difficult to estimate the degree in which the Baptist denomination, especially in Eastern Virginia, is indebted to him for the soundness of their faith - their general intelligence - their respectability - their harmony, and their efficiency. Many inferior lights were kindled at his torch. His chaste and effective eloquence wielded a moulding influence over the young and rising ministry. False interpretations of Scripture and erroneous opinion, usually vanished before his clear and resistless refutations. His wise counsels, weighty admonitions, and soft persuasions, were often effective in averting evil, and promoting good. He stood as a bulwark for truth and righteousness, and under its protection, many weak and timid combatants poured their destructive missiles on the common enemy. (Ibid, p.29-30)

7. Andrew Fuller. Andrew Fuller was a very famous Baptist in England from the middle 1700's to the first part of the 1800's, whom the Lord used more than any man of his times in the spreading of the gospel, in fighting heresies and in proclaiming the truths of God's word. Cathcart says:

“His literary reputation spread all over his own country, and his name long before his death, was as familiar in England and America as a household word. All denominations read his writings with profound interest, and they place the highest value upon them still. His “Calvinistic and Socinian systems examined and compared, as to their moral Tendency,” and “the Gospel its own witness; or, the Holy and Divine Harmony of the Christian Religion contrasted with the Immorality and Absurdity of Deism,” are works worthy of the greatest theologian of any age, and long since they have placed their author beside Dr. John Owen, Dr. John Gill, and John Howe, as one of the first expounders of the Bible of the Anglo-Saxon race” (Baptist Encyclopedia).

In his pursuit of spreading the gospel he considered his chief enemies Hypercalvinism, Antinomianism, Arminianism, Socinianism, and Deism; plus all the lesser enemies who followed in their train. He is supposed by many to have taught Universal Redemption - but let us let Fuller speak:

“Mr. Baxter pleads for “universal redemption;” I only contend for the, sufficiency of the atonement, in itself considered, for the redemption and salvation of the whole world; and this affords a ground for a universal invitation to sinners to believe; which was maintained by Calvin, and all the old Calvinists. I consider redemption as inseparably connected with eternal life, and therefore as applicable to none but the elect, who are redeemed from, among men.” (Fuller, Works, vol. 11, p. 714).

Jessey Mercer, (a “landmarker” before the system appeared), said:

“From the above it appears, that Mr. Fuller is not so opposed to Gill as many have thought. All that Fuller contends for, as to the infinite worth of the atonement, is comprehended in Gill’s view of the scheme of redemption. What Gill places in the covenant transactions, and considers as, past and done in the eternal mind, Fuller resolves into, ‘the sovereign pleasure of God, with a regard to the application of the atonement; That is, with regard to THE PERSONS, to whom it shall be applied.’ What then is the difference? A mere shade - a difference, only in the, modus operandi of the great plan. They are in perfect harmony in the, totality of human depravity - the necessity and efficiency of divine influence - the fullness and sufficiency of the covenant provision for, and the certain application of them to the salvation of the elect, only. The difference then, betwix them is only speculative; The agitation of which is much better calculated to promote those, oppositions of science falsely so called, or that, philosophy and vain deceit, from which Paul so much dissuades, rather than, Godly edifying” (Memoirs of Jesse Mercer, Mallory, p. 294-295).

And we might add: one would be hard pressed to prove that Graves did not go further towards Arminianism in regards to the atonement than Fuller is, supposed to have done by our modern Landmarkers (see Seven Dispensations, by Graves, pp. 105-108), and which is the only reason for the above vindication of the orthodoxy of Fuller because he is, thought to be such a heretic in our day by sovereign Grace Landmarkers.

What were this great man’s views on church organization? And was he a Landmarker? That he was learned, studied, and well acquainted with all Baptists and Baptist views no one will deny, what were his views?

"First, let us recollect the best periods of the christian church, and compare them with the present; and the best parts of own life, if we know when they were, and compare them with what we now are. - A recollection of the disinterestedness zeal and godly simplicity of the primitive christians, and their successors in after ages, millions of whom, in Christ's cause, loved not their lives unto death, would surely make us loathe ourselves for our Lukewarmness. As, Protestants, let us think of the fervent zeal and holy piety of our Reformers - think what objects they grasped, what difficulties they encountered, and what ends they obtained! As, Protestant Dissenters, let us reflect on the Spirit and conduct of our puritan and non-conforming ancestors. Think how they served God at the expence of all that was dear to them in the world, and laid the foundation of our churches in woods, and dens and caves of the earth! Say, too, was their love to God more than need be? Is the importance of things abated since their death? Might not they have pleaded the danger and cruelty of the times in excuse for a non-appearance for God, with much more seeming plausibility than we can excuse our Spirit of hateful indifference? O let us remember whence we are fallen, and repent!" (Andrew Fuller, Works, Vol. III, p. 323).

"The English Dissenters are commonly distinguished into three denominations; Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists" (Ibid, p. 459).

The following "Strictures on Sandemanism" which in many points are remarkably like Landmarkism and which brand of sectarianism appeared in some Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists should be closely noticed:

"I have denominated Sandemanism a, system because it not only, as I have said, affects the whole of Christianity, but induces all who embrace it to separate from other christians. Mr. Sandeman manifestly desired that the societies which were connected with him should be unconnected with all others, and that they should be considered as the only true churches of Christ. Such a view amounts to more than a difference on few points of doctrine; it is a distinct species of religion, and requires for distinctions sake, to have a name, and till some other is found by which it can be designated, it must be called after that of its author." (Ibid, p. 562).

"An Inquiry into the Principles on which the apostles Proceeded in forming and organizing Christian churches.

"You need not be told of the fierce disputes which were first agitated by the leaders of this denomination, and which have since extended to others besides those who choose to be called after their names, concerning the order, government, and discipline of gospel churches. To write upon every minute practice found in the New Testament would be to bewilder ourselves and perplex the subject. If we can ascertain the, principles on which the apostles preceeded in all they did, it will answer a much better purpose.

"Far be it from me to contend for an Erastian latitude in matters of church government and discipline, or to imagine that no Divine directions are left us on the subject, but that the church must be modelled and governed according to circumstances. This were to open a door to every corruption that human ingenuity and depravity might devise. But on the other hand, it is no less wide of the truth to consider the whole which is left us as, a system of ordinances, or positive institutions, requiring in all cases the most literal and punctilious observance. Such a view of the subject, among other evil consequences, must introduce perpetual discord, seeing it aims to establish things from the New Testament which are not in it." (Ibid, Vol. II, p. 629).

"Conceive of a church, or of a society of christians out of a number of churches, or of "any two agreeing together", as undertaking a mission among the heathen. One of the first things they

would attend to would be the selection of suitable missionaries; next they would instruct them in the things necessary to their undertaking; and after this send them forth to preach the gospel. Such exactly was the process of our Lord toward his apostles. He first selected them; then during his personal ministry, instructed them; and after his resurrection, gave them their commission, with a rich infusion of the Holy Spirit to fit them for their undertaking."

"The missionaries on arriving at the place of action would first unite in social prayer and fellowship; and this would be the first christian church. Thus, the apostles and those who adhered to them, first met in an upper room for prayer, preparatory to their attack on the Kingdom of Satan; and this little "band of about a hundred and twenty" formed the first christian church; and when others were converted to Christ and joined them, they are to be "added to the Church".

"Thus the apostles were not constituted such by the churches, but received their appointment immediately from Christ; nor was their authority limited to any particular church, but extended to all." (Ibid, p. 632).

"The same things which were done by the apostles were done by others appointed by them and had they been done by Elders whom they had not appointed, provided the will of Christ had been properly regarded, they would not have objected to their, validity." (Ibid, p. 633).

The sum is, that church government and discipline, are not a body of ceremonies, but a few general principles and examples, sufficient for all practical purposes, but not sufficient to satisfy those, who, in New Testament directions, expect to find an Old Testament ritual." (Ibid, p. 633).

"Although the writings of such men as Flavel, Boston, Guthrie, the Erskines, etc., are represented by Mr. Sandeman as furnishing "a devout path to hell," and the writers themselves as Pharisees, "Than whom no sinners are more hardened, and none greater destroyers of mankind," yet he allows them to have set before us "many articles of the apostolic doctrine"; yea, and to have "asserted, almost all the articles belonging to the sacred truth." (Ibid, p. 566).

"There is a zeal which may properly be denominated, catholic, and one which may as properly be denominated sectarian. It is not supposed that any man, or body of men, can be equally concerned in promoting Christ's interest in all places. As our powers are limited, we must each build the wall, as it were, over against our own houses. Nor are we obliged to be, equally concerned for the prosperity of all religious undertakings in which the parties may be in the main on the side of Christ. It is right that we should be most interested in that which approaches the nearest to truth and true religion. But true catholic zeal will nevertheless have the good of the universal church of Christ for its grand object, and will rejoice in the prosperity of every denomination of Christians, in so far as they appear to have the mind of Christ. Those who builded the wall against their own houses would not consider themselves as the only builders, but would bear goodwill to their brethren, and keep in view the rearing of the, whole wall, which should encompass the city. As it is not our being of the religion of Rome, nor of any other which happens to be favoured by the state, that determines our zeal to be catholic; so it is not our being of a sect or party of christians, or endeavouring with christian meekness and frankness to convince others of what we account to be the mind of Christ, that gives it the character of sectarian. It is a being, more concerned to propagate those things where in we differ from other christians than to impart the common salvation. Where this is the case, we shall so limit the Kingdom of heaven to ourselves as nearly to confine our good wishes, prayers, and efforts to our own denomination, and treat all others as if we had nothing to do with them in religious matters but in a way of censure and dispute, wherein this kind of zeal differs from that of the Pharisees,

that compassed sea and land to make proselytes, but who when made, were turned to them rather than to God, I cannot understand.” (Ibid, p. 645).

“I had a letter about a week ago from one of the Scotch Baptists about, order, discipline, etc. Ill as I was I scratched out the following, parable. ‘In one of the new Italian republics, two independent companies are formed for the defence of the country. Call the one A. and the other B. In forming themselves, and learning their exercise, they each profess to follow the mode of discipline used by the ancient Romans. Their officers, uniforms, and evolutions, however, are, after all, somewhat different from each other. Hence, disputes arise, and B. refuses to march against the enemy with A. as being disorderly. A. gives his reasons why he thinks himself orderly; but they are far from satisfying B., who not only treats him as deviating from rule, but as almost knowing himself to do so, and willfully persisting in it. A., tired of jarring, marches against the enemy by himself. B., sits at home deeply engaged in studying order and discipline. ‘If your form and rules,’ says A., ‘are so preferable to ours, why do you not make use of them?’ Discipline is a means, not an end. Be not always boasting of your order, and reproaching others for the want of it. It is true like the Quakers in 1745, you have bought waistcoats for our soldiers, and we thank you for them, but we had rather you would fight yourselves.’” (Ibid Vol. I p. 74).

“Those brief remarks are intended to prove that, in the above particulars, Mr. Sandeman and his followers have mistaken the true intent of Christ and his apostles. But whether it be so or not, the proportion of zeal which is expended upon them is far beyond what their importance requires. If, as a friend to believers’ Baptism, I cherish an overweening conceit of myself, and of my denomination, confining the Kingdom of heaven to it, and shutting my eyes against the excellences of others, am I not carnal? The Jews in the time of Jeremiah, thought themselves very secure on account of their forms and privileges. Pointing to the sacred edifice, and its Divinely instituted worship, They exclaimed; ‘The Temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these:’ but were they not carnal? In how many ways, alas are poor blind mortals addicted to err!” (Ibid Vol. III p. 628).

This is the only semblance of Landmarkism that I have found, this Sandemanism, other than the High-Church of England writers, and which they received from Rome, who taunted our Baptist forefathers about not having “authority”, or “being out of the Apostolic Church”. Fuller was no Landmarker - he wrote against such principles; yea, for Graves to “restore the ancient Landmarks which our fathers have set” he has to go to Sandemanism - not to Fuller!

The above works were written previous to and around 1850, but Landmarkism began spreading very rapidly and in 1874 W.W. Gardener in his “Missiles of Truth” offered a compromise to reconcile the regular Baptist belief relative to the commission to that of Landmarkism. He taught that the commission was:

“given to the apostles, not as disciples, nor as a church, neither as ministers merely, but as the inspired founders and instructors of the churches to the end of the world; and that it was given to them for the churches” (p. 72).

Then from the churches successively to the present. But it never caught on, Landmarks insist Christ built His church on Himself during His own personal ministry - not through the Spirit and His apostles after His death - thus they have an “edge” over all subsequent “man made” institutions. Their church was founded by Christ, they brag, and no others can be true churches,

EVEN THOUGH FOUNDED BY THE SPIRIT AND APOSTLES DOWN THROUGH THE AGES - THROUGH THE SCRIPTURES OF THE SPIRIT INSPIRED APOSTLES!

Then in 1900 Ben Bogard published "Pillars of Orthodoxy", a book of sermons and essays by prominent Baptists of the past - of which were, some Landmarkers, but L.D. Foreman's Foreword and Bogard's Biography sketches tell us in no uncertain terms that Landmarkism is one of the foremost pillars of orthodoxy - and all the while using other great baptists who were not Landmark!

"Since the death of J.R. Graves there has been no abler defender of orthodoxy. It was to Dr. Eaton that all the south looked for defence when Whitsittism had unsettled everything. It was Dr. Eaton more than any other man who forced Wm. H. Whitsitt to resign his position in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. It is true that such men as J.T. Christian, J.S. Coleman, J.N. Hall and others contributed largely to the great controversy. S.H. Ford, the historian and scholar, also wrote strong forceful articles on Whitsitt's vagaries, but it was Dr. Eaton that Dr. Whitsitt feared, and it was he that waged the war that resulted in victory for the orthodox Baptists of the South." (Ibid, p. 174).

Now while such statement may have some virtue in an ABA Sunday School Class somewhere for teenagers to bolster their position, anyone who knows the facts of the controversy knows how much, fear Whitsitt had of Eaton! Especially after Lofton's books were published in Whitsitt's defence. But my point is, why did Bogard use NON-Landmarkers as "Pillars" in his book, when Bogard's main "Pillar" is Landmarkism? I do not believe he was dishonest - I do not believe he was trying to mislead - I do think he was blinded by his theory. The sermon of J.R. Graves in Bogards' book complains:

"The practical evil that is cropping out of the theory, in some quarters, to the great disturbance of the churches, is that ministers claiming to be officers of the Kingdom are assuming the control of baptism, and Baptizing whom they please, and where they please, whether in a Baptist Church as was the immersion of Dr. Weaver, of Louisville, Ky, by Prof. Jas. P. Boyce without consulting the church, - or fifty miles away" (Ibid, p. 223).

Earlier in the same book was "Divine Decrees" by James P. Boyce; also in this book is Richard Fuller, J.B. Jeter, Broadus, and in an essay by Christian "What Baptists Have Done for the World", where many great Baptists are named, there is not but one landmarker in the list. My question is: Why do the Landmarkers claim all the great Baptist Scholars as Landmark when they were not?

But in 1906 appeared the work of a very learned Baptist theologian, Augustus H. Strong in which the old Baptist views are maintained against Landmarkism.

"Any number of believers, therefore, may constitute themselves into a Christian Church, by adopting for their rule of faith and practice Christ's law as laid down in the New Testament, and by associating themselves together, in accordance with it, for His worship and service. It is important, where practicable, that a council of churches be previously called, to advise the brethren proposing this union as to the desirableness of constituting a new and distinct local body; and, if it be found desirable, to recognize them after its formation, as being a church of Christ. But such action of a council, however valuable as affording ground for the fellowship of other churches, is not constitutive, but is simply declaratory; and without such action, the body of believers alluded to, if formed after the N.T. example, may notwithstanding be a true church of

Christ. Still further, a band of converts, among the heathen or providentially precluded from access to existing churches, might rightfully appoint one of their number to baptize the rest, and then might organize, de novo, a New Testament Church" (Theology, p. 902).

"It is the erroneous view that baptism is the act of the administrator which causes the anxiety of the High Church Baptists to deduce their Baptist lineage from regularly Baptized ministers all the way back to John the Baptist, and which induces many modern endeavors of pedit Baptists to prove that the earliest Baptists of England and the continent did not immerse. All these solitudes are unnecessary. We have no need to prove a Baptist apostolical succession. If we can derive our doctrine and practice from the New Testament, it is all we require" (ibid, p. 949).

Besides the testimony from the above we could mention "The Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches" by Francis Wayland, 1857; "The Old Baptist Test, or Bible signs of the Lord's People," by John M. Watson, "The History of the Baptists and their Principles," Stokes; which do not contain any Landmark dogma; but forbear because of weariness to the reader - only one more: Benedict's "Fifty years among the Baptists."

"Mr. Marshall, in one day, baptized forty-five persons of color, formed them, with others previously baptized, into a church, and ordained Andrew Bryan as their pastor. This was in 1789....Abraham Marshall, in forming this now old church, (Benedict was writing some 70 years later. D.G.) a large account of which was published by Dr. Rippon, of London, in his Annual Register, in 1791, acted alone, as no ordained Minister could be had to assist him. "I acted the part of a Bishop, in this case, from necessity," said he to me in relating the story. His brethren, however, sanctioned the measure at the time. Whether the leaders of our church affairs would do so now is a question which I shall not attempt to decide, as I do not recollect having seen it discussed in any of our treatises on church discipline. It is the usual custom of our Churches to convoke a council or presbytery, or eldership, in the language of our southern brethren, on such occasions, but in case of necessity, why may not our ministers, as well as Titus, ordain Elders alone?" (p. 53-54).

Some points: 1. Anyone who has read Benedict's four different histories, and has noticed his vast listings of materials in his 1848 history will know how widely read and acquainted with the Baptists this man was; 2. He knew Marshall's brethren sanctioned his action at the time (1788) but did not know if the brethren would at the time of his writing (1859); 3. There were no Landmark treatises in his day to counter Marshall's action; 4. He had no "Landmark glasses" to read Landmarkism into either one of the Keach's disciplines, or Griffeth's, or any existing one. 5. He tells of the, custom of the churches - but agrees with Marshall's action citing a, Scriptural example.

In L.D. Foreman's Foreword to Bogard's "Pillars of Orthodoxy" this is stated:

"It goes without saying that, in the majority of cases, the older one gets the more he appreciates history and the less likely he is to appreciate change. We do not oppose progress in some fields. We do, however, oppose progressive, or evolutionary, theories and practices which remove us from the ancient positions."

What else is Landmarkism but progressive, evolutionary theories and practices? In the previous works we have noticed by Dagg, Curtis, Jeter, Fuller, Strong, Burrows, Stokes, Wayland,

Watson, and Benedict, they either; 1. Did not mention Landmarkism at all (or spoke against it); because, a.) they did not really know about what they were writing, b.) they willingly deceived their readers, c.) they were prejudiced in their opinions and suppressed the “true” Baptist positions; d. or, Landmarkism either did not exist, or did not exist to the extent to cause much concern in their time. And if it were not an issue before the time of J.R. Graves, where does that place it in the historical position of the Baptists? Truly did Jeter warn (and I believe he was speaking directly about the coming heresy of Landmarkism):

“It cannot be doubted by any intelligent and unbiased reader of history that great injury has been done to Christianity by the unscriptural and extravagant importance attached to its ordinances and to ecclesiastical authority and discipline. By multitudes the church has been substituted for Christ and Churchianity for christianity.” (Baptist Principles Reset, p. 129).

Towards the close of Graves’ chapter on “The Church - What is it?” (Intercommunion) he states:

“We see among Baptists the definitions vibrate from the Presbyterian definition, borrowed and modified from the Catholics, as one extreme, to the unbaptized bodies of professed christians, of Wayland and Curtis, as the other. It is the, true mean between these that I shall attempt to find. It will be observed that the, trend of Baptist opinion in, strongly setting toward the local idea. The definition first put forth by Baptists, before they had been led captives by the Westminster Confession of Faith, through which the church universal idea has been engrafted upon, and ingrained into, the faith of our people.

The thoughtful reader can see, that so long as Baptists are confused and divided between these contradictory theories of a New Testament Church, there can be no general agreement touching all those questions of polity and practice that grow directly out of them...” (p. 113-114).

Graves was very much in error concerning the 1689 (2nd London) Confessors as any school boy can see by even the quotes in this article - Baptists have always believed in both the local and the Universal views of the Church - and Graves even read the local view into the first London Confession, in the same manner that a later Landmarker (T.T. Eaton) read the local view into the 2nd London Confession Graves is condemning! But I want to point out two fatal admissions within this quote of Graves: 1.”The faith of our people” (last five words of 1st paragraph) was in Graves’ time the universal view and Graves had just quoted Dagg, Wayland, Curtis, Pendleton, Everts, Breaker, and Adkins to prove it. But was “strongly setting toward the local idea”; and, 2. Landmarkism did not exist among the majority of Baptists because of such “contradictory theories of a New Testament Church” - which should show to any thinking person THE BEGINNING OF LANDMARKISM. And it is true that “Polity and practice grow directly out of “the Baptists” views of the church; note Mink’s statements in his second treatise, (Baptism: Preacher or Church Ordinance) concerning Breakers’ views: “Heresy”, “Grievous error”, “Deep Water Protestant-ism”, “Renders a grave disservice to Landmarkism”, and “not Baptist”. What was Breaker’s statement?

“The law of baptism, thus far considered, and which we have seen requires the administrator to be the accredited agent of a gospel church, is intended to apply where such a church is to be found or where access can be had to such a church, and to such an administrator. But we may suppose a case (as that of Roger Williams and his friends) where persons desire to receive the rite, and where there is no qualified administrator to perform it, can it be lawfully administered

under such circumstances? I think it can, and for the following reasons; John the Baptist was not baptized, and yet the rite was lawfully administered by him... under certain circumstances, then, I think Baptism by an unbaptized and unaccredited person would be valid, that is, (1) Where there is no true church or minister, (2) Where it is impossible for the parties desiring it to obtain the services of a qualified administrator from abroad, or where there is no knowledge, on their part of such an administrator, (3) Where the intention of those receiving the rite is thereby to form themselves into a gospel church, and (4) Where the person thus administering the ordinances does so in good faith, and in practical submission to the teaching of Christ, that is, he must be one of the number forming the church, and as such must himself receive the rite in turn, which John the Baptist would have done, had not his peculiar mission, prevented.” (ibid, p. 38).

This is all very much the same position of the Baptists of the 1600’s. Graves said Breaker was “another of our ablest denominational writers” (Intercommunion, p. 110). Mink demonstrates that Graves and Breaker were “poles apart on the doctrine of Landmarkism” (ibid, p. 37). Breaker did believe the Universal view of the Church:

“In every place where the word occurs, it means either (1) a particular local congregation of professed christians, or (2) the whole body of the professed disciples of Christ - that is the aggregate, not of churches, but of the membership of all the local Churches...” (Graves, Intercommunion, p. 110).

So not only have we seen the beginnings of Landmarkism but the evolutionary extremes it has wrought, Mink does not “read” landmarkism into Baptist history as Graves did - he simply denounces severely the Old Baptist polity and practice. Mink is correct on Landmark views - it is the Landmark view that is wrong. Mink adds even more to the doctrine of Baptism than his celebrated predecessors that we noted at the beginning of the article: Old Landmark Reset, Pendleton:

“Where there is no Baptism there are no visible churches” p. 12

“Inducting by Baptism into the Kingdom” p. 18

“There is a scriptural connection between Baptism and preaching” p. 26

“Can men now be ministers of the gospel who are not members of churches formed according to the gospel? I say they cannot...” p. 30

“How is the visible separation (from the world) to take place... Is it not by Baptism? p. 31

“My position is that according to the gospel, authority to preach must, under God, emanate from a visible church of Christ” p. 34

“Authority to preach... authority to Baptize must come from the same source (Baptist Church)” p. 37

Mink: “Baptism is important for hinged on it is intimate fellowship with Christ, His Church, brideship, and the coveted “well done” at the mercy seat of Christ” (Ibid, p. 40)

Let us examine some of the words and phrases that were made in the above statement:

1. “intimate fellowship with Christ”, is common to all the elect. Christ prayed for them all (Jno. 17); His work included their sanctification as well as their redemption (Titus 2:14); All the elect will share the common glorification of Christ (Rom. 8); Did Charnock, Owen, Crisp, Ames,

Brooks, Dabney, Sibbs, Huntington, Witsius, Goodwin and Henry have fellowship with Christ? Their works declare it!

2. "His church." The one, true, universal, invisible, Mt. Zion constantly affirmed by the elect throughout the ages has never been entered by baptism, neither has any local church been entered by baptism.

3. "Brideship." Even the founder of Landmarkism believed other of the elect than only Landmark Baptists will compose the Bride.

"These redeemed from among men from the days of Able until the day of the rapture" (Seven Dispensations, p. 461).

I realize Graves changed his opinion after this writing of 1883 but not even then to the degree of change of that of modern Landmarkism; but remember, Seven Dispensations was written, after his book on Landmarkism, showing the father of the system's views on the bride.

4. "The coveted 'well done' at the mercy seat of Christ." I am unaware of any such reference in scripture.

Baptism will simply not bear all these doctrines that have been placed upon it. Mink goes further:

"Baptism is an extremely serious matter, so much so that omniscience sent a vanguard in the person of John the Baptist to prepare by baptism the people whom Christ would later form His Church form." (Ibid, p. 40).

Prepared a people by Baptism! Is this Campbellism? Romanism? No, it is Landmarkism. When J.M.C. Breaker could not find the church into which the Eunuch was baptized, leaving him a baptized believer without any church affiliation, Mink comments:

"Such contention is ridiculous, promotes free-lance baptism, and it would, if let stand, destroy the ecclesiology of Baptists." (Ibid, p. 25, 1st Treatise).

It would destroy Landmarkism at any rate and return to the ecclesiology of Baptists before Landmarkism appeared. Spencer, in his "The Early Baptists of Philadelphia" relates many times of baptized believers not affiliated with any church and states:

"Then, as since, the churches were agitated as to the validity of baptism administered by one of a different faith from our own. It is evident, however, that where a person is thoroughly converted and is immersed in the name of the Trinity upon a profession of faith, the baptism is valid without any regard to the character of the administrator." (p. 167)

Then relates also the action of the Association:

"Whether can an Orthodox Baptist Church receive a person who has been baptized by a Tunker Universalist, without baptizing him again? The person has renounced universalist principles. Answer: Yes." (Ibid, p. 167).

"A Baptist Minister has a scriptural right to Baptize any one giving an evidence of his faith in Jesus, but it requires a vote of the church to make said person a member. The ordinance of

baptism seems to have been committed by our Lord to the ministry, and on this principle Dr. Holcombe proceeded.” (Ibid, p. 181).

This relates of Holcombe baptizing a convert without the knowledge of any church until after the fact.

Huffman condemned his own doctrine (Landmark) when he wrote:

“The Progression of error, as evidenced by history, is first, permission, then, practice, then, doctrine, and finally, dogma.” (Church Truth at a Point in Crisis, Forward).

This is exactly descriptive of Landmarkism, Graves’ theory of the church was local only - he knew practice and polity rested on which theory one held - he “read” his theory into the Old Baptists’ position, condemning all others - baptism became the chief corner stone on which everything stands - no one can have it or come by it except one way only (Mink’s way, or Cockrell’s, or Wilson’s). No, not under Christ or the scriptures, but under a preconceived theory of authority that supposedly honors Christ - it has to be correct, it is, their theory! Since it is “correct” all true Baptists in all ages must have believed it, or Christ lied! We could borrow Charles Hodge’s description of Emmonism and apply it to Landmarkism:

“Emmonism, or Emmonisism, for the names are equally barbarous, denotes a theological system which took its name, if not its origin, in New England, during the latter half of the last century, and which may be regarded as a monstrous growth from the trunk of Calvinism; such if let alone, the supplanting fungus would leave at length no grace in the parent trunk, or, if critics will allow us still further to mingle our metaphors, it is a frightful child of a comely parent with just enough of the family likeness to make one avert the face in dread.” (Princeton Review, Oct. 1842, p. 529).

“If not -, Christ lied”. I have noticed this statement many times during this article and it is nothing short of blasphemy for a mere man to say such in order to bolster his puny little doctrine. I intend to expose them for what they are.

“We do not admit that it devolves upon us more than upon every other lover of Jesus to prove, by incontestable historical facts, that this Kingdom of the Messiah has stood from the day it was set up by him, unbroken and unmoved; to question it, is to doubt his sure word of promise. To deny it, is to, impeach His veracity, and leave the world without a Bible or a Christ, we dare not do this. We believe that his Kingdom has stood unchanged as firmly as we believe in the divinity of the Son of God, and, when we are forced to surrender the one faith, we can easily give up the other. If Christ has not kept His promise concerning His Church to keep it, how can I trust Him concerning, my salvation? If He has not the power to save His, Church, He certainly has not the power to save me. For Christians to admit that Christ has not preserved his Kingdom unbroken unmoved, unchanged, and uncorrupted, is to surrender the whole ground to infidelity. I deny that a man is a believer in the Bible who denies this.” (Graves, Old Landmarkism, p. 70-80).

“I cannot help believing that the, Lord has kept His word.” (Alien Baptism, Dayton, p. 80).

“To teach that there have been “gaps” in church succession, is to deny the veracity of the Lord.”

“But, if the words of Jesus are true (and who can doubt such - Mt. 16-18), True Baptists had better hold the fort.” (Church Truth at a Point of Crisis, Huffman, p. 7, 14).

“If there has been a cessation for even an instant of either the church or the commission has not the present accompaniment of Christ also ceased and Christ be found a liar?”

“Then Christ Himself has failed for He is the truth.”

“If Christ cannot preserve his exclusive church, can salvation be certain?” (Hiatt, Exclusivity - A Statement of Baptist Succession, p. 5,8,12).

“Dare we even suppose that Christ left the work of evangelizing and baptizing to some lone unbaptized believer as our Reformed Baptist Friends assume? A Thousand times no! Jesus Christ would never have made such a foolish, silly, stupid blunder!” (Cockrell, How to Organize a Church).

But, on the other hand, the Landmarkers would have us believe a lone, unbaptized believer went to Holland to import baptism to England - Graves, Dayton, Ray, Jarrel; such inconsistency in his ridicule! “Sware not at all”; “Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement”; and James said: “Be not many teachers, that we shall have the more severe judgement.”

I have read Bro. Wilson’s like statement concerning Israel: “If we can’t believe the Word of the Lord concerning the future salvation of Israel, how can we believe his word concerning our salvation?” and another Brother: “I believe in that (future salvation of national Israel) as strong as I believe in Jesus Christ.” All this is beyond logic - pure, unadulterated ignorance.

I do not believe that all the Old Baptists that I have quoted “have impeached the veracity of Christ”, they certainly did not either. I do not have any doubts of “trusting Christ for my salvation” however, denying the Landmark system - I am a believer in the Bible, but not Graves’ system.

Here is a statement by Dayton for Modern Landmarkers:

“The man who admits that baptism is the initiatory into the visible Kingdom of Christ, as every Baptist must, or cease to be a Baptist, and yet contends that those are in that Kingdom, who have not been baptized, is not worth reasoning with; and he who cannot see that membership in the invisible Kingdom can give no right to any privilege in the visible before he enters it, must make much less use of his common sense when investigating scriptural matters than he is accustomed to do in examining other matters.” (Alien Baptism, p. 171,172).

This has always been the mark of landmark writers to tell us who are real Baptists and who are not - in this statement Dayton excludes most of the Modern Landmarkers: Graves through Dayton says, “You have ceased to be Baptists” by not believing his way.

Is anybody scared? Of course not - Dayton was just a man - that is his opinion. But to call God as a witness to man’s opinions is something else - then to make God a liar if this opinion is not true is further than I can go. I will have no part of it. Paul’s claims “Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief” (I Tim. 1:13) is much different than the landmarkers: they can no longer claim

ignorance of the past practices and beliefs of Baptists; yea contrariwise: "Baptists have always believed our way" in their dreary, man made philosophy - what is their excuse for blasphemy? We will not be deceived by their humanistic "logic": Swearing by the faithfulness of Christ in regards to His salvation cannot bind Him to promises He never made, nor to promises the Landmark, thinks He made i.e., The, manner He perpetrates His Churches. The Arminian could just as well argue: "Since God loves the world (Jno. 3:16), He cannot hate the world and destroy the world," (which was argued and answered very well by William Twisse, "The Riches of God's Love to the Vessels of Mercy consistent with His Absolute Hatred or Reprobation of the vessels of Wrath"); or the Universalist could argue: "That the world through Him might be saved" (purpose clause), that God is a liar if He does not save the world, and if He does not honor the one purpose how can we know that He will honor any purpose?" Or the holiness people: "If you are not sanctified to our specifications you are not saved and God is a liar if He saves you, because the scriptures say "without holiness no man shall see God." If the first premise is wrong the whole thing falls. It is such a joke; it should insult the intelligence of any man - it certainly insults the intelligence of scripture.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

Since the scripture never calls the Apostles the Church why do the Landmarks insist that they were the first church? Because in their ideas of mother Church, daughter church, Baptizmal succession they can boast that Christ is their founder and every other church was founded by man. They emphasize the fleshly administration rather than the Spiritual, but there could not be a new administration until the cross - the old covenant was not abrogated until the cross. The Administrator of the Old Covenant was Israel - there was no intermediate administration. Christ built his church upon the work he did, the new covenant; the Apostles built churches upon that same work - there is scripture for this view - but as we saw, none for the other. Some questions for the Landmarkers: There were several groups mentioned in the Bible - why couldn't they join this Church? John and his disciples, the Samaritans, the above 500 in Galilee, and the 120 at Jerusalem? Is it not the saints duty to assemble? Why was Judas a member? (,We know why according to the scriptures - but not according to Landmarkism).

In the Associational Records of the Millands, 1656, was this question:

"Whether a competent number of baptised believers in a troop or regiment may there walke as a Church?" Answer: Wee do not discern that a number of disciples in a troop or regiment canne there walke as and act as a particular church of Christ: as seeing no scripture to warrant it nor discerning them to be in a capacity to keep close to the rule of the worde in receiving - of members, dealing with them in all cases as the matter shall require, and that they are continually liable to be dissolved." (Associational Records of Particular Baptists of England, Wales, and Ireland to 1660).

They knew no scriptural warrant for a moving troop to be a church. They could have been shown many scriptures by our moderns - Christ and the Apostles! Now wait a minute. How do we know there were local, sovereign Grace, missionary, Independent, pre-mil, pre-trib., landmark churches everywhere at that time? "Because if not - Christ lied - case closed."

About the same time that Pendleton wrote "An Old Landmark Reset" for Graves (around 1850), there appeared from the pen of Jeremiah B. Jeter, Articles that would eventually be compiled in a book: "Baptist Principles Reset." "His mind was not only rich in the accumulated stores of information, well digested, but it was characterized by a manly vigor and a most uncommon

candor, which commanded the respect and admiration of all who knew him.” (Preface) He was not a Landmarker. Let us notice some things in his book:

“He (Christ) came, not to establish or to modify the “commonwealth of Israel”, but to introduce a new dispensation, or order of things. After a brief, but most instructive, ministry, termination in his sacrificial death, he endowed his apostles with plenary inspiration and the power of working miracles, and entrusted to them the duty of carrying into effect his gracious and sublime mission” (p. 19).

“The personal ministry of Jesus was preparatory to the constitution of churches. His preaching was eminently searching, and fitted to reform men and make them spiritual and devout, but during his life no church was organized, and his disciples were subject to no discipline, and their labors, except so far as they were directed by his personal attention, were without concert.

“On the day of Pentecost, after the ascension of Jesus, the apostles, by the descent of the Holy Spirit, were fully qualified to carry forward and complete the work that John and Jesus had begun. The first church was formed in Jerusalem...” (pp. 20-21).

“The gospel was given to the apostles, in trust for their successors - not their official successors, for they had none - but their successors in faith, Spirit, aims, labors, and usefulness - Their True Successors - “Alway, even to the end of the world.” (p. 131).

Jeter was one of many “liberal” opposers of landmarkism according to Graves - but he held the old Baptist position of baptizing “IN the name of “Christ” (not a system); he held the true position of whom the apostles were, vis.,: apostles; he knew to whom the commission was given: the apostles; He knew when the first church was built: Jerusalem, after the cross; he knew who the successors of the apostles were: those the Lord called in like precious faith, spirit, aims, labors, and usefulness.

In Cockrell’s “In Search of an Old Landmark” (Berea Baptist, Nov. 15, 1985), besides his continual garbling and misinterpretation of the facts, he suppressed the writings which clearly showed the views of the Baptists in the 1600’s - even while quoting them to “prove” his own points. His conclusion:

“This controversy seemed not so much to be over whether a minister should Baptize or not. Rather, it was whether or not church authority was needed from another already existing church in order to have valid baptism. Some denied the need of church succession while others believed it was necessary. Some believed that the baptizer must be baptized himself; others denied this, believing that an unbaptized person could begin baptism anew in a time of almost universal apostasy.”

I challenge him to prove anywhere where “church Authority” was the issue - also to prove where “succession” was the issue - he reads these things into their writings through his “Landmark glasses”. He follows Crosby’s misinterpretation through his own Landmark ideas. If our modern Landmarks had lived in those days they would be classed as “Seekers”, not Baptists. The Seekers were looking and waiting on “Authority”, not the Baptists - whose authority was the word of God. I wonder what is Cockrell’s definition of a Seeker and, why there were any Seekers at all, if the Baptists of the day had found their “succession” and “Authority” as Cockrell

makes out! Cockrell states: “Some” believed this, “Others” believed that; “Some” practiced this, “Others” practiced that. Crosby and Ivimey say “The greatest number and the more judicious” denied successionism. But, as we have shown, successionism was only Crosby’s, interpretation of the facts, no Particular Baptist of the day pleaded for successionism, but the authority of the word of God alone.

JESSE MERCER

An Account of James Hutchinson

The following is found in Jesse Mercer’s History of the Georgia Baptist Association:

“One thing however occurred on this occasion, which deserves a passing notice. Mr. James Hutchinson, a Methodist preacher, appeared at this session and requested an opportunity to relate his experience and faith in Christ, with a view to his becoming a member of the church at that place. This privilege was granted him, and his relation being satisfactory, he was received into membership. But although he gave up the Methodist discipline and doctrines, and embraced fully those of the Baptist denomination, he did not feel at liberty to give up his baptism; having been, immersed upon a profession of his faith, by the Rev. Mr. Humphries, a regular Minister of the Methodist connection. His was made a question for the Association then sitting; and to the body there appeared so much of the gospel order in it, that Mr. H. was admitted by the consent of the body upon his baptism thus received. But in the end it terminated unfortunately. Many were not well pleased at such a course, and therefore, it led to strife and confusion. However, as he was an eloquent man, and truly fervent in Spirit, many were conciliated by his zeal and perseverance; and strong hopes were entertained that much good would be effected through his instrumentality.

Not long after this, Mr. Hutchinson made a visit to his relations in London county, in Virginia, and commenced preaching in the woods. The people erected a commodious arbor and stand, and here he continued his ministrations with great success for the space of twelve months. He received and baptized about 100 persons as the fruit of his labors, and they were formed into a church. But here ended the joy. For no sooner did they apply for admission into the Association, than the validity of their minister’s baptism was called in question, which, of course, involved a question as to the validity of the baptism of the whole church. It became a subject of deep interest in the Association; a majority prevailed against it, and consequently the church was rejected. At this particular crisis, Mr. H. submitted to a re-immersion, and his people, with two or three exceptions, followed his example. Thus terminated a most fierce and distressing controversy. So much for admitting a, pedo-baptist administration of the ordinance of baptism!

Soon after this Mr. H. returned to Georgia, loaded with goods. He entered into merchandise, and in him was fulfilled the declaration of Paul to Timothy; “but they that will be rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition; for the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.” He plunged into worldly cares, lost his zeal for God, fell into transgression and was excluded from the church. And although he afterwards expressed repentance, and was in some degree restored, he never regained his former standing and usefulness. He struggled through a few miserable years in worldly pursuits, and died at last, under a cloud of darkness and deep distress.” (History of Georgia Baptist Association, Mercer, pp. 22-24).

Assuming the account of Mercer is correct, are his theological, and then, philosophical views, correct on the matter? If the administration of baptism by Judas Ischariot were valid, according to landmark dogma, performed under the authority of the church or directly from Christ; why were not the Baptisms performed by Hutchinson valid also under the same conditions? He was a member of a Baptist Church, and a gifted minister. The difference between Hutchinson and Judas was that the one was not scripturally baptised, according to the Landmark dogma, though a saved man, a gifted minister, and was used very greatly of the Lord - all the scriptural marks except Landmark Baptism! Now the other: a lost man, a deceiver, a hypocrite, a thief, and a betrayer; his administrations were good, because he had "authority" being "scripturally baptized". Where is such a system's consistency? Their "authority" is in their Idol of Baptism; because the, facts are: Through the instrumentality of the gifted Hutchinson's preaching about 100 received their saviour, were baptized in His name and a church formed. Baptism answered a good conscience in their case (I Pet. 3:21), according to the Bible. This is scriptural but, it did not answer the conscience of the unscriptural Association, according to the Laws of Landmarkism; which is not Biblical. Hutchinson's conscience was answered by his former baptism by the Methodist minister, and it was only after the coercion of the Landmark Doctors that he submitted, against his conscience, to a re-baptism. But when did the Lord bless his ministry? Before or after his landmark baptism? The, facts speak for themselves. And, instead of taking Mercer's philosophical conclusion of Hutchinson's sad, spiritual tailspin, and demiss, accrediting such to the fulfillment of Paul's declaration to Timothy, we might better apply the, wrong advice of the old prophet of Bethel to the young prophet (I Kings 13) which resulted in the death of the young prophet. Instead of Landmarkers today saying with Mercer "Alas, my Brother, You should have obeyed the voice of the Lord" like the old prophet stated, they could do better to consider their own way, which wounds so many spiritual consciences. All this, on following the logic and systems of mere men. Human logic will not produce spirituality.

In another letter by Mercer his views on baptism were very much different. Note the following:

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

"On the general principle, we say, as the best conviction of our own mind from the scriptures, that the only qualification on the subject of baptism, required in the Bible, is a credible profession of repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. And as to the Administrator, the New Testament lays down directly nothing about it; but it is fairly to be inferred, that he should be a man ordained to minister in holy things; of orderly walk and gospel faith. But the question will be asked, what shall his faith be? We reply: from analogy, it would seem his faith would be in perfect harmony with that of the subjects. He must believe in repentance and faith, as required by scripture, in order to baptism; and baptize the subject, in faith, into Jesus Christ, according to the faith of the gospel.

"What other degrees of faith may be requisite to a sound theological faith, we pretend not now to say; but to a gospel, valid baptism, we cannot see any thing else necessary, as to faith, but an accordance of belief in administrator and subject, and that that be what the gospel requires.

"And in regard to C.W. or any other minister, who may have adopted some articles of faith (say Unitarian) which dissolves his denominational connection with the regular Baptist, but yet retains his belief in the gospel requirements in order to baptism, and baptized into the faith of Christ, according to the scripture, we cannot see why his baptisms should not be admitted as valid; because his faith and practice are acknowledged to be good, and he is uncondemned so far

as baptism is concerned. And we do not see how unsoundness in articles of faith, which have no regard to the administration of ordinances, can affect the validity of their administration.” (Memoirs of Jesse Mercer, Mallary, p. 450).

Here we have the acknowledged validity of baptisms by a minister who has left the Baptists, and in the preceding case a minister who was a Baptist, but did not have Baptist baptism - his baptisms invalid! The modern Landmark plea for “authority” is not mentioned in either case. When were the baptisms of Mercer valid? When he held the view of the first case, or the second? If valid in both cases, Landmarks give up their argument. If valid in the first case only, and not the second, we should hope our own lineage of baptism, if from him, be performed when he held the views of the first case or else, our own baptisms invalid, our churches not churches - out of the Bride and not knowing it! I should hope not.

A Brief Review of Some Points
of
”The English Baptists on Church Succession”

(Berea Baptist Banner)
by
Milburn Cockrell

By definition Cockrell claims succession means:

“That one church organized another Church. Jesus Christ organized the Jerusalem Church during His personal ministry out of the material prepared by John the Baptist. The Jerusalem church organized the church at Samaria (Acts 8:5, 12; 9:31) by the missionary endeavours of Philip the evangelist. Barnabas, and Saul (Paul), members of the Jerusalem church, were instrumental in constituting the church of Antioch (Acts 11:22-26).”

“There was an organic connection between New Testament Churches, for a baptized missionary was sent out from one church with the authority to start other churches. In the Book of Acts churches did not spring out of the ground without scriptural baptism; they did not have spontaneous generation by some free lancer. Those who founded other churches were already themselves “in the church” (Acts 13:1; I Cor. 12:28), and they reported their activities to the church which sent them forth to this work (Acts 14:27-28). In this sense one church organized another church, and that church sent forth men who organized other churches, and this has continued until this present day. By this means there has been a series of churches across the centuries. This is what I mean by Church Succession. I believe this is what the Old Baptists in England meant, when they spoke of succession.” (Berea Baptist Banner, Oct. 1987).

Notice the last sentence in this quote, because in three columns over (same page) Cockrell states: “ A few English Baptists affirmed a visible succession and a number of others a spiritual succession of believers through all ages.” In view of the two statements - what does Cockrell mean? In the one the “Old Baptists in England”, Cockrell affirmed, believed in church succession, as Cockrell defined the term; in the other “only a, few”. But, verily, in all the quotes in Cockrell’s three part article, no author he quotes defines “succession” as he does. He asks: “Can there in fact be a succession of true churches without true baptism and true ministers to

administer it? Can baptism be administered apart from a New Testament Church?" In all the authors Cockrell quoted, Not one agreed with him on these questions. They used the term succession, but did not believe Cockrell's definition. Cockrell would lead us to believe they did. "Do modern Baptists believe and teach about the church like the Old Baptists did?" "Did the Old Baptists use the term succession or some other term?" What Old Baptists? We cannot tell from his references. Does he mean "the few", "the many", or what he, assumes about Blunt? As far as the evidence he gives, Cockrell cannot prove that all his authors did not agree with Spilsbury, because they did! I will give part of the title page to Spilsbury's book which tells us the points upon which he is writing:

A Treatise Concerning the Lawful Subject
of Baptism

†Wherein are handled these Particulars;

1. The Baptizing of Infants confuted.
2. The covenant God made with Abraham and his seed handled, and how the same agrees with the Gentiles and their seed.
3. The Baptism administered by an Antichristian power confuted, as no ordinance of God.
4. If either Church, or Ordinance be wanting, where they are to be found, and how recovered.
5. The Covenant, and not Baptism, forms the church, and the manner how.
6. There is no SUCCESSION, under the New Testament, but what is Spiritually by Faith in the Word of God.

Will Cockrell agree with the above? Certainly not! Then why is he trying to tell us that the Old Baptists agree with him?!! In heading number 4, Cockrell has already told us that Spilsbury did not agree with Blunt (the supposed position of Blunt); but what about number 5? Number 5 is, directly opposed to Cockrell's doctrine; as of course, is also number 6. The quote Cockrell gives from Spilsbury's book shows what he meant by "succession":

"And for the continuation of the church from Christ's words, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it, etc.' I confess the same with this distinction; which church is to be considered either with respect to her instituted state, as it lies in the scriptures, in the rules of the foundation, or in her constitution, or constituted form in her visible order, Against the first hell gates shall never prevail, the foundation stands sure; but against the last it hath often prevailed, for the church in her outward visible order, hath been often scattered though persecution, and the like in which sense she is said to be prevailed against, as Dan. 7. Rev. 13. Acts 8.1. Otherwise, where was their church, before it came from under the defection.

"Again, that which once was in such a way of being, and ceaseth for a time, and then comes to the same estate again, is, and may truly be said, to have ever a continuance, as Mat. 22.31.32. with Luke 20.38. In which sense the church may truly be said ever to continue, for though she be cast down at one time, yet God will raise her up at another, so that she shall never be so prevailed against, as to be utterly destroyed."

This is the form of Church Succession of Spilsbury's - but is it Cockrell's? Cockrell would have us believe "The raising up", "at another time" was a way of succession as Cockrell defines it - not as Spilsbury; because Cockrell knows no other definition. At the bottom of this very page in Spilsbury's book is the famous quote used by Crosby, Backus, and others besides myself in refuting that particular successionism view espoused by Cockrell, nurtured by High-church Anglicanism, and born in Rome:

"I fear men put more in baptism than is of right due it, that so prefer it above the church, and all other ordinances besides, so that they can assume and erect a church, take in and cast out members, elect and ordain officers, and administer the supper, and all anew, without any looking after succession; any further than the scriptures; but as for Baptism, they must have that successively from the Apostles, though it came from the hands of Pope John. What is the cause of this, that men can do all from the word, but only Baptism?"

Will Cockrell tell Spilsbury "What is the cause of this..."? And will he tell us why he quoted Spilsbury in his support? Yes, Spilsbury believed in succession - but not like Cockrell.

The following is another title page, part of it, to Daniel King's book quoted by Cockrell, also giving the points upon which he is writing - and we will not need anyone to interpret it for us, or give any outlines of his book. I have quoted some sections of it already, to which the reader may refer. King interprets himself:

(A way to Zion sought out and found for believers to walk in; or, a Treatise, consisting of three parts.) In the first part it is proved:

1. That God hath had a people on earth, ever since the coming of Christ in the flesh, throughout the darkest days of Popery, which he hath owned as Saints, and his people.
2. That the Saints have power to re-assume, and to take up as their right, any ordinance of Christ, which they may have been deprived of by the violence and tyranny of the Man of Sin."

Does Cockrell agree with the above? He certainly does not, but he would have his reader, think that King taught successionism like he does! Does he not know that John Spilsbury along with Kiffen, Patience, and Pearson wrote the preface to King's book in which they call Cockrell's brand of successionism "another desperate extreme"? (see earlier in the article). We ask for a quotation from any of these Old Baptists that defined Succession as Cockrell does. No inferences, no reading one's own ideas into their views - just the quote please. And if either Cockrell or Wilson cannot understand the Old Baptist's views on Succession without assuming they taught their own views every time "succession" is mentioned by the Old Baptists - that would be their own problem, not the Old Baptists, nor ours.

I take this stand, with the Old Baptists: Any company of saints can assemble together under the authority of God's word - by which they were born and made obedient, (by the same word and Spirit) and can covenant together, to follow God's word, elect officers, and practice ordinances;

and such is just as much a church of Christ as any other church of Christ - even without the knowledge of the existence in all the whole world, of any other church of Christ.

This is true succession - from the word and Spirit; or, "constant reproduction - from the scriptures" (Lofton); and which has been done countless times in the past; in the times of persecution; when the saints were scattered; or when the saints were brought out of Rome; or her affiliates. It is not done today in America; where there is no need for it, where the ordinances are "afoot", as King says, we take advantage "of those who are under ordinances", but we would not put the cart before the horse: "The ordinances were made for the church, not the church for the ordinances" (King); and, "The covenant, not Baptism, makes the Church" (Spilsbury); nor, would we "put more in baptism than is of right due unto it" (Spilsbury again). And, should any company of Saints, anywhere in the world, find that they are not obeying Christ, as taught in His word - they need no "reorganization", they are already "organized", which only means "covenanted together among themselves" - they only need to start obeying the Lord; no outside help needed. The Landmark's plea is "the authority is in the Church". The Old Baptist's plea was "The authority is in the word of God", which gave them authority to "take up, or re-assume as their right, any ordinance of Christ" (King and Spilsbury). For Cockrell to make his point he must prove: 1. That the Old Baptists believed only in the local church; 2. That they believed only the local church was given the commission; 3. That they believed "authority" resides only in the local church and can be delegated only from that church; and 4. That all the Baptists in all ages have believed and practiced such - which he has not done, nor can he do. He can "read" his ideas into their writings to convince himself - but he cannot convince us. He can brand us "liberals" (we have been called worse), or any other, such description - but he cannot make his point. The very idea! To quote author after author who used the term "succession", then to put one's own meaning on the word to 'prove' the authors held the same! "All these authors used the term succession - hence, all these authors were landmarkers." "This is reasoning backwards with a preconceived idea to prove a point" (to use Huffman's argument against himself) but is it reasoning at all?!

As touching the other authors to whom Cockrell refers in his article, we will not comment. Let us let Cockrell do it for us:

"NON-Landmarkers believe in two kinds of Churches" (Landmarkism Vindicated, Oct. 1986).

"Let us continue to reject the teaching of a universal, invisible Church, as taught by Protestants, liberal Baptists, and a few apostate landmarkers." (Ibid).

All the authors Cockrell quotes believed in two kinds of Churches (Cockrell's definition), either the Invisible and the local; or the Universal visible and the local - see the listing later. They were truly non-landmarkers, but why does Cockrell use them to bolster his position? Will he not take his own advice? How can you 'reject' and 'receive' at the same time?

"I can identify with these people (Blount and company) but I have a hard time identifying with Spilsbury or Jessey on Church truth" (In Search of an Old Landmark, Nov. 1985).

"so far as I know, none in our ranks would agree with Elder Gill, he totally denied church authority in Baptism." (Ibid)

"His (Spurgeon) views on this (administrator of Baptism, D.G.) Church communion, and other things caused the strict and particular Baptists of his day to brand him a "Liberal".

Indeed, Cockrell also ridicules this great man in the sentence just preceding this one: "Being only a lay preacher himself it is no wonder that he would ridicule the idea of the essentiality of an ordained Baptist preacher baptizing a convert." (Ibid) Then he ends his article as follows: "I take my stand with those who stood by the Old Landmark in those days." (Ibid)

What is the sum of this? Cockrell quotes author after author to prove successionism, after, of course, he has read his own definition of successionism into their views; but whom he told us himself, were "non-landmarkers" and should be "rejected"; and those he claimed were "liberals", and that he could not "Identify with", he now claims were True Baptists and Landmarkers! It seems "he is as turned around as a termite in a yo-yo".

We will not comment on the author's continual plagiarism which is so common to this writings; nor would we comment on his self-congratulations of his "defence" of successionism "to be preserved for future generations" - we would not begrudge him of one whit of glory he might derive either from himself or his fellows but, only to point out the ludicrous, historical methods that are used.

"I am fully satisfied," says bishop Hoadly, "that till a consummate stupidity can be happily established, and universally spread over the land, there is nothing that tends to destroy all due respect to the clergy as the demand of more than can be due to them; and nothing has so effectually thrown contempt upon a regular succession of the ministry as the calling no succession regular but what was uninterrupted; and the making the eternal salvation of christians to depend upon that uninterrupted succession, of which the most learned must have the least assurance, and the unlearned can have no notion but through ignorance and credulity."

If we would read "Baptists", instead of "clergy" and "ministry", in both lines five and eight, and "The brideship of Christ, the very choice of God's elect", instead of "The eternal salvation of christians", in lines nine and ten, we would have a very apt and timely description of Landmarkism. We believe that Cockrell, rather than crowing, is croaking (as in death to his theory).

'A Protestant Gloss adopted by Graves

"The subject of Baptism does not then profess any private faith he may entertain, but always the faith of the denomination baptizing him." (Graves) Were did Graves get such an idea, and is it scriptural? This is another Landmark doctrine built upon the sand. He got the idea from Catholics and Protestants and, fully adopted it!

"Now that Christian baptism has been and still is regarded as the act, on the part of the subject, of professing the faith of the church baptizing, whether true or false, is proven by the fact that from the third century onward the "catechumeni" - those under course of instruction for baptism - were required to repeat the creed of the church, and then the question was invariably asked: "Wilt thou be baptized into this faith?" i.e., do you desire to profess that you receive to hold and rest our salvation upon it? Only upon the candidate answering, "I will," was baptism administered.

Even when those post apostolic churches that perverted the rite of baptism to a "sacrament" and "seal" of salvation, and administered it to unconscious infants to secure their salvation, sponsors and godfathers and mothers were invented to answer for the speechless babe.

The Episcopalians retain this custom, and of every infant sprinkled by them this question is asked:

"Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles Creed?" The sponsor answers (for the infant) "That is my desire."

The subject of baptism does not then profess any private faith he may entertain, but always the faith of the denomination baptizing him.” (Christian Baptism, p. 9, Graves)

To show this doctrine was not a “Landmark restored” is only to quote some practices of the Old Baptists:

“To the church of Christ of which our brethren John Spilsberie and William Kiffen are members, and to the rest of the churches in and neere London, agreeing with the said church in principles and constitutions and accordingly holding communion with the same, the churches of Abington, Reading, Henlie, Kensworth and Eversholt send greeting...”

And in the Seventh General meeting this is stated:

“At a meeting of messengers at Tetsworth beginning December 2, 1653 these foure proposalls ensuing, which had been sent to the churches from the last meeting were confirmed in maner following:

Proposalls agreed unto by the Churches of Reading, Henlie, Abington, Kensworth and Eversholt, to be confirmed by their messengers at their meeting at Tetsworth the 27th day of the 10th month 1653.

1. That such baptized persons as hold the truth in the maine and have the power of godlyness appearing in them, who stand not related to any church of Christ, are to be instructed and encouraged to joyne themselves to some true church of Christ. And that (this) duty be performed by the church next adjacent to the said (persons) as also by the church (whose) members baptized them and by other churches as they (shall see) need and opportunitie upon knowledge of their condition to (be as) aforesaid. And also, to prevent such neglect for the future, that when an administratour is sent forth by any church to preach and baptize the said church doe take care that he be minded to exhort all such persons as he shall baptize to joyne themselves without delay to some true church of Christ and that everie such administratour be in like manner exhorted that soon after he shall baptize any person, he give notice thereof to some adjacent church.

2. That such baptized persons as stand not related to any church of Christ, who have fallen from part of the truth or are somewhat scandalous in their lives, or both, of whose recoverie there is ground of hope, be looked after and diligent endeavour used (according to the Scriptures) for their restoring. And this to be done by the church whose members baptized them if with conveniencie it may be or by the church next adjacent.

3. That such baptized persons whose totall apostasie and manifest impenitencie doth shew them to be unfit for communion are, by the church next adjacent, having sufficient knowledge of the manifestness of the said impenitencie and apostasie, to be declared against accordingly for prevention of scandall and that the members of the churches are to be admonished to take heed of them. And the like duty to be done by the church whose members baptized them, if need require, and it may stand with their convenience.” (Associational Records of the Particular Baptists in England, Wales, and Ireland to 1660)

Some observations:

1. They were in agreement with Spilsbury and Kiffen and therefore with the 1st London Confession.

2. Article 41 of the confession was practiced by them.
3. They did not believe baptism was the door to the church.
4. They were not baptized into the faith of the denomination but the faith of Christ.
5. Landmarkers want these and quote these Baptists as their successors.
6. These were heretics according to Landmark doctrine.
7. Benjamin Coxé was among these who wrote an appendix to the confession of the London Brethren which states:

“A disciple gifted and enabled by the Spirit of Christ to preach the Gospel, and stirred up to this service by the same Spirit, bringing home to his soul the command of Christ in His word for the doing of this work, is a man authorized and sent by Christ to preach the Gospel, see Luke 19:12 etc. Mark 16:15, and Matt. 28:19 compared with Acts 8:4, Phil. 1:14,15; John 7 (?). And those gifted disciples which thus preach Jesus Christ who came in the flesh, are to be looked upon as men sent and given of the Lord. 1 John 4:2; Rom. 10:15; Eph. 4:11,12,13. And they which are converted from unbelief and false worship, and so brought into church fellowship by such preachers according to the will of Christ, are a seal of their ministry, I Cor. 9:2. and such preachers of the Gospel may not only lawfully administer baptism unto believers, and guide the action of the church in the use of the Supper, (Matt. 28:19; Acts 8:5-12; I Cor. 10:16) but (in fulfillment of the office of eldership) may also call upon the churches, and advise them to choose (other) fit men for officers, and may settle such officers so chosen by a church, in the places or offices (of elder or deacon) to which they are chosen by imposition of hands and prayer. Acts 6:3-6; 14:23; Titus 1:5.”

Minutes of the Phil. Assoc., P. 89:

“A question was moved by the church of the Great Valley to this effect: Whether it be the prerogative of a church to receive applications for baptism, examine the candidates, and to judge of their qualifications for Baptism? or whether these be the distinct and peculiar prerogatives of the ministers, exclusive of the laity?

The occasion of this question was the opinion and practice of the church of Philadelphia, who by a general vote have allowed the said prerogatives to belong to the minister, by the tenor of the commission relative to baptism, and the universal practice of the commissioners; and that there is neither precept nor precedent for the contrary in scripture. All allowed that this may be, and in some cases must be; but that the other practice was more expedient. However, none pretended to say it was warranted by scripture.”

John Leland is a prime example of how many early Baptist ministers practiced baptism; few ministries have been blessed of the Lord more - it rebukes the whole “Landmark System”:

“Since I began to preach in 1774, I have travelled distances, which, together, would form a girdle nearly sufficient to go round the terraqueous globe three times. The number of sermons which I have preached, is not far from eight thousand. The number of persons that I have baptised is one thousand two hundred and seventy-eight. The number of Baptist ministers whom I have personally known is nine hundred and sixty-two. Those of them whom I have heard preach, in number, make three hundred and three. Those who have died, (whose deaths I have heard of)

amount to three hundred. The number that have visited me at my house is two hundred and seven. The pamphlets which I have written, that have been published, are about thirty. I am now in the decline of life, having lived nearly two-thirds of a century. When Jacob had lived twice as long, his days had been few and evil. I have spent my years like a tale that is told. Looking over the foregoing narrative, there is proof enough of imperfection; and yet what I have written is the best part of my life. A history seven times as large might be written of my error in judgement, incorrectness of behaviour, and baseness of heart. My only hope of acceptance with God, is in the blood and righteousness of Jesus Christ. And when I come to Christ for pardon, I come as an old grey-headed sinner; in the language of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner." (Writings, p. 35)

"He considered baptism a duty plainly enjoined on all the followers of Christ, by an express command; but connection with a church to be a matter of choice and expediency. Accordingly he always baptized such as gave evidence of piety, if they desired it, and left them to connect themselves with whatever church they pleased, or with none, if such was their preference." (Writings of Leland, p. 70-71).

The same was practiced by another famous Baptist Pioneer, J.M. Peck, 1789-1857. Following are his comments about a convicted murderer:

Thursday, 5th. Spent most of the day with Green. Found that the close talk that I had with him yesterday produced much effect upon his mind. He had spent the whole night in prayer and self-examination. He was now composed, firm in his hope, deeply penitent and the fear of death was removed. The Wood river church, with their pastor, the venerable Father Jones, attended for the purpose of public worship with the culprit in the prison; and Mr. Peck preached from Luke xxiii. 39-43 – the case of the penitent thief. Green then related his experience, which deeply affected every one in the house. His replies to very close, heart-searching questions put to him were pertinent and satisfactory, and he was received as a candidate for baptism. He was then conducted to the water, about two hundred yards the prison, having a small chain attached to his leg, and a rope around his body and arms which the sheriff held. The day was cold, and a hole was cut in the ice for the administration of the ordinance. His baptism excited much solemnity and deep feeling amongst the people. to baptize a murderer, under sentence of death, and who must inevitably be executed in one week, was a novel thing, and what I should least thought of doing once; but in this case I became satisfied that it was my duty, and would not shrink from it. (Memoir of J.M. Peck, p. 189).

Following are Peck's views of the call to the ministry:

If he has the gift and grace of a true minister of Christ, he will make that the paramount business of life. To use a Western figure, attributed to the eccentric Crockett, "He will stand up to the rack, fodder or no fodder." If he has the gift and enterprise that is characteristic of Christ's ministers, he will not wait till a church call him, but go into some destitute field, sustain himself and family by his own industry, and proceed to call a church, as many of our old pioneer preachers have done. (Ibid, p. 29).

Graves also used the "example" in Acts 19 for the doctrine

of rebaptizing:

“This example is positive instruction to the churches in all subsequent ages to re-administer the act, where there has been an irregularity, which is nothing less than a violation of the law governing the ordinance. The church at Corinth conscientiously believed they were correctly administering the Lord’s Supper, while they were shamefully perverting it, and making themselves “guilty of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus.” – I Cor. xi. 27. (Christian Baptism, p. 8).

But, Armitage says:

“It seems impossible to determine whether these “twelve” were rebaptized or not. Calvin best expresses the writer’s idea, but such high Baptist authority as Dr. Hacket and Hovey take the opposite view.” (Armitage, Hist., p. 54).

Graves settles it, although the best Greek Scholarship in the world cannot settle it! Calvin, Beza, Turrntine, Armitage, Cathcart, and Gill are some examples who do not think they were rebaptized. Luke calls them “Disciples”, Paul recognized they were “Believers”. Paul knew they could not believe without the Holy Spirit - he probably knew as much theology as the Landmarks! What was lacking in them was supplied by the laying on of Paul’s hands in verse 6. They had not heard of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The phrase in the King James in verse 5: “And having heard this,” is simply “having heard” in the Greek, a nom. 1. masc. aor. part. modifying “People” in the preceding verse, as also the following aorist verb “They were baptized”; both verses 4 and 5 contain indirect discourse with and and cannot be separated according to the grammar, (see Gill’s comm.). A scriptural example to back this interpretation is found in Acts 8:5-17: Phillip baptized believers in Samaria, the Apostles heard about this in Jerusalem - the Apostles sent Peter and John - “Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus) then laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit” (Acts 8:15-17). (This is only some of the argument on the other side.) So, Graves’ “example” may not even be an example - even his chief writer (Dayton) has doubts on it: “The eleventh example was the re-baptism, if indeed they were re-baptized, of the twelve disciples, (Acts 19)”. (Alien Baptism, p. 223): and Graves’ “proofs” are only his usual dogmatism and arbitrary interpretation - Landmarkers are welcome to it.

Questions for the Landmarks:

1. What about this adoption of Protestantism of Graves - are you baptized into the faith of the administrator? Why is the baptism by proxy by the one any different from the other? If Landmarkers can baptize one into the faith of the administrator, what quarrel can they have with infant baptism? And moreover, since the candidate for baptism is not professing his own personal faith but the faith of the one baptizing him, he must needs be a theological genius to determine if the administrator’s faith is correct biblical faith, along with the certain knowledge of the Landmark church truth: Authority, succession, correct ordination, doctrines of grace - he must know all these things and insist upon the verification of such in his administrator, or he, cannot allow baptism to be, conferred upon himself!!

2. Since the church is the Pillar and ground of the truth according to Landmarkism - why has not the church settled the interpretation in Acts 19? It would rather seem that J.R. Graves is the Pillar and ground of the truth to Landmarkers.

Arminian Baptist Baptism

Some years ago there was a controversy among the Landmarks of whether Arminian Baptist Baptisms were valid. Many of the Landmark Sovereign Gracers came from Arminian Landmark Baptists - they have never been re-baptized. Why? Do they consider the Arminians true churches? Would they ordain those Arminian Ministers? Can they have a true succession of Baptism without the true gospel? Since Baptism makes the church according to Landmark Dogma, and since there can be no true ministers apart from Baptism, nor any true preaching, there can still be a true succession of churches without the true Gospel!! Who will explain this contradiction?

This same controversy was aired in the Presbyterian General Assembly (old school) meeting at Cincinnati May, 1845 in which Hodge with Princeton in opposition to the Assembly with Thornwell:

“Asserted that the essential elements of baptism are found in the Romish ceremony, and the essential elements of a church in the Papal communion; and what is still more remarkable, he (Hodge) insists that, even upon the supposition that the Romish sect is not a church of the Lord Jesus Christ, it by no means follows that its baptism is not valid.” (Thornwell, Works, Vol. 3, p. 284).

Applying this to our Landmark baptists, their arguments would be with Hodge; but Thornwell states:

“Now, I propose to show that their distinguished Author (Hodge) has failed to prove any one of these positions, – either that the essential elements of Baptism belong to the Popish ordinance, or that without being a church Rome can have the sacraments of Christ, or that the testimony of Protestant Christendom is more clearly in his favor than it is against him.” (Ibid).

Now, we can take the same arguments and disprove Landmarkism, by the Landmarker’s own judgements: 1. The essential elements of baptism belong to the Arminian Baptist Ordinance. “Not if the one being baptized is professing the faith of the administrator”. 2. That without being a church Arminian Baptists can have the ordinances of Christ. “Absolutely not, the Church only has authority to baptize.” 3. That the testimony of Baptist history is more clearly in the Landmark’s favor than it is against him. “No known history is in favour of Landmarkism but it is assumed that is what scriptures teach so Baptists must have always believed it.”

Thornwell’s following statement is in exact agreement with our Baptist forefathers:

“The unbroken transmission of a visible church in any line of succession is a figment of Papists and Prelatists. Conformity with the scriptures, and not ecclesiastical genealogy, is the true touchstone of sound church-state; and if our fathers were without the ordinances, and fed upon ashes for bread, let us only be the more thankful for the greater privileges vouchsafed to ourselves.” (Ibid, p. 295).

'The Kingdom of God

Not only did Graves bring the local church only theory to Baptists but he bought the Kingdom of Christ only to Baptist Churches. These are not Landmarks reset but innovations. Both the first and second London Confessions taught that the Kingdom and the universal church was the same thing:

“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 faith of the gospel, being baptized into the 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.” (1st London Confession, Art. xxxiii).

“The purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan; nevertheless Christ always hath had, and ever shall have a Kingdom in this world to the end thereof, of such as believe in him, and make profession of his name.” (2nd London Confession, Art. 26, par. 3).

And we are quite sure the Landmark would never agree with this from the 2nd Confession:

“Neither prayer or any other part of religious worship is now, under the gospel, tied unto, or made more acceptable by, any place in which it is (Jno. 4:21; Mal. 1:11; 1 Tim. 2:8) performed, or towards which it is directed; but God is to be worshipped everywhere in Spirit and in truth; as in (Acts x:2) private families (Mt. 6:11; Ps. 55:17) daily, and (Matt. 6:6) in secret each one by himself, so more solemnly in the public assemblies, which are not carelessly, nor willfully, to be (Heb. 10:25; Acts 2:42) neglected or forsaken, when God by His word or providence calleth thereunto.” (2nd London Confession, Art. xxii, par. 6).

Nor again the writings of Booth:

“This mistake of the Jews, respecting the Kingdom of the Messiah, lying at the foundation of all the opposition with which they treated him, and of their own ruin, it behooves us to guard with diligence against everything which tends to secularized the dominion of Christ: lest by corrupting the gospel economy, we dishonor the Lord Redeemer, and be finally punished as the enemies of his government. Our danger of contracting guilt, and of incurring divine resentment in this way, is for from being small. For we are so conversant with sensible objects, and so delighted with exterior show, that we are naturally inclined to wish for something in religion to gratify our carnality. Under the influence of that master prejudice, THE EXPECTATION OF A TEMPORAL KINGDOM, Jewish depravity rejected Christ; and our corruption, if we be not watchful, may so misrepresent his empire, and oppose his royal prerogatives, as implicitly to say, we will not have him to reign over us.” (Booth, Works, p. 240-241).

“Under the gospel dispensation, however, these peculiarities have no existence. For Christ has not made an external covenant with any people. He is not the King of any particular nation. He dwells not in a palace made with hands. His throne is in the heavenly sanctuary; not does He afford His visible presence in any place upon earth. The partition wall between Jews and

Gentiles has long been demolished; and, consequently, our divine Sovereign does not stand related to any people, or to any person, so as to confer a relative sanctity, or to produce an external holiness.” (Ibid, p. 258).

Gill says this:

“Any action whatever, performed in a religious way, and in order for a man’s acceptance with God, and to obtain his favour, and according to his observance of which he judges of his state, and speaks peace and comfort to himself, or the reverse, is a yoke of bondage.” (Comm., Gal. 5:1).

How foreign is all this to Landmark dogma. The Landmarker assumes another covenant has been made with them other than the New Covenant. A covenant in which only they can direct true worship to God; and from only the Lord receives His worship; that their church was baptized in the Spirit at pentecost; that one can only worship in Spirit and in truth in and through their kind of Church; i.e., baptized by them and authorized by them. Yea, one cannot worship in Spirit and in truth only, but one must have the Landmark externals in order to do so.

Notice how Graves gives the paragraph from the 1st London Confession:

“Jesus Christ hath here on earth a spiritual Kingdom which is his church (i.e., composed of his churches)...” (Intercommunion, p. 107).

Graves neglects to tell us this is his parenthesis, then tells us:

“This, with but slight verbal alternation, purely, explanatory, is just as I would define it today.” (Ibid).

Then he states the Baptists of 1689 changed and adopted Protestant views on the church; and that the Philadelphia Association followed “without examination”, and “many of our earlier associations followed” - all which is inexcusable ignorance on his part. Note the following: 1. The 1689 confessions claimed in the 1st paragraph of their preface of their “firm adhering to those wholesome principles” (of the 1st London confessions, D.G.); 2. Kiffen and Knollys signed both the 1st confession and the 2nd; 3. Paragraphs 9 and 10 of chapter viii of the 2nd confession are lifted verbatim from articles 13 and 14 of the 1st confession and which are very significant to the point under this heading:

XIII “This office of mediator, that is, to be prophet, priest and King of the church of God, is so proper to Christ, that neither in whole, or any part thereof, it cannot be transferred from Him to any other.” I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 7:24; Dan. 7:14; Acts 4:12; Luke 1:33; John 14:6.

XIV “This office to which Christ is called, is threefold; a prophet, priest, and King: This number and order of offices is necessary, for in respect of our ignorance, we stand in need of His prophetic office; in respect of our great alienation from God, we need His priestly office to reconcile us; and in respect of our averseness and utter inability to return to God, we need His Kingly office, to convince, subdue, draw, uphold and preserve us to his heavenly Kingdom.” Deut. 18:15; Acts 3:22,23; Heb. 3:1, 4:14,15; Ps. 2:6; II Cor. 5:20; Acts 26:18; Col. 1:21; John 16:8; Ps. 110:3; Song of Sol. 1:3; John 6:44; Phil. 4:13; II Tim. 4:18.

Besides, Graves claimed to give us “The oldest confession put forth by English Baptists (A.D. 1643)...” which he did not. He gave the 2nd, edition of the first London Confession, 1646. The first edition gives the words:

“That Christ hath here on earth a spiritual Kingdome, which is the church, which he hath purchased and redeemed to himselfe, as a peculiar inheritance: which church, as it is visible to us, is a company of visible saints...” (McGlothlin, Confessions).

We can see why Graves quoted from the 2nd edition, the confessors deleted one of their phrases, and changed some wording - and it was easier for Graves to read his theory into it - but the confessors themselves had not changed their views on the church as the surrounding articles clearly show. The Offices of Prophet, Priest, and King are under the general heading of Christ the Mediator (the same way the 2nd London confessors placed it.) All the elect over whom, and in behalf of, Christ is Prophet and Priest - He is also King. They did not distinguish as the Landmarkers. The last phrase in the article (XXIII), quoted by Graves, is “By Christ their head and King”, which phrase also occurs in article XXIX:

“All believers are a holy and sanctified people, and that sanctification is a spiritual grace of the new covenant, and an effect of the Love of God manifested in the soul, whereby the believer presses after a heavenly and evangelical obedience to all the commands, which Christ as head and King in His new covenant hath prescribed to them.” 1 Cor. 12: 1 Pet. 2:9; Eph. 1:4; 1 John 4:16; Matt. 28:20.

The like phrase “Prophet, Priest, and King of the church” is also in articles X and XIII in the same 2nd edition from which Graves quoted showing also their views on the universal and local church.

Having already quoted Abraham Booth who was contemporary with the Philadelphia Association in the 1700’s; how that he agreed with the Baptists of the 1600’s; we will quote the famous Gill on the subject showing the same close agreement:

“Secondly, who are his subjects? A King is a relative term, and connotes subjects: a King without subjects is not King. The natural and essential Kingdom of Christ, as God reaches to all creatures; as has been observed; His Kingdom ruleth over all, Ps. ciii, 19. but his Kingdom, as Mediator, is special and limited, and is over a certain number of men, who go under the names of Israel, the house of Jacob, the holy hill of Zion, and are called saints; hence Christ is said to be, King of Israel; to reign over the, house of Jacob; to be set King upon the, holy hill of Zion; and to be, King of saints, John 1:49; Luke 1:33; Ps. 2:6; Rev. 15:3, and by Israel, and the house of Jacob, are not meant the people of the Jews, as a body politic, of whom Christ was never King in such a sense; nor carnal Israel or Israel according to the flesh, especially the unbelieving part of them, who would not have him to reign over them, in a spiritual sense; nor only the part of them called the election of grace among them; the lost sheep of the house of Israel Christ came to seek and save, and so to rule over, protect, and keep; but the whole spiritual Israel of God, consisting both of Jews and Gentiles; even that Israel God has chose for his special and peculiar people among all nations, whom Christ has redeemed by his blood, out of every kindred, tongue, and people; and whom, by his spirit, he effectually calls, through grace; and who are saved in him,

with an everlasting salvation: and these are meant by the holy hill of Zion, over which he is set, appointed, and anointed King; even over all those whom God has loved with an everlasting love, and chosen in Christ his son, and who are sanctified and made holy by his Spirit and grace; and are brought to make an open profession of his name, and become members of his visible church, and are immovable in grace and holiness; for all which they are compared to Mt. Zion, the object of God's love and choice, a hill visible, holy, and immovable: and to these Christ stands in the relation, and bears the office of a King; and they are his voluntary subjects; and who say of him and to him, Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints! Rev. xv. 3. The church of God is Christ's Kingdom, and the members of it his subjects." (Body of Divinity, Gill, p. 443).

From the above we can assume Graves would also charge Booth and Gill, as he did the Philadelphia Association, of following the Baptists of the 1600's "without examination" because they taught the same doctrine. If Graves had had 40% of the learning of Gill or even of Booth, he would not have made 80% of his historical blunders and errors.

Note also: The gospel is never said to be the church's. Nowhere do we read of the gospel of the church, but the "Gospel of the Kingdom" - genitive of possession. Not as Scofield and followers: "The good news about the setting up of the Kingdom", which according to Scofield, is merely unfulfilled prophesy; but, "The, Word of the Kingdom" (Mt. 13:19): "Word", Mk. 4:14; "Word of God", (Luke 8:11), which is the exact same gospel of the Kingdom of Luke 8:1; "And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God...", and which gospel is "understood by the heart," "Converts," people "believe", "are saved," and "bring forth much fruit", and as all Bible students know - the, only gospel in scriptures. But it is the Gospel of the Kingdom not the gospel of the Church. Neither are the ordinances, Church ordinances, but, Gospel ordinances. The one is performed before church membership, the other after. (More on this later.)

Communion

Another "Landmark" falsely restored by Graves and followers is closed communion. Remember he is the one who stated: "Publicly advocated the policy of strictly and consistently carrying out in our practice those principles which, all true Baptists, in all ages, have professed to believe." (Old Landmarkism, p. 15-16). (Emphasis mine, D.G.)

For clarity, definitions follow:

1. Closed communion - local church membership only.
2. Close communion - Immersed believers only.
3. Open communion - all professed Christians.

The Baptists of the 1st London confession were both open and strict communion Baptists according to their writings as seen by comparing the Associational records of the churches in England, Ireland, and Wales to 1660, with Bunyan, Jessey, and Spilsbury and what can be gathered by Kiffen's split from Spilsbury. The "close" Baptists were known as "strict" Baptists. Likewise, in the Appendix of the 1689 2nd London Confession, this is stated:

"We are not insensible, that as to the order of God's house, and entire communion therein, there are some things wherein we (as well as others) are not at a full accord among ourselves; as for instance, the known principle and state of the consciences of divers of us, that have agreed in this confession is such, that we cannot hold church communion with any other than baptized

believers, and churches constituted of such; yet some others of us have a greater liberty and freedom in our Spirits that way; and therefore we have purposely omitted the things of that nature, that we might concur in giving this evidence of our agreement, both among ourselves, and with other good Christians...”

Notice “closed” communion is not mentioned at all, but “close” and “open”, and since Landmarkers have such a hard time understanding the plainest expressions, I will quote Cathcart showing what he understood about the above:

“This refers to the admission of unbaptized persons to the Lord’s table by some churches, and their rejection by others.” (Baptist Encyclopedia, Art. “Confession”).

Then Cathcart shows the safeguard the Philadelphia Association placed on the Supper in an additional article, “on the Laying of of hands,” again, “close” communion, not “closed” as Landmarkers teach. And, accordingly, in the Discipline prepared for the Association by Benjamin Griffith, 1742, p. 107, this is stated:

“By virtue also of such communion, the members of one such church may, where they are known, occasionally partake at the Lord’s table with a sister church...”

B.H. Carroll relates this in discussion with J.R. Graves:

“Dr. J.R. Graves took the position that only the members of a local church, celebrating the supper, should participate in its observance. He once asked me what I thought of his position,. I told him as a matter of right, only the Church could administer the Supper, and only the members of that church could claim as a right to participate, but inasmuch as visiting brethren and sisters are of like faith and order, that on invitation they might participate. Then we had it on this case at Troas, and on the uniform Baptist custom. Notice. That whenever they go to observe the Lord’s Supper the preacher says, “Any brethren or sister of sister churches of like faith and order, knowing themselves to be in good order (not disorder), are invited to participate with us.” That is what is called inter-church communion, but not a very good name for it. I always invite the visiting brethren and sisters, but I specify very particularly who is invited.” (Comm., Acts, p. 363-364).

Here were two Landmarkers discussing “close” and “closed” communion; Carroll, according to his practice, believed the uniform Baptist practice was on his side - as we noticed above. But, Graves’ statement was “all true Baptists in all ages have professed to believe”, i.e., his Landmarks which shows another perversion of the facts. Graves squarely admits in the first pages of his communion book “Denominational Communion as at Present Practiced Among Baptists”; “an old and papular usage”; “intercommunion, now so generally practiced among Baptists”. Graves was a “reformer” just as surely as was Alexander Campbell. Should any think my language too strong, I will quote from Graves himself in his “Closing words to my brethren”:

“Some of you have, and ere long many will cordially embrace the views herein set forth before possibly your pastor, or a majority of the church of which you are members; and, in your zeal, you may be tempted to FORCE your church to change its long standing practice. I wish to

caution you against rashness, and to advise patience and forbearance. All permanent reformations move SLOWLY BUT SURELY..." (Ibid, p. 353).

In "Open Communion and the Baptists of Norwich", Gould, 1860, the history of these two opinions is set forth - documented evidence of the "open" and "close" position of the particular Baptists. The "closed" position does not even appear. Gould quoting Kinghorn shows the problem:

"As a controversy has arisen on this subject, between the paedobaptists and Baptists, and particularly among the Baptists themselves, it may be expedient to state, a little in detail, the sentiments of each party respecting Baptism, and the requisite qualifications for Church Membership. The paedobaptists believe that Baptism consists in the application of water with the prescribed form in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, either by immersion, or by pouring, or the "sprinkling" that it ought to be administered to infants; that those who have been baptized are fit subjects for Christian Communion, if they profess to trust in Christ for salvation, and live according to the rule of the gospel; and in general they believe, that none ought to come to the Lord's Supper who are not baptized. The Baptists act on a different plan: they think that Baptism ought to be administered to those only, who profess repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and that it should be administered to them, on such profession, by immersion: and then, and not before they consider such persons properly qualified according to the New Testament for the reception of the Lord's Supper. Hence arises a controversy between these two parties; not only respecting Baptism, but also respecting their conduct to each other on the subject of Communion. The greater part of Paedobaptist Dissenters have no objection to admit Baptists to Communion with them in their Churches, since they do not deny that the Baptists are baptized; and if they approve their character and conduct in general, they feel no difficulty in the case. Many Baptists, on the other hand, do not think it right to admit the Paedobaptists to Communion in their estimation they are not baptized; and they think that it is not according to the law of Christ, that persons unbaptized should come to the Lord's table: these are called Strict Baptists. Others are not only willing to admit Paedobaptists, but are desirous that Baptists Churches should generally admit them: these are the friends of what is called Open, or Mixed Communion. They plead for this practice by various arguments: they allege that they have seen reason to form a high opinion of many of their Paedobaptist brethren; and that communion on earth cannot be wrong, when held with those with whom we hope to enjoy communion in heaven. Besides, as their Paedobaptist brethren think themselves baptized, they are willing to admit them on that ground, since they do not object to Baptism itself, but only differ from others in the circumstantial of the ordinance. And some lay down a still wider principle, that Baptism has no connection with Church Communion, and that in forming a Christian Church, the question ought not to be, are these persons who wish to unite in Church fellowship baptized, whatever that term is considered as meaning; but, are they, as far as we can judge real Christians? This last theory has received a powerful supporter in Mr. Hall."

Then gives his own opinion:

"The defence which was set up, and the judgement which was pronounced, rested upon documented evidence of the practice of open membership in particular Baptist Churches, the writers to whom appeal has been made advocated the fellowship of all persons professing the

faith of the gospel; and whilst zealous to maintain the ordinance of baptism as instituted by our lord, refused to make it a term of communion, I was not aware, when the question was discussed at St. Mary's, that strict communion was the innovation upon the original practice of Baptist Churches in this country: and did not imagine that the question admitting believers in Christ to His table, in distinction from admitting them into the Membership of a church, is of still more recent origin. But I am now convinced of the truth of these propositions..." (Intro. cxlii).

Then gives:

"The Master of the Rolls in this suit about which Gould is writing;"

"The inference is irresistible, that, as the principle of Free or Mixed communion was not a fundamental point of faith, the practice must be subject to the regulation of each church or congregation; and accordingly, this is distinctly laid down in the 2nd article of the narrative" (of the proceedings connected with the assembly in 1689, and the confession of faith then agreed to be published): II. "That in those things wherein one church differs from another church in their principles or practices, in point of communion, that we cannot, shall not impose upon any particular church therein, but leave every church to their own liberty to walk together as they have received from the Lord."

"This is, in my opinion, conclusive on this point. It follows then from what I have stated, that, in my opinion, it is established, that each congregation was, from the earliest time, at liberty to regulate its practice, either to the strict communion, or to the free - or mixed communion, as it might seem best to such congregation." (Ibid, p. 319).

Thus we see the evolution of the doctrine of closed communion: first open, then close (strict), then closed, an innovation on an innovation! Carroll and Graves did not discuss "open", that was a "closed" subject with them. The doctrine of local church only, necessarily carries with it change in the doctrine of communion also. Communion is no longer a gospel ordinance but a church ordinance. Open communion Baptists would not be considered Baptists at all by our moderns - but can they prove their baptisms, their authority, did not come from the ones they condemn? No, but they would demand it in you. Not proof. The proof is to the contrary, but mental assent to their innovations.

In the "Narrative of the Proceedings" of the Assembly of Baptists (1689), last paragraph, this is stated:

"The Elders and messengers of the assembly, in consequence of illiberal aspirations cast upon their connections, concluded the narrative of 1689, declaring their abhorrence of the late King's absolute and dispensing power, as well as their united and most hearty determination "to venture their all for the, protestant religion, and the liberties of their native country:" "And we do," say they "with great thankfulness to God. Acknowledge his special goodness to these nations, in raising up our present King William, to be a blessed instrument in his hand, to deliver us from Popery and arbitrary power; and shall always, as in duty bound, pray that the Lord may continue him and his royal consort long to be a blessing to these kingdoms; and shall always be ready to the utmost of our ability, in our places, to join our hearts and hands, with the rest of our protestant brethren, for the preservation of the protestant religion, and the liberties of the nation." (Emphasis, mine; D.G.) (cited from History of the English Baptists, Ivimey, p. 501, Vol. I).

Now, one of the main propositions against which Graves was writing, but which such authors as Gardiner, Arnold, Hovey, Sampson, Colby, Curtis, Osgood, Howell, etc., concurred, was: "That in all the fundamental doctrines of grace and things essential to salvation, Baptists substantially agree with Protestant denominations." (Intercommunion, page 43). Graves was highly amazed at the statement (as are his modern followers) but the statement is true (as a comparison of the 2nd London with the Westminster and Savoy confessions will show). And, such was clearly known and recognized by the compilers of the 2nd London confession (revealed in their "narrative of proceedings, their Preface, and their Appendix); and moreover -, All the Reformers in the great Protestant Reformation in the 1500's believed the absolute predestination of all things and the doctrines of grace - upon these things was the Reformation built. But from the man beginning a new extreme, all is denied! Remarkable!

Jesse B. Thomas

This man was another Landmarker, who like Graves, spoke against the 2nd London Confession. I will agree that the 2nd London Confession is not a Landmark Confession. The world had to wait until the 1900's to get that - but I very much disagree with both Graves and Thomas in their assessment of the famous 2nd London Confession. Thomas, like Graves, ignorantly tries to disparage these great confessors:

□ "In the Confession of 1689 the Westminster definition of the invisible "catholic or universal Church" is bodily appropriated, while the so called visible catholic Church, there mentioned, is ignored, and the identity of either with the kingdom fails also to be asserted. Throughout the rest of the document reference is almost uniformly had to the local body. The single article alluded to must, therefore, be recognized as a fruit of the eager desire expressed, in their prefatory words, by the compilers, to avoid the suspicion of an "itch to clog religion with new words." They have, as they affirm, carried their conciliatory purpose so far as to "make use of the very same words with them both" (Presbyterians and Congregationalists), wherever harmony of general opinion would permit. While their adoption of so much of the Westminster formula is an unquestionable assent to the notion involved, it can not be regarded as so positive and well considered an endorsement as if the language had been wrought out on an independent Scriptural basis by themselves.

It will be noticed, furthermore, that this Confession of Faith was modestly claimed to be approximate only, and that our fathers declared they would "account him their chiefest friend that shall be an instrument to convert us from any error that is in our ways." The Westminster folk, whom they loyally followed in part, have already been convicted of an "error in their ways," as Dr. Candlish confesses, in their overconfident identification of the Church and the Kingdom. Having proven untrustworthy at one point, it cannot be unlawful to suspect possible error and misleading influence at another. A hint of disposition to distrust at this point may possibly appear in the circumstance that the later New Hampshire Confession, probably more widely adopted than any other by the Baptist Churches of America, excludes all reference whatever to a "universal Church", visible or invisible.

After this protracted and unfruitful reconnoitering of the exegetical horizon, we may be forgiven, at least, for the suspicion that infallible guides are not in sight. However uniform the interpreters may be in their agreement that there is a universal Church, they are as persistently uniform in mutual contradiction as to its nature." (The Church and the Kingdom, Jesse B. Thomas).

To show that the confessors, did think for themselves I will place both the 2nd London and the Westminster side by side:

I. "The catholic or universal church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit, and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole (Heb. xii. 23; Col. 1.18; Eph. i,10,22,23; Eph.v.23,27,32) Number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (2nd London Confession).

I. "The Catholick or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" Eph. i,10,22,23; Eph. v. 23,27,32; Col. i. 18." (Westminster Confession).

Note the additional scriptural reference in the Baptist confession - Heb. xii. 23. Thomas states that "the identity of either with the Kingdom fails also to be asserted." They both assert the contrary:

111 "The purest churches under heaven are subject (I Cor. v.; Rev.ii; iii.) to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become (Rev. xviii. 2; 2 Thess.iii.11,12) no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan; nevertheless Christ always hath had, and ever shall have a (Matt.xvi. 18;; Ps. lxxii.17; Ps. cii.28; Rev. sii.17) Kingdom, in this world to the end thereof, of such as believe in him, and make profession of this name." (2nd London Confession).

II. "The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is not ordinary possibility of salvation" I Cor.i.2; I Cor. xii, 12,18; Ps. ii.8; Rev.vii.9; Rom. xv.9,10,11,12; I Cor. vii.14; Acts ii.39; Ezck. xvi.20,21; Rom. xi.16; Gen.iii.15; Gen. xvii.7; Matt.xiii.47; Isa.ix.7; Eph.ii.19; Eph.iii.15; Acts ii.47. (Westminster Confession).

And moreover, the Baptist confessors equate the Kingdom with the church in Matt. 16:18 (note their reference) which the Westminster did not in this instance, see par. 5 of Westminster Confession.

Notice the disparaging remarks of Thomas:

1. That the Baptists "bodily appropriated" the Westminster definition of church - not the scriptural.
2. "eager desire expressed"... "to avoid the suspicion of an itch to clog religion with new words."
3. "Their conciliatory purpose" (which taken as a whole amounts to compromise according to Thomas).
4. "It cannot be regarded as so positive and well considered."

5. "Approximate".
6. "The Westminster folk, whom they loyally followed."
7. "Having proven untrustworthy".
8. "misleading influence".
9. "The suspicion that infallible guides are not in sight."
10. "Uniform in mutual contradiction".

Only a blind Landmarker would write such outright slander. One example: Knollys was driven out of England with his wife and infant, penniless, and en route to America their infant died. Then, being driven out of America for "Heresy" returned to England under the most adverse conditions - he was no stranger to England's persecutions and prisons:

"In the spring of 1684 Knollys, now eighty six years of age, was again thrown in prison - for sixteen dreary months." (Culross).

Yet, we are asked to believe that, after James II issued the Declaration of Indulgence (1687), and Mary, the Protestant daughter of James, and her husband, William of Orange enacted the Toleration Act (1689), that our Baptist forefathers "loyally" and "conciliatorily" followed the "misleading influence" of the Presbyterians! The reason the Westminster Confession was followed is that it was the best ever written and the Baptists of that day were scholars enough to readily recognize it - not as Thomas who would use the New Hampshire which, was a compromise confession:

"It has been sometimes criticised as aiming at the difficult task of preserving the stern orthodoxy of the fathers of the denomination while at the same time it softens the terms in which that orthodoxy is expressed in order to remove the objections of neighboring opponents." (Cutting, Historical Vindication, P. 105).

That Cutting's statement is correct can be seen by reading the Crawford-Alexander Debate - both were A.B.A. Baptists, both followed the New Hampshire confession, both were Landmark - One was a particular (in the main), the other a General Baptist. The same could be said about Bogard, one time he is Calvinistic, another time he is Arminian - you can be both under the New Hampshire Confession. Cathcart says: "We have unlimited faith in the goodness and sanctity of the late Dr. Brown, but we very much prefer the Philadelphia confession of faith, so dear to our fathers, to the New Hampshire Creed" (Baptist Encyclopedia, p. 268). If one is, already a Calvinist, the New Hampshire confession is beautiful; but if not, he will not learn much Calvinism from it. "Indeed", says McGlothlin, "it is doubtful if it ought to be called calvinistic, since it is non-committal on every point of difference between the calvinistic and arminian systems" (Baptist Confessions of faith, p. 299).

Thomas' statement that "the, single article alluded to..." in reference to the Universal church of the confessors is just not true because in the very first article of this confession "of the holy scriptures" there are two references to the Universal Church, and in chapter eight on Christ the Mediator, first paragraph, there is a reference; also in paragraph nine which was not taken from either the Westminster or the Savoy, but was the 13th article of the 1643 1st London Confession, another reference is stated: "The office of Mediator between God and man is proper (I Tim. 2:5) only to Christ, who is the prophet, priest, and King of the church of God..." Indeed, in the very article Thomas is criticizing (article 26 of the Church) in paragraph 4, three references there of the church must be taken in the Universal sense - the confessors used the, same reference (Col. 1:18) there as they used in the first paragraph describing the universal church; and in their appendix there are three more (fifth and sixth paragraphs from the end and in the last paragraph). Further, in the next general assembly of these Particular Baptists (1691) in their "address to the churches" they speak of "...the spirit of love which is diffused throughout all the members of Christ's mystical body" (Ivimey, vol. 1, p. 513), meaning the exact same thing that anyone else means when they say the same. So much for the Landmark "explanations"!

THE QUESTION LANDMARKS CAN'T ANSWER

In the book of Pendleton, "Old Landmark - Reset", and that of Dayton, "Alien Baptism", arguing with some of the top scholars of the age; Wayland, Johnson, Curtus, Benedict, Waller, Williams, Fuller, Bythewood, Lathrop, Broadus, Burrows, Lynd, Everts, Farnum, etc., which party wins? The Landmarkers first premise is: "The Commission was given to the Church"; the other side: "The Commission was given to the Ministry, and whoever God calls and enables to preach can also baptise." Each side wins with his own premise. But in both books there is a question raised that the Landmarks could not answer:

"Witness Whitfield and Knox, Wesley and Edwards, Calvin and Luther, and a host like them. Who will deny that Christ has sent them? Who will deny that Christ, the King, is pleased to dispense with baptism in such holy men as these?"

Dayton: "We only reply, that although Christ may see fit to dispense with their baptism, he has not authorized his churches to do so." (Alien Baptism, p. 99).

We may well ask, "Is not Christ the head of His Church?"

Pendleton says: "Nor does the success that attends the ministry of a preacher, prove either that he is in the visible church of Christ, or that he is a goodman. When Narn: preached in Rome "half the city went from his sermons, crying along the streets, Lord have mercy on us, Christ have mercy on us." He belonged to the church of Rome, not the church of Christ. Seldom has the preaching of any man produced such effects. And you will admit that many preachers who have been very successful, have shown subsequently that the grace of God was not in them. I am not under obligation to account for this, but it shows that the word of God alone can be relied on to decide what is true, and what is right." (Old Landmark Reset, p. 39-40).

Both these statements, that cannot be answered by Landmarkers, completely destroy their theory: If the Spirit of God made their ministries successful (and only the Spirit of God can make a ministry successful), why say they have no authority of the Lord? They have His power. Gill,

who read and used Protestant scholarship, probably more than all Landmarkers put together, said this:

“Their (scholastic) theology lay in contentious and litigious disputations; in thorny questions, and subtle distinctions; and their whole scheme was chiefly directed to support antichristianism, and the tenets of it; so that by their means popish darkness was the more increased, and Christian divinity was banished also out of the the world; and was only to be found among a few, among the Waldenses and Albignese, and the inhabitants of the valleys of Peidmont, and some particular persons and their followers, as Wickliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague; and so things continued till the reformation begun by Zuinglius and Luther, and carried on by others; by whose means evangelical light was spread through many nations in Europe; the doctrines of the apostles were revived, and supernatural Theology once more lift up its head; the reformed churches published their confessions of faith, and many eminent men wrote common pieces and systems of divinity; in which they all agreed in the main, to support the doctrines of revelation; as of the Trinity, and Deity of the divine Persons in it; those of predestination and eternal election in Christ, of redemption by him, pardon of sin by his blood, and justification by his righteousness.” (Gill, Divinity, Introduction, p. 29).

All becomes clear when we leave the Landmark premise, and take the words of Christ as to His “Apostles and their successors in the Ministry” - this as we have abundantly shown has, always been the interpretation of the Baptists.

Waller said (against Landmarkism); “We are sustained by the great majority of Baptists now and in time gone by.” (Alien Baptism, p. 50). Which, as we noticed, was said also by Crosby and Ivimey. And, Waller further says:

“Permit us then to suggest a plan by which the difficulties in this Association may be amicably adjusted: - Let all those who can furnish clear and indubitable evidence of the validity of their baptism, according to the terms of the affirmative of this question, vote non-fellowship for those churches and ministers who believe right to receive a member who has been immersed on profession of faith by a Pedobaptist minister; and let all the rest keep silence. We hazard the prediction, that this will put the matter forever at rest. And what can be more fair? Surely no brother, in all Alabama, would wish to condemn in another what he allows in himself?” (Ibid, p. 113)

This action was done (in part) when the East Texas Baptist Convention left the Southern Baptist Convention and formed their own in 1899; and when the General association of Baptist Churches was formed in Little Rock, Ark. in 1902. The latter and their successors in 1950 (A.B.A.) put forth the only Baptist Confessions known that supports Landmarkism. John T. Christian frankly admits this is new Doctrine (his “History” is published by the Bogard Press). First, Christian tells us:

“John Spilsbury did not believe he was under obligation to send anywhere for baptism; but that he had a right to baptize like John the Baptist did.” (Vol. 1, p. 253).

“The position of the Particular Baptists meant that for an administrator of baptism they did not go beyond the authority of the New Testament. They declared that it was not necessary to prove succession of Baptist Churches.” (Ibid, p. 254).

This is repeated and proved by the writings of the Particular Baptists seven times by Christian in Vol. I, pp. 249,254,256,264,276,281. Then on pages 38-39 in Vol. 2 this is stated:

“Much has been written and said in regard to the irregularity of the baptism of Roger Williams. As Baptist church polity is, now interpreted it was certainly irregular; but it is necessary to understand the viewpoint of those times. Williams was an intelligent university man, had come up under the tutelage of Sam Howe, and Baptist minister of London, and he appears in his baptism to have strictly followed the most approved standards of English Baptists. Both the General and Particular Baptists of England were sticklers for regularity; but they held that, in case no administrator could be had, it was lawful for two believers to begin baptism, and they quoted the Scriptural authority of John the Baptist.

John Spilsbury is sufficient authority to establish that this was the Baptist position, and Williams, when no administrator was available, carried out their injunctions, Spilsbury says: “And because some make it such an error, and so far from any rule or example for a man to baptize others, who is himself unbaptized, and so think thereby to shut up the ordinance of God in such a strait, that none can come by it but thro’ the authority of the Popedom of Rome; let the reader consider who baptiz’d John the Baptist before he baptized others, he himself unbaptized. We were taught by this what to do upon like occasions”. (Crosby, The History of the English Baptists, 1. 103,104. London, 1738).

Williams strictly followed the Baptist program laid down by the foremost Baptists of his day. “Neither Pedobaptists nor Baptists,” says Dr. Babcock, “can, with any propriety, object to this procedure. Not the former, for on their principles Mr. Williams was already an authorized administrator of the ordinances of Christ’s house, and his acts strictly valid. Not the latter, for they have ever rejected as of no avail a claim to apostolic succession through the corruption and suicidal perversions of the papacy. Nor, indeed, has any prelatical hierarchy of any kind ever found favor in their eyes; since each body of believers meeting in any place for the worship of Christ, and the discipline which his institution requires, they believe to be the highest source of Christian authority on earth and when acting and deciding according to the Scriptures, they doubt not, has the approval of the only Head of the church.” (The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle, January, 1842. I.1).

To say the least, this is a very strange and inconsistent admission of an A.B.A.’s own historian. Bogard said, “All real Baptists have always held”; just exactly opposite of what Christian clearly proves. A great many of the Landmarkers that I personally know have come from the A.B.A. - they left because of the gross Arminianism in the A.B.A. - but they did not leave their Landmarkism with them! They still hold that old heresy and claim no one is a true Baptist who does not agree with them!

This premise could be made: True Baptism to be valid must be performed in the Jordon River. We could call this doctrine “Jordon River Baptism”. Our Lord was baptized there, and the First Sovereign Grace Missionary Landmark, Pre-Trib., Pre-Mill, (Souls riding white horse theory) Baptist Church was also. We do not care what anyone else thinks or ever did think - this is our belief, and this belief pleases the Lord - that is what counts - historical Baptists have always believed this. But what about the 3000 baptized at Jerusalem, or the Eunuch, or the Jailor, etc.?

Answer: These were special cases under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit before the churches had really grown and understood their mission, and in the Apostolical age only, clear? Then Baptism cannot be performed anywhere but in the land of Palestine to be valid? That is not true at all - there are two ways ("from the mouth to, two witnesses"): The river Jordan flows into the dead sea where evaporation occurs, the wind currents carry the clouds all over the earth and rains this self, same water from the Jordon River wherever there will be a baptism (the type of this was the water that followed the children of Israel in the wilderness), and since the Lord commanded baptism in his name unto the end of the age, surely it would be no problem for Him to supply the water, and moreover, the veracity of Christ is at stake here - it must be so or the Lord lied (all true Baptists have believed it). What about water that has been treated that we get from the city and Rural water systems - does the treatment of the water invalidate it? Yes. And moreover, since the twelve who had received "River Jordon Baptism" were His bride according to Jno. 3:29 and no one else; and the Ephesians also in the bride (Eph. 5), who said plainly to Paul's question in Acts 19: "unto John's Baptism" (John baptized in the Jordon, Mt. 3:6); Paul, must have taken them to the River Jordon; also the Corinthians because they are said to be in the Bride (2 Cor. 11) - no one can prove he did not, all that the scriptures say is that he did baptise them -, where it does not say, Paul practiced what he preached! I deny that a man is a Baptist who denies this! All real Baptists have believed it. Who? You can prove anything by history, just read long enough and you will find someone who believes it. We do not take history or the writings of mere men but the the scriptures only, (familiar?).

I hesitated to write the above - not only because it is so silly, ridiculous, and stupid, and actually sacrilegious - but because some Landmarker may adopt the doctrine! The first premise is what is wrong, and everything that flows from it is wrong also. But, I could "prove" the doctrine like the Campbellites "prove" baptismal Regeneration; or the PedoBaptists "prove" infant Baptism; or the Mormons "proving" from prophecy their existence; or the Catholics, popery; the Arminians, free-will; the Hardshells; immediate regeneration; or the Landmarkers, church authority and Baptismal succession.

CHAPTER VII

THE COMMISSION

To whom was it given? Catholics and Landmarkers say the Church, and by definition, the church is always local according to modern landmarks. This was not true according to Graves and Pendleton as we will notice under another heading, but this is the dogmatics of our day. After reading through Lumpkin's book of Baptist confessions, the prominent ones being the 1st London, The Somerset, the 2nd London and the New Hampshire confessions, we come to the strange statement by Bogard of the American Baptist Association:

10. "We also hold in common what real Baptists have ever held, that the great commission was given to the churches only..."

And when this Association split in 1950 the seceders printed their confession:

12. "Water Baptism (immersion) to be administered to believers only and by Divine authority as given Missionary Baptist Churches."

16. "World wide missions according to the great commission which Christ gave his church. (Matt. 28: 19,20)."

21. "We believe that baptism to be valid must be administered by the authority of a true scriptural Missionary Baptist Church, and we believe that a so-called Baptist church which knowingly receives alien immersion is not a scriptural Baptist church, and its ordinances are not valid."

Some questions: Why did it take 1900 years for Baptists to come up with what "real" Baptists have ever held? "The Commission given only to the church?" and "Under the authority of a true scriptural Missionary Baptist Church?" By Bogard's definition all the confessors of the past were not "real" Baptists. And by the seceder's confession all previous confessors had invalid Baptism because they did not believe the commission was given to the Church but to the Apostles and their successors in the ministry. Why were all the old Baptists so loose in expression, and actually stupid, so as to not "pin down" Authority and validity of baptism, like the "new" Baptists? Wonder of wonders!

"Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world." The Landmarker claims this could only apply to the church since the Apostles died out and the office of the apostleship died with them; and that they were the first church anyway. But since the first church ceased to exist they say this must be taken in the sense of succession - one church from another - to the end of the age. But the same sense could just as easily and truly apply to individual preaching disciples - to admit the one is to admit the other. The latter view was the view of the Baptists of the 1600's as we saw. A more strict view, but also exactly in line with that view, was with them also: "The commission was given to the Apostles."

“That all nations of that day heard the Gospel is definitely told in the book of Acts and the Epistles. Particular emphasis is given in the second chapter of Acts concerning the Jews from all nations of the world present on the day of Pentecost when the Gospel was proclaimed. “And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” (Acts 2:5). The eighth chapter of Acts records how the Gospel went to Ethiopia, and we can well believe that there were similar incidents not recorded.

Paul, in writing to the Romans, rejoiced that their faith was known throughout the whole world (Rom. 1:8). The same fact is proclaimed in Colossians 1:16: “Which is come unto you, as it is in all the world; and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you.” In verse 23 of the same chapter Paul states: “If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven.”

The above verses indicate beyond a doubt that the Gospel was preached by the apostles and their fellow laborers throughout the habitable world before the destruction of Jerusalem. Those who deny this must quarrel with the statements of Scriptures. All nations of the world heard the Gospel proclaimed before the year 70 A.D.” (J.M. Kik, An Eschatology of Victory, p. 100).

They preached the gospel to every creature in their lifetime, to all nations; the Lord was with them; they performed miracles; they built churches; and superintended the work of the churches. And since their death, they, still do the same work through the scriptures - they wrote the scriptures. This view is found in the Somerset Confession of 1656 signed by representatives of 16 churches of the counties of Somerset, Wilts, Devon, Gloucester, Dorset, and written by Thomas Colier in 1655, ordained to office of “General Superintendent and messenger to all The Associated Churches”. In the “Epistle Dedicatory”, they “disclaim any dislike to the former confession (1643) of our beloved brethren, whom we own, and with whom we are one both in faith and practice, neither is there anything in ours contradictory to our brethren that we know of.” McGlothlin, Confessions, p. 201.

Article XXIX:

“That the Lord Jesus Christ being the foundation and cornerstone of the gospel church whereon his Apostles built (Eph. 2:20, Heb. 2:3) He gave them power and abilities to propagate, to plant, to rule and order (Matt. 28:19,20; Luke 10:16), for the benefit of that his body, by his kindness towards it in the ages to come (Eph. 2:7), which is according to his promise (Matt. 28:20).

XXX

“That this foundation and ministration aforesaid, is a sure guide, Rule and direction, in the darkest time of the Anti-Christian apostasy, or spiritual Babylonish captivity, to direct, inform, and restore us in our just freedom and liberty, to the right worship and order belonging to the Church of Jesus Christ (I Tim. 3:14,15; II Tim. 3:15,16,17; John 17:20; Isa. 59:21; Rev. 2:24; Isa. 40:21; Rev. 2:5; I Cor. 14:37; Rev. 1:3; II Thess. 3:14; Rev. 2:11; I Pet. 1:25; I John 4:6; II Pet. 1:15,16; Isa. 58:11,12; II Pet. 3:2; Isa. 8:20). (McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions, P. 201).

This is in accordance to Article 41 of the 1st London Confession:

“The persons designed by Christ, to dispense this ordinance, the Scriptures hold forth to be a preaching disciple, it being no where tyed to a particular church, officer, or person

extraordinarily sent, the commission injoining the administration, being given to them under no other consideration, but as considered disciples.”

And Cox’s appendix to it in 1646, 2nd. edition:

“A disciple gifted and enabled by the Spirit of Christ to preach the Gospel, and stirred up to this service by the same Spirit, bringing home to his soul the command of Christ in His word for the doing of this work, is a man authorized and sent by Christ to preach the Gospel, see Luke 19:12, etc. Mark 16:15, and Matt. 18:19 compared with Acts 8:4, Phil. 1:14,15; John 7:(?). And those gifted disciples which thus preach Jesus Christ who came in the flesh, are to be looked upon as men sent and given of the Lord, I John 4:2; Rom. 10:15; Eph. 4:11,12,13. And they which are converted from unbelief and false worship, and so brought into church fellowship by such preachers according to the will of Christ, are a seal of their ministry, I Cor. 9:2. And such preachers of the Gospel may not only lawfully administer baptism unto believers, and guide the action of the church in the use of the Supper, (Matt. 28:19; Acts 8:5-12; I Cor. 10:16) but (in fulfillment of the office of eldership) may also call upon the churches, and advise them to choose (other) fit men for officers, and may settle such officers so chosen by a church in the places or officers (of elder or Deacon) to which they are chosen by imposition of hands and prayer, Acts 6:3-6; 14:23; Titus 1:5.”

And the second London Confession:

Chapter XXVIII

of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper

1. Baptism and the Lord’s supper are ordinances of positive and sovereign institution, appointed by the Lord Jesus, the only lawgiver, to the continued in his Church (Matt. xxviii. 19,20; I Cor. xi.26) to the end of the world.
2. These holy appointments are to be administered by those only who are qualified, and there unto called, according to the commission of Christ. (Matt. xxviii, 19).” (Emphasis mine, D.G.)

And the practice of the Philadelphia Association:

4. A question was moved by the church of the Great Valley to this effect: Whether it be the prerogative of a church to receive applications for baptism, examine the candidates, and to judge of their qualifications for baptism? or whether these be the distinct and peculiar prerogatives of the ministers, exclusive of the laity?

The occasion of this question was the opinion and practice of the church of Philadelphia, who by a general vote have allowed the said prerogatives to belong to the minister, by the tenor of the commission relative to baptism, and the universal practice of the commissioners; and that there is neither precept nor precedent for the contrary in scripture. All allowed that this may be, and in some cases must be; but that the other practice was more expedient. However, none pretended to say it was warranted by scripture. The question was put, – Whether the point was a term of communion? and whether it should be debated, or dropped? None stood up for either. So that it was dropped.” (Minutes of Philadelphia Association, p. 89).

Another famous Baptist, John Myles, in 1656 wrote "An antidote against the Infection of the Times" by the direction of the Assembly of the Welch Baptist Association which was an apology, or answer, in defence of the faith and practice of the Baptists, against the attacks of the Quakers. It was designed to be a brief and plain declaration or confession of faith. They understood the scriptures in reference to the commission like their Brethren in England:

"Besides, he breathed on his Apostles the Holy Ghost, and commissioned them for the ministry, John 20.21,22,23. Mark 16.15. Matt. 28,18,19,20." (p. 5).

"Marks how long the Lord promiseth his presence with the Ministry, always, even to the end of the world." (p. 15).

"Baptism of believers in water ordained by Christ, Mt. 28.19,20. Mar. 16.15,16. practiced by him as our pattern, Mat. 3.15,16. and administered according to the said commission (which was as large for it, as for making Disciples) and pattern by the primitive Disciples on all believers..." (p. 22).

"Ministry, though most cleerly instituted to continue to the end of the world..." (p. 23).

In 1649 Edward Drapes wrote Gospel Glory in which is stated:

"I come next to speak of the administrator or preacher of this gossell; and herein I will minde you, that the gossell was preached by Apostles, by Evangelists, by members of particular churches, and by scattered brethren." (p. 91).

After proving the above by scripture he states this:

"Thus may we see clearly, that one gossell was committed to several sorts of christians to preach it to the world, who were all sent of God, being called of God according to the working of his owne Spirit." (p. 92).

"But what are the marks of those true Ministers that wee may know them? The onely true ground of a visible judging or discerning them, is by their doctrine." (p. 93).

"The commission given to the Disciples." Math. 28.19. (p. 102).

"The Preacher of the gossell: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," is the true administrator of this ordinance." (p. 113).

"Visible appearances are the ground of visible administrations, and our faith and practice is not tyed to the persons of any, but to the doctrine of Jesus Christ. So that if any one comes in the name of a disciple, preaching the doctrine of Christ, and God makes us to see our duty to conforme to his doctrine, wee should not question so much his calling, as manifest our ready conformity to the will of God."

"I shall only add this, to this particular, that I cannot finde, that God's people were ever made incapable of doing their duty for want of an administrator: But the same God, that enjoynes the observation of a command, likewise provides a suitable way for the execution thereof." (p. 114).

Kiffen states:

Ananias, a certain Disciple, Baptized Paul; (and not an Apostle.) Peter commanded Cornelius, and those that were with him, to be Baptized; but the text doth not say Peter did it; it might be done by some of the Brethren that came with him: neither can it reasonably be supposed that the 3000 converted by Peter's sermon, Acts 2 was all Baptized by him, or the Apostles only; but it is very like they had many administrators, which doth not at all intrench upon the great commission of Christ, but is found in it; it being given to Preaching Disciples, as Preaching Disciples; and all Preaching Disciples have authority from thence, to Preach and Baptize; (these being, properly no Church-Ordinances) though in order to it." (Wm. Kiffen, *Some Serious Reflections on that Part of Mr. Bunyan's Confession of Faith*, p. 39,40).

This substantiates and shows the close agreement among the Particular Baptists on the subjects of the commission and the administration of Baptism, and all which, is not Landmarkism.

The Apostles

John 20: The Lord breathed on them the Holy Spirit, the Apostles communicated the Holy Spirit by laying on of hands, no one else could do this. On the passage "whatsoever sins ye remit", Matthew Henry says:

"Now this follows upon their receiving the Holy Ghost; for if they had not an extraordinary Spirit of discerning, they had not been fit to be entrusted with such an authority; for in the strictest sense, this is a special commission to the Apostles themselves, the first preachers of the gospel who could distinguish who were in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity and who were not. By virtue of this power, Peter struck Ananias and Sapphira dead, and Paul struck Elymas blind. Yet it must be understood as a general charter to the church and her ministers..." (Henry, Comm.).

The Apostles "had the mind of Christ"; They spoke "the wisdom of God in a mystery". That mystery "God revealed to them by the Spirit" and they spoke it, "not in words which man's wisdom teaches but which the Holy Spirit teaches." They were "Ambassadors for Christ" and "besought men" in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God." They authoritatively taught the doctrine and law of their Lord; They organized churches, and required them to keep the traditions - Acts 11; I Cor. 2:16, 2:7,10,13; 2 Cor. 5:20; I Cor. 11:2.

Apostolical Authority: 1. Seen the Lord. 2. Infallible Inspiration. 3. Immediately called and chosen by Christ. 4. They performed miracles. 5. Their charge not confined to any particular church, but had care of all the churches. 6. No successors but the word of God.

Having noticed what the early Baptists believed about the commission, let us notice what the scriptures say!

Mt. 28:18-20

"And Jesus came and spake unto them saying, All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the

Son, and of the Holy Spirit: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age.”

Mark 16:15-20

“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils’ they shall speak with new tongues; 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. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.”

Luke 24:44-49

“And he said unto them, these are the words which I spoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding that they might understand the scriptures. And he said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.”

John 20:21

“Then said Jesus unto them again: Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.”

Acts 1:8

“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”

In all five of these instances these words were spoken to the Apostles. Luke says the same:

“The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Spirit had given commandments unto the, apostles whom he had chosen.” Acts 1:1-2

Peter states:

“Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded, us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” Acts 10:40,43.

Paul says:

“Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by, them that heard him; God also bearing, them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will? Heb. 2:1-4.

Here are seven instances where we are told by scriptures that the commission was given to the Apostles. Landmarkers say the church but these scriptures say the Apostles; and as the scripture is our sole rule of faith and practice - we must believe scripture.

1. The commission was given to the same ones that the scriptures were given. The command, “teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you”, can only apply to the inspired Apostles - they only could obey it, and they only understood fully what they wrote. Anyone can see how close landmarkism here is with Catholicism - the only difference is the Landmarker is not as consistent in his heresy. This commission is executed anywhere the scriptures are executed and that only as the Spirit leads.

2. The promise of the Spirit - to the Apostles. The Spirit of truth enabling them to execute the commission. “He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you”, Jno. 14:26. “I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you unto all truth”, Jno. 16:12-13.

These scriptures have only to do with the Apostles and were faithfully executed by the Apostles - not the church, as Landmarkers teach. Paul wrote: “Keep the ordinances (traditions) as I delivered them to you” (I Cor. 11:2); and, “Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle” (II Thess. 2:15); and, “What? came the word of God out from you? (Landmarker say, “Yes”) or came it unto you only? (“yes, again”), If any man think himself to be a prophet, or Spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord” (I Cor. 14:36-37)). If the church has the authority and Paul was under the authority of a church as Landmarkers teach, he certainly was out of line to say the least in the above, wasn’t he? Let him believe it who can! Even after churches and believers had been baptised in the Spirit, they still needed instruction from the Apostles. Note: Jerusalem (Acts 15), Corinth (I Cor. 12), and Cornelius (Acts 10).

3. The leadership of the Apostles. The Lord Jesus said “upon this Rock I will build my church”. Whether Christ was meaning Himself by the “Rock” or Peter (speaking for all the Apostles), “thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,” makes no essential difference - both expressions mean the same thing. The use of the future shows it has not been built yet, and moreover, Paul said in Eph. 2:20: “And are built (same word) upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone”; and, those under the new covenant “Have come to this heavenly city” (Heb. 12:22); and had for the foundations of its wall “The names of twelve apostles of the Lamb” (Rev. 21:14). Anyone should see that it is the inspired teaching of the Apostles about the New Covenant mediated by Christ that is the central teaching here - not a Landmark, hierarchical, organization, known as the “LOCAL CHURCH”! And furthermore, it

could not be built until, after the death of Christ, we will have more on this later under another heading, but let us notice, The Apostles judging the 12 tribes. I will quote the excellent comments of Gill. He was not a Scofieldite as many of the Landmarkers are.

Gill, Comm. Mt. 19:28

ver 28. And Jesus said unto them &c.) To all the disciples whom Peter personated; verily I say unto you: the thing being something very considerable, and of great moment, Christ used the asseveration he sometimes does in such cases; that ye which have followed me; Christ does not deny that they had forsaken all for his sake, nor does he repeat it, but only takes notice of their following him, which including their faith in him, their profession of him, and subjection to him, was a much greater action, and of more importance than the other, and therefore is only mentioned, and which our Lord confirms: in the regeneration. This clause is so placed, that it may be read in connexion with the preceeding words, and be understood of the disciples following Christ in the regeneration; meaning, not the grace of regeneration, in which they could not be said, with propriety, to follow Christ; and one of them was never a partaker of it: but the new state of things, in the church of God, which was foretold, and is called the time of reformation or setting all things right, which began upon the sealing up the law, and the prophets, and the ministry of John the Baptist, and of Christ; who both, when they began to preach, declared, that this time, which they call the kingdom of heaven, was at hand, just ushering in. Now the twelve apostles followed Christ herein; they believed, and professed him to be the Messiah; they received, what the Jews called, his new doctrine, and preached it to others; they submitted to the new ordinance of baptism, and followed Christ and attended him wherever he sent, working miracles, peaching the Gospel, and reforming the minds and manners of men. Now this new dispensation is called the regeneration, and which more manifestly took place after our Lord's resurrection, and ascension, and the pouring down of the Spirit; wherefore the phrase may be connected with the following words, "when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, in the regeneration"; not in the resurrection of the dead, or at the last judgment, but in this new state of things, which now began to appear with another face: for the apostles having a new commission to preach the Gospel to all the world; and being endued with power from on high for such service in a short time went every where preaching the word, with a great success. Gentiles were converted, as well as Jews, and both brought into a Gospel church-state; the ceremonies of the old law being abolished, were disused; and the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's supper, every where practised; old things passed away; and all things became new: agreeably to this the Syriac version renders the phrase, in the new world; and so the Persic. The Arabic reads it, "in the generation or age to come"; which the Jews so often called the world, or age to come, the kingdom of the Messiah, the Gospel dispensation. When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his Glory, or glorious throne; as he did when he ascended in to heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God; and was then exalted as a Prince, and made, or declared to be Lord and Christ; and was crowned in human nature, with honour and glory, and angels, principalities, and powers, made subject to him: "ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones: for though Judas fell from his apostleship, yet Matthias was chosen in his room, and took his place, and made up the number twelve; a metaphorical phrase, setting forth the honour, dignity, and authority of their office and ministry, by which they should be judging the twelve tribes of Israel; doctrinally and practically; by charging them with the sin of crucifying Christ, condemning them for their unbelief, and rejection of him, denouncing the wrath of God, and the heaviest judgements that should fall upon them, as a nation for their sin: and by turning from them to the Gentiles, under which judgement they continue to this day. So the doctors among the Jews are represented as sitting and judging

others: of the potters, in I chron. iv. 23, they say, “these are the disciples of the law, or the lawyers, for whose sake the world is created, who sit in judgement, and establish the world; and build and perfect the ruins of the house of Israel.”

An Eschatology of Victory

M. Kik

P. 218: JUDGING THE TWELVE TRIBES

Coming back to Matthew 19:28 we read that in the regeneration the apostles will sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Without going too much in detail, the meaning of this is that the apostles through their teachings rule the Church of God. This is just another way of stating that the Church is “Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets” as stated in Ephesians 2:20. It is stated in still another way in Revelation 21:14, “And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles.”

In this dispensation the apostles are still ruling the Church through their teachings. We read in Matthew 23:2,3: “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.” Moses through the giving of the law ruled the old Israel until the coming of Christ. Now the apostles rule the new Israel. The “twelve thrones” of the apostles take the place of Moses’ seat.

We are now in the period of the regeneration. True Christians who form the “Israel” of God are judged (ruled) by the apostles. The “thrones” of the apostles are no more literal than the “seat” of Moses. All this is in agreement with our interpretation of Revelation 20:4 where the thrones of the saints are not to be considered as literal and the period of their reigning has reference to this earth. It is the period of the Messianic reign. It is the period of the regeneration.” (p. 218)

4. “Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.” “The consummation of the age” on the lips of a Jew of that period, meant the completion of the ante-Messianic Jewish age, which completion was expected to come to pass in the establishment of the Messiah’s Kingdom.” (Hovey’s Comm., Mark, p. 180). Also Lightfoot, Owen and Russell (The Parousia).

If this is the meaning the Lord was with the Apostles to the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the age which was 70 A.D.; or, if it is to be taken through the Messianic age, He is with the Apostles through their writings to the end of the present age. And this is exactly how the Old Baptists interpreted the passage - rather than a succession of churches to give them authority for their faith and practice they claimed the scriptures alone:

Barber, Baptism, 1641 - Who claimed to be one of the first to divulge the truth of baptism in England:

“We grant the ordinance being lost none but a Christ, a Moses, Elias, or a prophet from heaven can raise it; but believers having Christ, the Word, and Spirit have this: Mt. 18:19,20; and 11:11; Luke 7:28; Rom. 10:6,7,8.

Edward Drapes, Gospel Glory, 1649, P. 96.

“That I may end this discourse, we are to consider, that we have the Apostles, and the Miracles that Jesus and the Apostles wrought with us, that there needs no pleading for the Apostles againe in the flesh, nor miracles neither; for by having the Apostles, I meane their works, their writings, their word, their gospel, their Spirit; which is the whole council of God for us.”

See also the testimony already given: Kilcop, Spilsbury, Blackwood, King, Knollys, Collier, and Cox. They all agree. "One thing thou lackest," says the Landmark, is "Delegated Authority". The old Baptists thought they had it delegated from Christ and the Apostles - through the Scriptures.

5. Baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and The Holy Spirit. The phrase, "In the Name of", expresses authority. Paul said, "now this I say, that everyone of you saith. I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye, baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." (I Cor. 1:12-15). Landmarkers clearly teach "In the name of the trinity," plus in their own name, by way of authority - another example of their gross usurpations.

(11) "For all that a name implies, of authority, character, rank, majesty, power, excellence, etc., of everything that the name covers (a) of the Name of God as expressing His attributes, etc., e.g., Matt. 6:9; Luke 1:49; John 12:28; 17:6,26; Rom. 15:9; I Tim. 6:1; Heb. 13:5; Rev. 13:6; (b) of the name of Christ, e.g., Matt. 10:22; 19:29; John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18; Acts 26:9; Rom. 1:5; Jas. 2:7; I John 3:23; 3 John 7; Rev. 2:13; 3:8; also the phrases rendered in the name; these may be analysed as follows: (1) representing the authority of Christ, e.g., Matt. 18:5 (with *epi*, on the ground of My authority); so Matt. 25:5 (falsely) and parallel passages; as substantiated by the Father, John 14:26; 16:23 (last clause), R.V.; (2) in the power of (with *en*, *in*), e.g., Mark 16:17; Luke 10:17; Acts 3:6; 4:10; 16:18; Jas. 5:14; (3) in acknowledgement or confession of, e.g., Acts 4:12; 8:16; 9:27,28; (4) in recognition of the authority of (sometimes combined with the thought of relying or resting on), Matt. 18:20; cp. 28:19; Acts 8:16; 9:2; (eis, into); John 14:13; 15:16; Eph. 5:20; Col. 3:17; (5) owing to the fact that one is called by Christ's Name or is identified with Him, e.g. I Pet. 4:14 (with *en*, *in*); with, for the sake of, e.g., Matt. 19:29; with *dia*, on account of, Matt. 10:22; 24:9 Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:21; I John 2:12; Rev. 2:3 (for I Pet. 4:16 see note below)." (Vines Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words Article, Name.)

"But as it is administered according to the pattern, and as first delivered, it appears to be of an heavenly original; the counsel of God, a wise appointment of his, and in which all the Three Persons have a concern; they all appeared at the baptism of Christ, and gave a sanction to the ordinance by their presence; the Father by a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased! as in his person, so in this act of his, in submitting to the ordinance of baptism; the Son in human nature, yielding obedience to it; and the Spirit descending on him as a dove; and it is ordered to be administered in the name of all Three, Father, Son, and Spirit. Which, among other things, is expressive of divine authority, under which it is performed. Christ received from God the Father honour and glory, as at his transfiguration, so at his baptism, by the voice from heaven, owning his relation to him, as his Son, and expressing his wellpleasedness in him, as obedient to his will; the Son of God, in human nature, not only left an example of it, that we should tread in his steps; though he himself baptized none, yet he countenanced it in his disciples, and gave them orders to do it; which orders were repeated, and a fresh commission given for the same, after his resurrection from the dead: and the Spirit of God shewed his approbation of it, by his descent on Christ at his baptism; and his authority for it is to be seen in the administration of it in his name, as in the name of the other Two Persons: so that it is to be regarded, not as an institution of men, but as an ordinance of God; as a part of

righteousness to be fulfilled, a branch of the righteous will of God, to be observed in obedience to It.” (Gill Divinity, p. 899).

“Baptism in (eis, not into) the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in the name of the Trinity. Objection is raised to this language in the mouth of Jesus as too theological and as not a genuine part of the Gospel of Matthew for the same reason. See Matt. 11:27, where Jesus speaks of the Father and the Son as here. But it is all to no purpose. There is a chapter devoted to this subject in my *The Christ of the Logia* in which the genuineness of these words is proven. The name of Jesus is the essential part of it as is shown in the Acts. Triune immersion is not taught as the Greek Church holds and practices, baptism in the name of the Father, then of the son, then of the Holy Spirit. The use of name (onoma) here is a common one in the Septuagint and the Papyri for power or authority.” (Robertson’s Word Pictures, p. 245).

“It cannot reasonably be objected that he that baptized should necessarily be himself a baptized person: For tho ordinarily it will be so. Yet it is not necessary to the ordinance; for not the personal baptizm of him that administers, but the due commission he hath for baptizing, is alone considerable to make him a true minister of baptism. And here that expression holds not, one cannot give what he hath not, as a man cannot teach me that wants knowledge himself; because no man give his own baptism, but conveys, as a public person, that which is given us by Christ.” (Laurence, Baptism).

“And therefore did the Church of Rome or England, Baptize believers, only confessing faith and sins, desiring it, wee would never separate from them, much lesse remove their baptism, as false, because it is God’s ordinance in itself, but so was never the sprinkling of infants.” (Edward Barber, Baptism, p. 28).

“Query. Whether beleivers who upon profession of faith in Christ have been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus by a baptized Gospel preacher practising and pleading for mixt communion of beleivers baptized and unbaptized in church fellowship and the use of the Supper may, upon the manifestation of a hearty returne from this errour, be received into full communion with a true church of Christ without renewing their bapisme; or whether they ought to be baptized againe before they be so received.

Answer: They ought, as we judge, to be received as in the query is expressed and not to be baptized again inasmuch as there was nothing essential to the baptisme of Christ found wanting in baptisme. The Subject of baptisme was right, the same being a beleever professing and manifesting faith in Christ. Acts 8.36f. The action of baptizing was right, the same being the dipping of the beleever in water, into the name of the Lord Jesus and so into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Acts 2:38, Mat. 28:19. The end of this baptisme was right, viz., that Christ’s command might be obeyed in their being baptized into his death, Ro. 6.3. They were not baptized into the name of him that baptized them, nor into a profession of walking in his way; but into the name of Christ and into the profession of the beliefe of his Gospell and of walking according to the rule thereof. That errour in judgement and practise about mixt communion did not make the baptizer no minister of true baptisme, being such an errour as may be found continuing in a true beleever and such as doth in no wise utterly disable him to preach the Gospell. Consequently, he being a baptized disciple and Gospell preacher professedly

continuing in the faith, remains a true administrator of baptism.” (Associational records of the Particular Baptists: England, Wales, Ireland to 1660, p. 177).

The above shows plainly against the anti-scriptural sectarian view Graves maintained: “The subject in baptism shows not his own personal faith, but the faith of the administrator.”

6. The commission was given to the same ones that the following was given: “Whatsoever sins ye remit are remitted, whatsoever sins ye retain are retained” (John 20:23). And “Neither pray I for these alone but for them also which shall believe on me through their word” (John 17:20); and “I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (Mt. 16:19).

Will Landmarkers go as far as Rome here? Why not? Huffman writes: “Consistency, Thou art a jewel”. where is their consistency here? These scriptures are consistent with the Apostles and their writings - no other way. But the Landmark says, “The church is the Pillar and Ground of the truth”. First, no one can prove that the King James is correct here. Gill, Lange, Bengel, and by far the majority of commentaries did not think so. The phrase, “Pillar and Ground of the truth” is either in apposition to “assembly of the living God”; or, is a new proposition heading what follows. The one would be a very much limited and relative meaning while the other would be absolutely true in harmony also with I Cor. 3:11 (other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ). Second, suppose the King James is the correct rendering: avoiding the Roman heresy of Church salvation and Papal infallibility the issuing relative meaning does not leave much meaning in the Landmark sense. what church has ever arrived at full knowledge? Or, what church has ever arrived at the place she does not need to continually grow in knowledge and grace? The fact is, she is only scriptural to the extent she follows scripture, which was not given by her in the first place but by the Apostles. Calvin’s Commentary is good on the King James side, but then it is relative to the Ministry, and no help for the Landmark. Third, translated as “the Pillar and ground of the truth, and confessedly great is the Mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory,” is absolutely true; and without which, there would be not truth: “I am the way, the truth, and the life, No man cometh to the Father but by me.” Fourth, if the church is the Pillar and Ground of the truth, why is she not infallible? Mutability denies infallibility - will the Landmarks answer? Actually, the, truth is the pillar and ground of the church (Gill).

And right here we might well ask two questions of the Landmarkers answered by William Sherlock in his, “The Protestant Resolution of Faith, 1685,” title page:

1. How far we must depend on the Authority of the Church for the true sense of Scripture?
2. Whether a visible succession from Christ to this day makes a church, which has this succession an infallible interpreter of scripture; and whether no church, which has not this succession, can teach the true sense of scriptures?

Now, disregarding, some Landmark claims concerning the infallibility of the King James Translators, let them answer the questions about the scriptures as they are in their original tongues. Gill says:

“Here I cannot but observe the amazing ignorance and stupidity of some persons, who take it into their heads to decry learning and learned men; for what would they have done for a Bible, had it not been for them as instruments? and if they had it, so as to have been capable of reading it God must have wrought a miracle for them; and continued that miracle in every nation, in every age, and to every individual; I mean that gift of tongues, in a supernatural way as was bestowed upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost; which there is no reason in the world ever to have expected. Bless God, therefore, and be thankful that God has, in his providence, raised up such men to translate the Bible into the mother-tongues, of every nation, and particularly into ours; and that he still continues to raise up such who are able to defend the translation made, against erroneous persons, and enemies of the truth; and to correct and amend it in lesser matters, in which it may be failed, and clear and illustrate it by their learned notes upon it.” (Divinity, p. 14).

Where does the Landmarker stand in light of the above? The Landmark Church is the Pillar and Ground of the Truth. They wish to take this as a relative statement and make an absolute from it, applicable to them only, only such has any authority or commission to proclaim it - only then, from such does the Lord, and can the Lord, get his glory! And here they come with their books of Graves, Simmons, and Taylor with ample plagiarisms of Vine, Strong, and Scofield Bible notes telling us who true Baptists are and the only way one can attain the state of being a true Baptist. Scholarship? The Bible alone (K.J.); History? All true Baptists have believed it; References? “We do not take history or the writings of men, but the Bible only.”!!! The Landmarker claims the commission was given to the church. The scriptures never say this. The scriptures always say the Apostles. But, the Landmarker leaves scripture here and “proves” the Apostles were the first church in the three following ways: 1. “And God hath set some in the church, first Apostles...” I Cor. 12:28. 2. “He that hath the bride is the Bridegroom” John 3:29. 3. “In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee” Heb. 2:12. The Landmarker says if Christ did not build His church in the days of His personal ministry - He lied; and if Christ did not have His church which they say is the bride - John lied; And if He did not sing in His church when He instituted the Lord’s supper - David lied; And if the Apostles were not first (in time) in the church - Paul lied. Case closed. “He set some in the church, first apostles” (I Cor. 12:28). Notice my punctuation - it is the Landmark: “first Apostles” period, (ignore the context and the rest of the verse), first Apostles! Which proves to them; 1. That Christ organized the first church, in his public ministry, and 2. That the Apostles were that first Church. This verse does not even remotely teach it. “And God has set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?” I Cor. 12:28-30.

Each of the questions or verse 30 expects a negative answer in the Greek, so when Paul asks literally, “All are not apostles, are they?”. The Landmarker says, “yes”. Well, Paul said, “no”. And moreover, if the adverbs meant “in time”, we would have this strange teaching: “God set some in the church, first (in time) apostles, secondarily (in time) prophets, thirdly (in time) teachers, after that (in time) miracles, then (in time) gifts of healing, etc.”, and asks, “All are not apostles, are they” (expecting the negative answer) and the landmarker answers, “The were at one time, the time when Christ organized his Church”! Until the Landmarkers can prove that the

next immediate disciples among the 120 gathered at Jerusalem waiting for the promise of the Spirit, whom are supposed to have been added to the Apostles, were secondarily in time, prophets; and the next addition, teachers; and so on until the Church at Jerusalem at the beginning, were all officers, no common disciples; all this in 33 A.D., then show any relevance of such teaching to Paul's instruction to the Corinthians, A.D. 60, we can safely, and must most surely, discount all such absurdities.

And further, should any think the passage has to do with the Corinthian Church exclusively, or generically, having these Apostles, prophets, teachers, etc. in the membership at Corinth, the idea is precluded by the nature of the case, i.e. why would another Apostle (Paul) outside the membership of a church that already has apostles have to write them to correct their divisions? Could not their own apostles do it?

The adverbs have to do not with time, but with the degree of importance of each office in the Church universal, God set them there. God also "set the members everyone of them in the body, as it hath pleased him" - the local body at Corinth. Since this is God's work, and they were baptized in the spirit (aorist passive), they had better not abuse their gifts and cause divisions, etc.

Let us notice King on 1 Cor. 12:28:

By the church there, I cannot see that he meaneth any one particular congregation of the Saints; but the church in relation to her head Christ, which is but one complete congregation, consisting of all saints and congregations too. Cant. 6.9. May beloved, my undefiled is one, etc., And so they are set in the church in the sence I have before laid down for I cannot find that in the Apostles and primitive times, any one congregation was indued with all these gifts; for the 12 Apostles went from church to church, and continued not in one particular congregation, neither was it possible for every particular congregation to have an apostle among them; for 1. There was a church at Jerusalem, Acts 2 and church at Samaria, Acts 8; there were divers churches in Judea, Galatia and Samaria, Acts 9:31. A church in Antioch, Acts 11.26. Churches at Lystra and Iconinm, Acts 14.21,22,23. Seven churches in Asia the less, Rev. 1 and 3. A church at Rome, a church at Corinth, churches in Galatia, Gal. 1.2 Suppose but two: churches in Macedonia, suppose but two also, 2 Cor. 8.2. A church at Phillpi, a church at Colosse, a church of the Thessalonians, a church of the Bereans, Acts 17.11,12. Churches in divers cities of the Cretians, Tit. 1.5. Suppose but three cities in Crete, and but three churches there, there were churches in Syria and Cilicia, Acts 15.41. A church in Cenchera, Rom. 1 and 1. A church in Babylon, 1 Pet. 5.13. So that suppose but two, where churches are named in the plural, and but one else-where; the scripture mentioneth at that time 39. or 40. Churches, and there were but 12 Apostles; therefore there could not be Apostles in every particular church; but they ordained them elders in every church, therefore the one must continue, when the other may not; and churches and administrations are to continue. (King, A Way To Zion, p. 67,68

CHAPTER VIII

THE BRIDE

On different occasions of our Lord's ministry his disciples asked who would be the greater, and the mother of Zebedee's children desired her two sons the chief places in the Kingdom. But, Christ said the greatest would be a minister or servant to others. Landmarkers believe they will be the greatest - the Bride of Christ. They add another link to Paul's chain in Rom. 8: "Whom he foreknew, them he also predestinated to the image of his son; whom he predestinated them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified; (Landmarkers add) and, some whom he glorified, them he will also, much-more glorify." (i.e. to make them His bride)! But, glorification is the grand end of God's salvation, and this as well as the other things of God's salvation, has nothing to do with the part of man. Salvation is in three senses: Justification: Salvation from the penalty of sin; Sanctification: Salvation from the practice of sin; and Glorification: salvation from the presence and effects of sin. One could hardly think he could have more or less of the fulness of Christ, for the Lord told Abraham, "I am thy exceeding great reward."

Landmarkers take, "For I am jealous over you with godly jealousy: For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." (II Cor. 11:2); and, "for this cause shall a man leave his Father, and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church." (Eph. 5:31,32); and prove that the local church will be the bride of Christ. But is this, exclusive of the others He saves? If so, the preceding verses exclude salvation from any but the local church: "...and he is the saviour of the body" (v.23); "...Christ loved the church and gave himself for it." (v.25). In the same reasoning Paul excluded everyone but himself from salvation in Gal. 2:20: "...and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." And further, to show that the church cannot be taken in an exclusive sense, (granted that it is a local church) are the purposes Paul lists in Eph. 5:26,27: "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Paul said in Titus 2:14 that Christ's work was to "Redeem, and Purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them (Eph. 2:10)" all the elect.

So the passages on the Church being the bride of Christ hinges on interpretation. No one but Landmarkers ever interpreted these passages in an exclusive sense, ignoring the parallel passages that go with them. But, the point I want to cover is the mention of the Bride in John 3:29. Landmarkers "prove" from this verse that Christ had his church at this time. Let us notice the excellent comments of Brown on this passage, and while Brown is writing about another subject his remarks are to my point against the Landmark interpretation:

"Before passing from Mr. Bickersteth here, I will give one brief illustration of the extreme slenderness of the ground on which he rests the weightiest conclusions.

“In every human household (he says) or marriage, there are usually four parties - the bridegroom, the bride, friends, and servants;” and if we do not admit as many “varieties” at least of “union with Christ,” we are charged with “not only crossing many express statements, but every lesson of analogy.”

Now, let us see what conclusions this will bring out of a single passage of Scripture: “He that hath the Bride,” said the Baptist, “is the Bridegroom”; but the Friend of the Bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the Bridegroom’s voice; this my joy therefore, is fulfilled.” – (John 111 29) According to Mr. Bickersteth’s way of viewing such language, the poor Baptist will not be of “the Bride” at all. Though “the first resurrection,” and the millennial glory of the risen saints, is said to be specially designed for suffering believers, this rare example of fidelity, humility, love to the Saviour, and self-sacrifice, will not be found in that class at all, but be seen on the lower platform appropriated to the “friends” of the Bridegroom! At this rate the wise virgins who went forth to meet the Bridegroom in the parable (Matt. xxv.), represent not those who are to be “the Bride” at his coming, but those who merely attend the nuptials as “friends” and those who are invited to the marriage supper (Matt. xxii.), though clothed with the wedding garment are on this principle to be held as representing a distinct class altogether from those called “the Bride”. I cannot persuade myself that the author would accept these conclusions. But why not? and where shall we be if we are thus to explain the figures of Scripture? Who does not see that the Baptist called himself “the friend of the Bridegroom,” not to express his personal, but his official standing in relation to Christ? and that the same believers are termed “the virgins,” in respect of their call to be ready for Christ’s coming – the “guests” at the marriage supper, in respect of the fellowship they hold with him and “the bride,” in respect of their intimate and endearing union to him. In vain, then, are endless “varieties of union with Christ” drawn out of such figurative language, and wonderful it is, that from premises so very slender such mighty conclusions should, by any sober writer, be drawn.

3. Mr. Bonar’s theory of the distinction between the Bride and the whole number of the saved, has not certainly the repulsive appearance of the other theories we have been noticing. He admits that the Christians who are to people the earth after Christ has descended to it with his completed Bride, will, like ourselves, “be found in the miry clay by the sovereign God, be converted by his Holy Spirit, led to see sin and the Saviour – (Why does he not add, united to Him by faith, as we are?) – sanctified probably far more rapidly and thoroughly, yet still by the same Spirit, through the word, and so prepared for a future eternity.” It is something to get footing like this – to get a Christianity that one can understand – for the millennium. Nor will I disturb it by asking, just now, how this Christianity is to be produced in sinful men, with Christ in glory before their eyes, and “the righteous shining forth as the sun” in their very presence. Waiving this for the present – the following very obvious remarks are enough to show that the theory which Mr. Bonar propounds is without any solid foundation, and is opposed to the whole current of Scripture.

(1.) When Christ’s people are termed his “Bride”, his “Spouse” – when they are said to be “espoused” and “married” to him – in a word, when conjugal relations, intercourse, and affections are employed to set forth what subsists between Him and them, – who, until now, ever doubted that a union common to all believers is intended? And on what principle can it be maintained that the term “Bride” is meant to point, not to that internal, vital union to Christ which is common to all who shall ever believe in him, but to special privileges peculiar to one class of them?

(2.) As the union of all believers to Christ is the same as to its essence, so the future glory of them all alike is represented as flowing from that union, and not from any external circumstances in which they may differ from each other. Is it necessary to give proofs of what is so manifest?

“Thou hast given thy Son power over all flesh,” said Jesus to his Father, “that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory,” &c. (John xvii, 2:24).

Here, all the elect get eternal life from Christ’s hands – will any that ever shall believe in him get less? But here, also, Christ wills that the same elect company be with him where he is, to behold his glory – and can any class of believers have more?

“This is the father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. No man can come to me except the Father, which hath sent me, draw him: and I will raise him up the last day. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” – (John vi. 39,44,54,56).

Who that reads these words can doubt that the elect – drawn to Christ by common supernatural grace, one with Him in common, by mutual inhabitation through the Spirit, and thus saved with a “common salvation” (Jude 3), are destined to partake in common of the resurrection, life, and glory of their Head? “The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one.” – (John xvii.22).

“Whom he did foreknow,” says Paul, “he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren, (in resurrection and glory surely, as well as every thing else.) Moreover whom he did predestinate (the whole company of the elect), them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. If any man (during the millennium surely, as well as at any other time) have not the Spirit of him that raised he is none of his. But 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.” – (Rom. viii. 29,30; 9,11).

But why go on? Who can read the New Testament, and fail to see that all the life, and glory, and fellowship with the Lamb, which any believers shall ever have, is made to flow from the common oneness of all believers with Christ, as Head of his body the Church, and not from the mere “external circumstances” which may distinguish one class of them from another?

Not only is there no ground for any such distinction, but the passages which, by a palpable misconception of them, are adduced in support of it prove just the reverse, For example

—

17.) “If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.” (Rom. viii.

“If we suffer we shall also reign with him.” – (2 Tim. ii.12.)

Who does not see that in these passages it is not suffering as opposed to unsuffering Christians, but true Christians as opposed to false, that are here described? In the one passage, we have but to read the whole verse to see this at once: –

“If children, then heirs, heirs, of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”

Shall we say that the latter clause of this verse is intended to limit the former? and that the apostle’s meaning is, that not all the children of God are heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ, but only such of them as suffer with him? As well might we say that in the first verse of this chapter, when the apostle says –

“There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.”

he means that not all that are in Christ Jesus are freed from condemnation, but only such of them as walk in the Spirit. The other passage shows this even more clearly, when, instead of only the one-half, we read the whole of it:

“If we suffer, we shall also reign with him; if we deny him He also will deny us.”

Here are not two kinds of Christians – suffering and unsuffering Christians – both genuine: but true Christianity distinguished from false, by “fellowship in Christ’s sufferings, and conformity to his death,” is the indispensable prelude to participation in his glory and reign.” (David Brown, Christ’s Second Coming, pp. 88-94).

Again, Landmarkers who place such weighty conclusions on such slender ground - let them consider this: “For we are (present tense) 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.” (Eph. 5:30-31). Paul quoting from Gen. 2:23,24 of the first creation and marriage likens the same to Christ and His church in the present tense. Also in Rom. 7:4 he states: “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” - present tense again. Right here I cannot help but quote from a famous Old School Baptist of yesterday, and though the quote is lengthy, it will be very rewarding to the careful reader:

REVELATION XXI. 1,2.

We are aware that there is a difference of opinion among even our most enlightened brethren in regard to the application of this, as well as many other portions of the book of

Revelation, particularly in regard to the period to which these portions refer. Some have understood this passage to refer to the gospel state of the church in the primitive age; others have thought it applicable to a state of primitive purity at which the church shall be restored before the dissolution of the world, while others again have regarded the language as descriptive of the final triumphant state of the church, after the resurrection of the dead. But while these differences have been held and expressed without giving the least offense, or disturbing the fellowship of brethren, all experimental christians have agreed in applying this Scripture to the church of the living God; and in understanding the striking and beautiful imagery as expressive and illustrative of the distinguishing doctrine of the gospel.

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride for her husband.”

Without any design to controvert the view of any brother, we will simply present such views, imperfect though they may be, as the subject suggests to our mind, and leave our readers to examine and receive or reject them, as their judgment may dictate. To us, the new heaven and the new earth which John saw, is the same which he also calls the holy city, the New Jerusalem, and both figures mean the church of Christ under the gospel dispensation. This church has existed in such form and manner as to answer the description in the text and its connection, from the time of her organization on the day of Pentecost, to the present time, and will so continue until the end of time; but her peculiar beauty is not always apparent. Since her gospel organization, she has, to all human appearance, seemed to wax and wane like the moon. Sometimes she has been involved in clouds and thick darkness, and sometimes she has looked forth as the morning - shining in the heavenly radiance of the Son of righteousness. Sometimes driven into the wilderness, and anon, she is seen standing on a sea of glass, or appearing before the throne of God and the Lamb, and sounding her loud Alleluias to the Lord. John seems to have had a view of her, in his visions, in every variety of attitude and circumstance which she had then, or ever should present. As the new heaven and the new earth, and as the holy city, the New Jerusalem, her gospel comeliness, as the perfection of beauty, in distinction from the old receding heaven and earth and sea, of the legal dispensation, appears. The same figurative idea is also presented by the old and new Jerusalems. As the old Jerusalem, according to Paul's allegory, was in connection of Hagar, or Mount Sinai in Arabia, signifying her identity with the old covenant, and her bondage with her children. (Gal. iv. 25.) The new Jerusalem is free, and the mother of us all, who, as Isaac was, are the children of promise; so the old heavens and earth which had passed away, must, if we are correct in understanding their figurative import as being the same, refer to the abolition of the ceremonial covenant, and the new heaven and earth, must refer to the new covenant and its dispensation.

Israel, under the legal covenant, embraced or embodied those elements which were destined to melt with fervent heat, when the old heavens should be rolled together as a scroll, and as a vesture be laid aside. As an old heaven, that order of things had its elements as the sun, or inspired revelation; its moon, or the embodied types, which borrowed light from the sun, and reflected it upon the people of God under that dispensation, and its stars, the prophets of the Lord; but all these were shadows of good things to come, the substance or body of which is Christ.

The glory of the new heaven is beautifully set forth in the sublime language of the inspired psalmist, Psalm xix. 106, “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge.

There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the Son; which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the ends of the heaven, and his circuit unto the end of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof." Philosophers, astronomers and wise men of the earth, have ever found much to admire in the contemplation of the natural heavens, where worlds of living light and beauty proclaim to all the families of the earth, the surpassing workmanship of God. But how much more sublime and elevated must be the contemplation of the new heaven and new earth, when the mind, illuminated by divine revelation, is permitted to "mount up and view the glories of the eternal skies." The church of God, under this figure, presents her sun, her moon, her stars, and all in perfect harmony pour forth their floods of living light in honor of him who has garnished the heavens, and marshaled all the heavenly hosts. In the new heaven which John saw, and which all enlightened christians may see, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Sun of righteousness with healing in his wings, comes out of his chamber, as a bridegroom. Riding upon the heavens in the help of his people, and in his excellency on the sky. Like a strong man, and as the man whom God has made strong for himself, the man Christ Jesus, rejoiceth to run his race. One and identical with the Father in absolute Deity and eternal Godhead, yet filling, as Mediator, the place of Days-man, "who can lay his hand on both," he is worshiped and adored by all the angels and spirits of the just, before the throne of heaven. He bows his heavens and comes down to find and fill that tabernacle which he has set in the new heaven for the Sun. His brightness, says the prophet Habakkuk, was like the light, he had horns coming out of his hand, and there was the hiding of his power. He is the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person. As the natural sun rises in the east, and pours his radiance unto the extreme west, so the Sun of righteousness is from everlasting to everlasting. His going forth is from the end of heaven, even from everlasting, and his circuit is unto the ends of it. He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending, the Almighty. How gloomy would be the natural heavens without the natural sun; but how much more gloomy would be the spiritual heaven without Christ. He is the fountain and source of all spiritual light. He is the light of the world; for there is no spiritual light in the world but what is in him. He shines in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God. He has bespangled the new heavens with stars, which he holds in his right hand; but all their brilliancy is by the light reflected from him through them. He has given gifts for the edification of the body, the church, and these he has marshaled in their appropriate orbits, and they cannot, nor do they desire to turn either to the right hand or to the left. The apostles had their spheres appointed, and so with all the gifts of prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, for he holds them in his right hand; nor will he allow the voluntary associations of men, or mission boards, or ecclesiastical dignitaries to pluck them from his hand. His clouds of witnesses are in the new heavens, charged with the thunder of his word, and the lightning of his truth. "Ask ye of the Lord rain in the time of the latter rain; so the Lord shall make bright clouds." - Zech. x. 1. Through his bright clouds his doctrine shall drop as the rain, and his speech shall distill as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as showers upon the grass. (Deut. xxxii. 2.) In the clouds of this new heaven he makes the rainbow of the covenant appear. John saw a rainbow encircling the throne on which the Prince of glory presides. (Rev. iv. 3; x. 1.)

Time and space and ability fail in our attempt to describe the superior glory of the new heaven and the new earth. All the elements of the holy Jerusalem are new; nothing of the old remains, they are like a vesture laid aside, and their elements are melted with fervent heat.

Behold, says Christ, I make all things new. Paul was caught up to the third heaven, and saw what he was unable to describe of the new heaven, and it is not surprising that our limited powers should utterly fail to express things which are so indescribably glorious.

John says, "And I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven." It is impossible for the wisdom of this world to comprehend the origin of the church of God. Many imagine that it is composed of flesh and blood; that it comes by observation; that men are employed, and money invested, for the purpose of procuring from the earth a kingdom for our Lord; that men are to win a bride for the lamb. But they do not know that his bride is already betrothed, and already prepared as a bride for her husband. They do not know that this kingdom was with God, as a prepared kingdom from the foundation of the world. (Matt. xxv. 34) The holy city was not seen coming up, but coming down from God; her origin is above, her life is hid with Christ in God. Nor does she descend to earth to procure a bridal dress, or to make preparation for the consummation of the marriage; for, like everything that comes from God, she come already prepared. A boundless theme for contemplation is presented in the ancient preparation of the bride for her husband. As set forth in the figure of the first Adam, whose bride was provided in his original creation and formation, so as far back into the ancients of eternity as we can trace the goings forth of Christ in his Mediatorial capacity, we may contemplate the church of God set up in him who was set up from everlasting, chosen in him, blessed with all spiritual blessings in him, by which she is not only prepared, but also adorned as a bride for her husband. She is and was clothed with salvation before the world began; for Paul says, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an 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." Clothed in his salvation, and covered with his righteousness, and adorned with all the rich gifts of the Spirit, shod with the preparation of the gospel, wearing the helmet of salvation, the shield of faith, she is well described as the perfection of beauty. (Psalm 1.2.) And her language is, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God: for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with jewels." – Isaiah lxi. 10 He whose works were all finished from the foundation of the world, (Heb. iv. 3), hath thus clothed, beautified and adorned her; and, thus prepared, she is made manifest by revelation. So we see that this holy city, this New Jerusalem, is not only adorned for her Husband; but she is adorned by her Husband. She has not clothed herself with salvation, nor covered herself with righteousness. He hath done it all, and in thus clothing and adorning her, he hath done it all in a manner calculated to express the union and relationship of the Bridegroom and the bride. He has clothed and covered her with salvation and righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself, not as he decketh another; for she is recognized by him as the bone of his bones, and the flesh of his flesh; and in adorning her with ornaments, and decking her with jewels, it is all done by him as unto himself, and not as for another. Thus the church, though viewed in any other light than that of her relationship to Christ, is black as the tents of Kedar, yet in the comeliness which Christ has put upon her, she is as white and spotless as the curtains of Solomon. (Cant. i. 5.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men," &c. The great voice which John heard, is the voice of the Bridegroom, and the voice of the bride; or in other words, the voice of Christ, by his Spirit through the gifts which he has bestowed upon his members, and this is truly a great voice in many respects. It is great, as being his voice by which the worlds were made, by which dead sinners are made alive in a spiritual sense, and by which all they are in their graves shall be raised at the last day. Great, as

emanating from him who has all power in heaven and in earth. Great, because of the importance of the proclamation uttered, and great as being proclaimed in every nation, language and tongue, throughout the world, through the gifts bestowed upon his church. The heaven from which John heard this voice, is the new heaven of which he had a revelation as declared in this text, and evidently means the church of the living God, which is the ground and pillar of the truth. The gospel of the Son of God proclaims what John heard, namely, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall dwell with them," &c. The tabernacle which Moses made in the wilderness, according to the pattern which the God of Israel showed him in the holy mount, was a type or figure of the tabernacle intended in our text, and was to be set up in manner and form precisely as it stood in the mount of God when Moses first saw it, and to be made of the materials which God had before designated, and it was to be consecrated to the purpose by him ordained, and to contain the ark of the covenant, the mercy-seat, the cherubims of glory, and to be the place where the God of heaven would meet his chosen tribes, in the person of their High Priest, and commune with them from between the cherubims, and from over the mercy-seat.

The body in which Christ appeared in his incarnation, may be viewed as a tabernacle of God, for God was manifest in the flesh, and in that body all the church of the first-born was represented. The fullness of the Godhead bodily and the church was and is complete in him. But in the immediate sense of the text under consideration, the mystical body, the church, is in our view, intended as the antitypical tabernacle of God. The psalmist says of the church, "God is in the midst of her." – Psalm xlv. 5. And again, "For the Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it. I will abundantly bless her provision: I will satisfy her poor with bread." – Psalm cxxxii. 13-15. The application of the figure of the tabernacle in the wilderness, as designed to prefigure the true tabernacle into which Christ has, by his own blood, and through the eternal Spirit, entered, is very clearly stated in Heb. viii. 2-5; ix. 2-14. It is a tabernacle made without hands. For God dwelleth in the church, as we have proven, but we are told that God dwelleth not in tabernacles made with hands, therefore the church is a building of God, a house or tabernacle not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. (2 Cor. v.1.) A kingdom prepared for the saints from the foundation of the world. (Matt. xxv. 34.) A stone cut out of the mountain without hands. (Dan. ii. 45.) But in the revelation made to John, Behold it is with men. This holy city, New Jerusalem comes down from God, out of heaven, and is set up in gospel order, according to the pattern in the mount of God, and God, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, comes down to dwell in it, because he has desired it, and he will dwell in this tabernacle forever. The church is frequently spoken of as the temple as well as the tabernacle of the Lord, which signifies his special dwelling place. In the mystical body of Christ what wonders are revealed. The eternal God and redeemed sinners meet together there. The saints are redeemed unto God, and God is in Christ. Here the fullness of eternal God head is embodied, and here the church is complete; the fullness of him that filleth all in all. And he, the eternal God, will dwell with them, (Eph. i. 23; Col. ii. 9,10,) with men redeemed from the earth. What a wonderful household is this! God dwells with his people: "And they shall be his people," "They shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." – Mal. iii. 17. And this is the special provision of the new covenant, I will be their God, and they shall be my people, (Heb. viii. 10; Jer. xxxi. 33.) And God himself shall be with them, and be their God. He will never leave nor forsake them; and he will put his fear in their heart, that they shall not depart from him, and he will not turn away from them to do them good. He will be their God, to protect and defend them, to feed and comfort them, to wipe away all their tears. He will be their God, as the object of their worship, their

adoration and praise; they shall trust alone in him, and have no other God before him. They are safe while he condescends to be with them as their God. The eternal God is their refuge, and underneath them are his everlasting arms; their place of defense is the munition of rocks; God is a wall of fire around about, and a glory in their midst. He is their Shepherd, they shall not want. He leads them in green pastures by the living waters. And "The Lamb, that is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of water: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." – Rev. vii. 17. Middletown, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1855, (Gilbert Beebe, Editorials, Vol. 3, pp. 277-287).

A Future Bride?

The truth is in the type. Israel did not wait till the end of her age to become the wife of God. The Israel of the New Covenant did not either - Eph. 5; Rom. 7. Notice the present tenses in these verses. Only in the absurd, futuristic scheme of Darby - Graves, Scofield and our modern Landmarkers do we wait after 2000 years for the wedding of the bride. Using Scripture to interpret scripture, not interpreting the ancient Hebrew and Greek with modern literal English prose, the Preterist scheme is the only interpretation that will stand. When that child was born (Isa. 9:6-9) His reign, His rule, His kingdom, His covenant all began. The end of the one age ended with the ending of the first covenant - the last vestige of which was at the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D. The new age (and the last) began in its complete full force sense at that time - The new Jerusalem, The New Covenant, the New Israel, the Kingdom, the heavenly reign of the heavenly Mediator, fulfilling all the prophets: Luke 1:70; 24; 44; Acts 3:18, 24,25,; 13:23-33.

The sheep "go in and out and find pasture" through the door of the sheepfold (John 10:1-9); The nations of the saved walk in the light of the heavenly Jerusalem - bring their glory and honor into it - and "they (only enter it) which are written in the lambs book of life" (Rev. 21:24-27); the same heavenly Jerusalem to which the Hebrew christians had already come (Heb. 12:22) at the coming of the New Covenant figuratively proclaimed by the "shaking and removal" of heaven, the abolishing of the old covenant and the inauguration of the new, i.e., and new heaven and a new earth (Heb. 12:25-29; II Pet. 3:10-13; Rev. 21:1-2; Isa. 65:17). Paul applies Isa. 54:1 to the churches of Galatia as the Israel of God (6:16). In Gal. 4:27, and also in Isa. 54:5 this is written: "for thy maker, is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called," which also applies, according to Paul, to them under the New Covenant.

Moreover, in Rev. 21:3 this is stated after John sees the heavenly city descending: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men and he shall dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God;"; typed in Israel under the first covenant (Lev. 26:11-12) "And I will set my tabernacle among you; and ye shall be my people;"; Prophesied at the coming of the new Covenant in Ezk. 37:26; "Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them...and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forever more. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people;"; fulfilled in II Cor. 6:16: "As God has said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." All pertaining to this age, the age of the Messiah.

"In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee" Heb. 2:12. Landmarkers say this occurred at the close of the Lord's supper (Mt. 26:30), showing plainly the Lord had his church

at this time. Landmarkers refer to this but Paul does not. Paul is speaking of the glory of Christ, after the death of Christ and His deliverance:

□“Saying, I will declare thy name unto My brethren” (v. 12). Once more the apostle appeals to the written Word for support of what he had just affirmed. A quotation is made from Psa. 22, one which not only substantiated what had been said in v. 11, but which also made a further contribution towards removing the objection before him. As is well known, the 22nd is the great Cross Psalm. In vv. 20,21, the suffering Saviour is heard crying, “Deliver My soul from the sword (of Divine justice, cf. Zech. 13:7), My darling from the power of the dog (the Gentiles, cf. Matt. 15:24-26). Save Me from the lion’s (the devil’s, cf. I Peter 5:8) mouth.” Then follows faith’s assurance, “For Thou hast heard Me from the horns of the unicorn.” This is the turning point of the Psalm: the cries of the Sufferer are heard on High. What a conclusive and crushing reply was this to the objecting Jew! God’s own Word had foretold the humiliation and sufferings of their Messiah. There it was, unmistakably before them. What could they say? The Scriptures must be fulfilled. No reply was possible.

But more: not only did the 22nd Psalm announce beforehand the sufferings of the Messiah; it also foretold His victory. Read again the last clause of v. 21: “Save from the lion’s mouth: for Thou hast heard Me.” Christ was “saved”, not from death, but out of death, cf. Heb. 5:7. Now what is the very next thing in Psalm 22? This: “I will declare Thy name unto My brethren” (v. 22). Here the Saviour is seen on resurrection ground, victorious over every foe. It is this which the apostle quotes in Heb. 2:12.

Now that which it is particularly important to note is that in this verse from Psa. 22 Christ is heard saying He would declare the Father’s name unto His “brethren.” That could only be possible on resurrection ground. Why? Because by nature they were “dead in trespasses and sins.” But as “quickened together with Christ” (Eph. 2:5) they were made sons of God, and therefore the “brethren” of the risen Son of God. Hence the great importance of noting carefully the very point at which v. 22 occurs in the 22nd Psalm. The Lord Jesus never called His people “brethren” on the other side of the Cross! He spoke of them as “disciples,” “sheep,” “friends,” but never as “brethren.” But as soon as He was risen from the dead, He said to Mary, “Go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My Father and to your Father” (John 20:17). Here, then, was the unanswerable reply to the Jews’ objection: Christ could reach resurrection ground only by passing through death, cf. John 12:24.

“I will declare Thy name unto My brethren.” Here the Son is heard addressing the Father, promising that He would execute the charge which had been given Him. The Greek word of “declare” is very emphatic and comprehensive. It means, To proclaim and publish, to exhibit and make known. To declare God’s “Name” signifies to reveal what God is, to make known His excellencies and counsels. This is what Christ came here to do: see John 17:6,26. None else was competent for such a task, for none knoweth the Father but the Son (Matt. 11:27). But only to His “brethren” did Christ do so. They are the “babes” unto whom heavenly things are made known the “mysteries of the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 13:11). From all others these blessed revelations are “hid,” to those “without” they are but “parables.”

“In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto Thee” (v. 12). This completes the quotation from Psalm 22:22. NO doubt the first fulfillment of this took place during the “forty days” of Acts 1:3: mark how Acts 1:4 brings in the assembly; though its ultimate fulfillment is yet future. The position in which Christ is here viewed is very blessed, “in the midst”: it is the Redeemer leading the praises of His redeemed. Strangers to God may go through all the outward forms of mere “religion,” but they never praise God. It is only upon resurrection ground that

worship is possible. A beautiful type of this is found in Ex. 15:1: it was only after Israel had crossed the Red Sea, and the Egyptians were dead upon the shore, that “Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song.” Note how Moses, the typical mediator, led their praises! (A.W. Pink, Hebrews).

Also Owen:

1. The singing of hymns of praise unto God in the great congregation was then a principal part of his worship. And in the first expression two things are observable: – (1.) What Christ undertakes to do; and that is, to praise God. Now this is only exegetical of what went before. He would praise God by declaring his name. There is no way whereby the praise of God may be celebrated like that of declaring his grace, goodness, and love unto men; whereby they may be won to believe and trust in him, whence glory redounds unto him. (2.) The cheerfulness and alacrity of the spirit of Christ in this work. He would do it as with joy and singing, with such a frame of heart as was required in them who were to sing the praises of God in the great assemblies in the temple.

2. Where would he do this? “in the midst of the congregation,” – “the great congregation,” as he calls it, verse 23; that is, the great assembly of the people in the temple. And this was a type of the whole church of the elect under the new testament. The Lord Christ, in his own person, by his Spirit in his apostles, by his word, and by all his messengers unto the end of the world, setting forth the love, grace, goodness, and mercy of God in him the mediator, sets forth the praise of God in the midst of the congregation. I shall only add, that whereas singing of hymns unto God was an especial part of the institution of worship under the old testament, to whose use these expressions are accommodated, it is evident that the Lord Christ hath eminently set forth this praise of God in his institution of worship under the new testament, wherein God will ever be glorified and praised. This was that which the Lord Christ engaged to do upon the issue of his sufferings; and we may propose it unto our example and instruction, namely, –

v. That which was principally in the heart of Christ upon his sufferings, was to declare and manifest the love, grace, and good-will of God unto men, that they might come to an acquaintance with him and to acceptance before him.

There are two things in the psalm and the words that manifest how much this was upon the heart of Christ. The most part of the psalm containeth the great conflict that he had with his sufferings, and the displeasure of God against sin declared therein. He is no sooner delivered from thence, but instantly he engageth in this work. As he lands upon the shore from that tempest wherein he was tossed in his passion, he cries out, “I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.” (John Owen, Hebrews).

Also in this same Psalm, verses 25-27: “My praise shall be of thee in thy great congregation.” and speaks of “all the ends of the world”...“among the nations,” gentiles. Paul quotes in another place of Christ singing among the gentiles: “And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.” (Rom. 15:9). Gill says:

“As it is written, in Psal. xvii. 49, for this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto they name; which words are not spoken unto God by David, literally considered, but as personating the Messiah; for David when he penned this psalm was in the decline of life,

the next account after this is of his last dying words, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1; nor could he hope to praise God among the Gentiles, nor did he in person, but in his Son the Messiah. These words are the words of Christ unto his Father, who in the title of the psalm is called the servant of God, he being the Mediator eminently; he is represented as encompassed with the sorrows and snares of death and the grave, which agree with Jesus when in the garden, and on the cross. God is all along in it spoken as his Helper and Deliverer, as he was to Christ in his human nature, having promised to be so, and on which he depended; and the person, the subject of the psalm, is a victorious person, one that has got the conquest over all enemies, which is in the fullest sense true of the Messiah, who has overcome the world, made an end of sin, destroyed Satan, spoiled principalities and power, and abolished death: and particularly is said to be the Head of the heathen, and they to be voluntary subjects to him, ver. 43,44; which is expressed in much the same language as the like things are in Isa. lv. 4,5.; which is so manifest a prophecy of the Messiah; add to all which, that the Lord's anointed, the King Messiah, and who is called David, is expressly mentioned in the words following these that are cited, and which are applied by the Jews themselves to the Messiah; as in the 32d verse of this psalm paraphrased of him, by the Targumist upon it; what is here said by the Messiah to God, is that he would confess to him among the Gentiles: which is to be understood not of confession of sin, or of a confession of faith in him; but of praise and thanksgiving, a celebration of his perfections, particularly his grace, mercy, and goodness; ascribing honour and glory to him, either for the conversion of the Gentiles, as he did in the believing Jews, Acts xi. 18; or by the mouth of the Gentiles, for what God had done in bringing the Gospel to them, Acts xiii. 48, or among them, by his apostles and ministers of the Gospel being made very successful among them, and made to triumph in Christ, whilst they diffused the savour of his knowledge in every place. The word Lord is omitted in this citation, though it appears in the Vulgate Latin and Arabic versions, and in the Complutensian edition, and two of Stephen's copies: and sing unto thy name; psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, to the glory of his grace, and in all the churches of the Gentiles, to which they are directed by the Spirit of Christ, Ephes. v. 19, Col. iii. 16." (Gill, Commentary, Rom. 15:9).

These two passages present much difficulty to the advocates of the generic theory. The first of them contains two parallel clauses, in which "my brethren" and "the church" are corresponding phrases, and signify the same persons. The brethren of Christ are the "many sons" whom he, as the captain of their salvation, is conducting to glory. He declares God's name to the brethren, and in the midst of the church, the assembly of these brethren, he celebrates the praise of God. This is the church universal; for he says, concerning them, in presenting them to the Father, "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me." This cannot be consistently interpreted of a local church, either single or generic. (Dagg, Theology, p. 117).

The Sending of Paul - Acts 13

Landmarkers make much of this scripture - the, only one they have which "proves" that: 1. The church has the authority; 2. That Paul himself was under this authority; 3. That for anyone else to be "scriptural" he, must do likewise.

First, let us notice Gill on this scripture - he wrote long before Landmark Dogma appeared, and was deeply studied in the mannerism of the Jews. Note the following:

“Ver. 3. And when they had fasted and prayed, &c. Not when they had done fasting and praying, at the time the Holy Ghost made an impulse on their minds, to separate two of their brethren to a work they were appointed to; but at another time, which was fixed for that purpose; when they fasted and prayed, not for direction, who they were to set apart and send; for the persons were before pointed out to them, but that they might have every needful gift and qualification for the work, and be succeeded in it: and laid their hands on them; not as ordaining them, for this was not an ordination; the Apostle Paul particularly was not ordained an Apostle by man, but by Jesus Christ; who personally appeared to him, and ordained him his minister and Apostle; and much less by men inferior to himself, as Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen were; but this was a gesture and ceremony used among the Jews, when they wished any blessing or happiness to attend any persons; and so these prophets, when they separated Paul and Barnabas from their company, and were parting from them, put their hands on them, and wished them all prosperity and success: could this be thought to be an ordination, as it cannot, since both of them were stated and authorised ministers of the word, and one of them an apostle long before this; there might seem some likeness between it and the Jewish ordination of elders, which was done by three, as here were Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen; but then this was not done without the land of Israel, as here, nor by imposition of hands: now when they had thus prayed for them, and wished them well, they sent them away; to do the work they were called unto; not in an authoritative way, but in a friendly manner they parted with them, and bid them farewell.” (John Gill, Commentary, Acts 13:3).

And further, Gill’s comments on Gal. 2:9:

“They gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; as a token of a covenant or agreement between them; they took them, as it were, into partnership with them, admitted them as apostles into their society, and give their full consent, particularly to this article, that we, Paul and Barnabas, should go unto the heathen, preach among the Gentiles; and they, Peter, and those that were with him, unto the circumcision, and discharge their office among the Jews; and, to show their joint agreement, used the above rite; and which ceremony was used as among other nations, and so with the Jews, when covenants were made, or partnership was entered into; see Lev. vi.2; where the phrase, in putting of the hand, and which we render in fellowship, is, both by Oukelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel, rendered, in fellowship of the hand, or by the right hand of fellowship; that being given in token of their agreement and consent to be partners together, to which allusion seems to be here; or to the making of proselytes, to whom they stretch out the hand to bring them under the wings of the Shekinah, or in token of their being proselytes. Gal. 2:9

This sending was by the Holy Spirit, not after Landmarkism, but after the manner of the Jews. Paul did many things after the manner of the Jews: he circumcised Timothy while carrying letters against circumcision to gentile churches, (Acts 16); within the letter itself were instructions honoring some Jewish laws, (Acts 15); he took a vow in Acts 18, and another in chapter 21 -

“For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more, and unto the Jews I became as Jew, that I might gain the Jews to them that are under the law, as under law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.) that I

might gain them that are without law. To the weak I became as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospels sake..." I Cor. 9:19-23.

Paul was not your average Landmarker. Let us notice the sending of Paul. When, "Paul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple", Acts 9:26. Did he not have an authoritative letter from the Damascus Church? Evidently not. When the question of circumcision came up at Antioch, Paul and Barnabas "had no small dissension and disputation with them" (Acts 15:2), all, before the Council of Jerusalem and when they returned, from the Council of Jerusalem, and gathered the "multitude together (at Antioch) they delivered the epistle: which when they had read they rejoiced at the consolation" (Acts 15:30-31). If Paul and Barnabas were under the authority of the Antioch church, they were teaching things beyond the knowledge of that church even disputing with that church - is this correct Landmark doctrine? The Antioch church sent Paul and Barnabas and other brethren (authoritatively, no doubt!) to the Jerusalem council (Acts 15:2); which in turn, sent them back to Antioch (Acts 15:15); but lo and behold! Jerusalem claims Paul and Barnabas as, their missionaries in verse 25: "It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with OUR beloved Paul and Barnabas." Acts 15:36: "Some days after Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the Word of the Lord, and see how they do." Then came the dispute between Paul and Barnabas over John Mark. Why did the Landmark Church at Antioch not settle this dispute that, their missionaries had? Did the church not have the authority? Let us notice some more sendings of Paul: at Thessalonica, "The brethren immediately, sent away Paul and Silas by night unto Berea", Then the "Brethren (in Berea), sent away Paul to go as it were to the sea." (Acts 17:10,14). These, sendings are about as authoritative as the sending in Acts 13 where "Paul had moved his membership!"

"But Paul came back to Antioch and, reported to them." Authoritatively? He did not the last time - according to the Landmark view Paul greatly wronged the church at Antioch by not "reporting" the last time - he knew he would, never see them again. Some Landmarkers say Paul proceeded to Jerusalem, against the advice of the Spirit - how absurd - he proceeded in, preparation by the Spirit for the coming persecution.

But apart from all this, Paul's conversion, commission, and following action completely disproves the Landmark theory which states: Commission only to Church, Apostles worked through Church.

"But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts 26:16:18).

All this is not through a church but immediately from Christ - just as the other Apostles; and notice Paul's action:

"But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace, to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the heathen; immediately I

conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's Brother" (Gal. 1:15-19).

Paul did not seek any supposed "Church authority" - did not go to the Apostles - was "unknown to the churches of Judea which were in Christ" (v. 22) - he did go to Arabia and undoubtedly preached and organized churches there: "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision" (Acts 21:19); and, "Immediately" he began his work. How unlike the Landmark system! And if the Landmark system were true, why was it not observed with Paul? Yea, any other place in scripture? Christ ordained the twelve apostles Himself - Paul being no exception - he was a witness of the resurrected Christ, received his commission directly from Him. "The apostles were not limited to any particular church, but had the care of, and presided in all the churches wherever they came." (Gill, Divinity, p. 863).

And now arises another problem for the Landmarkers (the Modern ones), who claim that a new born child (newly organized church) cannot have but one mother (profound wisdom!) Since Paul did not administer baptism himself (only rarely, I Cor. 1), and in his company were "Sopater of Berea; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus" (Acts 20:4); and unless it can be proven that these were "out of town members" of the church of Antioch, only the Lord knows to which church their converts were baptized "into"! Especially more does the Landmark absurdity appear when we consider that the scriptures nowhere speak of a "mission" being organized out of another church. An assembly of Saints in the scriptures is an assembly, not a mission. Can anyone imagine on the great day of the organization of any of these converts into a Sovereign Grace, pre-trib, pre-mill, Landmark, local Baptist Church, that one was waiting for his "letter" from Berea, another from Thessalonica, another from Antioch, another from Asia, of Derbe? Ad nauseum. Such a caricature by our modern "theologians"!

The plain facts are: The Apostles were sent immediately by the Lord, guided by the Spirit, (The hand of the Lord was with them, the Spirit suffered them not to go, or to go), they were not under the authority of anyone but Christ; no more under the authority of the churches of that day than their writings are of the Landmark churches of our day! And how simple it is to storm these Landmark strongholds and leave their silly little cavils destitute of any reason or scriptural sense!

CHAPTER IX

BAPTISTS AND THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH

This is a very dreaded heresy according to Landmarkism - one just cannot even be a Baptist today and believe it. To Landmarkers, it is either Local Church or Universal - there cannot be both: "...There is, one body" (Eph. 4). But as Thornbury points out:

"What are the facts of the case? Our study of these matters has revealed that the universal usage of the church, 1. Is not an invention of Protestants but can be found in the writings of Christians in the pre-Reformation period and even in the earliest Christian writings, and 2. Is not a concept of a minority of orthodox Baptists but was practically universally held by Baptists prior to the Landmark movement of the past century and by the overwhelming majority of them since then." (The Doctrine of the Church, Thornbury, p. 150).

That this is exactly so can be determined by reading his book - he proves it abundantly quoting from Lumpkin's confessions and by the greatest scholarship the world has known among Baptists. The Universal view was not held to the exclusion of the Local, but, inclusive. J.M. Pendleton and J.R. Graves both held it - they were the fathers of the Landmark system - though there were Landmarkers who preceded them, Jesse Mercer and Spencer Cone are examples. Here is the quote from Pendleton written almost twenty years after he wrote "An Old Landmark Reset":

"In its application to the followers of Christ, it refers either to a particular congregation of saints, or to the redeemed in the aggregate. It is employed in the latter sense in Ephesians 1:22; 3:21; 5:25,27. Here we have the expressions, "Head over all things to the Church": To him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages world without end"; "Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it...that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." In these passages, and a few more like them, it would be absurd to define the term Church as meaning a particular congregation of Christians, meeting in one place for the worship of God." (Church Manual, p. 5-6).

The following quote from Graves is one of the latter of his writings, some six years after he had written "Old Landmarkism":

"But I am fortunate in standing here this day, for the first time during this debate, to defend the common faith, on this point, of every denomination represented, or unrepresented, in this house, Disciples, Presbyterians, of all sorts, Episcopalians, high and low, Methodists, North and South, Baptists - and thank God, the teaching of the Sacred Word. It is at least gratifying to know that it is possible for us all to agree on any-one thing, and may the time soon come when we can agree on all that Christ has taught as well and so be one body, having but one Divine Head - and I believe that prayer of Christ will yet be answered: all true Christians will one day be one - mere partisans, never." (Graves - Ditzler Debate, p. 808).

I will not cover too much material on this subject - I wouldn't want to insult the intelligence of the reader - it would be a very poor student of history to say "all true baptists of the past have always and only held the Local Church view".

Jones gives three confessions of the Waldenses - the, first in the year 1120. The first Article stated:

"We believe and firmly maintained all that is contained in the Twelve articles of the symbol, commonly called the Apostles Creed, and we regard as heretical whatever is inconsistent with the said articles." (Jones, History, p. 45, vol. 2).

Article 9 of this creed states:

"(I believe) in the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." (See "Comparative table of the Ante-nicene Rules of faith, as related to the Apostles creed and the Nicene Creed" (Creeds of Christendom, Schaff, p. 40-41).

Jones gives the, second:

"The centuriators of Magdeburgh, in their history of the Christian Church, under the twelfth century, recite from an old ms. the following epitome of the opinions of the Waldenses of that age: "That is the Church of Christ, which hears the pure doctrine of Christ, and observes the ordinances instituted by him, in whatsoever place it exists." (Jones, p. 48).

(This is all I contend for in this article - Landmarkers would say the same with several pages of qualification.)

The, third confession of 1544, art. 4: "We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that have existed from the beginning of the world, or that shall be to the end thereof..." (p. 51, vol. 2).

Were these Waldenses unsound, then sound (with qualifications), then unsound again? Everyone knows but the Landmarks.

The first London Confession (2nd edition):

"And although the particular congregations be distinct, and several bodies, every one as a compact and knit city within itself; yet are they all to walk by one rule of truth; so also they (by all means convenient) are to have the counsel and help one of another, if necessity require it, as members of one body, in the common faith, under Christ their head. I Cor. 4:17, 14:33,36, 16:1; Ps. 122:3; Eph. 2:12,19; Rev. 21; I Tim. 3:15, 6:13,14; I Cor. 4:17; Acts 15:2,3; Song of Sol. 8:8,9; II Cor. 1:4, 13:14." (E.B. Underhill, Confessions, p. 44).

Are we to take this in the generic, institutional, distributive, abstract sense? I have heard Landmarkers say so, but look at Thornbury's quote:

"(5) The London confession, 1644 "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.” We suggest that the universal invisible church is strongly implied by the expression, “as it is visible to us”. This expression would be meaningless if the “spiritual Kingdom, which is the Church” referred to is the local church. In 1689 the same group of Baptists defined the universal church in no uncertain terms.” (Thornbury, *Doctrine of the Church*, p. 159).

To further verify Thornbury’s opinion one only needs to read some of the writings of the signers of this confession, vis. Spilsbury on Baptism; Kiffen on Communion; Hobson on Divinity; Knollys on Revelation; and the Minutes of the Associations of the Particular Baptists of the time. (At the end of this heading there will be a listing.)

The reason I quoted from the 2nd edition of the 1st London confession was not only to include another signer (Knollys) but to include Coxes’ appendix to this confession which states in article

XVII Believers baptized ought to agree and join together in a constant profession of the same doctrine of the Gospel, and in professed obedience thereunto, and also in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers Acts 2:42. And a company of baptized believers so agreeing and joining together, are a church or congregation of Christ, Acts 2:47.”

Now, any Landmark would agree with this, plus his qualification, i.e.. that a duly authorized Minister baptized them, from a duly authorized link-chain Landmark Baptist church, that they further were organized according to duly authorized Landmark dogma. But Notice:

THE ABINGDON ASSOCIATION RECORDS

“The first General Meeting

Wormsley, 8th month (vulgarly, October) 1652.

At a meeting of chosen members of the churches, viz., of Henly, Reding and Abingdon, it was concluded as followeth:

1st That particular churches of Christ ought to hold a firme communion each with other in point of advice in doubtful matters and controversies, Acts 15. 1s., 6,24,28; 16,4s. Which scriptures, compared together, shew that the church at Jerusalem held communion with the church of Antioch affording help to them as they could.

2ly In giving and receiving in case of want and poverty, I Cor. 16.3.

3ly In consulting and consenting to the carrying on of the worke of God as choosing messengers, etc., 2 Cor. 8.19. and, in all things else, wherein particular members of one and the same particular church stand bound to hold communion each with other for which conclusion we give these scripture reasons:

1st. Because there is the same relation

betwixt the particular churches each towards

other as there is betwixt particular members

of one church. For the churches of Christ

doe all make up one body or church in

generall under Christ their head as Eph.

1.22s; Col. 1.24; Eph. 23ff.; 2 Cor. 12.13f,

As particular members make up one particular

church under the same head, Christ, and all

the particular assemblys are but one Mount

Syon, Is. 4.5; Song 6.9. Christ his undefined is but one and in his body there is to be no schisme which is then found in the body when all the members have not the same care one over another. Wherefore we conclude that every church ought to manifest its care over other churches as fellow members of the same body of Christ in generall do rejoice and mourne with them, according to the law of their relation in Christ.”

Benjamin Coxe was one of the Ministers of the association, they claimed they were in agreement with the churches of London, Spilsbury, Kiffen, etc. Inconsistent? Only to the Landmark! Coxe taught the local and the Spiritual.

THE MIDLAND CONFESSION, 1655

In the Midlands seven churches were formed into an association of Particular Baptists by Daniel King in which later many others were added (Stokes, Lumpkin, Goadby), and in their “Sixteen Articles of faith and Order unanimously assented to by the messengers met at Warwick, the 3rd Day of the 3rd month, 1655,” the 9th and the 15th Articles show their belief in both the universal and the local aspects of the church:

9th. That Christ is the only true King, Priest, and Prophet of the Church. Acts iii. 22-23; Hebrews iv, 14, etc.; viii, 1, etc.

15th. That persons so Baptized ought by free consent, to walk together, as God shall give opportunity in distinct Churches, or assemblies of Zion, continuing in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, breaking of bread and prayers, as fellow-men caring for one another, according to the will of God. All these ordinances of Christ are enjoined in His Church, being to be observed till his second coming, which we ought diligently to wait for.”

(Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith)

Since Daniel King was the chief author of these Articles, we will give a quote from his book, *A Way to Zion*, etc., showing even more definitely that belief:

“...But it is certain Jews and Gentiles shall be brought into one sheepfold. John 10:16, and one shepherd shall be shepherd to them all, they shall all be under one King, Rev. 11:15. The Kingdoms of this world are our Lord’s and his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever; Zech. 14:9, the Lord is King over all the earth, in that day there shall be one Lord. there is but one mystical body of Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, 1 Cor. 12:13 for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, etc., Eph. 4:4. There is one body and there is one Spirit, by which they are inspired; there is but one hope of our calling: Jews and Gentiles have but one Lord, Jews and Gentiles have but one faith, Jews and Gentiles have but one baptism, Jews and Gentiles have but one God and Father of all, Eph. 4:4-6. And how could this be, if there were two several covenants, one for Jews and another for Gentiles? (*A Way to Zion*, P. 15).

And further, since four of the most prominent Baptists in London wrote the Preface to Kings' book, highly recommending it, and three of these four men were signatories of the famous 1st London Confession (Spilsbury, Kiffen, and Patience), which, with the confession, clearly shows their belief in both the universal and local aspects of the church.

Another example is Collier and the Somerset Confession:

"In 'The Epistle Dedicatory,' they disclaim any dislike to the former Confession of our beloved brethren, whom we own, and with whom we are one both in faith and practice, neither is there any thing in ours contradictory to our brethren that we know of." (The seven Churches of London. D.G.) The reasons given for publishing this Confession are: to show their agreement with the London Churches, especially in the matter of Calvinism; to bear "a public testimony before all men that (through grace) we do with one soul desire to cleave to the Lord, contending earnestly for the faith that was once given to the saints" (this in opposition to the Quakers, against whose dangerous errors there is a long and earnest warning and exhortation); there is exhortation also against formality, hypocrisy, and especially "pride in apparel and covetousness"; Underhill, pp. 61 to 106. (McGlothlin, Confessions p. 201).

†XXIV.

†

"THAT it is the duty of every man and woman, that have repented from dead works, and have faith towards God, to be baptized (Acts 2:38; 8:12, 37, 38.), that is, dipped or buried under water (Rom. 6:3, 4; Col. 2:12.), in the name of our Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16.), or in the name of the Father, son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19.), therein to signify and represent a washing away of sin (Acts 22:16.), and their death, burial, and resurrection with Christ (Rom. 6:5; Col. 2:12.), and being thus planted in the visible church or body of Christ (I Cor. 12:3.), who are a company of men and women separated out of the world by the preaching of the gospel (Acts 2:41; 2 Cor. 6:17.), do walk together in communion in all the commandments of Jesus (Acts 2:42.), wherein God is glorified and their souls comforted (2 Thes. I:II, 12; 2 Cor. 1:4.)." (Lumpkin, Confessions).

Again, Landmarkers will agree with this with their qualification, but notice in another writing by Collier:

1. It intends a people gathered out of the World by the ministry of the Gospel to the visible profession of Faith in Christ Jesus, and obedience to him, to Faith and Holiness, the Gospel constituted Church of Christ; and this is the Church I especially intend to speak of, the visible constituted Church of Christ; and this is distinguished into several bodies, or congregational Assemblies, under the regal Government of Christ their Lord, yielding professed subjection to Jesus Christ in his Law and Ordinances, as far as they are instructed therein; every particular Congregation having the same power from Christ their Head and Lord; not one to Lord it over another, but to help and assist in love; and the Church of Christ is thus gathered into many particular Assemblies, by reason of defiance of place, number of persons, that they cannot assemble in one; or a few Assemblies, but in as many as are necessary for their coming together, and comfortable serving of the Lord. That the Church of Christ is, or should be gathered thus, appeareth, AU. 14.23. I Cor. 1.2. Gal. 1.2. Rev. 1.4. All which proves the truth asserted, and that they had all of them the Ordinances of Christ administered in each Assembly, as appears evidently by the Apostles reproof and direction on this account, about matters of Order and

Ordinances, as relating to particular Churches, I Cor. 11. and 14. Chapt. Tit. 1.5. Phil. 1. 1. Rev. 2 and 3 Chapt.

And this Church in all its particular Assemblies is gathered out of the World, and from the World, to the Lord, by the Word and Spirit of Christ, Matt. 28. 19,20. Mar. 16. 15,16. AU. 2. 41,42,47. and 4. 4. and 13. 48,49. This was the Apostles commission, Au. 26. 17,18. Which work was always accomplished in this way, without, and contrary to the humane power, who ordinarily hath opposed this new Covenant work of Christ.” (Collier’s Divinity, p. 458-459).

The same is said in the 2nd London Confession which was adopted by the Philadelphia Association in America:

“The catholic or universal Church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit, and truth of Grace may be called invisible, consists of the whole. (Heb. 12:23; Col. ii.18; Eph. i. 20,22,23, and Ch. v. 23. 27. 32) number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the Head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” (Underhill, Confessions).

This is the first paragraph, the remaining fourteen paragraphs (on the Church) refer almost exclusively to the Local. My, oh my, laments the Landmark, were not these old Baptists inconsistent! “They were simply overcome with the Protestant Scholarship of the age!” Such a degrading statement describing our Baptist forefathers! Graves says “The New Hampshire Confession appeared fifty years ago, and has been adopted by the larger body of American Baptists, - gives no other definition of a New Testament Church than a local assembly, and it had been well had no other idea ever been instilled into the minds of Baptists,” Intercommunion, p. 108. While it defines the local church, it certainly implies the universal. Says Thornbury:

“Twice in this document, in articles 12 and 13, reference is made to the, Visible church. Historically the terms, visible and invisible have been used to distinguish between the two meanings of the church. We have every reason to assume that Mr. Brown and those who aided him in the composition of the New Hampshire Confession used the word, Visible in the ordinary sense. Section 13 says, “we believe that a visible church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers,” etc. Thus the confession is not seeking to give a comprehensive definition as to the different Biblical meanings of the word Church, but is merely defining one kind of a church. i.e., a visible one. But this, implies the existence of a church which they do not explicitly define, namely, an, invisible church. It must be remembered that the New Hampshire Confession is much shorter than the Philadelphia Confession, The latter has 34 lengthy sections, the former only 18 short sections.” (The Doctrine of the Church, Thornbury, p. 161).

To prove the correctness of Thornbury’s assumption we only need to give a quote from J.N. Brown’s views of the Church, then we can clearly see his intent when composing the New Hampshire confession:

“The term ‘church’ is here used, it will be seen not for the whole body of the elect which is ever invisible on earth - nor for any particular body of Christian believers assembling together in one place, as in Jerusalem, or Antioch; but in a third sense equally scriptural and important, for the aggregate of all such particular independent churches” (Southern Baptist Review, Graves, Vol. 1, 1855, p. 206).

(Graves was well aware of this statement - he is the author of the article on "Church History" in which this quote by Brown appears - from a much larger quote.) Why did Graves mislead? He quotes authors with whom he disagrees, on points where there is general agreement, then reads his own views into their writings as if these authors were in complete agreement with him!

What do the scriptures teach? After all they are our sole rule of faith and practice - but I do want to point out here - this is the same claim of all the Baptists who held the universal view, that these same scriptures were also their sole rule of faith and practice; and since they did not hold the Landmark view of the nature of the church, their practice was also different in the administration of Baptism and the organization of churches, as has been abundantly shown throughout this paper.

The old covenant contrasted with the new: An earthly people - an heavenly; an earthly Kingdom - an heavenly; earthly sacrifices - an heavenly; earthly land - an heavenly; earthly city - an heavenly; the old covenant was the legal administration of the covenant of Grace - the new covenant the Spiritual administration of the covenant of Grace; the one; the old heavens and the old earth - the other: The New Heavens and the New earth; an earthly Israel - an heavenly Israel of God. Much of this will be disputed by the Landmark as many of them are Dispensationalists - and dispensationalism goes hand in glove with Landmarkism - both rejoice in carnal, earthly administrations, but all the above is much larger than the Local Church. The New Covenant is tied to an heavenly people (our citizenship is in heaven, Phil. 3:20); is tied also to the heavenly Kingdom ("Now is come salvation and strength, and the Kingdom of our God." Rev. 12:10); is tied to an heavenly sacrifice (to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Able, Heb. 12:24); is tied to an heavenly country ("But now they desire a better (country), that is, an heavenly", Heb. 11:16); is tied to an heavenly city ("Ye have come to the heavenly Jerusalem", Heb. 12:22); is tied to the one great antetype of which everything under the old covenant was mere typical (earthly passover - heavenly passover - the vale - His flesh, Heb. 10:20 - the temple itself - His body, Jno. 2:21 - Caanan's Rest - The believers rest in Christ); is tied to the New Heavens and the New earth ("Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be shaken", as the old Heavens and earth which were shaken at their removal - at the cross, Heb. 12:28: is tied to God's Israel (as compared to the old, Gal. 6:16 -, we, elect gentiles and Jews, are the true circumcision, Rom. 2:29).

But what has the local church to do with the above? The local church is a visible manifestation of the above -, "Ye are a city set on a hill", Christ told His Apostles - a visible manifestation of the Spiritual heavenly. One Spiritual City in the heavenlies - many earthly manifestations of it. Paul says: "For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." (Gal. 4:25-26). This, doubtless, is the same heavenly city unto which Paul wrote the Hebrews, "they had come".

"But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and 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, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. 12:22-24.

This is a contrast between "Ye have not come" to Moses and the old covenant, and, "ye have come" to Christ and the new covenant. It is a Spiritual coming fitted for every redeemed

child of God. It is not to a local church somewhere to which they had come - that would mean the universal gathering of angels had come to them! This coming is to the heavenly Jerusalem, which Paul and John says is above where the throne of God is. Notice the parallel scripture:

“And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills and all nations shall flow into it.” Isa. 2:2.

“And he carried me away in the Spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God... And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God almighty and the lamb are the temple of it... And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it... And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither worketh abomination, or a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life.” Rev. 21:10,22,24,27.

“Ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ... But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.” I Peter 2:5,9.

Isa. - “All nations shall flow into it”

John - “The nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it”

Peter - “Ye are built up an spiritual house - an holy nation (the elect of the five provinces he mentioned)

Paul - “Ye have come to Mt. Zion, the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem...”

Now, these scriptures harmonize, but the theologians do not. Again notice:

Paul - “Which are written in heaven” - Spirits of just men made perfect”

Peter - “Elect (throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia).

John - “Which are written in the lambs book of life.”

Paul calls this “The church of the firstborn”; John: “The bride of the lamb”; the local church? Hardly, it is all the redeemed. The “Ye have come” of Paul represents the coming of anyone of the elect, or all of the elect, to the new covenant and what is associated with it, a spiritual coming to the heavenly Zion.

It has been pointed out that in the Septuagint is the translation of the Hebrew qahal, congregation, assembly, which makes a valid point for the local church interpreters; but I wish to point out that the gathering of the whole nation at Mt. Sinai; all millions of them, where the Lord made a covenant with them was not merely a congregation - but, a people under the Old Covenant; and all which typified the people under the new covenant -, all of them also. Their earthly redemption from Egyptian bondage through the blood of the passover lamb was typical of our spiritual redemption by our passover. Their earthly names are our heavenly: Mt. Zion, Jerusalem, Israel, Elect, holy nation, etc..

The same applies to the, one, flock in John 10: "and other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one flock and one shepherd" (Jno. 10:16). This cannot be generic, one kind of flock because it could then mean "one kind of shepherd" - the language has to agree with itself - and there can be no doubt but what all for whom Christ died is meant by the one flock, they are in the same context: "I lay down my life for the sheep, them also I must bring. They shall hear my voice, there shall be, one flock and, one shepherd" (compare also Rom. 8:29-30). In John 17 the Lord said, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one..." Who can doubt that the word "one" in this context means the same as in the other? Caiaphas under inspiration said, "That he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad - elect Jews and Gentiles" (John 11:52). Paul calls the local church of Ephesus a flock which Christ purchased with his own blood (Acts 20:27-28); Peter writing to the elect "strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (I Peter 1:1-2), told them "ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (I Peter 2:5), the chief corner stone of which was Christ (verse 7), and further tells them "But ye are a chosen generation a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light" (verse 9). And further: "For ye were as sheep going astray: but are now returned to the shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (verse 25). All of this is not the local church exalted, but the one Spiritual house over which Christ is the shepherd; but in chapter 5:2, Peter localizes it; "Feed the flock of God which is among you... being ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear..." All which shows the Spiritual and the earthly manifestation of it.

The House that Christ Built. "He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish the throne of His Kingdom forever... And thine house and Kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever" (II Sam. 7:13,16). And again: "Behold the man whose name is the BRANCH: and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord: even he shall build the Temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the council of peace shall be between them both" (Zech. 6:12-13). Paul says Christ fulfilled this (Heb. 1:5), and also: "For this (man) was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some (man); but he that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; But Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." (Heb. 3:3-6). The "wherefore" at the beginning of this section looks back to the work of Christ in bringing many sons to glory, the faithful and high priest - truly, "The law came by Moses but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." This House, Kingdom, reign, a priest

on His throne, in behalf of His people who make up this house under the new covenant, is purely Spiritual (Ye have come... to the Spirits of just men made perfect, Heb. 12); but Paul also identified the house with a local church in I tim. 3:15. The exact same house?, no; but the visible manifestation of the heavenly and spiritual.

'The Building. "On this Rock I will build my church" (Mt. 16:18). Right here I will quote from a very learned Greek Scholar:

Peter, the very one to whom Jesus is here speaking, writing to the Christians in the five Roman provinces in Asia (I Pet. 1:1), says "You are built a spiritual house" (oikodomeisthe oikos pneumatikos). It is difficult to resist the impression that Peter recalls the words of Jesus to him on this memorable occasion. Further on (2:9) he speaks of them as an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, showing beyond controversy that Peter's use of building a spiritual house is general, not local. This is undoubtedly the picture in the mind of Christ here in 16:18. It is a great spiritual house, Christ's Israel, not the Jewish nation, which he describes. What is the rock on which Christ will build his vast temple? Not on Peter alone or mainly or primarily. Peter by his confession was furnished with the illustration for the rock on which His church will rest. It is the same kind of faith that Peter has just confessed. The perpetuity of this church general is guaranteed." (A.T. Robertson, Word Pictures).

Also, in Ephesians 2:19, "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundations of the Apostles and the prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone." (Eph. 2:19-20).

"Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. "As the corner stone," says Thayer, "joins together two walls, so Christ joins together as Christians, into one body dedicated to God, those who were formerly Jews and Gentiles." The general reference will be to that fundamental place which Christ fills in all that which is to a Christian matter of faith or rule of life.

21. In whom all the building. The Revision reads, "each several building," Winer (18.4) does not recognize a necessity for this change "As Paul," he says, "is speaking of the Christian Church as a whole, 'the whole building,' is the proper translation." Alford, Ellicott, and Braune, among commentators, also prefer this rendering, though the Revision agrees with Meyer. Dr. Boise also agrees with him. "IN one vast temple" he says, "are many 'buildings' ()," and refers to Matt. 24:1, "the buildings of the temple." Riddell seems to understand by "buildings," "the separate Christian congregations" and speaks of these as "each of them growing in the same way, in the personal Christ." The allusion does not seem to be to congregations, or to churches, but to individual Christians, such as these to whom Paul writes. One finds in the passage a general sense much like what appears in 4:16, below, where mention is made of "the whole body." The omission of the article in the Greek makes the usage in the verse under consideration exceptional, yet one which occurs in other places, cited by Winer, as in this Epistle (1:8), and in James 1:2. It seems most in consistence with that emphasis which the apostle is placing upon the idea of unity, and with the figurative method of illustration employed throughout this part of the chapter, to understand him as representing all Christians, however diverse in other things, yet by their common faith and their common union with Christ, themselves so brought into unity as to constitute this spiritual "temple in the Lord." (Hovey American Commentary).

Paul says, "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed

how he buildeth there upon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” (I Cor. 3:10-11).

What is Paul saying? The Prophets said Christ would build his house and Kingdom, that God would establish His throne forever (II Sam. 7:13); (Fulfilled said Paul, Heb. 1:5, 3:3); That the Branch would build His Temple, sit and rule upon His throne, would be a priest upon His throne (Zech. 6:12 and 13). Fulfilled according to Acts 2:30 and Heb. 3:1, but Paul said he was a wise master builder, that he laid the foundation, and that the Ephesians “were built upon the foundations of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone”. Does Paul mean his organization of the saints at Corinth into a Landmark Sovereign Grace Church, authoritatively and successively from a like kind of which he was a member? Does Paul mean about the foundation he laid and about the warning of how other ministers are to build upon the foundation, a link-chain Baptism which constitutes a local Church? NO ONE EVER THOUGHT SO UNTIL THIS AGE!

The New Jerusalem has twelve gates upon which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel, and twelve foundations, in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (Rev. 21:12,14). This New Jerusalem is the Bride of the Lamb. The most general view of Landmarkers is that this city is the “Home” of the bride - not the bride itself as the scripture says. Also, they do not believe each local church is the bride, which would be consistent with their local view - they believe all the faithful from each local church will make the bride, which as anyone can see is mere interpretation - but if one does not agree then he is “weak”, or worse, “unsound” on the Bride.

But let us take all these things together that we have mentioned concerning the building: Christ said He would build it (Mt. 16:18); Peter describes it as a Spiritual house composed of materials from five Roman Provinces in Asia; Paul, to the Ephesians, said they were “fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God”; and, “Our citizenship is in heaven” (Phil. 3:20). John sees it and describes it in its completeness, the New Jerusalem. Who are its citizens? “Those written in the Lamb’s book of life.” Thus we see also how each local church is a building, and all the Redeemed are a building.

The Body of Christ. This figure is used in scripture as synonymous with the church. In I Cor. 12:27, Paul said to the church of Corinth, “Now ye are the body of Christ”; or, “Ye are Christ’s body”. But this figure as a human body referring to a local church is used to refer to the universal church in other places as a mystical Body. Christ is not described as the “head” of the Corinthian Church: “And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you” (I Cor. 12:21); Paul could not ascribe such irreverent language to our Sovereign Lord, (he is teaching the church, not the Lord) - this obviously has to do with a figurative human body to which Paul is likening the members of the church at Corinth; but in Ephesians and other places, Paul says Christ is the head of the body, all of the elect whom Christ has redeemed.

Eph. 1:22-23: And hath put all things under his feet. The word has a stronger meaning than simply to ‘put under’. Arrange under, subordinate, implying absolute subjection. And gave him to be head over all things to the church. The purpose of the exaltation is here made known. It is in the interest of human redemption that all this is done. In this way it is provided that there shall be no possibility of opposition of hostility in any quarter with ability to mar in any way the perfection of the plan, or hinder or delay its execution. by ‘the church’ here, is clearly meant that totality of all the redeemed on earth or in heaven, and in all the ages, spoken of in the next verse

as “his body.” The more customary use of the word (), “the called out,” the “chosen,” is that of the local and organized company of believers. In a very natural figure, this local “assembly” is made to supply a name for the whole innumerable company of the saved.

23: Which is his body, This representation of the ‘church’ under the figure of a ‘body’ has occurred before in the writings of this apostle, as in Rom. 12:4,5, where we read: “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members, one of another”; also to a like effect in I Cor. 12:12-27. In the verse before us, however, Paul for the first time presents the conception of a spiritual unity of all the saved under a like figure. In the places just referred to he is occupied rather with “the members” of the body, and these in their relation to each other in the practical Christian life. Here he has in mind, not the body in any localizing view of the church, but the body as representing the redeemed in their spiritual totality and oneness. As such he sees in them ‘his body.’ (Gould, American Commentary).”

Landmarkers do not recognize the change in the figure - or the change in what it figures. Taking the figurative human body sense only they cannot literally interpret. They are forced to give many passages a, theological rendering to accord with their preconceived ideas of Church and Body. They are forced to distinguish between the family, the church, and the Kingdom - Paul makes no such distinction.

Rom. 12:4: “So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.” and from the quote of Rom. 12:4 to 14:17 where he states: “For the Kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,” Paul uses the pronouns “we”, “us” and “ye” interchangeably. The same body of which Paul says he was a member in Romans 12:4, also included them at Rome; The same Scripture Paul used for them at Rome included himself; and both, without a doubt, were in the same Kingdom.

The same is stated in Colossians, only in reverse order:

“Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son.” In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins; Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist, and he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn 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.” (Col. 1:13-19).

Now, taking this passage in Colossians with the passage in Ephesians we will harmonize as the scriptures do - not distinguish as the Landmarkers:

“That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might, head up in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him... Which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and has put all things under his

feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. 1:10,20-23).

The qualifying noun for both passages is redemption. It is in Christ as Prophet, Priest, and King that all the things said in both passages follow after. Following are the comments of Charles Hodge, the famous theologian, editor, and commentator: (though we differ from Hodge as a theologian, his comments on the literal word meaning in Greek cannot be disputed)

Eph. 1:10 - That the passage does speak of that union which is effected by redemption, may be argued - 1. From the context, Paul, as we have seen, gives thanks first for the election of God's people; secondly, for their actual redemption; thirdly, for the revelation of the gracious purpose of God relative to their redemption. It is of the redemption of the elect, therefore, that the whole context treats. 2. Secondly, the union here spoken of is an union in Christ. God has purposed "to gather together all things in Christ." The things in heaven and the things on earth are to be united to Him. But believers alone, the members of his body, are ever said to be in Christ. It is not true that angels good or bad, or the whole mass of mankind are in Him in any scriptural sense of that expression. 3. The word here used expresses directly or indirectly the idea of the union of all things under Christ as their head. Christ is not the head of angels, nor of the material universe in the sense in which the context here demands. He is the head of his body, i.e. his church. It is therefore only of the redemption of the church of which this passage can be understood. 4. The obviously parallel passage in Colossians 1, 20 seems decisive on this point. It is there said: "It pleased the Father... having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." From this passage it is plain that the union to be effected is a reconciliation, which implies previous alienation, and a reconciliation effected by the blood of the cross. It is, therefore, not a union of subjection merely to the same Lord, but it is one effected by the blood of Christ, and consequently the passage can be understood only of the subjects of redemption.

That the church or people of God, excluding angels good or bad, and the finally repentant among men, are alone the subjects of redemption is proved, as to evil angels and impenitent men, by the numerous passages of Scripture which speak of their final destruction; and as to good angels, by the entire silence of Scripture as to their being redeemed by Christ, and by the nature of the work itself. Redemption, in the scriptural sense, is deliverance from sin and misery, and therefore cannot be predicated of those angels who kept their first estate.

These considerations exclude all the interpretations above enumerated except the fourth and fifth. The fourth, which supposes the passage to refer to the union of the Jews and Gentiles, is excluded by its opposition to the uniform language of Scripture. The Jews are never designated as inhabitants of heaven. It is in violation of all usage, therefore, to suppose they are here indicated by that phrase. Nothing therefore remains but the assumption that the apostle refers to the union of all the people of God, i.e. of all the redeemed, in one body under Jesus Christ their head. They are to be constituted an everlasting kingdom; or, according to another symbol - a living temple, of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone.

Eph. 1:22 This view of the passage had the advantage of giving the same reference here that it has in the preceding verse. All things are placed under his feet, and he head over all things, is head of the church.

Eph. 1:23 The expression all in all, or all with all, does not mean all the church in all its members, or with all grace, but the universe in all its parts. There is nothing in the context to restrict or limit. The words must have the latitude here which belongs to them in the preceding verses. The analogy of Scripture is in favour of this interpretation. God's relation to the world, or totality of things external to himself, is elsewhere expressed in the same terms. Jer. 23,24, "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord." Comp. I Kings 8,27, Ps. 139,7. In the New Testament Christ is set forth as creating, sustaining, and pervading the universe. Col. 1,16,17. Heb. 1,3. Eph. 4,10. This therefore, determines the sense in which he is here said to fill all things. It is not that he replenishes all his people with his grace; but that he fills heaven and earth with his presence. There is no place where he is not. There is no creature from which he is absent. By him all things consist, they are upheld by his presence in them and with them. The union, therefore, which the church sustains, and which is the source of its life and blessedness, is not with a mere creature, but with Christ, God manifested in the flesh, who pervades and governs all things by his omnipresent power. The source of life, therefore, to the church is inexhaustible and immortal.

Eph. 2:20 V. 20. As means both a family and a house, the apostle passes from the one figure to the other. The Gentiles are members of the family of God, and they are parts of his house. They are built, on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner stone.

Eph. 2:21 The words even without the article, which, because wanting in the oldest manuscripts, many critics omit, must here mean "the whole," and not "every building." It would destroy the whole consistence of the figure to represent "every congregation," as a temple by itself resting on Christ as the corner stone. Christ has but one body, and there is but one temple composed of Jews and Gentiles, in which God dwells by his Spirit.

Eph. 2:22 V.22 What was said of the whole body of believers, is here affirmed of the Ephesian Christians. "In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Builded together, may mean either, 'you together with other believers;' or, 'you severally are all united in this building.' The former appears more consistent with the context. Habitation of God, is only an equivalent expression to the phrase "holy temple" of the preceding verse. There seem to be no sufficient reason, for considering that the

of this verse refers to individual believers, and in the preceding, to the united body. So that the verse were, 'God, by dwelling in each of you by his Spirit, makes you collectively his temple.' This confuses the whole figure. The two verses are parallel. The whole building grows to a holy temple. and you Ephesians are builded together with other believers so as to form with them this habitation of God."

Landmarkers can theologically restrict "the headship", "the fulness", the "all things," The body" to fit their pre-conceived notions, but they cannot change the literal, grammatical sense of the scripture - it still states the same both before and after the Landmark interpretation, for in restricting "the headship", "the fulness", "the all things," "the body" - they would have to restrict the qualifying noun that governs the passage: redemption! A redemption from the redemption! This is much like the dispensational millenarian interpreting the whole Bible around Revelation 20. First his interpretation of Rev. 20, then harmonizing the Bible to that interpretation. So the

Landmark: First, as a local, organized assembly only, then everything else harmonized to that view. In Ephesians Paul also said, "as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish: (Eph. 5:25-27). Other parallel scriptures show that Paul is speaking of the church here in another sense than the local - the universal sense, because:

1. 1. Christ loved all the elect - Rom. 8:29
2. 2. Christ died for all the elect - John 10:15
3. 3. Christ sanctifies and cleanses whom He redeems - Titus 2:14
 - a. By the word - "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth" - John 17:17
 - b. His workmanship - "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." (Eph. 2:10)
4. Christ will present all of the elect unto Himself - Rom. 8:30; Heb. 2:15; Mt. 25:34
5. Christ is glorified in all His elect - John 17:10; HE prayed for the elect's perfection - John 17:23

Where is the consistency in the Landmark interpretation of in the book of Ephesians? In Ephesians 3:21 "Unto to Him be glory in the church through Christ Jesus unto the end of the world," the Landmark says "Exclusively so" - no glory anywhere else; but in Eph. 5 where it is stated Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify it and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word." - - this is not to be taken exclusively according to them, but that it pertains to all the elect, and in the last phrase of the verse: "that he might present it to himself..." according to them: "It is the aggregate of all the Landmark Baptists" (or all the faithful of them) leaving their local concept altogether. Again, they claim Christ is the "head" of each local church, but not exclusively so, because in I Cor. ii Christ is said to be the head of every man (elect). Why do they insist on exclusivity in the one but not the others? They are not true to their own precepts.

When we assemble at a large Bible Conference, from different local churches, are we then an assembly? A Church? "No, don't be ridiculous", says the Landmark, "Don't be absurd": we are only using the Landmark's own interpretation of the passage - why not? To be consistent, with the Landmark's interpretation of at the resurrection, each one of God's elect will be raised to assemble with his own assembly of which he was a member in his mortal life, and then each local church will be presented to Christ. What of the thousands of Churches that have apostatized and their candle sticks removed? And what of the many saints who have been members of many churches during different times in their mortal lives - will they be allowed to choose in which church to be reckoned at the presentation?

The same thing applies to the Landmark's interpretation of the Bride, the church is the bride - again Landmarks leave their own interpretation at this point and believe Christ has, one bride, the aggregate of all the Baptists (or all the faithful from the Baptists); they do not believe Christ will have, many brides - what happens to their local church only view? THEY, THEMSELVES, EXPLAIN IT AWAY! When Saul "persecuted the church" he was not persecuting an assembly - but saints. He nowhere claims that he wanted to put down the institution that the Lord only "works through", from which "The Lord only gets His glory", "to stop its succession"; no he hated the saints and persecuted them.

Where is the after it dismisses its services at 12:00 o'clock Sunday - there cannot be an assembly unless it assembles. What happens to the promises of continuity? Most Landmark churches are not an assembly but for a few hours each week - six hours out of fifty-two - the other forty-six hours they are an unassembled assembly. "That's a contradiction in terms, we do not hold that" - but they do hold this as well as the other we have noticed (the presentation, bride, persecution) in a non-literal manner, all at the same time confidently asserting their knowledge of the Greek word meaning of ! The usage of the word in the New Testament determines its meaning - it does not, and cannot, always have the same meaning - Baptists have always seen this. Landmarkers themselves change the meaning, but never agree that they do - they blast everyone who does, even while claiming to be in the "True Succession" of them who did!

The individual was chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world. Not the local church. The individual was predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ - not the church. It was the individual for whom Christ died - not the local church. The individual is purified, sanctified - not the local church. The individual is the recipient of the decrees in Rom. 8 - foreknown, predestinated, called, justified, and glorified - not the local church. But the scriptures say "Christ loved the church and gave Himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word" - as the saints in local church capacity? As an organization? Institutional? Generic? Distributive? As an ideal? Abstract? - As a theological concept? Landmarkers say so - and since Christ loved this kind of church, this is what they love and honor.

Some Landmarkers say Christ loves His church "In a special way", and Christ being "the, Saviour of the body" means not in this case redemption, but to preserve it, and hence, to perpetrate it (successively, no doubt). But surely Graves' Axiom would be true here: "Things equal to or like the same thing are equal to and like each other" (Old Landmarkism, p. 21). Since all the elect share the same eternal, immutable, Divine love of Christ - they also share in the same salvation resulting from the work of Christ, it is common to all: "Whom he set his heart on before hand (Williams Trans.) he did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son... Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8:29-30).

Jude writes "To them who are sanctified by God the Father, preserved in Christ Jesus, and called." And he exhorts them to "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered unto the Saints" (Jude 1,3). According to Landmark dogma no one can contend for the faith but Landmark churches, no one is authorized to do so. And by claiming such, they claim a special calling - and in turn a special sanctification. The saints at Ephesus were "commended to God, and to his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified: (Acts 20:32). And also Paul was sent "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Acts 26:18). This was unto all to whom Paul was sent - and even yet wherever the scriptures go. Since Christ prayed for the sanctification of all HIs elect (John 17, Eph. 5), and all the elect are sanctified in Him (Heb. 2:11; 10:14; 13:12), have the same inheritance, the same calling, the same preservation - they have the same exhortation to earnestly contend for the faith; all which shows the Landmarks put themselves far above anything the simplicity and harmony of Scriptures do.

Who cannot see the fallacies of the Landmark interpretation? A, special love for the local church (Eph. 5:25); a, special calling (Col. 3:15); a, special glorification (Eph. 5:27)!! We

hear of hyper-Calvinism concerning salvation, but surely this is hyper-ecclesiology, the, special sanctification of some extreme Landmarkers in our day is a, doctrinal sanctification! Will the Landmarker claim a, special headship of Christ? We are told that Christ is the head of every (elect) man (I Cor. 11:3); that He is above all principality and power, and might, and dominion (Eph. 1:21); that He is the only potentate, King of Kings and Lord of Lords (I Tim. 6:15); that angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him (I Peter 3:22); that He is the head of the corner (I Peter 2:7); yet the Landmarker either erroneously confines that headship or believes a, special headship for his local church only doctrine.

These Landmark greek “scholars” who give the only meaning to as a local, organized assembly - why are not they so particular with the verb tense in Eph. 5, and Heb. 12? B.H. Carroll can explain the tense away, can reason that the scripture does not say what it says, can tell us what is “unbaptistic” and what is not (but, review the quotes to see what is baptistic, pp. 217-228) - he can satisfy his mind and his fellow Landmarkers but when we go back to scripture it, still states: The same church of which “Christ ‡is (present tense) the head and, is (present) the Saviour of the body”; that “we, are (present) members of this body”; the same church that he “loved and gave himself for”; the same church that “he might present it to himself a glorious church not having spot or wrinkle”, is the same church that he “nourisheth and cherisheth” (present tense) at the time of Paul’s writing. And B.H. Carroll himself said, “Let the scripture say what they want to say” - let us take his advice - let us do not shape scriptures to fit our theories; and then to be consistent, the church is local all the way through this passage, or it is not! One way or the other, consistency demands - Landmarkers, cannot have it both ways.

Another word that is used in the New Testament as a synonym to εκκλησια is (synagogue) and it also shows the local and the universal sense of church.

James 2:2 “For if there come unto your assembly (synagogue) a man with a ring, in goodly apparel...

Hebrews 10:25 “Not forsaking the assembling (synagoguing) of yourselves together.”

Matt. 23:37 “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered

() thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.”

Matt. 24:31 “And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together () his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.”

Before Dispensationalism came among the Baptists the latter passage was commonly believed to be the world wide evangelism by the ministers of Christ; the Lord is quoting from Deut. 30:4 “If your outcasts are at the ends of heaven, from there the Lord your God will synagogue you, and from there he will take you” (Septuagint); but at any rate, it does not refer to a local Landmark Church - this gathering is of all the elect to Christ for salvation; the preceding passage also does not mean the Lord was trying to organize Jerusalem into a local, Landmark Church. Chilton says:

“The Old Testament promise that God would “synagogue” His people undergoes one major change in the New Testament. Instead of the simple form of the word, the term used by Jesus has the Greek preposition (ἐπι) prefixed to it... This is a favorite New Testament expression, which, intensifies the original word. what Jesus is saying, therefore, is that the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 will

reveal Himself as having come with clouds to receive His Kingdom; and it will display His church before the world as the full, the true, the, Super-Synagogue.” (Paradise Restored, p. 105).

Following are the excellent comments from Pooles’ Commentary on Eph. 1:10 (a reference the 2nd London Confessors used in their article on the Invisible church which has in its context the greek word, “to head up”):

“In the dispensation; in that administration or distribution of the good things of God’s house, which he had determined should be in the fulness of time. It is a metaphor taken from a steward, who distributes and dispenseth according to his master’s order to those that are in the house Luke xii. 42. The church is the house of God, God himself the Master of the family, Christ the Steward that governs the house; those spiritual blessings, mentioned ver. 3, are the good things he gives out. These treasures of God’s grace had been opened but to a few, and dispensed sparingly under the Old Testament, the more full communication of them being reserved till the fulness of times, when they were to be dispensed by Christ. The fulness of times; the time appointed of the Father for the appearance of Christ in the flesh (according to former promises,) the promulgation of the gospel, and thereby the gathering to gather in one all things in Christ. It is spoken in opposition to the times and ages before Christ’s coming, which God would have run out till the set time came which he had pitched upon, and believers expected: see Gal. iv. 2.

4. Gather together in one; to recapitulate; either to sum up as men do several lesser numbers in one total sum, which is the foot of the account, but called by the Greeks the head of it, and set at the top; or as orators do the several part of their speeches in fewer words; thus all former prophecies, promises, types, and shadows centered, and were fulfilled, and as it were summed up, in Christ: or rather to unite unto, and gather together again under, one head things before divided and scattered. All things; all intellectual beings, or all persons, as Gal. iii.22. In Christ; as their Head, under which they might be united to God, and to each other. Which are in heaven; either saints departed, who have already obtained salvation by Christ, or rather the holy angels, that still keep their first station. Which are on earth; the elect of God among men here upon earth in their several generations. The meaning of the whole seems to be, that whereas the order and harmony of God’s principal workmanship, intellectual creatures, angel and men, had been disturbed and broken by the entering of sin into the world; all mankind, and many of the angels, having apostatized from him, and the remnant of them being in their own nature laible and mutable; God would, in his appointed time, give Christ (the Heir of all things) the honour of being the repairer of this breach, by gathering together again the disjointed members of his creation in and under Christ as their Head and Governor, confirming the good angels in their good estate, and recovering his elect among men from their apostate condition. Though it be true, that not only believers under the Old Testament were saved, but the elect angels confirmed before Christ’s coming, yet both the one and the other was with a respect to Christ as their Head, and the foundation of their union with God; and out of whom, as the one, being lost, could not have been restored, so the

fall of the other could not have been prevented, nor their happiness secured.”
(Poole’s Commentary, Eph. 1:10).

No one told our Baptist forefathers that they must interpret the church passages in Col., Eph., and Heb. in a generic, distributive, abstract, ideal, or local sense - and they did not! Since the church is the pillar and ground of the truth according to Landmarkism, why did they not know this truth? The generic, distributive, abstract, ideal is a Theological concept - not literal interpretation, and to call all Baptists untrue that did not hold such is outrageous to the facts.

Let us compare some interpretations of scripture and show the differences between the Landmarkers and the Old Baptists:

“On this rock I will build my church”

Landmark: The rock is Christ, He builds up or edifies the church He has already built, i.e. the one He called forth and organized in His personal ministry. They insist the verb is used figuratively but not the noun.

Old Baptist: The rock is the afore confessed Christ - the work of redemption of the Messiah (Prophet, Priest, King). The building is future, looking to the cross. The church is the object of His redemption - all His elect.

Spurgeon gives the view of the Old Baptists:

“Jesus is the builder, and he and his apostles make up the first course of stone in the great temple of the church, and this first course is one with the eternal Rock on which it rests. In the first twelve courses or foundations are the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (Rev. 21:14). We are “built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone.” Apostles are not the foundation of our confidence meritoriously; but they underlie us as to date, and we rest upon their testimony concerning Jesus and his resurrection.

“The assembly which Christ gathers he builds together; for he says, “I will build my church.” He builds on a firm foundation; “Upon this rock I will build.” What Jesus builds is his own: “My church. He makes his rock-founded building into a strong-hold, against which the powers of evil lay continual siege, but all in vain; for “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (Commentary on Matthew).

Also Gill:

There is another sense in which the church may be said to be catholic, or general, as it may consist of such in any age, and in the several parts of the world, who have true faith in Christ, and hold to him the head, and are baptized by one Spirit into one body; have one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all, and are called in one hope of their calling: and this takes in, not only such who make a visible profession of Christ; but all such who are truly partakers of his grace; though they have not made an open profession of him in a formal manner; and this is the church which Polycarp called, the whole catholic church throughout the world: and Irenaeus, The church scattered throughout the whole world to the ends of the earth: and Origen, The church of God under

heaven: and this is the church built on Christ the rock, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail; such a church Christ has always had, and will have; and which may be, when there is no visible particular congregated church, or a particular church gathered according to gospel-order; and of this the apostle seems to speak, when he says, Unto him be glory is the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end, Eph. iii. 21.

“The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.”

Landmark: because local church is often destroyed, it means genus, kind, institutional.

Old Baptist: universal church, Disciples, redemption, a resurrection of the elect.

“I am with you (plural) always even unto the end of the world.”

Landmark: As a genus, Kind, cannot be literal

Old Baptist: Literal as disciples - universal church

“Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.”

Landmark: as a genus, kind - glory in an institution

Old Baptist: disciples, universal, as His redeemed

“Loved the church and gave Himself for it”

Landmark: local as an institution, genus, kind

Old Baptist: universal, all elect, the redeemed

“That He might present it to Himself without spot or wrinkle...”

Landmark: all Landmark Church saints grouped together (or the faithful from among the Landmarks)

Old Baptist: all the elect under the common salvation

“Ye have come... the church of the first born ones”

Landmark: Local church - all these things mentioned had come to them

Old Baptist: Universal church - they had come to Christ and the New Covenant in the Spirit.

“I will show thee the bride the Lamb’s wife”

Landmark: All faithful Landmark church saints (where they will live)

Old Baptist: Universal, all the elect, the redeemed, figurative language describing them.

OBSERVATIONS: 1. Each passage requires interpretation - a non-literal, according to the Landmarkers, Local churches die, the Apostles died, individual disciples die - the Lord was not literally with any three examples to the end of the age. 2. Because interpretation is required, and any honest interpreter always interprets to the best harmony of the Bible, why disfellowship any for being honest? 3. Baptists have universally held the universal view - Landmarkers are out of step with the general Baptist view. 4. The best Greek Scholars among Baptists have always held the Universal view, so why do Landmarkers insist Ekklesia always means local? 5. The Universal Church doctrine needs to be studied and learned like any other doctrine of scripture (if you do not know it - you did not know election, or predestination or anything else before you studied it out). 6. The Old Baptists did not believe Paul persecuted an institution, but saints; yet Paul said he persecuted the Church. Likewise, they believed Christ loved the elect, not the church as an institution.

This short study has by no means been, or meant to be, exhaustive - and by far the greater part of it has come from the works of others, our Baptists forefathers. This was given simply to show that the scriptures do apply the same figures both to the local church and to the universal: the city, the flock, the House, the temple, the building, the body, and finally the church itself.

The famous Benjamin Keach in "Tropologia, or Key to open scripture metaphors" (1682), gives: the city of God, the moon, the temple of God, an olive tree, an inn, a vine, a dove, a natural god, a vineyard, a virgin, a wife, a bush on fire, a mother, a garden, a lily, a merchant ship, a candlestick, a flock of sheep, a house, a family, a household, - all compared to the church and because of the symmetry of scripture (the scripture cannot be broken, John 10:35) the distinctions Landmarkers claim between the family, the church, the kingdom do not exist - remember Graves axiom: "Things equal to or like the same thing, are equal to and like each other."

The same blessings to each local church are the exact same blessings to all the elect. All Baptists of all ages have believed this - Landmarkers claim the contrary, the only problem is - they cannot prove it! One editor in California was "proving" that Irenaeus believed in a local church - certainly so, but he also believed the universal. I have never known of any Baptist who denied the local and held exclusively to the universal - that is not the point. The point is: Baptists have universally held to both the Local and the Universal.

Besides the noticing of the foremost Particular Baptist Confessions of faith that taught both the Universal and the Local views of the church (Waldensian, 1120, 1544; 1st London, 1643; Somerset, 1656; 2nd London, 1677; The Philadelphia, 1743; and the New Hampshire, 1832), that which follows is a listing of many of the great Baptists of the past who believed in the Universal and the local church doctrines. I give the Author, book, and page number of the latter Baptists because of the availability of material but quote those of the 1600's. (A large part of the list of modern Baptists came from Thornbury's book).

John De Wycliffe, 1383

"Of the church of Christ, of her members, and of her Govenance; Christ's Church is his spouse that hath three parts...The first part is called the overcoming part, the middle is called the sleeping, the third is called the fighting. And all these make one church, and the head of this church is Jesus Christ, both God and man. This church is mother to every man who shall be saved, and containeth no other." (Tracts and Treatises, p. 74).

William Tyndale, martyred at Vilvorde Oct. 1536

I said that Christ's elect church is the whole multitude of all repenting sinners that believe in Christ, and put all their trust and confidence in the mercy of God; feeling in their hearts that God for Christ's sake loveth them, and will be, or rather is, merciful unto them, and forgiveth them their sins of which they repent; and that he forgiveth them also all the motions unto sin, of which they fear lest they should thereby be drawn into sin again. And this faith they have without all respect of their own deservings, yea, and for none other cause than that the merciful truth of God the Father, which cannot lie, hath so promised and so sworn.

And this faith and knowledge is everlasting life; and by this we be born anew, and made the sons of God, and obtain forgiveness of sins, and are translated from death to life, and from the wrath of God unto his love and favour. And this faith is the mother of all truth, and bringeth with her the Spirit of all truth; which Spirit purgeth us, as from all sin, even so from all lies and error, noisome and hurtful. And this faith is the foundation laid of the apostles and prophets; whereon Paul saith (Eph. 2) that we are built, and thereby of the household of God. And this faith is the rock, whereon Christ built his congregation. Christ asked the apostles (Matt. 16) whom they took him for. And Peter answered for them all, saying, "I say that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God, that art come into this world." That is, We believe that thou art he that was promised unto Abraham, that should come, bless us, and deliver us. Howbeit, Peter yet wist not, by what means. But now it is opened throughout all the world, that, through the offering of his body and blood, the offering is a satisfaction for the sin of all that repent, and a purchasing of whatsoever they can ask, to keep them in favour; and that they sin no more. And Christ answered, "Upon this I will build my congregation:" that is, upon this faith. And against the rock of this faith can no sin, no hell, no devil, no lies nor error prevail. (Tyndale: Answer to More, "Parker Society, 30-31).

John Spilsbury, *A Treatise concerning the Lawful Subjects of Baptism*, 1642, p. 30-31:

"And thus the Apostle proves their first estate to be holy, as first fruits of that holy and blessed relation they stood in to God by faith. From which for their unbelief they are cut off, and the Gentiles according to Gods election in their line by faith admitted in, of mere grace, and not to boast: and yet there is a remnant of them to be called as the lump, and a second fruit, which are also holy in reference to the first fruit of the same holy root, as aforesaid. And as the root it self is holy, so shall these branches be when they can be grafted in again to their own root or olive tree, as at the first, which is union and communion with God in his holy way of worship, under the gospel as of old under the Law. And so much for the root or olive tree, which must be understood of Christ mystically considered, and not of believing parents, as aforesaid...

The Church of God, which is the mystical body of Christ, is not a mixt company, but onely one substance, suitable to her head and matter, by which she was produced, being the immortal seed of the Word; and therefore one holy spiritual uniform compacted body, both for nature and form, Cant. 6.9. Mal. 2.15. Eph.

2.14. to 22. John 4. 3.2. All which considered, proves the body of Christ, or Church of God under the New Testament, not to consist of infants, neither in whole not in part; and so the branches aforesaid, not to be understood of Infants, but believers.”

Christopher Blackwood, *The storming of Anti-Christ*, 1644, p. 6 and 7.

...That there are but two sorts of Churches mentioned in scripture.

1. Catholic, comprehending all the elect of body of Christ, born or unborn, which are purchased with Christ's blood; Eph. 5:25.

2. Particular church or churches; which is no other than a company of saints in profession, explicitly or implicitly consenting together, to worship God in the word, sacraments and, prayer, and all other duties of religion.

Daniel King, *A Way to Zion Sought Out and Found*, 1650, p. 13: (The Preface to this book written by Spilsbury, Kiffen, Patience and Pearson).

...But it is certain Jews and Gentiles shall be brought into one sheepfold. John 10:16, and one shepherd shall be shepherd to them all, they shall all be under one King, Rev. 11:15. The Kingdoms of this world are our Lord's and his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever; Zech. 14:9, the Lord is King over all the earth, in that day there shall be one Lord. There is but one mystical body of Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, I Cor. 12:123 for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, etc., Eph. 4:4. There is one body and there is one spirit, by which they are inspired; there is but one hope of our calling: Jews and Gentiles have but one baptism, Jews and Gentiles have but one God and Father of all, Eph. 4:4-6. And how could this be, if there were two several covenants, one for Jews and another for Gentiles?

Edward Drapes, *Gospel Glory*, 1649, p. 129

It is not said, the gates of hell shall not prevaile against any Church in particular; but against the Church, that is to say, the whole body of Christ in all ages. And though we cannot see a Church successively from the Apostles: yet I shall prove there hath beene a church in all ages, Eph. 3.21. “Unto him be glory in the Church by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end, Amen. Behold here a Church, in all ages: the Churches, and so the Ordinances of the Churches were not to abide onely in the Apostles dayes, but to the end of the world, in all ages.

Paul Hobson, *Practical Divinity*, 1646, p. 8:

“We should now have further proceeded to the next points; namely these from the words: “My Dove, My undefiled is one. Doc. 2. That Christs Dove is not a

defiled, but an undefiled company. Thirdly, that Christs undefiled Dove is but one; though they be scattered and divided here to men, yet to Christ they are but one, where wee should have shewed the folly of many in these days, that they ty their loves only to the congregated body of which they are in fellowship with; and if they differ in judgement from them; they have no love to them; neither do they account them of the number of Christs one, undefiled Dove; This is gross ignorance, and preceeds from weakness, pride, and folly; and is indeed neere anti-Christ; and the sopperies of men: Congregated, or uncongregated, so they bee Christs dove, we ought to love them.”

Hanserd Knollys, Song of Solomon, 1656, p. 8:

“The Mystical form of this spiritual house is the framing, sitting, joyning, compacting and building together of these living and spiritual materials (vis Believers) upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. Jesus Christ (who himself is the chief corner stone) by the Spirit of love, Col. 2:2,19, which is the work of the ministry of Christ, who are labourers together with God, and workers together with him, I Cor. 3:5,6,9,10,11; II Cor. 6:1; Eph. 2:19-22 and 4:11-16. This house is here commended by two adjuncts added as the most needful and useful parts of this spiritual building, to wit, beams and rafters, which are put in their proper places; either in the constitution of the church, or in the Reformation thereof. The beams of the house are the main timber thereof, which supported and beareth up the roof, these were of cedar, I Kings 6:36. By these Cedar Beams you may understand the ministers or elders of the churches of God, who seem to be pillars, Gal. 2:9 holding the mystery of faith in pure conscience I Tim. 3:2,9. being strong in grace to bear up them that are weak, Rom. 15:1, strengthening the weak hands and feeble hearts of the poor, doubting, tempted, and afflicted members of the church of God, Heb. 12:12-13.”

Thomas Kilcop, The Unlimited Authority of Christ’s Disciples Cleared, 1651, p.5:

Obj. God hath set such in the Church, I Cor. 12:28,29.
I answer, it is in that place evident, that the Church there specified, is no particular Church, but the Church general, called else-where the general Assembly of the first born written in Heaven, Heb. 12. of which if we be not Members, not only Church and minister, but our readings, prayings, and distributions are little worth. But if we be of this Church general, (as all believers be) then may we acceptably pray, read, etc. and as acceptably associate, preach, break bread, and what not? for if justified by faith, we have peace God-ward through our Lord Jesus Christ, by him also we have access to this grace, wherein we stand, Rom. 5.2. Rejoyce not in men for all is ours, Paul, Appollo, things present or to come, all is ours, and we Christs, I Cor. 3.21,22,23.

Henry Denne, AntiChrist Unmasked, 1645, p.2:

When the Church travailed in pain, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the doctrine of justification in Martin Luther's days; we see cardinal Cajetan in special, and the rest of the scarlet conclave, ready to swallow up both mother and issue, had not the providence of God, carrying the defenders of truth upon Eagles wings, and rightfully defending them... among the rest, the church is now travailing, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the doctrine of the baptism of water, raked up heretofore in an imitation of Pedobaptism. The truth of the ordinance and institution of the Lord Jesus, lying covered with custom and practice, and a pretended face of antiquity.

Obediah Holmes, 1651 (cited from Ill news from New England, John Clark, 1652, p.18:

"Unto the well beloved brethren John Spilbury, William Kiffen, and the rest that in London, stand fast in that faith, and continue to walk steadfastly in that order of the gospel which was once delivered unto the saints by Jesus Christ. Obediah Holmes, an unworthy witness, that Jesus is the Lord, and of late a prisoner for Jesus' sake at Boston, sendeth greeting.

Dearly beloved, and longed after,

My hearts desire is to hear from you, and to hear that you grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and they your love to him, and one unto another, as he hath given commandment, aboundeth, would be the very joy and great rejoycing of my Soul and Spirit; had I not been prevented by my beloved Brethren of Providence, who have wrote unto you (wherein you have my Mind at large) and also by our beloved Brother Clarke of Road-Island, who may (if God permit) see you, and speak with you mouth to mouth, I had here declared my self in that matter, but now I forbear; and because I have an experimentall knowledge in my self, that in members of the Same Body, while it stands in union with the head, there is a sympathizing Spirit, which passeth through, and also remain in each particular, so that one member can neither mourn nor rejoyce, but all the members are ready to mourn or rejoyce with it; I shall the rather impart unto you some dealings which I have had therein from the Sons of Men, and the gracious supports which I have met with from the Son of God, My Lord, and yours, that to like Members you might rejoyce with me, and might be encouraged by the same experiment of his tender mercies, to fear none of those things which you shall suffer for Jesus sake."

John Canne, A Stray against Straying, 1639, p. 75:

"...for edification, which Christ the only teacher of his church hath appointed, then it is set down, by the Apostle in Eph. 4:11-13, the reason is, because Paul there mentioneth all ministerial means for the perfect and complete building of the church from the first to the last; so write Fehner, Laiton, Piscator, Cartwright, Beza, Calvin, Polanas, and others (with references).

Francis Cornwell, A Description of the Spiritual Temple, 1646, p. 4,5:

What is the form of this Spiritual house? Union: They which gladly received the word were baptized, and were added unto the church (and so were compacted into one Spiritual house, whereof Jesus the Christ is Lord: Heb. 3:6. But Christ as a son over His own house, whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.) And these continued stedfastly in the Apostles doctrine, and fellowship, in breaking of bread, and prayers, etc. Acts 2:41,42.

The furniture of this Spiritual house of the New Testament, whereof Jesus the Christ is the King, Priest, and Prophet, is a priesthood, sacrifice, and an altar; but all Spiritual.

First, the Priests, whether they be male or female, they are all one in Christ, Gal. 3:28. Yea, every member of this Spiritual house are made kings and priests to God the Father, Rev. 1:6. Yea, and the whole church united into a body, is a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that they should shew forth the virtues of him that hath called them out of darkness into his marvelous light: which in times past were not a people, but are not the people of God, I Pet. 2:9-10.

John Myles, *An Antidote Against the Infection of the Times*, 1656, p. 8:

That we are to expect the Second coming of the same Jesus, is the same manner as he ascended into Heaven, at the time of the restitution of all things, Acts I. 11. and 3,21. Heb. 9.28. to glorifie, and be glorified in his Saints, who at that time shall, if sleeping in their graves, be raised; if living on the earth, be changed into in immortal glorified state, and shall as one glorious Spouse adorned for her husband meet the Lord with his mighty Angels in the aire, 2 Thess. 4.14,15,16,17. whence after the triumphant marriage of the Lamb, Rev. 19.7. This royal Spouse even the Saints in their glorified bodies shining like Christs glorious body, Phil. 3.20. shall come with him. Zach. 14.5. to reign and judge the world both quick and dead, Jude 14.15. I Cor. 6.2 Matth. 19.28. Rev. 2.25,26,27. For as the Saints shall be raised by virtue of union with Christ their head, so also shall the wicked be by his power forced to rise, John 5.28,29. Acts 14.15.

John Bunyan, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 467, 1682:

Universal, that is the whole church. This word now comprehendeth all the parts of it, even from Adam to the very world's end, whether in heaven or in earth... the universal church cannot be visible, a great part of that body being already in heaven, and a great part as yet, perhaps, unborn."

Thomas Collier, *Body of Divinity*, 1674, p. 463, 464:

2. The word, Church of Christ, does sometimes intend all true Believers in the World, whether in or out of particular constituted Churches; and this is it which is so commonly called the invisible Church, which is indeed in some sense invisible, that is, none can certainly know the true believers, but God alone (2 Tim. 2.19, "The Lord knoweth them that are his) and none else, no not themselves, some of them, and at some times; yet in some sense the Church thus considered is visible in the world, and do visibly own the Lord, according to the measure of means and

light enjoyed; the Church thus considered I take to be intended in these Scriptures, Rom. 10.11,12,13. I Cor. 1. 2. Eph. 1.21,22,23. where the Church is called, The body and fulness of Christ, Col. 1.24. and as it is without question, that in all ages many of the visible Church in prosession miscarried, being none of Christs body truly, the Church taking its denomination from the better part, though all ought to be such; so likewise we are in charity to judge, that many may be out of the right constituted visible Church and Churches of Christ (that are Members,) though its none of their virtue so to be; God hath his people in Babylon, Rev. 19:4. and his Church (on this account) hath he had in the world, throughout all ages, Eph. 3.21. although for a long while, but little of visibleness, according to Gospel rule did appear, and that is it I understand is intended, Rev. 11:1,2 where the Worshippers are measured rather by the spiritualness of their invisible Worshipping, then by the rule of their Ordinances, Order and publick bearing up the name of Christ in this matter, being trodden under foot of the Gentiles, that is, of the Babylonish and Antichristian world, and this is it I take to be the Universal (and in some sort) visible Church of Christ in the World, the body of which all true believers are Members.

3. The word Church sometimes intends all the elect of God, and this is the invisible Church (as to man) and this is evident from the Scriptures, Eph. 5.25. Christ loved the Church (before it was visible) and gave himself for it, So Heb. 12.22. We read of the Universal Church of the first born, &c the Church in this sense includes all the Elect, but it is the bounden duty of all true believers to get themselves into the visible Profession of christ, and bearing up his Name in the World, according to the rules by him prescribed, and the highest and best light they have, or may attain therefrom in this matter, and to be under the government of Christ, in some particular constituted Church of His.”

Thomas Grantham, *Christianimas Primitivus*, 2nd part of the 2nd treatise, p. 2, 1678:

“...but if the definition be made of the thing itself according to the largest consideration, then it may be this, the whole number of the saved ones, from the beginning of the world to the end thereof. This is that Body whereof Christ is said to be the saviour, Eph. 5:23, called the General Assembly or Church of the first born who are written in heaven, which in respect of all the individuals is not known in this world by men, God only knowing who are his; yet thus much we may say in general, that such as only fell in Adam, and have no personal guilt of their own, together with all such in every Age and nation as fear the God of heaven, and work righteousness, are rationally supposed to be within the verge of this vast Body, and may by the grace of God be heirs of salvation.”

Associational Records of the Particular Baptists, England, Wales, and Ireland to 1660, p. 131:

Thomas Tisdale, John Comes, William Millward, James Cowdery, Robert Knight, Benjamin Cox. John Tyler, Edward Tub, Edmund White.

At this meeting also this ensuing epistle was subscribed by the messengers of the churches of Henly, Kenseworth and Eversholt and afterwards by the churches of Abington and Reading:

To the church of Christ of which our brethren John Spilsberie and William Kiffen are members and to the rest of the churches in and neere London, agreeing with the said church in principles and constitutions and accordingly holding communion with the same, the churches of Abington, Reading, Henlie, Kensworth and Eversholt send greeting:

Faithfull and beloved brethren,

The Lord our God having made us to lay to heart how the churches of Christ in the apostles' dayes held a firme communion each with other and how necessarie it was for us to endeavour to doe the same, as it becometh particular assemblyes which make up but one Mount Syon, Is. 4.5, that we might endeavour to keep each other pure and to cleare the profession of the Gospell for scandall and to manifest our love to all the saints, and thereby (to mani-) fest ourselves to be true churches of Christ and that we (may) shew ourselves sensible of the need that we have, or may have, one or another and that the worke of God, wherein all the churches are concerned, might be the better carried on be a combination of counsells, prayers and endeavours."

Joseph Hooke, A necessary Apology for the Baptized Believers, 1701, p. 137:

"8. We agree that Christs People should Assemble to gether to Worship God, for which there must be some Place, and its no matter how Convenient it is for that purpose. But we differ again here: for they call their Meeting Place a Church, but we do not call ours so. We know that the People of God are called the Church in Scripture, and we cannot be sure that the Place where they met was ever called so, no more can Honest Dr. Pearson that hath written very wisely upon the Creed, and particularly about the Catholick Church, which comprehends our Sect as well as his, but for the Place where the Believers met, he cannot shew plainly that it is called the Church in any Place of Scripture, only he produces frome places that seem to favour that opinion, and theres all."

John Spittlehouse, A vindication of the continued Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ, 1692, p. 28:

For what need is there of restoring that by any one man when the aforesaid Church hath power to doe it (when need requireth) of, and by it self, the Church of Christ being as a tree (Psal. 1.3.) whose seed is in it self: now experience teacheth us, that a tree so planted as aforesaid albeit in the autumnall or winter season, it become seemingly dead, by being deprived of its outward ornaments of leaves and fruit (which is procured by the coldnesses of the season, which causeth the sap to shrink down into the root) yet the like experience doth also teach us, that at the Spring time the aforesaid sap or moisture, being exhaled again by virtue of the heat of the Sun, doth furnish the same tree again with its like naturall ornaments of leaves and fruit, and that of, and from it self.

So put the case, that during the autumnall or winter season of the Antichristian persecution of the Church of Christ, it might be deprived of its aforesaid ornaments of order, and form of worship, yet the root and the tree being preserved (viz. the Word of God as the root, and Saints as the tree, wherein the aforesaid order and form of worship have been retained, during the

aforesaid time) hath by the virtue and power of the Sun of righteousness shining upon it (at the time of its approach out of its aforesaid condition) even as much power to furnish it self with its Spirituall ornaments, of order, and form of worship, and that without any other artificiall help whatsoever, as the aforesaid tree hath to produce its own leaves and fruit.

Henry D'Anvers, *The City of God*, 1762, p. 172:

So here these twelve Gates serve for entrance. In the new Jerusalem to all the Elect, who are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham (for they that are Christs, whether Jew or Gentile are Abrahams Seed according to promise) even those, who are built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; and so entering in by Christ the door, they have admission by the Angels or Ministers of Christ, into the rights and priviledges of this Holy free City, the Mother of us all; and are to be esteemed as the true Isaacs, the children of Sarah the free Woman, the marked sealed number belonging to the twelve Tribes Spiritual.

Hercules Collins, *Believer's Baptism from Heaven*, 1691, p.37:

OBJECT 7. If the first Fruit be Holy, the Lump is also Holy; if the Root be Holy, so are the Branches. Hence some would infer a Derivative. Holiness from the Parent to the Children, therefore to be baptized.

ANSWER. This Objection is raised from Rom. 11.16. The scope of the Apostle in this place is to shew, That Abraham, Father of the Faithful, is the Root, not as a Natural, but Spiritual Father: And if we boast our selves of being Branches of this Root, we must have the Faith of our Father Abraham; for the grafting in here does not consist in outward Ordinances, but in saving Grace; not in the Visible, but Invisible Church by Faith.

Edward Hutchinson, *A Treatise Concerning the Covenant and Baptism*, 1676, p. 36-37:

"and now the promises running to Christ personally, God makes him over for a Covenant to the Elect, and all the promises in him. Isa. 42.6. So that in Christ he is our God, and in Christ, he takes us to be his people. In christ, and a right to the promises, out of Christ, and strangers to the Covenants of promise, Eph. 2.12. so that it is evident, that the promises, respecting the eternal inheritance, and Spiritual blessings were first made to Christ personally, and in him to his mystical body, the Church, who are united to him by faith.

Secondly, as to that Scripture I Cor. 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: It rather seems to be meant of the invisible Church of true believers, than of the visible; for the Apostle there, calls none the body of Christ but such as had received the gifts of the Spirit, and such as by one Spirit (as the concurring cause) had been baptized into one body, yea such who had received the Spirit to profit with all, such, that had a real sympathy one with another, vers. the 26th. If one Member suffers all the members suffer with it, if one member be honoured, all the members rejoyce with it: All which cannot (in any tolerable sense) be applyed to the visible Church, amongst whom there are many hypocrites, that never received the Spirit, not by the Spirit, could sympathize one with another,

&c. But however, it is most certain infants are not called the body of Christ, if it be meant of the visible Church indeed, by virtue of the grace of election, some of them may be members of his mystical body, the invisible Church, but not at all members of the visible, especially from this chapter; for it is said, if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; and the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every one to profit with-all, which cannot be applicable to infants.”

Benjamin Keach and Elias Keach, *The Glory of a Gospel Church, and the true Orderly Discipline thereof explained*, 1697, p. 6:

“The Beauty and Glory of which Congregation doth consist in their being all Converted Persons, or lively Stones, being by the Holy Spirit, united to Jesus Christ the Precious Corner-Stone, and only foundation of every Christian, as well as of every particular Congregation, and of the whole Catholick Church.”

Thomas De Laune, *A Plea for the Non-conformists*, 1683, p.108:

2. Its Members.

The members of the Christian church are not any empire, region, city, or province, but only such of the faithful, or believers, in all parts of the world, who are called to visible saintship, and orderly put together into distinct congregations, as Christ has directed in the New Testament.”

William Kiffen, *A sober Discourse of Right to Church Communion*, 1681, p. 138:

Baptism in those days did certainly precede Church - Enjoyments, for it was esteem'd (as it still ought to be) a means of implanting men into Christ, or the Body of Christ the Church, Gal. 3:12. Rom. 6:3. Now let it be considered what a Planting together imports; It must be certainly the first putting of Christians together, in order to their Growing together in Christ, and yet all this was done by Baptism: and may we not suppose Trees to grow together, as this Spiritual Plantation of Christ, viz. the Church, or Society of Christians, who were, and should still be Planted together by Baptism, not into this or that particular Church; but into that one Church of Christ, which is distributed into several parts and particular Societies.

Samuel Richardson, *Some Brief considerations on Doctor Featley his book intituled The Dipper Dipt*, 1645, p. 13:

5. If by their natural birth they be born in the covenant of Grace, then are they not by nature the Children of wrath as well as others who are born of unbelievers, which is against Ephes. 2:3. How can one be under the covenant, and under grace, and under wrath at one and the same time?

6. Then there is two ways of entering into the covenant of grace, one by natural birth, another by faith.

7. That there is two ways to enter the church of God, one by a natural birth, and another to another by the second birth, without which none is to enter into the Kingdom of God this latter enters by profession of faith and repentance.

8. That as of old, so now there is some fleshly priviledge as by which we become members of the church now, viz. by being born of a believer; therefore all old things are not done away, and all become new, which is contrary to divers scriptures: as they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted (by God) for the seed Rom. 9.7,8. with Gal. 3.9.

Gill, John, Body of Divinity, p. 853;
Booth, Abraham, The Reign of Grace, p. 153;
M'Lean, Archibald, Works, p. 88, vol. 6;
Fuller, Andrew, Works, p. 177, vol. 4;
Hall, Robert, Works, p. 333, vol. 1;
Haldane, Robert, Romans, p. 560;
Carson, Alexander, Baptism, Its Mode and its Subjects, p. 49;
Spurgeon, Charles, Metropolitan Pulpit, p. 255, vol. II;
Maclaren, Alexander, on John 17;
Backus, Isaac, Pamphlets, p. 140;
Dagg, John, Theology, p. 100;
Hovey, Alvah, Theology, p. 302;
Jeter, J.B., Campbellism Explained, p. 41;
Curtis, T.F., Progress of Baptist Principles, p. 236;
Strong, A.H., Theology, p. 887;
Dargan, E.C., Ecclesiology, p. 33;
Broadus, John, A., Matthew, p. 358;
Vedder, H.C., History, p. 24;
Hiscox, E.T., New Directory for Baptist Churches, p. 24;
Newman, A.H., History, p. 125, vol. 1;
Mullins, E.Y., Theology, p. 425;
Eaton, T.T., The Faith of Baptists, p. 5;
Conner, W.T., Theology, p. 269;
Dana, H.E., Ecclesiology, p. 56;
Johnson, W.B., (1st president of S.B.C.) Sermons on Sovereignty, p. 34;
Fuller, Richard (3rd president of S.B.C.) Baptism and Communion, p. 178;
Harvey, H., The Church, p. 27;
Jones, William, Apocalypse, p. 403;
Boyce, J.P., Theology, p. 294;
Pink, A.W., Hebrews, p. 1051;
Hackett, H.B., Acts 7:38 - Hovey's Commentary;
Gould, E.P., I Cor. 12:13 - Hovey's Commentary;
Smith, J.A., Eph. 1:23 - Hovey's Commentary;
Kendrick, A.C., Heb. 12:23 - Hovey's Commentary;
Williams, N.M., I Pet. 5:4 - Hovey's Commentary;
Clarke, W.N., Theology, p. 382;
Burrage, H.S., Baptist Doctrines (Jenkins) p. 152;
Brown, J.N., Southern Baptist Review, vol. 1, 1855, p. 206;
Everts, W.W., Cited from Intercommunion, Graves, p. 110;
Breaker, J.M.C., Cited from Intercommunion, Graves, p. 110;

Atkins, Cited from Intercommunion, Graves, p. 111;
 Graves, J.R., Graves - Ditzler Debate, p. 808;
 Pendleton, J.M., Church Manual, p. 5,6;
 Watson, J.M., The Old Baptist Test, p. 141;
 Hassell, S., History of the Church of God, p. 18;
 Beebe, Gilbert, Editorials, vol. 3, p. 278;
 Broadus, Andrew, Sermons and Other Writings, p. 442;
 Ford, D.B., Studies on the Baptismal Question, p. 580;
 Burrows, J.L., What Baptists Believe, p.8
 Conant, T.J., The Meaning and Use of Baptizein, p. 189
 Cathcart, W.M., Baptist Encyclopedia, Article on Baptist W. Noel.
 Edwards, Morgan, Life and Works of Morgan Edwards, p. 80
 Robertson, A.T., Mt. 16:18, Word Pictures

The Abstract of Principles is the first official confession of Faith which Southern Baptists endorsed. As Southern Baptist Theological Seminary opened its doors in 1859 in Greenville, S.C. (later to be moved to its present location in Louisville, Ky), the principal founder and first President, James P. Boyce, was greatly concerned that the professors of the new school believe and teach within acceptable boundaries of recognized Southern Baptist orthodoxy. To insure this (so he thought) Boyce commissioned Basil Manly, Jr. to draw up an "abstract of doctrinal principles" which would be included in the official foundation documents of the seminary.

The "Fundamental Laws" of the Southern Seminary, which were written into its charter on April 30, 1858, contain the follow section: "9. Every Professor of the Institution shall be a member of a regular Baptist Church; and all persons accepting Professorships in this Seminary, shall be considered by such acceptance, as engaging to teach in accordance with, and not contrary to, the Abstract of Principles hereinafter laid down." (Mueller, History of Southern Seminary, p. 238). This 20 point document remains today the doctrinal foundation of Southern Seminary, and its professors are still required to sign it before assuming their duties in the classroom. (The Founders Journal).

†XIV. THE CHURCH

†

The Lord Jesus is the Head of the Church, which is composed of all His true disciples, and in Him is invested supremely all power for its government. According to His commandments, Christians are to associate themselves into particular societies or churches; and to each of these churches He hath given needful authority for administering that order, discipline and worship which He hath appointed. The regular officers of a Church are Bishops, or Elders, and Deacons. (The Abstract of Principles).

Notice what A.T. Robertson writing in the Religions Herald of April 27, 1899 says about The Abstract of Principles written in 1858: "When I no longer believe in the Universal spiritual church, my connection with the Seminary ceases; for I have sworn to teach it in signing the seminary creed. (Art. xiv). And Robertson further says: "His position rests on all Baptist creeds and scholars." (Srygler-Hall Discussion. p. 67)

This seminary creed endorsed by the Professors takes in such noted scholars as Boyce, Broadus, Manly, Williams, Whitsitt, Robertson, Dargan, and McGlothlin.

In the Vol. 2, 1856 Southern Baptist Review, Graves ran an article intitled "Is there a Universal Church" and in a footnote to the title Graves explains: "At our request the author of Theodosia Ernest has furnished this extract from the discussion of the subject in his forth-coming book – The 2nd volume of Theodosia, or ten days travel in search of the church. The view is original and against the "received authorities" -but is it not correct?

Here is an admission by Graves that the Local church only view of Dayton was not an old Landmark but a mere innovation, that it was "original" with Dayton, and against the "Received Authorities" -Note also this contemptuous punctuation of the received authorities.

In view of the above witnesses, what must the reader think of the following statements?:

"We hear much of the invisible church as contradistinguished from the church visible. Of an invisible church in this world I know nothing, the Word of God says nothing; nor can anything of the kind exist, except in the brain of a heretic." (Why be a Baptist, H.B. Taylor, p.63).

Or this:

"There is no portion of God's truth more neglected, perverted, denied, and abused today than is church truth. Very few, even among truly saved people, know the first thing about church truth. Men's blind belief in the awful heresy of the universal invisible church has shut the door for them upon what the Bible really teaches about the Lord's true church. No man can believe in a universal invisible church and even begin to understand the Bible teaching on the Lord's church." (Baptist Examiner, Nov. 12, 1888).

That is what I thought myself!

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

In bringing this paper to a close I would like to point out, by way of review, that Landmarkism does not call us back to the old paths in which “all true Baptists in all ages have walked”. Contrariwise, it is simply an evolutionary rising of a sectarianism based upon the innovations of its chief spokesman. Following are some of these innovations.

1. That the nature of a church is local only - never universal.
2. That God gets his glory solely from this local church.
3. That the faithful members of this local church will constitute the bride.
4. That the commission was given to this local church.
5. That Baptism to be scriptural (valid) must be performed by this local church.
6. That the Lord’s supper can be observed by this local church only.
7. That a linked-chain succession, either in baptism (Old Landmarkism), or in organic mother church - daughter church (new Landmarkism) is absolutely necessary for the propagation and existence of true churches down through the centuries.
8. The passing of authority from mother church to daughter church.
9. A mother church having members who never, and cannot, assemble with the assembly.
10. Such members constituting a Mission by a Missionary from the Mother Church awaiting a coming time to be constituted a church by the authority of the Mother Church.
11. The Kingdom (of Heaven, God, Christ, God’s dear Son) composed of Baptist Churches only.
12. That the local church is the pillar and ground of the truth.
13. That the Brideship is conditional upon obedience to the Landmark principles
14. That the Promise of the Spirit was fulfilled on Pentecost to the church, as a Church, and thus to continue with true churches organized according to Landmark principles down through the ages.
15. That a church may lose this office of the Holy Spirit (removal of the candlestick) by disobedience.
16. That Baptism is the initiation or door into the church.
17. That there can be no visible churches without Baptism.
18. That Baptism inducts into the Kingdom.
19. That there is a scriptural connection between Baptism and preaching.
20. That a man cannot be a minister who is not a member of a Baptist Church.
21. That Baptism is the visible separation from the world.
22. That authority to preach, to baptise must come from a Landmark Baptist Church.
23. That Intimate fellowship with Christ is hinged on Baptism.
24. That John the Baptist prepared by Baptism the people whom Christ would later form His Church from.
25. That one’s love to his theological system makes him either a “true” or an “untrue” Baptist, depending on who is judging.
26. That in Baptism no personal faith is expressed, but the faith of the administrator.

Church salvation is common to Anti-Christ. The notorious arrogance claimed by Roman Catholics, Mormons, and others has always been justly repudiated by Baptists. But there is more to salvation than Justification - there is also sanctification and glorification. The latter two phases are claimed exclusively by Landmarkers - Church salvation; admittedly, some to greater extremes than others, but common to all - their system demands it.

Traditions with scripture has always been Anti-Christ doctrine. The scriptures are not the sole rule of faith and practice of Landmarkers - their system first, then scripture. Truly to them in an extreme manner the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth - their theological system binds them to misinterpret both scripture and history. As has been shown abundantly in this paper, the Baptists of the 1600's thought they had authority from the scriptures only to perform scripture commands - not so the Landmarker: without previous church authority the scriptures, cannot be followed by anyone (it would be a "farce" to think so)!

Speaking of traditions, Baptists have always believed both the Spiritual and the local aspects of the church - then after 1900 years a small select group of Baptists denounce that teaching as heresy; "They were all wrong - we must follow scripture rather than man" (even while claiming them in their succession); on this we are all agreed - we must follow scripture. But those who believed the Spiritual Church believed the same. They interpreted in the literal, primary manner while the Landmarker insists on the theological interpretation in many cases where Ekklesia is used as we noticed earlier. So it is really a question of hermeneutics, and until the Landmarkers can produce the greek scholarship equal to the other side, which would be the safest course to follow? What Baptists have always believed? - or the moderns? This is a true sense in which tradition must rule, not above scripture - but in accordance with and under scripture, for it is incredulous and preposterous to claim the Baptists have always been wrong on church truth until our Modern era when any little ole Landmarker can tell you the exact and only meaning of Ekklesia - even without ever having studied the language.

Says Thornbury:

From these quotations it is reasonable to conclude that there is no argument against the view of universal church based on the usage of the Greek word ekklesia. If the contrary is true, how can it be explained that the universal usage is not only allowed for but explicitly given by lexicographers? It is scarcely a reasonable answer that they were all prejudiced. This might be possible in a few instances, but it seems most unlikely that a poisonous bias on the meaning of ekklesia could infect the minds of lexicographers as a whole. It is the task of lexicographers to define a word by its original and true meaning, not by the usage of contemporary writers. If all the distinguished Greek scholars and lexicographers are in error on ekklesia, it is a case for which there is no parallel in biblical criticism. (Doctrine of the Church, p. 21).

Another anti-Christ doctrine is mentioned by Loftin:

"The Popish fiction of organic or visible succession founded on Matt. 16:18, as already said, was never adopted by Baptists until recent date; and it has not only engendered a false Baptist ideal and spirit, but it has from the beginning been a source of strife and confusion among good brethren. No body of Baptists in the world, among themselves, has been more unhappy than where this fiction has

prevailed, or since this notion began to be pursued among them. We have had more or less of strife for fifty years, based largely upon this difference of opinion among Southern Baptists; and there appears to be little prospect of peace until this Romish novelty shall be surrendered. I can remember, when affected by this ideal and spirit of high-church Baptism, I was led to believe that such men as Fuller, Broadus, Boyce, Jeter and others were not sound Baptists; and for some years this fiction led me to feel that it was almost impossible for a Pedobaptists to be saved. The object of this volume is not only to sustain a historical fact, but to set up the old Baptist landmark of constant reproduction instead of visible succession; and if I can help to unite my brethren upon the Bible as the sole rule of authority, and the only basis of our continuance – under God – I shall think myself happy. In the fear of God, and in the light of Scripture and history, I dedicate this work to the peace and prosperity of the Baptists denomination; and I affirm my solemn belief that God never intended that his people should have a visible or organic succession, the claim of which has always engendered a traditional pride and persecuting spirit in those who have held it.

The charge will be made that the position of the English Baptists as Separatists and Reformers makes them the offspring of Rome – a daughter of the “Mother of Harlots.” Such is not the case. In every age God has cried: “Come out of her my people”; and in every age they have come out and from under the shadow of the great Apostasy by separation or reformation. Every Anabaptists leader and sect of History was Separatist or Reformer; but they threw off the “mark of the beast,” infant baptism, and other Romish heresies, and hence were never daughters of the old harlot of Rome. No Pedobaptist reformation or separation ever got out of Rome. The retention of infant baptism is “the mark of the beast,” and so of other Romish heresies which make every Pedobaptist denomination in some respect akin to Rome and like their mother or grandmother. Anabaptist separation or reformation generally went to the other extreme of Romanism; and hence their counter errors which, in many instances, helped to divide and destroy them. The only likeness which any Baptist has to Rome, is holding to visible succession, “Antichrist’s chief hold.” (English Baptist Reformation, p. 260-261).

Another Anti-Christ stronghold is the suppression of the scriptures from the people. Tyndale, the patriarch of the Authorized Version, the true hero of the English Reformation, stated: “Ere many years he would cause a boy that driveth a plough to know more of Scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew” (1520 A.D.); and his last words before his martyrdom: “Lord open the King of Englands eyes” were soon answered in the translation and distribution of the scriptures to the people. But how is it with the Landmarker? You do not dare learn anything but Landmarkism to fellowship with them. You do not dare voice any other opinion but theirs - or you are out. You cannot use the learned works of others without “taking it with a grain of salt.” You must be silent when they corrupt the scriptures, history, mis-quote, or mis-apply their interpretations, or you are a “heretic”. At a Bible conference I once heard a layman from a Landmark church say: “Calvin killed thousands of Baptists”. Where? When?! And from the same party commenting on the Reformed Baptists: “What did they reform from?” To him it was very intelligent being ignorant that the term only identified the doctrines of grace, or Calvinism, that those Baptists teach.

It is no less a command to “prove all things” with regard to ‘church truth’ as it is regarding the doctrines of grace, especially since the former occupies so much time in the pulpit and space in the papers in modern church life, and it may be added, to the great detriment of the latter. One would not have to be a Philadelphia Lawyer to determine that in the three major themes being preached today: Escatology, ecclesiology, and salvation (mostly in that order), and that if the first two were erroneous as preached today in comparison with scripture and the practice of historic Baptists, then it is no wonder the spiritual famine prevailing throughout the nation - two thirds of Bible doctrine lost and the other third curtailed by the ramifications of that which is lost! The doctrine of Christ and practical christian life are the dominate doctrines in scripture - not who is the greatest, or who are “true” baptists, who can or cannot be a church, who does or does not have “authority”, who can or cannot obey scripture - God is God of, all His children, not just the Landmarkers. God, “who worketh all things after the council of His own will” (Eph. 1:11) “predestinated the inheritance of the elect in Christ”, “before ordained their good works and their walk”, (Eph. 2:10) - The great Shepherd of the sheep; yet only a very small portion of these, and that after 1850 years A.D., are Landmarkers. It is unbelievable - this speaks against the Great Shephard. I agree with Bunyan “who lived and died in the conviction, that differences were permitted among christians to stimulate them to search the scriptures, and to exercise the grace of forbearance, as was the case in the primitive churches, in their disputes about meats and days, and even as to whether the Gentiles were to be visited with the gospel” (Works, II, p. 744). This is what the Landmark system, cannot do - they, cannot love the brotherhood. They can pay lip service to the doctrine of love, but they cannot exercise it - their system is exclusive of practical love. Neither Gill nor Spurgeon could preach in their pulpits - they would be “dangerous heretics” on “church truth” or “second coming truth” or the other ninety percent of the exclusivity of Landmarkism. Yes, Brethren, you can dot your I’s and cross your T’s - you can satisfy yourselves “that you are the people” - you can cast down, exclude, withdraw, split churches, hurt feelings, disrupt and wound the consciences of multitudes - but you cannot Love. Why? Love is a gift of the Spirit (I Cor. 13:13) - “Try the Spirits” (I Jno. 4:1) - “Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of” (Lk. 9:55).

APPENDIX I

Since many brethren do not have Ivimey's History of the English Baptists, that work now having become quite scarce, and who said Crosby's history was "so badly written, that an abridgement and arrangement of its contents have long been thought desirable" (Preface, vii); I have thought it might be interesting to some to set forth his account of the restoration of believers' baptism, among the Particular Baptists in England, and to follow with some comments on the same:

It must be admitted that there is some obscurity respecting the manner in which the ancient immersion of adults, which appears to have been discontinued, was restored, when, after the long night of antichristian apostasy, persons were at first baptized on a profession of faith. The very circumstance however of their being called Anabaptists as early as the period of the Reformation, proves that they did, in the opinion of the Pedobaptists, re-baptize, which it is not likely they would do, by pouring or sprinkling, immersion being incontrovertibly the universal practice in the church of England at that time.

It has not been uncommon for the enemies of the Baptists to reproach them with the manner in which this practice was restored. In a work published at the close of the seventeenth century by Mr. John Wall, entitled "Baptism anatomized," the writer says, "Their baptism is not from heaven, but will-worship, and so to be abhorred by all Christians; for they received their baptism from one Mr. Smyth who baptized himself; one who was cast out of a church, and endeavoured to deprive the church of Christ of the use of the bible."

To this charge, made with so much asperity, Hercules Collins, a Baptist minister at Wapping, replies with great indignation in a work entitled, "Believers' baptism from heaven, and of divine institution: Infant baptism from earth, and of human invention:" Published in 1691. Mr. Collins denies that the English Baptists received their baptism from Mr. John Smyth, and says, "It is absolutely untrue, it being well known to some who are yet alive how false this assertion is; and if J.W. will but give a meeting to any of us, and bring whom he please with him, we shall sufficiently shew the falsity of what is asserted by him in this matter, and in many other things which he hath unchristianly asserted."

It is to be regretted that Mr. Collins did not give the account which is here referred to. This defect is however in some measure supplied in a work published by Mr. Edward Hutchinson in 1676, entitled, "A Treatise concerning the covenant and baptism." The dedication is addressed "to the spiritual seed of Abraham, especially those of the baptized congregations." He says, "Your beginning in these nations (of late years) was but small; yet when it pleased the Lord to dispel those clouds that overshadowed us, and to scatter some beams of the gospel amongst us, he gave you so great an increase that Sion may say with admiration, Who hath begotten me these?"

"Nor is it less observable, that whereas other reformations have been carried on by the secular arm, and the countenance and allowance of the magistrate, as in Luther's time by several German princes; the protestant reformation in England by King Edward, Queen Elizabeth, &c.; and the Presbyterian reformation by a parliament, committee of estates, and assembly of divines, besides the favour and assistance of great personages; you have had none of these to take you by the hand; but your progress was against the impetuous current of human opposition,

Commented [dwe1]: Should this be formatted like the other quotations?

and attended with such external discouragements as bespeak your embracing this despised truth to be an effect of heart-sincerity, void of all mercenary considerations. Yea, how active has the accuser of the brethren been to represent you in such frightful figures, exposing you by that mischievous artifice to popular odium and the lash of the magistracy; insomuch that the name of an Anabaptist was crime enough, which doubtless was a heavy obstacle in the way of many pious souls!

“What our dissenting brethren have to answer on that account, who instead of taking up, have laid stumbling-blocks in the way of reformation, will appear another day. Yet notwithstanding the strenuous oppositions of those great and learned ones, the mighty God of Jacob hath taken you by the hand, and said, Be strong.

“Besides, it has a considerable tendency to the advancement of divine grace, if we consider the way and manner of the reviving of this costly truth. When the professors of these nations had been a long time wearied with the yoke of superstitious ceremonies, traditions of men, and corrupt mixtures in the work and service of God; it pleased the Lord to break these yokes, and by a very strong impulse of his Spirit on the hearts of his people to convince them of the necessity of reformation. Divers pious and very gracious people, having often sought the Lord by fasting and prayer that he would show them the pattern of his house, and the goings out and comings in thereof, resolved by the grace of God not to receive or practise any piece of positive worship which had not precept nor example from the word of God. Infant baptism coming of course under consideration, after long search and many debates it was found to have no footing in the scriptures, (the only rule and standard to try doctrines by,) but on the contrary a mere innovation, yea, the profanation of an ordinance of God. And though it was purposed to be laid aside, yet what fears, tremblings, and temptations, did attend them, lest they should be mistaken, considering how many learned and godly men were of an opposite persuasion! How gladly would they have had the rest of their brethren gone along with them! But when there was no hope, they concluded that a christian’s faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, and that every one must give an account of himself to God; and so resolved to practise according to their light. The great objection was the want of an Administrator, which as I have heard was removed by sending certain messengers to Holland, whence they were supplied. So that this little cloud of witnesses hath the Lord by his grace so greatly increased, that it is spread over our horizon, though opposed and contradicted by men of all sorts.”

Crosby says that this agrees with an account given of the matter in an old manuscript said to be written by Mr. Willam Kiffen. This relates, that:

“several sober and pious persons belonging to the congregations of the dissenters about london were convinced that believers were the only proper subjects of baptism, and that it ought to be administered by immersion, or dipping the whole body into the water, in resemblance of a burial and resurrection, according to Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12. That they often met together to pray and confer about this matter, and consult what methods they should take to enjoy this ordinance in

its primitive purity. That they could not be satisfied about any administrator in England to begin this practice; because, though some in this nation rejected the baptism of infants, yet they had not, as they knew of, revived the ancient custom of immersion. but hearing that some in the Netherlands practised it, they agreed to send over one Mr. Richard Blunt, who understood the Dutch language; that he went accordingly, carrying letters of recommendation with him, and was kindly received both by the church there, and by Mr. John Batte their teacher; that on his return he baptized Mr. Samuel Blacklock, a minister, and these two baptized the rest of their company, whose names are in the manuscript to the number of fifty three.”

“But the greatest number of the English Baptists, and the more judicious, esteemed all this but needless trouble, and what proceeded from the old popish doctrine of right to administer sacraments by an uninterrupted succession, which neither the church of Rome nor the church of England, much less the modern dissenters, could prove to be with them. They affirmed therefore, and practised accordingly, that after a general corruption of baptism, an unbaptized person might warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation.”

These testimonies to a matter of fact by such men as Hutchinson, Collins, and Kiffin, may be safely relied on, as they were all eminent Baptist ministers at a time when they could easily procure information from their aged members concerning it. AT the time when Hutchinson and Collins wrote, Mr. Kiffin was still living; and from his perfect knowledge of all things in the denomination almost from the very first, he was doubtless one of the persons from whom they had received their information, and to whom Mr. Collins probably referred, who would give Mr. Wall every necessary information on the subject.

That Mr. Kiffin was well acquainted with this affair, there can be no doubt. He joined Mr. Lathorp’s church very soon after the division had taken place in it, when he was about seventeen years of age; and five years afterwards was dismissed from it to Mr. Spilsbury’s church, which was founded at Wapping.

It may perhaps be thought that this statement is incompatible with the history of the Baptists already given. What occasion, it may be objected, was there to send out of the kingdom a person to be baptized by immersion, if there were at the same time so many persons in it who had been baptized in the same manner? Might not one of them have been the administrator?

One answer to this objection is, that by violent persecutions almost all the Baptists had been driven out of the kingdom, so that in the beginning of the reign of Charles the first, it would have been a difficult matter to find a minister who had been baptized by immersion. The conjecture of Crosby however is very probable, that if such a one or many such could have been found, yet the old popish doctrine, not yet fully effaced from the mind even of nonconformists, that the right of administering the sacraments descended by uninterrupted succession, would prevent persons desiring baptism from applying to any but a regularly ordained minister, who had been baptized on a profession of faith by a person who had himself been so baptized. Such ministers were to be found in the Netherlands, whose baptism they thought, and perhaps with truth, had regularly descended from the Waldensian Christians, and therefore, it is not to be wondered at that they should apply to that quarter.

It is farther to be observed, that the account which Mr. Kiffin gives does not relate to the people who left Mr. Lathorp’s church in 1633, and who settled at Wapping under the care of Mr. Spilsbury; but to “many sober and pious people belonging to the congregations of dissenters

about London, who sent Mr. Blount to Holland, and were afterwards baptized by him and Mr. Samuel Blacklock, to the number of fifty-three.” It is not known at what precise period this happened, but it is evident that these were not Mr. Spilsbury’s people. Edwards, in his Gangraena, speaking of this church, associates with Mr. Blount the names of Emmes and Wrighters, as its ministers, and calls it “one of the first and prime churches of Anabaptists now in these latter times.”

Still it may be asked, As Mr. Helwisse had formed a church in London prior to the year 1615, and had been baptized by Mr. Smyth, how was it that they did not receive baptism from him, or from his successors?

To this it is replied, that the church of which Mr. Helwisse was pastor, was of the General Baptist denomination, and was composed of Arminians, whereas the persons desiring baptism were probably Calvinists, between which denominations there never was much fellowship or religious intercourse, nor is there to the present day. Admitting then that there were ministers of this description, it is not probable that Calvinists would repair to them for an administrator of baptism. But as we are told that the greater number of Baptists, and the more judicious of them, considered all this to be needless trouble, it is highly probable that this account refers to a few people, rather than to the Baptists in general.

These observations are made for the purpose of explaining and reconciling matters of fact which have been generally mistated, and not as an apology for the conduct of our predecessors; since the Baptists of the present day unite with the greater part, and the more judicious of that time, in maintaining, that after a general corruption of baptism, an unbaptized person may warrantably baptize, and so begin a reformation. (Ivimey’s History of English Baptists, pp. 139-146).

Ivimey assumes the manner of the restoration of Baptism for some of the Particulars in a very curious way. He states Collins “Did not give the account which is here referred to,” and then says, “This defect is however in some measure supplied” by Hutchinson who “heard” of Blount going to Holland agreeing with an account “Said” to be written by Kiffen; and calls these “Testamonies to a matter of fact, to be safely relied on.” But, what matter of fact? Collins, did give the account of the manner of restoration of Baptism, and which account will not warrant the assumptions of Ivimey nor his conclusions to a “matter of fact.” In Collins’ book, four lines before Ivimey’s quote, this is stated: “Could not the ordinance of Christ, which was lost in the apostasy, be revived, (as the Feast of the Tabernacles was, tho lost a great while)...” This is one of the Particular’s arguments to “take up” Baptism when it is wanting, which we noticed in the article: P.8 (King); P. 15 (Gosnold); P. 26 (Appendix to 2nd London Confession); and which I have found also in several other writings: Thomas Kilcop, one of the signers of the 1st London Confession, wrote a book:

The names of all 11 Mo. Janu: begin

- | | | |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Richard Blunt | Sam Blacklock | Tho. Shephard) |
| 2. Greg Fishburn | Doro Fishburn | his wife) |
| 3. John Cadwell | Eliz Cadwell | Mary Millison) |
| 4. Sam Eames | Tho. Munden | |
| 5. Thos. Kilcop | William Willieby | |
| 6. Robert Locker | Mary Lock | |
| 7. John Braunson | John Bull | |

8. Rich. Ellis	Mary Langride
9. Wm Creak	Mary Haman
10. Robert Carr	Sarah Williams
11. Martin Mainprise	Joane)
)Dunkle
	Anne)
12. Henry Woolmare	Eliz. Woolmore
15. Henry Creak	Judeth Manning
16. Mark Lukar	Mable Lukar
17. Henry Darker	Abigal Bowden
13. Robert King	Sarah Norman
14. Thomas Waters	Isabel Woolmore
Ellis Jessop	Mary Kreak
	Susanna King

41 in all

11th month understood 11 January 9 added

as appears	John Cattope	George Wenham
above: &	Nicholas Martin	Thomas Davenant
this was	Allie Stanford	Rich. Colgrave
Jan 9th	Nath Matthon	Eliz. Hutchinson
	Mary Birch	John Croson
	Sybilla Lees	
	John Woolmore	

Thus 53 in all

This title page says very much and on Page 8, this is stated:

“For these are therein Bid _____ (by teaching to make disciples all nations) with this addition, verse 20: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and loe, I am with you always, etc: Teaching them, to wit, the discipled, whether Jew or Gentile, to observe, to do, to practice all things, every gospel command whatsoever I have ever since I estated to you in gospel worship commanded you.”

“But Christ had taught these to be Baptised, to pray, to preach, to baptise, to assemble, to break bread, Acts 2:41,42, Ergo, the discipled must do the same, of what nation or age soever. Therefore as praying disciples may pray, so preaching disciples may preach, uniting disciples may unite, if they have ability they want not authority, being disciples, and so we being disciples, learners of Christ, hearkners to Christ, have authority to practice what we find in scripture be Christs gospel commands.”

“The scripture is a guide to find out God’s ways and commands, to the law and to the testimony if they speak not according to this word there is no light in them, Esa. 8.20. The Jews by reading the scriptures found dwelling in booths a Law for them to observe, and so betook themselves to the practice of it with great joy, for they had been so long without it, that they know it not to be a law til they found it so to be by reading scripture. And as this being given to Israelites, Israelites might obey it, so gospel commands were given by Christ to disciples, and therefore disciples may set to the practice of them, Matth. 28.19,20”. (PP. 46,47)

Francis Cornewell writing in 1644, “The Vindication of the Royall Commission of King Jesus”, uses the same argument in his teaching of Reformation, p.11:

“To Reform any error crept into the Churches of Old and New Testament, it was their holy custom to reduce all things to their first institution, according to Tertullians judgement: As David in the miscarriage of the Arke, I Cor. 15.2.12.13. And zealous Josiahs rule (whom the Spirit of God so commendeth in Scriptures, that none was the like before him for his Reformation, II Corn. 34.41. And as Nehemiah did after his returne from the Babylonish Captivity, Nehem. 10.29. They clave to their Brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and a oath to walke in God’s Law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, to observe, and see all the commandments of the Lord our God, and his Judgements, and his statutes. So is the Reforming of the particular churches of the New Testament, whereof Jesus is head, King, and Prophet; and (if ever she be rightly brought out of her Spirituall Babylonish captivity) we must reforme as the Lord Jesus hath left us a rule...”

Then on p. 13 states:

1. “That way that Jesus Christ as head and King hath constituted his church, that is the way for all believers to take up, and walk in. But by Teaching the Gospel and dipping, Jesus Christ as head and king hath constituted his church, Ergo. Teaching the Gospell, and dipping is the way for all believers to take up and walke in.”

One of the most prominent Baptists of that age was Thomas Collier, and that which follow is the title page of one of his books:

The names of all 11 Mo. Janu: begin

1. Richard Blunt	Sam Blacklock	Tho. Shephard)
2. Greg Fishburn	Doro Fishburn	his wife)
3. John Cadwell	Eliz Cadwell	Mary Millison)
4. Sam Eames	Tho. Munden	
5. Thos. Kilcop	William Willieby	
6. Robert Locker	Mary Lock	
7. John Braunson	John Bull	
8. Rich. Ellis	Mary Langride	
9. Wm Creak	Mary Haman	
10. Robert Carr	Sarah Williams	
11. Martin Mainprise	Joane)	
)Dunkle	
	Anne)	
12. Henry Woolmare	Eliz. Woolmore	
15. Henry Creak	Judeth Manning	
16. Mark Lukar	Mable Lukar	
17. Henry Darker	Abigal Bowden	
13. Robert King	Sarah Norman	
14. Thomas Waters	Isabel Woolmore	

Ellis Jessop	Mary Kreak Susanna King	
		41 in all
11th month understood as appears above: & this was Jan 9th	11 January 9 added John Cattope Nicholas Martin Allie Stanford Nath Matthon Mary Birch Sybilla Lees John Woolmore	George Wenham Thomas Davenant Rich. Colgrave Eliz. Hutchinson John Croson
Thus 53 in all		

And on p. 49, he writes against an objection that baptism was for the Apostolic age only:

“Thirdly, it being given forth by command from Christ as hath been before proved, and being no where by the same authority made null must be still in force: The nulling of the ordinances of Christ is no where found in the scripture, therefore it is safe for those that believe in the Lord, and love his name to observe his will in all things; and if it be objected that antichrist hath made them null because there hath been a cessation for a time; I answer, that antichrist hath no authority to make null the ordinance of Christ, that is to give more power to antichrist than to Christ; it is true he may take them away, or pervert or destroy them for a time, but they are the saints privileges and they may seize on them as theirs; Christ is the same, and his commands are the same.”

Again, p. 58: “Object. 7. There hath been a cessation of the practice of ordinances a long time by reason of the apostasie, so that there is no succession; Therefore it is requisite that there should be some men extraordinarily gifted and called of God for the raising and renewing of the ordinances of Christ. Answ. First it’s true there hath been an apostasie, and by reason of that a cessation of the ordinances of Christ: So there was amongst the Jews in their Babylonish captivity, a type of the mystical Babylon and spiritual captivity of the saints, and ordinances of Christ under the gospel, but when the time of their deliverance was come, the Lord brought them forth, not by might nor by power, but by his Spirit, Zach. 4.6. So in the Spiritual deliverance now in the last days, we find the Lords work to be the same, not by might or power of signs and wonders, but by his Spirit: and indeed here is a great and precious work of the Lord to bring over souls to believe in him, and to follow him in the ministry of the gospel without signs and miracles, according to Christs words, John 20.29. and we shall find that when the Lord brought his people out of the material Babylon, he did not raise up any new Moses, but they found the book of the Law, and read in that, and so came to find out the mind of the Lord, and practised accordingly, and that with great joy too. Nehemiah the eighth throughout.”

“And thus hath God dealt with his people, notwithstanding the great apostasie and captivity, yet the Lord hath preserved the scriptures, the law and rule of saints, and hath given his Spirit the inlightnor and director of his people; we have as truly Christ and his Apostles, as they have Moses and the Prophets: it were well if it were more Saints joy, that the Lord hath dealt thus graciously with us, he hath not dealt so with all people, neither have they the knowledge of

his will; so that we are to have recourse to the scriptures, Christ being the same to us, as he was to the saints in the primitive times, we as truly having the mind of Christ, by his Apostles, as they, and the Apostles are truly our apostles, and the gospel of truth recorded by them, is ours who believe in Jesus, as truly as it was theirs; so that the saints by the light of the spirit coming to know the Lord, and believe in his name, are to do his will revealed in the Scriptures: and I know no reason why we should look for a succession of ordinances anymore than a succession of faith; if the Lord hath left us the Scriptures, and a ministry by which the Spirit worketh faith, this word and Ministry is sufficient for the practice of ordinances, Esay 8.20 Rev. 22.18”

Another earlier book of Queries in the year 1645 by the same author on p. 5 states:

“Ob. but here was true churches once before Popery, and these churches having been long coupled, our duty now is, to reform them, for we hold our church by succession from the primitive times, though much corrupted. An. Those that thus reason, much mistake themselves, for I deny the whole nation of England, that is, the people of the nation, ever to be the Church of Christ: but if ever here was true churches, as it is probable there were before popery came in these churches; when the Pope attained to his Papall dignity, who knows not, but that he then broke to pieces the churches, of the saints, ‘She maketh herself drunk with the blood of the saints, Rev. 17.6 and compells all to come and worship her, that is, to submit to her power, and to that government she sets up, and so makes all the people Christians, as they terme themselves, but the truth is, they are not Christians, they worship the beast: hence learne, that the power that establishes church government, and compells men thereunto, set themselves in the room of God, and they that submit unto them worship not God, but them, Rev. 13.4. Thus you may see who laid the foundation of your church, not Christ but Antichrist, it is in vaine for you to plead a church by Succession unless an Antichristian one.”

From these three witnesses and the three in the article we can readily understand Collins’ words not given by Ivimey: “Could not the ordinance of Christ, which was lost in the apostacy, be revived, (as the Feast of the Tabernacles was, tho lost a great while)...” to be to the same conclusion as the other Particular Baptists who made them - not as Ivimey concludes.

Another of Ivimey’s “matters of fact” is the so called Kiffen Ms. Kiffen may have written it as a matter of history, but Kiffen certainly was not of that opinion as Ivimey assumes. Kiffen, as well as Spillsbury, Patience, and Pearson signed the Preface to Daniel King’s Book, “The way to Zion Sought out and Found”, written in 1650, and besides what was quoted in the article, this is found on pp. 94-95:

“Ob. But peradventure all this will not prevail without a direct command from Christ to take up a lost ordinance.

Answ. There is no ordinance lost, but as to the world that were never found; for that which is in the scriptures, and revealed to be our duty, and we believe it, it is not lost: Therefore turn your eyes upon the commission, Mt. 28.29. and you shall find there (it being well weighed) a direct command for it. “Goe teach, baptizing them”: So that I conclude hence, that every Disciple that God hath enabled by his Spirit to Disciple men, or teach them may baptize them; for this is a joynt - commission, and bindeth as firmly, and giveth liberty as freely to the one as to the other. Now then, if none may baptize, none may preach, but one that hath the Spirit of God may preach by virtue of the Spirit, is cleare, Acts 10.47. And the text that I handle maketh it

good, "My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds seed, saith the Lord."

"Goe Teach all nations, baptizing them", Mark it how they are joyned; so that I conclude, if baptism and Doctrine and all had been lost utterly; Yet whensoever God by his Spirit stirred up any man to understand the truths in scripture, and to teach them, and by his teaching to draw men to believe, and embrace the same, hee might as lawfully Baptize as teach; and hath as large a promise of Christs presence to accompany him in doing the one, as in doing the other; and from the last V. "Teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you": It hath cleare footing; for Christ commanded them to teach and Baptize, and they were to teach those they converted all things that Christ commanded them, and whatsoever they taught is the duty of the Church to observe. And if shee may not take up one duty, because there is not a personal succession of men, or because men cannot work miracles; Shee may not take up another duty without such a succession, or such miracles; And then if a man be converted meerly by the wonderful power of God, without mans ministry, he may not pray, because hee was not set upon it by a praying man that had his gift by a personal succession from the apostles, or by miracles; but that is false, Acts 19.11. Saul that was converted by Christ himself speaking from heaven, and not by any praying man that had his gift by personal succession from the Apostles, or tha could work miracles; yet God testifieth before ever Ananias came to him, "behold he prayeth." Therefore if a man may set upon the use of one ordinance, without a personall succession, etc., he may set upon another to practice it also; Therefore I conclude hence, that as soon as believers see the Baptism of Believers, according to the institution of Christ, to be their duty; they may, nay they ought (upon paine of neglecting their duty) to take it up. Indeed, when the ordinance is afoote, then for Believers to make use of those under the ordinance to administer it, is to goe on in an orderly way: But this that I have spoken, vindicateth him, whosoever it were, that first saw the truth, and recovered this truth from under Anti-Christ, to beare him out in doing this duty, in Baptizing those believers that desire to partake of the ordinance."

Now it should be very clear to all that the same Kiffen who signed the preface of King's book, could have just as easily had told King of Blount going to Holland, where the ordinance was afoote, using those who were under the ordinance to administer it, going on in an orderly way (notice: not, the orderly way);, if such were the case, and could have saved King the trouble of vindicating him (whosoever it were - King does not name him) who first saw, recovered, and did his duty in Baptizing Believers. but Kiffen did not! The simple facts are: if Kiffen even knew of the so-called Kiffen Ms. and the assumption made from it, that was not his theology - he endorsed King's book.

Ivimey says on p. 138, "It is rather singular that Crosby should pay so little attention to his materials as to overlook these circumstances, and to confirm the common error respecting the origin of the Baptist Church..." Well, we could say to Ivimey, "Physician heal thyself," or else his blunder concerning Collins and Kiffen had not occurred. But what he does say about Spilsbury is true: "It is evident that these (Bount, Blacklock, etc.) were not Mr. Spilsbury's people," (Crosby, Ivimey, Armitage, Lofton, and Christian all agree on this point). And I might add: "or, any particular Baptist in those days, (recorded)". Ivimey concludes: "But as we are told that the greater number of Baptists, and the more judicious of them considered all this to be needless trouble, it is highly probable that this account refers to a few people, rather than to the Baptists in general." This is according to facts, if the account is true, and if the assumptions

concerning the account were true. Ivimey continues: "These observations are made for the purpose of explaining and reconciling matters of fact which have been generally mis-stated, and not as an apology for the conduct of our predecessors; since the Baptists of the present day (1811, D.G.) unite with the greater part, and the more judicious of that time in maintaining, that after a general corruption of Baptism, an unbaptized person may warrantable baptize, and so begin a reformation." This is almost the same thing I said in the second sentence of the article. Particular Baptists have never held Landmarkism, and as we saw before concerning the Kiffen Ms., Ivimey's assumptions are merely following Crosby's assumptions about Blunt's purpose in going to Holland. Blunt was in no way connected with the Particular Baptists, he is never mentioned one other time by his contemporaries.

Besides the four most prominent Baptists in England who wrote the preface in King's book (Patient, Spilsbury, Kiffen, Pearson), to further show the agreement among all the Particular Baptists on the subject of Church organization, baptism, etc., we will add the testimony of Spittlehouse, More, and Knollys who use the same language, the same wording, the same argument as King, to make the same points.

King:

"And to make this more clear, consider the church is compared to a tree; and all Believers, Members, Officers, ordinances and duties are but as so many fruites of the tree. John 15,16. I have chosen you (saith Christ) and ordained you, that you should goe and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain. He alludeth to Matth. 28,19, teach all nations, etc. Hee meaneth that they should goe and convert soules, and plant churches, and set up ordinances according to the mind of Christ, that so he may have fruit in all the wayes of obedience from his people. Now then an ordinance ceasing by reason of some obstruction, where should it center, but into the sappe, the Spirit of Christ, dispensed to the church from Christ, and that centers into Christ the true root: And whensoever Christ dispenceth that again into the body, as in a Springtime, how can it but flourish and bear fruit again; which fruit is to set up all the wayes of obedience to Christ according to his word.

"Now a tree has divers acceptations in scripture; but to wave them all, and to prove that in hand; that the church is compared to a tree. Exod. 3. 2,3,4,7. It is compared to a bush that burnt and did not consume and the Lord called to Moses, and said Mosses, Moses, and hee said here am I etc. and then Mark verse 7. God doth expound this sight that Moses saw; I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters, for I know their sorrows; So that the bush was the Church, the burning was the burthens in the brick-hill in Egypt; the bush not consuming, was God's preserving the church, notwithstanding their sorrows that they lay under. And in Jer. 11,16,17 the church of the Jews is compared to an Olive tree. The Lord called thy name a green olive tree, faire, and of goodly fruity, Hosea 14.6. Israel is compared to an olive-tree, Ezek. 1.16. All along the chapter, the Jews are compared to a vine - tree: so that you can see the church is compared to a tree, and the members of the church are compared to Branches. Rom. 11.27.

"Now taking trees and branches in this sense: The preaching of the gospel being as the rind where the sap runneth into every brance out of the foot; and whensoever Christ conveyeth the sap of the Spirit of life into his church after any decay, it must needs freshen and set afoot the ordinances as well as the Members and Officers, which are fruits of this tree, else there could not be a correspondence in the things compared, which is the church compared to a tree." (A Way to Zion, Etc. - King, pp. 93-94).

Spittlehouse AND MORE:

(commenting on the following phrase by an objecter - that the gospel - frame of gospel - government is to be restored by some one man, etc.)

“For what need is there of restoring that by any one man when the aforesaid church hath power to doe it (when need requireth) of, and by itwelf, the church of Christ being as a tree (Psal. 1.3) whose seed is in it self: Now experience teacheth us, that a tree so planted as aforesaid, albeit in the autumnallor winter season, it become seemingly dead, by being deprived of its outward ornaments of leaves and fruit (which is procured by the coldness of the season, which causeht the sap to shrink down into the root) yet the like experience doth also teach us, that at the spring - times the aforesaid sap or moisture, being exhaled again by virtue of the heat of the sun, doth furnish the same tree again with its like natural ornaments of leaves and fruit, and that of, and from itself. “So put the case that during the autumanall or winter season of the Anti-christian persecution of the church of Christ, it might be deprived of its aforesaid ornaments of order and form of worship, yet the root and the tree being preserved (vis. the word of God as the root, and the saints as the tree, wherein the aforesaid order and form of worship have been retained, during the aforesaid time) hath by virtue and power of the Sun of righteousness shining upon it (at the time of its aproach out of its aforesaid condition) even as much poser to furnish itself with its spirituall ornament of order and form of worship, and that without anyother artificall help whatsoever, as the aforesaid tree hath to produce its own leaves and fruit.” (A Vindication of the continued Succession of the Primitive Church of Jesus Christ (now scandalously termed Anabaptists) from the Apostles Unto this Present Time, p. 28, John Spittlehouse and John More, 1652).

King:

“We do not affirme that every common Disciple may dispence Baptisme, or any other Ordinance in the church, But that a disciple able to preach the gospel may dispence it, that we affirme, it being no where in scripture tyed to any officer, either Pastor, Teacher, Elder, Deacon, or any other: but to Disciples as Dieciples preaching the gospel, are commanded also to Baptise, Matt. 28:19. Beside, we do not affirme that every common Disciple able to preach neither, may dispence Baptisme; for women are Disciples, Acts 1:14, and some of them able to preach the Gospel as Prissilla Acts 18, yet we do not afirme that women may Baptise; But a disciple able to preach the Gospel, and moreover chosen and design’d of the church thereunto, who hath power to elect and choose administrators and officers, in and of herself; and so he is something more than a common Disciple in this, though he be no pastor neither: And see the 13 exceptions against the Seekers, where it saith, that there is no such power for ordinances as is pretended, but believers as Disciples my administer, and so did the Apostles and believers formerly as they were Disciples, Mat. 10.1 compared with Mat. 18.13. John 8.31. If ye continue in my word then are ye Disciples indeed. (Ibid, p. 123).

Knollys:

“We do not affirm, that every common Disciple may baptise, there was some mistake in laying down our opinions, Page 14. Where it is conceived, that we hold whatsoever Disciple can teach the word, or make out Christ may Baptise and administer other ordinances. We do not so, for though believing women being Baptised are Disciples, Acts 9:36, and can make out Christ yea, some of them (by their experimental knowledge and Spiritual understanding of the ways order and faith of the gospel) may be able to instruct their teachers, acts 18:26, Rom. 16:3, yet we do not hold, that a woman may preach, baptise, nor administer other ordinances. Nor do we judge it meet for any brother to baptise, or administer other ordinances; unless he have received such gifts of the Spirit as fitteth, or enableth him, to preach the gospel. And these gifts being first tried by, and known to the Church, such a brother is chosen, and appointed thereunto by the surrage of the Church.” (The Shining of a Flaming Star in Zion, p. 9).

Now, keeping in mind, these were not new converts looking for scriptural baptism, or authority to begin churches - these were already companies of antipedobaptists dissenters with Pastors who had come to correct views on Baptism by immersion; hence, their vindications for their practices. They were not Ana-Baptists, only “scandously” so-called. They were dissenters from the dissenters. The fifth heading in Spilbury’s book, written 1642, states: “The covenant, and not Baptism, form the church and the manner how.”

So also King - endorsed by Patient, Spilbury, Kiffen, Pearson:

“Now the church being proved to be the greater, must needs give being to ordinances, which are the lesser; for the church was not made for ordinances, but ordinances for the church, as Christ says of the sabbath, in another case.”

Spittlehouse and More:

“The church has even as much power to furnish itself with its spiritual ornaments of order and form of worship – without any artificial help whatsoever.”

Knollys:

The gifted brother “first tried by, and known to the church, such a brother is chosen, and appointed thereunto by the surrage of the church.”

This is all completely backward from the Landmark doctrine: first Baptism that gives being to churches, that gives being to Ministers, that gives being to authority, that gives being to baptism.

APPENDIX II

Concerning John Gill's writings of Baptism (Body of Divinity, 1896):

"Not a church ordinance." "When I say it is not a church ordinance, I mean it is not an ordinance administered in the church, but out of it, and in order to admission into it, and communion with it; it is preparatory to it, and a qualification for it, it does not make a person a member of a church, or admit him into a visible church... Admission to baptism lies solely in the breast of the administrator, who is the only judge of qualifications for it, and has the sole power of receiving to it, and of rejecting from it; if not satisfied, he may reject a person thought fit by a church, and admit a person to baptism not thought fit by a church; but a disagreement is not desirable nor adviseable: The orderly, regular, scriptural rule of proceeding seems to be this; a person inclined to submit to baptism, and to join in communion with a church, should first apply to an administrator; and upon giving him satisfaction, be baptized by him; and then should propose to the church for communion; when he would be able to answer all proper questions: if asked, to give a reason of the hope that is in him, he is ready to do it; if a testimony of his life and conversation is required, if none present can give it, he can direct where it is to be had; and if the question is put to him, whether he is a baptized person or not, he can answer in the affirmative, and give proof of it, and so the way is clear for his admission into Church- fellowship."

To bad poor Gill did not understand "Church Truth" (says the Landmarker). What about "baptized into one body"? Or Church authority? "Too Bad Gill was so weak in this area"! But I would like to give three earlier witnesses than Gill, and one later, to this same teaching - the reader can judge who is out of step - the Landmarkers or Baptists practice.

The unlimited Authority of Christ's Disciples cleared - Kilcop, 1651:

"Scripture doth not clear church gathering, without ministries and Baptism preceding." I answer, True, and we by the aforesaid ministerie were converted, and were also baptized, before we congregated. P. 16,17.

"John preacht and baptized; and in so doing began the gospel. Mar. 1,2,3,4 before a gospel church had a being, also though these had been of a visible church. Yet now their church-state was broken by persecution, yea all people were preacht to, and baptized, before they became a visible church." P. 29.

Some Serious Reflexions on the Part of Mr. Bunions Confessions of Faith, Wm. Kiffen, 1673:

"Ananias, a certain disciple, baptized Paul; (and not an apostle). Peter commanded Cornelius, and those that were with him, to be baptized: but

Brethren that came with him: neither can it reasonably be supposed that the 3000 converted by Peter's sermon, Acts 2 was all baptized by him, or the apostles only; but it is very like they had many administrators, which doth not at all intrench upon the great commission of Christ, but is found in it; it being given to preaching Disciples, as preaching disciples and all preaching Disciples have authority from thence, to preach and Baptize; (These being properly no church ordinances) though in order to it. PP. 39-40.

41st Article of the 1st London Confession, 1643:

"The persons designed by Christ, to dispence this ordinance (Baptism), 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."

Baptism, and the Terms of Communion: An Argument, Richard Fuller, 1850:

"When urging the covenant of circumcision, our opponents call baptism the seal. In the present argument they call it the door to the visible church," an assertion which contains almost as many errors as words. Baptism is never represented in the Bible as a door. It is no more a door than it is a window or a chimney. Baptism is an act of personal obedience, by which a believer publicly confesses Christ. It does not initiate anybody into any church. P. 146.

"Baptism is, indeed, one of the prerequisites to membership in any of the visible churches, and in our churches the candidate generally comes before the church previously to his baptism, because this saves the trouble of a subsequent examination. But a minister may baptize, as Phillip did, without consulting any church. It is his work, and not that of the church. P. 147.

"While Baptism is a personal individual act, by which we confess Christ, the Lord's supper is a social ordinance, belonging to the visible churches, and to be observed by those churches as churches." P. 183.

APPENDIX III

Morgan, Rev. Abel, was of Welsh descent, and was born at Welsh Tract, Del., April 18, 1713. He was baptized when about twenty years of age, and was soon afterwards ordained. He had laid the foundation of the learning which he subsequently evinced at the academy in Pencador. In 1739 he took charge of the church in Meddletown, M.J., and continued there until his death, in 1785. The period of his life was an important one, and he was equal to the work demanded from him. His influence and the history of the denomination in New Jersey and America are inseparably connected. He had a good judgment, unusual literary attainments, a logical mind, and a very valuable library. He was powerful in debate; he was also unsparing in labor by night and by day. In his old springless cart he rode long distances to preach Jesus. Dr. Jones, in his century sermon, called him "the incomparable Morgan." Edwards says of him, "He was not a custom divine, nor a leading-string divine, but a BIBLE DIVINE." He was on different occasions challenged to debate on doctrine, and always maintained his position. In 1742 there was a great revival at Cape May, in which Baptist and Presbyterian ministers preached. Too many of the converts "took to the water" to suit the Presbyterians. Mr. Morgan accepted a challenge from Rev. Samuel Finley, afterwards president of Princeton College, to discuss the baptismal question. He gained a signal triumph. Mr. Finley tried his pen, and wrote "A Charitable Plea for the Speechless." Mr. Morgan had a reply printed, under the title "Anti-Paedo Rantism, or Mr. Samuel Finley's Charitable Plea for the Speechless examined and refuted, the Baptism of Believers maintained, and the Mode of it by Immersion vindicated, by Abel Morgan, of Middletown, in East Jersey. Philadelphia, printed by B. Franklin, in Market Street. MDCCXLVII." This little work is so valuable and scarce that it sells for \$12.00 or more.

As a patriot, his trumpet gave no uncertain sound. Even while the royal troops were moving through his neighborhood, after the battle of Monmouth, he was outspoken. The next Sunday he had for his text, "Who gave Jacob for a spoil and Israel to the robbers?" He says in his diary, that the Sunday after that, "Preached in mine own barn, because the enemy had taken out all the seats in the meeting house." He baptized many persons, and was the means of converting and edifying many more. He wrote some of the most important documents issued by the Philadelphia Association, and was frequently called by it to preach and preside. His many manuscripts, neatly written, show careful preparation, sound doctrine, and practical application. The inscription upon his plain tombstone at Middletown is, "In memory of Able Morgan, pastor of the Baptist church at Middletown, who departed this life Nov. 24, 1785, in the 73rd year of his age. His life was blameless, his ministry was powerful; he was a burning and shining light, and his memory is dear to the saints." (Baptist Encyclopedia, Cathcart, 1881).

The following is the last page of this book:

"We are persuaded, notwithstanding anything our author may endeavour to throw at our Ministers or our practice, that we stand on as good ground, as other Protestants do: and we think with the Reverend Mr. Davison afore-mentioned, that a succession of the Apostles Doctrine believed and received by a people of any nation, and being satisfied of one another's Graces and principles, and being thereupon united together by mutual Covenant, to promote the glory of God, and the mutual advantage of each others souls, and the good of others, in the public

worship of God; we say, such a community, have sufficient authority from Christ, to call and constitute whom they shall judge qualified, to minister among them in Holy things. This being agreeable to the true Protestant principle, upon which the whole Reformation was built. Upon this Protestant principle we satisfy ourselves, that our churches have in them sufficient to give our ministers as valid a mission as other Protestants have; and a regular right and claim to preach the gospel, and to administer the sacred ordinances according to the Lord's pure institution, without going to Rome; or else where, for it, and without wanting for a new commission from heaven, to renew and restore them (as our Author vainly insinuates) for we esteem the commisssion, Mat. XXVIII. 19.20. Mark XVI:15,16. as still in force.

I shall not trouble myself at present, with anything further in the said pamphlet, but advise the Author (if living) not to make further use of old Romish Clamours; and if he is a minister of any Reformed Church, to be more sparing of his flings, least he find them to his himself, and he be found sapping the grounds of the whole Reformation, by his zealous endeavouring to defend a Scriptureless Practice." P. 174.

Was this great man a Landmarker? Why did the Philadelphia Association use him so extensively, if they were Landmark? He was non-sectarian as was the Association.

APPENDIX IV

– EKKLESIA FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

Baptists, as our name suggests, and as thousands of works from the same have proved, are sticklers for literal word meanings. To baptize means to immerse, period - nothing more, nothing less. Whom do we baptize? Believers, nothing more, nothing less. Baptists have won this argument hands down; see Gale, Gill, Booth, Carson, Conant, D.B. Ford, and Robertson. But only since the days of J.R. Graves (which he also admits) have Baptists from the Landmark side made such an issue of the word meaning of ekklesia: Local only, nothing more, nothing less. Why were “True” and “real” Baptists so slow in taking up this issue? All of the above named Baptists believed both the broad and the narrow sense of ekklesia, Graves not excepted as we have seen. The local church only theory, is the main pillar of Landmarkism, and ekklesia to them means assembly or congregation - nothing more, nothing less.

One of their chief arguments is that the Septuagint, always translates the Hebrew qahal by ekklesia whenever they thought it was obvious that the narrow sense of qahal was meant. Qahal does have a broad sense as well as the narrow. the following from Hoeksema are the facts of the matter:

Whether the LXX translators, always were consistant is open to dispute but clearly it was their intent to translate qahal by ekklesia whenever the narrow sense of qahal was apparent (and even B.H. Carroll and Jesse B. Thomas agreed qahal was used in the broad and narrow sense). But the LXX translators were not inspired - they were no more “Borne along” by the Holy Spirit than were the King James translators. The Hebrew qahal and edhah were the inspired Hebrew words not the LXX translation. So consider!

“Our Lord undoubtedly spoke in Aramaic” (Hebrew) (Broadus, Commentary on Matthew, p. 355).

“Christ using Aramaic, probalby used in Mt. 18. He took his idea of the church from it, not from the heathen use of the word ekklesia which expresses the notion of locality and state much more than . . . the larger sense of ekklesia is the primary.” (Andrews by Strong, Theo. p.892).

“Christ and the Apostles spoke it (Aramaic), as may be seen from several words and phrases occurring in the New Testament.” (Schaff and Herzog Encyclopedia; see also McClintock and Strong, Eyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature).

“It is not certain whether Jesus used the word qahal or edhah, each of which is used commonly in the Old Testament of Israel as God’s people.” (Commenting on Mt. 16:18, Ladd, a Theology of the N.T. p. 892).

If the Lord used qahal or edhah ekklesia must take the same meaning as the Hebrew, and not the Hebrew from the Greek! i.e., both the broad and narrow sense, and Baptists have always

believed up until the Landmark age that the two places the Lord used the term during his earthly ministry (Mt. 16:18 and Mt. 18:17) he did just that.

For the LXX to have any authority it must be quoted in the New Testament by the inspired apostles, and there is only one quotation, Heb. 2:12, that bears upon our subject: "Saying in the midst of the church (ekklesia) I will sing praise unto thee"; and which quote taken in the context and studied as a unit declares:

"In the first section of the epistle he begins by quoting seven passages which demonstrate the deity of Christ in His superiority over all created intelligencies principally the angelic order. He continues by quoting from Psalm 8 and applying it to Christ, so as to demonstrate His superiority over the first man as it relates to dominion over the material creation. He then continues in the same vein (2:11-18) by quoting from Psalm 22 and Isaiah 18 to show that Christ is superior to both Satan and death, having achieved a victory over them. Having followed this method into the beginning of the third chapter the writer then draws his conclusion. Here the "house" of Moses stands in stark contrast to the "house" of Christ, and the term "house" represents a group of people similar to qahal or ekklesia. Both the "house" of Moses and the "house" of Christ may be labeled as "The people of the Lord." (Good, Are Baptists Reformed? p. 144).

Significantly enough the first time qahal is used in scripture, Gen. 28:3 (and there is a law of first mention) where the Abrahamic covenant was given to Jacob, "That thou mayest be a company (qahal) or Peoples", in the same chapter when Jacob reached Bethel the Lord told him: "In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed", and Jacob said "This is the house of God and the gate of heaven"; and the only direct quotation from the LXX containing ekklesia (Heb. 2:12) also contains the context contrasting the house of Moses from the house of Christ". The qahal and ekklesia Christ said he would build (Mt. 16:18) is the same house Paul said Christ built (Heb. 3); the same house of which Jacob referred resulting from the work of the promised "seed" (Gal. 3:16), is the promised qahal of the Abrahamic covenant - the Spiritual, redeemed people of Christ, for Christ is that ladder Jacob saw at Bethel, reaching into heaven, angels descending and ascending on it (John 1:51).

So the King James translators were wise in keeping with the Geneva translators in retaining "church" instead of "congregation" and "Baptize" instead of "washing", etc. Here are their words:

"Lastly, wee haue on the one side auoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes, who leaue the olde Ecclesiasticall words, and betake them to other, as when they put, washing for, Baptisme, and, congregation instead of, church: as also on the other side we haue shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their, Azimes, Tunike, Rational Holocausts, Prapuce, Pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may bee kept from being vnderstood. But we desire that the Scripture may speake like it selfe, as in the language of, Canaan, that it may bee vnderstood euen of the very vulgar." (The Translators to the Reader; A facsimile of the A.V., 1611).

This is why they did it, not according to any “Rules” the King laid down, but as in the “Language of Canaan,” “Church” means “The Lords”; and qahal or edhah according to the language of Canaan simply does not have the strict, narrow meaning the Landmarks seek to put on ekklesia.

So really, where is the Landmark argument from the Septuagint? There is not a Landmarker in the world who can say that Christ used the Greek ekklesia and not qahal or edhah in Mt. 16:18 - nor if He did that He meant it in the strict, local sense of qahal or edhah, for both words do also have a broad sense; they can only arbitrarily dogmatically state their opinion - but it is, only that, their opinion, no proof.